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Based on the Award-Winning Play
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NEW REQUIREMENTS for cinema and video advertising came into effect from 1 May 1989, and apply to all cinema and video releases classified after that date. The requirements deal with advertising on the front and back of video covers, video cassettes, posters, newspaper advertisements and other material, advertising films or videos. The classification categories, the symbols, the age information and the category descriptions are as follows:

- **G** For General Exhibition
- **PG** Parental Guidance Recommended For Persons Under 15 Years
- **M** 15+ Recommended For Mature Audiences 15 Years And Over
- **R** 18+ Restricted To Adults 18 Years And Over
- **X** 18+ Restricted To Adults 18 Years And Over

A new scheme which requires advice about the content of a film to be displayed on film posters, along with more information about the film categories, comes into effect on 1 May 1989. The new developments will make it easier for parents to have greater participation in the selection and supervision of material they wish their children to watch.

Under the scheme, information about the classification and content of videos will be clearly marked in a 20-millimetre band across the bottom of the cover. The new requirements apply to all films and videos classified after 1 May.

The new markings and advertising requirements followed a report by the Joint Select Committee on Video Materials to the Parliament in April last year. The Committee recommended, among other things, that more information should be available about the content of films and videos to allow those intending to see them to make better informed choices. The Committee also recommended that more information should be provided about age suitability.

The PG category will carry the explanation “Parental guidance recommended for persons under 15 years” and the M category will carry the sign 15+ in addition to the explanation “Recommended for mature audiences 15 years and over”.

The restricted category, in addition to the R symbol will carry the sign 18+ and the explanation “Restricted to adults 18 years and over”. This additional information will appear on all large posters for films and in the larger newspaper advertisements. The smaller advertisements will have the classification categories and signs more prominently displayed than they are at present. All films and videos classified after 1 May other than those classified for General Exhibition would indicate the age categories recommended by the film Censorship Board.

There will be additional consumer advice on videos and in advertisements to inform viewers, and parents in particular, of the stronger elements which warrant a particular classification. The markings on the front of video covers will be prominently displayed and the classification will be clearly marked on the video cassette itself.

### FILM VICTORIA'S MISSION IMPOSSIBLE

Sixteen episodes of the adventure series *Mission: Impossible* will be filmed in Victoria later this year, in a joint venture between Paramount and the National Nine Network. *Mission: Impossible* had previously been filmed in Queensland. The production company, McMahon-Lake, Australian Film Studios and local unions co-operated in producing a major submission to Paramount, following a trip to Los Angeles by a Film Victoria team earlier this year.

LEFT: John Calvin as Doyle and Shannon Meredith in *Mission: Impossible*. 

---

**1989 National Screenwriters' Conference**

This year's four-day residential conference will be held at Queenscliff in Victoria from Thursday 21 to Sunday 24 September. Negotiations are underway to bring four overseas writers to join the Australian industry executives and entrepreneurs as official speakers.

The conference will provide masterclasses, workshops and panel debates on the radical changes facing Australia’s film and television industries including amendments to the Broadcasting Tribunal regulations, the advent of pay TV, “internationalism” and film financing. Registration numbers are limited to 190 on a first-come first-served basis. For further information, contact the director, Ellen McArthur, on (03) 489 3239

---

**Melbourne Spoleto Writers' Festival**

The 1989 Melbourne Spoleto Writer’s Festival will focus on the relationship literature and writers have with other art forms.

The program includes forums; debates; indoor and outdoor cafe readings; informal discussions and meet-the-author sessions; interviews; exhibitions; book launches, social activities; “a schools” program; a seminar on self-publishing; and music. Some of the international guests include Andre Brink, Marilyn Duckworth, Maxine Hong Kingston, Keri Hulme, Bernice Rubens and Luisa Valenzuela. The Festival will run from 13 – 19 September at the Kino Cinema, Melbourne.
WITH ALL THAT PRAYING and rallying and preparation for martyrdom we hear so much about on the television now, it’s hard to imagine the people of Iran have much time for the cinema. But apparently they do: according to The Economist, upwards of 2 million movie tickets are sold every day in Iran, mainly to unemployed men who tend to sit in the cinemas from eleven in the morning till nine at night. Mostly (63% in 1985), they watch Iranian films.

Two Iranian films screened at the recent Hong Kong International Film Festival: The Pedlar, directed by Mohsen Makhmalbaf (1987) and The Spell, directed by Dariush Farhang (1988).

The Pedlar is actually three short films in one. The first is about the desperate efforts of a poor couple, all of whose children are badly handicapped, to give away their newborn baby to someone who can take better care of it. The second is a surreal tale of a middle-aged man’s emotionally-charged relationship with his ancient, dictatorial, psycho-wor­thy mother. The third is a tense, gangster shoot-up. The subject matter is heavy, but the treatment is gently ironic, even humorous at times. I admit to being somewhat surprised by the frank portrayal of poverty and misery in The Pedlar, and, despite the fact it was made by the forbiddingly-named Arts Bureau for the Propagation of Islamic Thought, by the absence of any obvious religious (or political) message.

In The Spell, a family marries off its beloved daughter to the son of its enemies as “blood money”. On their wedding night, the unhappy couple become lost in the woods. They take refuge in the palace of a bitter and lonely aristocrat. They discover that the aristocrat’s wife, whom he believes died on their wedding night years before, is being kept alive — in her tattered wedding gown (and under layers of white powder for that “wan” effect) — in the dungeon by his unfaithful servant. The butler did do it! This is a real gothic piece, complete with high melodrama, secret passageways and great thundersstorms.

The Economist, which seems to know an awful lot about these films, assures us that “fooling the censor is a favourite technique in both films”. Was the dialogue in The Pedlar clipped just so that the censors couldn’t read anything into it? Is the family feud in The Spell an allegory for the Iran-Iraq war and the old aristocrat a Khomeini figure? It’s all a bit baffling to the uninitiated.  

LINDA JAIVIN

PASS THE POPCORN, MOHAMMED

The prizes at the 42nd Cannes Film Festival were awarded as follows:

PALME D’OR
Sex, Lies and Videotape
Steven Soderbergh (USA)

SPECIAL GRAND PRIZE OF THE JURY
Too Beautiful For You
(Bertrand Blier, France)

AND
New Cinema Paradiso
(Giuseppe Tornatore, Italy)

BEST DIRECTOR
Emir Kusturica,
Time of the Gypsies (Yugoslavia)

BEST ACTOR
James Spader
Sex, Lies and Videotape (USA)

BEST ACTRESS
Meryl Streep
A Cry in the Dark (Australia)

BEST ARTISTIC CONTRIBUTION
Mystery Train, Jim Jarmusch (USA)

JURY PRIZE
Jesus of Montreal
Denys Arcand (Canada)

CAMERA D’OR
My Twentieth Century
Ildiko Enyedi (Hungary)

TECHNICAL PRIZE
Shohei Imamura, Black Rain

AUSTRALIAN FILM FINANCE CORPORATION FUNDING DECISIONS: MARCH - MAY 1989


M ARG ILYN L I V ES

Marilyn Monroe Australian Fan Club has recently been formed by Jane Guy. The Club will publish six newsletters a year and new members will receive a set of six Marilyn Monroe postcards. A yearly subscription costs $20. For further information send a self-addressed envelope to: Australian Fan Club, 41 Chapel Street, Prahran, Victoria 3181.

LEFT: Marilyn photographed in 1952 by Philippe Halsman for her first of nine LIFE covers.
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GETTING IT STARTED: THE PRODUCERS. *The Delinquents* has not been an easy project to get into production. For producers Alex Cutler and Michael Wilcox, it began almost by accident four years ago. They were trying to acquire the rights to another Australian novel, and were having difficulty coming to an agreement with the author. It was suggested to them that they also have a look at a novel Penguin would shortly be reissuing that was set in the same period.

*The Delinquents*, by Australian author Criena Rohan, had been published in London in 1962, a year before her early death. The sharp and tender story of Fifties teenagers, with its downtown Romeo and Juliet, Brownie and Lola, was exactly what they had in mind.

Criena Rohan was the pseudonym of Deirdre Cash, born in 1925, the daughter of a poet and Marxist, Leo Cash, and a singer, Valerie Cash. Barrett Reid, in his introduction to the reissued *Delinquents*, says that she was “beautiful, bohemian, never far from being ill, witty, loved a good story, and revelled in the human drama; and she was not above assisting drama to a decent climax if things got too slow.” She first started to write when she was 18, but *The Delinquents* was not published until 1962, the year before her death from cancer. A second novel, *Down by the Dockside*, was published posthumously, and a third, *House with the Golden Door*, has been lost.

“We fell in love with it almost immediately and we negotiated a deal with Penguin virtually on the same day,” Alex Cutler says. “And then we struggled and suffered for a long time.” Once they had acquired the rights, they spent two years developing the project, until a chance remark at a David Bowie press conference in October 1987 gave it a new visibility.

Bowie had been asked what his future film plans were. He replied that he was interested in a book he had recently read, and was trying to find out who owned the rights. The book was *The Delinquents*.

“And so the following morning the project went from total obscurity to front-page interest,” Alex Cutler says. Bowie made contact with Cutler and Wilcox and told them of his enthusiasm for the book. “He had the same emotional reaction to the novel that we had. He loved it, and he wanted to see it get made. He was quite prepared to become involved with other people, but it took a bit of time for us to find out whether we wanted to go in the same direction, but once we determined that we shook hands on an association. We got a fair amount of unsolicited publicity because of that and it put the project on the agenda for a lot of people.”

Bowie is working on the soundtrack, but his reported involvement was considerably greater: stories that he would star in the film or function as producer have been doing the rounds. “A lot of it has been misinformation and distortion, especially reports of him pulling...
out,” Alex Cutler says. “But that is because a lot of people expected him to be in it as an actor.”

After acquiring the rights, Wilcox and Cutler set about the long process of bringing the book to the screen: getting a script and getting backers. “One of the things we struggled most with was the question of track record,” Wilcox says. “We were constantly met with queries about our track record and it always bemused us because we felt that track record had something to do with being successful rather than how many films you had done.”

Cutler adds: “We came from a different orientation from that of most new independent filmmakers. We had largely commercial backgrounds, we were both lawyers, and therefore naturally regarded with suspicion because we all know” - he says, with deliberate irony - “lawyers are not creative.”

Cutler, an American, was business affairs manager at the Grundy Organization and then worked for Hoyts on the distribution, financing and marketing of a number of Hoyts-Edgley productions, including *An Indecent Obsession*, *Burke and Wills*, *Coolangatta Gold* and *One Night Stand*. Wilcox was a business affairs manager for McElroy, working on projects like *The Tear of Living Dangerously*, *Razorback*, *Return to Eden* and *The Last Frontier*.

They took the Delinquents project to the then New South Wales Film Corporation for script development money for the first draft, on which Lex Marinos worked. Cutler says: “In retrospect, what happened there was probably going to be indicative of the way things went thereafter. They liked the novel too, But they said it was a very difficult adaptation, and when we delivered the first draft they said, ‘Yes, this confirms our fears that this is a highly difficult novel to adapt and we don’t think that you can live up to the earlier work.’”

Cutler and Wilcox then went to the Australian Film Commission (AFC), which was “interested enough to keep us coming back - modify this, change that ... They really spent a lot of time on the project, considering they didn’t put any money into it for some period of time,” according to Cutler.

It was David Bowie’s unscheduled enthusiasm that “rekindled the AFC’s interest”, as Michael Wilcox puts it. Script development assistance enabled playwright and poet Dorothy Hewett to come on the scene and work on a second draft.

PUTTING THE DEAL TOGETHER: THE EXECUTIVE PRODUCER. Cutler and Wilcox took the project to the Village Roadshow Pictures a year ago. John Tarnoff, executive vice-president in charge of production at Village Roadshow Pictures, was interested in the idea, and had tried to work out a deal, but it was not until he and Greg Coote joined Village Roadshow from Island in October 1988 that things started to move.

Tarnoff recalls. “We decided to make this not just a small Australian picture, but a picture with international value and impact, and the way to do this was to ‘cast it up’. It was Greg’s suggestion that we try Kylie, which we did. (The producers had already thought of Minogue.) I knew her manager, Terry Blarney, from a prior transaction: I gave him the script, he and Kylie read it and immediately came back to us and said they were interested.”

Tarnoff, who came to Australia when de Laurentiis was setting up its Australian arm, is eloquent about Village Roadshow Pictures’ plans. It aims to establish a niche as an international production company based in Los Angeles that can “do projects in Australia and elsewhere, where we can take advantage of the fact that as an international company with international connections and financing and distribution, we can bring projects back to the American distributors at savings to them, nevertheless maintaining the quality of production.”

He says : “What I find really exciting about working here and working with these folks is the international potential. I think what has happened now in the business in the States over the two years is that we have seen the independents going out of business, and the ones that haven’t gone out of business are madly scrambling to figure out a way of staying afloat.

“What Wall Street doesn’t understand is that the movie business really isn’t like any other business - we’re not manufacturing door-handles here, it is a really difficult business to survive in, to start up, particularly now with the way that distribution works. You really have to be a major studio, or major distribution company in order to survive. You have to have the established track record, the established distribution system and distribution relationships to the exhibitors, and you have to have the library and the ancillary sources of money to keep you going over the long haul. The other side is that if you are Paramount and all your pictures are out there making lots of money,
ability to deal with these territories gives us the opportunity to raise
arena. Europe is now its own market; Japan and the Far East is a very
big, growing market; having access to these markets and having
the ability to deal with these territories gives us the opportunity to raise
we'll make it for you, we'll cashflow it and we'll bring certain things
project themselves, and perhaps the answer lies in the international
want to do. We can come in and say, 'OK, we'll take the responsibility,
majors have - I mean, they aren't going to be able to make every
project themselves, and perhaps the answer lies in the international
area. Europe is now its own market; Japan and the Far East is a very
big, growing market; having access to these markets and having
the ability to deal with these territories gives us the opportunity to raise
a substantial proportion of money.

"I think the Australian filmmaking community is wonderful, but I think they are going through a
difficult time right now - there seems to be an identity crisis going on through the community
here right now, this kind of "post-10BA blues". I think it's a challenging time and a lot of people will
probably go out of business. And other people, who have the savvy and the creativity and the
perseverance to make it through will emerge. And I think a better product will emerge out of that.
There is a real problem of quality with the 10BA years, the decline of quality in those films. This is
the problem when you are not making films for an
audience but are making films for tax reasons. It
happened in Canada and it was disastrous for the
Canadian film industry - it has not recovered.
Canada now is being used as a location for Ameri­
can films, and the same Canadian filmmakers who
were working before are working now, but as an
opportunity for the Canadian film industry it was
disastrous. I hope the same thing is not going to
happen in Australia, I hope Australian filmmakers
are more able to pick up the pieces.

"I think the FFC is great but I also think it will
only be able to apply to a relatively small group of
films - not just in terms of how they're funded; I'm
talking not just of theatrical films now, I'm talking
in terms of television content and non-theatrical
content - I mean, those are of great value. I worry
that there's a little bit of "Catch 22" in that the
FFC tries on the one hand to ensure that the films
to have an Australian content; on the other
hand they need to have presales; and one may
exclude the other.

"We have been fortunate in that we have
properties which because of the way they are put
together and because of the nature of the projects,
have international marketability. How many of
those projects are there out there? Hopefully there
will be a lot but I think they are hard to come by.

The leads in The Delinquents have clear inter­
national marketability, but they entail certain
changes to the original characters. Lola, in the
book, is a Eurasian girl. ["My name is really
Lexus," Lola tells her young lover, Brownie. "But
mother always calls me Lola. She says it is enough
to have Eastern blood without an Eastern name."]

Culter and Wilcox say that they had thought of Minogue for the
role at an early stage. Wilcox says: "We weren't close enough to
financing the film at that stage to make overtures and commitments.
But we thought she was going to be an extraordinarily big star; and
even though Lola was written as a Eurasian character, we never saw
her trauma as being derived from her ethnic background. This was
not a story about racial discrimination, it was a story about oppression
because of non-conformity, of what happens when young kids don't
conform to the values of their parents and the values of society.

"The other aspect was that in the book Lola starts off at 13 and
go through to 21. We needed an actress who could play very young
and very innocent, and on the other hand be a mature woman."

In finding a male lead, they looked to the one place where, as
Michael Wilcox puts it, "Kylie is not a megastar - domestic US". As
Lola's lover Brownie, a drifter with a love of the sea, American actor
Charlie Schlatter has been cast. He has appeared in Bright Lights, Big
City and 18 Again.

"When that role was being considered," Michael Wilcox says,
"Warner Brothers started showing considerable interest in the film
and in those circumstances where you have an American major
becoming very interested in US domestic distribution, or world
distribution in this case, they naturally take a view that some elements
have got to have marketing value." Brownie is of Norwegian extrac-
tion, but this could be changed, Wilcox says, arguing that the important things about the character were that he wanted to go to sea, and that he was a drifter and an outsider. "Mind you," he adds, there have been instances of Australian films using imported elements where it has been totally grating and totally inappropriate. But I believe you can employ an American actor and make it work."

Village Roadshow Pictures made a commitment to half the budget of the picture, and an application to the Film Finance Corporation was made in October 1988.

"We got an approval on specified terms and conditions at the beginning of January 1989," Wilcox says. The film was due to go into pre-production shortly after this: but, according to Alex Cutler, Village Roadshow "was faced with cashflowing the production pending the resolution or execution of agreements, because the FFC wouldn't spend the money, or didn't have it."

Says Wilcox: "I think Village certainly has been prepared to take a commercial risk by supporting and cashflowing the film. I think at some point the FFC has to work out what risks, if any, it will take to support production in Australia."

Alex Cutler argues that "the FFC is occasionally a bit inconsistent with its stated desire to conduct business on a commercial basis and then at other times its way of behaving by Governmental strictures."

PUTTING IT ON THE SCREEN: THE DIRECTOR. Once the deal started to come together, director Chris Thomson was approached. Thomson directed the feature, The Empty Beach, and several mini-series, including Waterfront, 1915, and The Rainbow Warrior Conspiracy. For the last couple of years he has been working in US television, "I wouldn't want to spend the rest of my life doing 'Movies of the Week'," he says, "but it was an interesting experience to work in a different environment with crews who have very different approaches to what they want to put on the screen. Here we tend to consider that the most important thing is to have a beautiful script or story. Over there, sometimes you have the feeling that they'll do anything to get a 'name' actor, a star, and they'll change the story if necessary.

"I was sent the script of The Delinquents late last year when I was in America. I didn't like it very much, but then they sent me the book, and that was wonderful. As soon as I read it, I wanted to do the film. I persuaded them to bring Mac Gudgeon on -- it was my contribution to suggest that he work with me on the script. He came up here and sat in my pad, writing away all day while I was in here, and we'd sit down at night talking about the next day's scenes and so on. I had worked with him before on Waterfront, and we are good friends."

Thomson has plenty to say about the task of adapting the novel. "The book leaps in its tone from tragedy to farce. I tried to make the tone as real and naturalistic as possible, concentrating on the story of the boy and the girl coming together and being thrown apart.

"It is obviously a young writer's book -- she is still experimenting and trying to put everything in. She has a complicated time sequence, jumping backwards and forwards, which isn't popular in movies. The book takes about seven years, and we had to compress that so our actors didn't have to age that much. There are various things we've taken out, and characters we've omitted."

"But the hardest thing to replace was a kind of ironic narrator who comments on the action -- we've tried to replace that by the way the scenes are written, and by the dialogue. Dialogue is Mac's strongest point and he is very good at picking just the right piercing phrase that someone throws in somewhere, a phrase that reflects on the scene and what's happening to the principals."

"The music also replaces the narrator in a sense. It's Fifties music, the badge of rebellion, and we're using that to underscore the rebelliousness of the two kids and their milieu, contrasted with the stuffiness, the conservatism and the tight-arsed nature of the authorities. And the adults in those days thought children should be children until they were 21, that they were the 'property' of older people and should do what they were told. So I hope the music provides that tone of rebelliousness."

He is enthusiastic about Minogue's work, though he admits he was unaware of her box-office potential. "I knew she had been in Neighbours, but I had been away most of last year when she was apparently having all these big hits, so I knew almost nothing about her when I read the script. But she is an extraordinary actress. She's very professional, she works hard, and I think she's quite ambitious. She's astonished us all."
AUSTRALIAN DIRECTORS HAVE BEEN MAKING THEIR WAY TO AMERICA FOR SOME TIME: BUT NOW THEY ARE BEING JOINED BY ACTORS, WRITERS, PRODUCERS AND THE WALLABY DARNED RESTAURANT.

FROM THE OFFICE OF Katherine Haber at Consolidated Entertainment, there’s a classic LA view. No palms, no lawns, no art moderne architecture... leave those to Westwood and Santa Monica. Here, in the DMZ between Beverly Hills and Hollywood, film interfaces with the record business. The monuments are all to bad taste and the hard sell: On The Rox disco, Tower Records' sprawling warehouse store, and a billboard for Jackie Collins' own personal junk industry. More than a Hundred Million Sold.

As the sun sinks, Sunset comes alive with black leather, spandex, studs. Manes of moussed hair, male and female, shimmer in the streetlights. Jackie's billboard ignites, neon outlining the imperious Collins silhouette, and down the gutters roll dusty skeins of tape from gutted cassettes. Sunset Tumbleweed.

Production executive to Sam Peckinpah, Ridley Scott on Blade Runner and Michael Cimino on The Sicilian, Haber is setting up an indieprod. She reels off a list of directors so far approached or considered - a UN of talent. "Stephen Frears, Joel Schumacher, Barry Levinson, Lawrence Kasdan, Hector Babenco, Louis Malle, Martin Brest, Roland Joffe, Robert Redford, Sidney Lumet, Joe Ruben, Emile Ardolino, Roman Polanski, Sidney Poitier, Mark Rydell, Ridley Scott, Jonathan Demme, Jean-Jacques Annaud..."

No Australians - though there might well have been. The Hollywood in which executives like Haber operate is ecumenical, international. Doesn’t matter where you come from. Just as long as you can cut it in this city of broken promises and one-night stands, where the streets, even if they don’t have palms, are shady. On both sides.

According to legend, a sign hung in the writers’ building at Paramount during the great days of the Thirties European influx. “Here You Must Work. It Is Not Enough Just To Be Hungarian.” After hearing three Australians (mis)quote this in a week, the slogan emerges as a motif of the contemporary Australian presence in Hollywood. It also raises some interesting questions.

QUESTION: HERE YOU MUST WORK. IT IS NOT ENOUGH JUST TO BE AUSTRALIAN - BUT ARE THERE ANY AUSTRALIANS IN HOLLYWOOD?

“When I first arrived here,” Graeme Clifford recalls, “half the people I spoke to didn’t even know where Australia was, so it’s come a long way since then. I used to be asked questions like, ‘Do you have golf courses down there?’ and ‘Do you have kangaroos jumping up George Street?’ They had absolutely no idea at all. Not even geographically. They didn’t even know which side of the continent Sydney was on. Now they think everyone goes round throwing shrimps on barbecues.”

Today, most Californians know where Australia is. And Australians are returning the compliment. Mel Gibson, Bryan Brown and Paul Hogan are more-or-less permanent Angelenos. In March of 1989, Gibson paid almost US$3 million for the Malibu house once owned by Rick Springfield. The LA Times says wife Barbara and the five kids have already moved in. Gibson just completed Lethal Weapon II, is working on Bird on a Wire, then will go on to Air America – or is Franco Zeffirelli serious about starring young blue eyes as Hamlet?

With the Aussie dollar no longer on the critical list of economic invalids, fewer American producers are attracted to making films in Australia, though Warners are well down the track with plans for a movie theme park behind Surfers’ Paradise at the ex-De Laurentiis studios which, through their new association with Village Roadshow, they now control.

But why go to Australia when Australia is happy to come to
Hollywood? It’s always been the Mecca international filmmakers prayed to; now they’re making the pilgrimage as well. Phil Noyce was here for the launch of Dead Calm at 20 LA cinemas. John Duigan, whose The Year My Voice Broke was a major succès d’estime (and the film most quoted when the trade talks of Australia) paused in LA after his Mexican shoot of Romero, with Raul Julia as the assassinated Salvadoran archbishop.

Simon Wincer’s mini-series of Larry McMurtry’s Lonesome Dove won praise and excellent ratings. And ex-Wincer associate Richard Davis, line producer on Phar Lap, has thrived since relocating in Vancouver. His first film, Alan Goldstein’s The Outside Chance of Maximilian Glick, was judged Best Picture at the Toronto Film Festival and Most Popular Canadian Film. Davis is reading his first Hollywood project, Cadence, to be written and directed by Martin Sheen, and starring Charlie Sheen and Gary Busey.

The Cinerama Dome on Sunset is already advertising Peter Weir’s new film for Touchstone, The Dead Poets’ Society, an adventurous non-comedy with Robin Williams as a Fifties schoolteacher trying to ignite some love of literature in the students at a snooty boys’ school. A year ago, Weir said: “These days, you’d probably describe me as a Hollywood filmmaker. I’m working within the system, and my approach to the narrative film and my interest is in those pictures. Those were the ones I grew up with.”

Weir sees a Hollywood base as inescapable. “We speak the same language. We can get into cultural discussions involving one’s attitude to America and American films and how important is the national cinema and so forth, but really you should open that sort of discussion on the question of language. Clearly, if Sweden spoke English you’d see Bergman shooting in America. It’s really a starting point for a discussion. Therefore, as an English-speaking filmmaker, it’s rather natural for me to be drawn over here.”

Few Australians feel the need to apologize for their presence in California, and the ritual assurances that they’d return home in a moment if the right project came up are losing their vigour. (Fred Schepisi, coasting on the critical success of A Cry in the Dark and Meryl Streep’s Oscar nomination, is developing The Way of the Warrior, a fantasy adventure about Aboriginal and white boys in the outback, to be shot in Australia for Disney. But New York-based Schepisi has always kept more aloof from California than most.) The majority have learned, if not to love then at least to live with LA’s rollercoaster lifestyle. Many expatriates would endorse Clive James’s justification for shifting to Britain. “As Ahab said when Moby Dick carried him down for the third time, ‘I’m here because this is where the work is.’”

The St. James Club perches like a grey and silver wedding cake on a ledge of Sunset where the road swings wide over the flats of West Hollywood. Below its art deco towers, the land slopes into a golden morning haze, half sun, half smog.

The Terrace Room looks sunny and bright — until you notice that the trellised red flowers overhead are vinyl and the sunlight a cunning duplication. We are in fact in a basement — appropriate to the morning’s event, announcements of nominations for the Saturn Awards for the year’s best horror and fantasy films.
AUSTRALIANS IN HOLLYWOOD

Dracula impersonator Ed Ansara, in full Bela Lugosi regalia, emcees the event, presiding over a parade of glittering eccentricity: three smouldering bimbos in the Miss Saturn competition, "little person" Billy Barty, whose career ranges from 42nd Street to Lobster Man from Mars, and a trio of doubles from Ghostbusters II. Almost bizarre in their normality are Oscar-winning Beetlejuice make-up man Robert Short and, unrecognizable without his leather loincloth and Mohawk, the Wez of Mad Max II, Vernon Wells.

QUESTION: HERE YOU MUST WORK. IT IS NOT ENOUGH JUST TO BE AUSTRALIAN. BUT CAN YOU WORK?

After Mad Max II, Vernon Wells did the rounds of Australian agents and waited for work. He waited five years. When the second film offer did come, it was from Hollywood-based Joel Silver, asking him to recreate Wez as a parody in John Hughes' Weird Science.

"I expected nothing," says Wells. "I came over here to do that film and, as far as I was concerned, that was the only thing I was doing. And the initial reaction was just, to me, overwhelming. I was having calls from every major casting agent in the country. I was being taken to meet people whom actors work their lives to get an interview with.

"I wasn't awed by it because I didn't realize what you go through in this country to see these people. Coming from Australia, where if you want to be in anything you plog around, knocking on doors and talking to every casting agent in Melbourne and Sydney, I felt this was a normal thing: if these people wanted to see me, they were casting agents and that's as far as it went. But suddenly people were saying 'You went and saw who? My God, how did you get in to see them?' So I started to realize there was a total difference between Australia and Hollywood."

Graeme Clifford came to the US in 1969 as assistant to Robert Altman on That Cold Day in the Park. Even so, crashing Hollywood wasn't easy. "It took five years to get into the union. You had to get all sorts of work experience, and without the work experience you couldn't get in, and you couldn't get work experience if you weren't in the union: it was a perfect Catch-22."

Altman's personal assistant for five years, Clifford cut Images for him, The Postman Always Rings Twice for Bob Rafelson, F.I.S.T. for Norman Jewison, The Man Who Fell to Earth and Don't Look Now for Nicolas Roeg, and Convoy for Sam Peckinpah. He's since directed Frances, Burke and Wills in Australia, and most recently Gleaming the Cube.

"I firmly believe," he says, "that in order to get anywhere in this country you have to come and stay here; you have to live here and be a constant presence here. Bryan Brown lives here. He has a house here. A lot of the pictures he's got, it's because he's got an American agent working very hard for him, and he's here all the time."

Brown's is the archetypal Hollywood success story. Lacking Gibson's matinee idol appeal (Mel is assessed as the only leading man who can lure women into seeing an action picture) he relied on talent and persistence. The trashy Cocktail made a fortune, Gorillas in the Mist won some serious reviews, and he'll soon debut as his own producer in Confidence, a project for Taylor Hackford (An Officer and a Gentleman) co-starring Karen Allen (Raiders of the Lost Ark) which started shooting in Australia in March.

Living in LA is only half the battle. You also need credits, an agent, and a guild or union affiliation—and ideally all three. But even then it's no picnic. "A number of Australian directors seem to have overcome the distance problem," Clifford says. "But it's different for, say, writers. You never hear of an Australian writer working on an American project; at least it's extremely rare. Even Australian producers never get..."
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IN HOLLYWOOD’S EYES AUSTRALIA HAD A UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY TO CUT A SPACE FOR ITSELF IN WORLD CINEMA BUT THREW IT AWAY... A POTTED HISTORY IN THE JUNE ISSUE OF PREMIERE READS: “WHILE PAUL HOGAN WAS FEASTING ON HIS $400 MILLION, THE REST OF THE INDUSTRY WAS IN NEAR-STARRATION, THANKS TO A BOTCHED GOVERNMENT SUBSIDY SCHEME, THE FAILURE OF AMERICAN OUTPOSTS LAUNCHED IN OZ BY THE DE LAURENTIS ENTERTAINMENT GROUP AND NEW WORLD ENTERTAINMENT, AND A TOUCH OF THE PETER PAN SYNDROME. IN TRUTH, AUSTRALIAN CINEMA HAVEN’T WANTED TO GROW UP...”

anything going here. The McElroys have come closest to it. A few years ago they had quite a visible presence here, but I haven’t heard from even them lately.”

In Hollywood’s eyes, Australia had a unique opportunity to cut a space for itself in world cinema, but threw it away. A potted history in the June issue of Premiere, most widely-read of the movie monthlies, judges us harshly. “While Paul Hogan was feasting on his $400 million, the rest of the industry was in near-starvation, thanks to a botched government subsidy scheme, the failure of American outposts launched in Oz by the De Laurentis Entertainment Group and New World Entertainment, and a touch of the Peter Pan syndrome. In truth, Australian cinema hasn’t wanted to grow up...”

“Growing up” in this context means accepting commercial realities – something Australians, hooked on the “little Aussie battler” image, have never found easy. If it’s any consolation, the game is just as hard for locals. “Last year I wanted to do a Western epic based on a book called Son of the Morning Star,” complains Bill Durham and Field of Dreams star Kevin Costner. “Bruce Beresford was going too direct from a great script by Melissa Matheson, who wrote E.T. We were going to do it as a mini-series, but a 29-year-old television executive turned it down because he had never heard of Bruce Beresford and I didn’t have a high television recognition factor, whatever that means..”

On finishing Weird Science, Vernon was offered a major role in Commando which starred Arnold Schwarzenegger. He accepted eagerly, only to find the offer withdrawn as smoothly as it had been made. Somewhat put out by this studio double-talk, Vernon went home to Australia. Almost on his return, he was contracted for an HBO movie called Fortress with Rachel Ward. Shooting started on schedule and everything proceeded smoothly until, one Sunday morning, with a week’s shooting still to come, Vernon got a call at 3 am from Joel Silver, the producer of Commando, who said that things were not working out with the actor they had chosen and could Vernon catch a plane to the States tomorrow, (Monday) to start work on Sunday. True to his word, the actor had not only accepted, but had also organized a plane to be waiting for him at the airport. Almost on his arrival, he was given a major role in the movie, with which he had been associated since its inception.

In Hollywood’s eyes Australia had a unique opportunity to cut a space for itself in world cinema, but threw it away...
Richard Franklin was exposed to one of the most insidious - Gaslighting. Gaslight, Franklin reminds us, is "the film where Charles Boyer tries to convince Ingrid Bergman she's insane by telling her to do things, then asking her why she did them." After the success of Psycho II, Universal in 1983 offered Franklin a thriller with its then-hottest new star, Henry Thomas from ET. The film was to be a remake of Ted Tetzlaff's 1949 thriller The Window.

Franklin's euphoria lasted through the first production meeting. He was looking forward, he said, to shooting in New York. The producers looked blank; why shoot there? Well, said Franklin, the boy in Cornell Woolrich's original story witnessed a murder from a New York fire escape. The whole story hinged on that fire escape. No, the studio decreed: New York locations were too expensive.

Franklin set to work with Tom Holland on the script. Universal had only one requirement. Action: lots of action: in fact "wall-to-wall action." In due course Franklin delivered the script - to a cool reception. It was fine, Universal said. It's just that they didn't care for action.

It got worse. Setting up a meeting with Thomas, execs discovered he had only one requirement. Action: lots of action: in fact "wall-to-wall action." In due course Franklin delivered the script - to a cool reception. It was fine, Universal said. It's just that they didn't care for all this action.

It went worse. Setting up a meeting with Thomas, execs discovered the young actor lived in San Antonio, Texas. In a burst of enthusiasm, they elected to shoot the film there. Too late, it was discovered that San Antonio is one of two cities in the United States which ban exterior fire escapes. Since this experience, Franklin has worked only in Britain and Australia.

The Universal Studios Tour. Each day, tens of thousands of trippers flow through this Disneyland of the film business, trundled in articulated open floats through a series of vertiginous rides closer to sideshow than film. Earthquakes are hot this year: the tour's new ride, "Earthquake: The Big One", thrusts you into an underground railway station as a tremor, 8.5 on the Richter Scale, hits LA. The roof opens, an oil tanker falls towards you, and water floods down the steps from ruptured mains. All the while, low-frequency sound sends shivers up the spine as Universal finally gets back part of its massive investment in the failed Sensurround process.

In shows somewhere between pantomime and stage spectacle, stunt men clown, animals caper, and performers re-enact scenes from Conan and assorted sword-wielding fantasies. Miami Vice is turned into a circus, with convincing helicopter and machine-gun fire.

Occasionally real filmmaking surfaces. You're taken through what remains of the back lot, shown the Psycho house and the street where Dirty Harry threatened to blow a bank robber's head clean off. There's a special effects show too. And in the middle of this, billed as a "reconstruction of an early Edison short", perches an Australian film, as blatant as a blowfly on a slice of pavlova. Just a scrap, uncredited, embedded in the show, as Australian cinema itself is embedded in the mosaic of contemporary film.

It comes from a Film Australia dramatized documentary on telephone manners in which Sydney actor Max Meldrum played Alexander Graham Bell. Bell pops up in all sorts of places - in an apparently normal office while a seated businessman clamped into his seat, then optically righted.

I know this film well, since it was made when I worked at Film Australia. I sent a still to Australian film writer John Bromsn in London. He put it into his book on special effects, Movie Magic. Universal saw it and found their way, via Brosnan, to Lindfield and the vaults of Film Australia. Which makes Max Meldrum, with an audience of 4.2 million people a year, the most widely seen Australian actor in Hollywood. Good on you, Max. Who said an Australian can't make it in America?
Colorfilm is full of professional people who are dedicated to beautiful pictures. That's why we're the very best at what we do. The largest and most comprehensive post production organisation in The Southern Hemisphere with an international reputation for quality and service.
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JUST INSIDE a cluttered office on Santa Monica Boulevard stand three folding chairs respectively stencilled “Philippe Mora”, “Christopher Walken” and “Communion”. On them perch three blue alien heads, and above, a poster for the werewolf movie The Howling II. From the inner office, a mid-Pacific voice is raised in genteel wrangling over prints. The director is In.

If there’s anything to Oscar Wilde’s fantasy in Picture of Dorian Gray that the evil a man does may be consigned to a portrait, leaving the subject unsullied, then Philippe Mora is its proof.

For someone who’s unleashed a succession of horrors on the world, he’s strikingly unmarked. His films The Beast Within, The Howling II, The Howling III and now Communion may seethe with the sinister and the inexplicable, but the boyish Mora looks like a Bacchus out of Caravaggio. All he needs to complete the picture is a bunch of grapes and a lute.

Yet Mora’s films cluster like werewolves waiting for nightfall along what Robert Browning called “the dangerous edge of things”. Mad Dog Morgan scandalized Australia’s film bureaucrats in 1975 with its raw picture of larceny, sodomy and genocide. Undaunted, he followed it with a series of horror and fantasy films ranging from stylish to silly. But Mora also made two of the most skilful historical compilation documentaries of the last 20 years, the environmental thriller A Breed Apart, the clever but ill-fated satire, The Return of Captain Invincible, and Death of a Soldier, about Melbourne’s 1942 “Brownout Murders”. And now, Communion, his most controversial project yet.

Communion springs from the febrile mind of Whitley Strieber, best-selling author of those urban chillers The Wolfen (about werewolves in Manhattan) and The Hunger (vampires ditto).

Spending Christmas 1985 with his wife and young son in rural upstate New York, Strieber experienced what he believed to be – note the qualification – an abduction by intelligent non-humans. He remembers them inserting needle-like instruments into his rectum, nasal passages and skull. (Beforehand, one visitor politely enquired, “What can we do to help you stop screaming?”) Later, hypnosis uncovered earlier experiences in Strieber’s life that may also have involved alien visitors.

Did it really happen? When his account of the incident was
published as Communion (with a $1 million advance), Strieber received plenty of mail from around the world in which others claimed to have shared similar experiences. All he’ll say today is “We do not know yet what is happening to people. It seems very real, but there isn’t any proof that it is aliens.” Producer/director Mora skates round the question of the film’s viewpoint. “It’s very much about a writer who’s in some kind of crisis, who believes he’s been abducted by aliens. But it could be a creative crisis in his work. Or he could be inventing this to create a book. And Christopher Walken puts that across really well.” Sounds like a sceptic. On the other hand, there are those blue heads...

Mora’s Communion, scripted by Strieber, starring Walken as the writer and Lindsay Crouse as his wife, has its roots back in 1968. That year, the 17-year-old Mora, Paris-born but Melbourne-raised, having seen every movie in sight, religiously studied Sight and Sound and, incidentally, helped to found Cinema Papers, decided to relocate. “There was no film school (in Australia), no industry at all, so I didn’t have much choice. And the thing people did then – it seems pretty quaint now – was go to London.”

At the London School of Film Technique, Mora met another film student – Whitley Strieber. In the book of Communion, Strieber describes how he found himself there. Plagued by “secret terror”, he’d fled Texas for London in January, 1968. Less than a year later, he also left Britain after an erratic stay plagued by vague fears of prowlers, unverifiable memories of midnight raids on his apartment and feelings of dread that drove him to rambling tours of the Continent, details of which he couldn’t later recall.

Strieber and Mora understandably lost touch. Mora became a filmmaker. The independent Trouble in Molepolis led to two compilation documentaries, Swastika, about the rise of Nazism, and Brother Can You Spare a Dime?, on the Depression. In 1975, he returned to Australia to direct his first professional fiction feature, Mad Dog Morgan, with Dennis Hopper.

Shot is six weeks for $400,000, Mad Dog Morgan was a considerable achievement – though not in the eyes of film bureaucrats. They were aghast at the suggestion that 19th century Australia was not inhabited exclusively by white-clad schoolgirls and Chips Rafferty.

Nor were there any takers for his next project, an original science fiction script called The Black Hole. (No relation to the later dismal Disney production.) What was the Australian film community’s reaction? “Bewilderment,” says Mora. “‘Black Hole? What’s a black hole?’”

Hollywood, however, was very interested in a director who could make a costume feature for the cost of an episode of The Streets of San Francisco. United Artists’ producer Harvey Bernhard (The Owning) offered Mora a “go” project, ready to shoot - a horror script by Tom Holland (Psycho II, Fright Night, Child’s Play) called The Beast Within.

Paul Clemens, Ronny Cox and Bibi Besch were cast in this early shape-shifter tale of boy-into-insect that horror film historian Don Willis calls “the first were-cicada movie.”

Mora’s memories of the project are best described as semi-fond. “It was a low budget movie for a studio picture: $4 or $5 million. UA was going through convulsions at the time because Heaven’s Gate was happening. We shot some of it in Mississippi, just outside Jackson. To cut costs, they found this disused hospital I could shoot in. It turned out that it was a disused mental hospital: the largest mental hospital in America. Five thousand inmates. Then it turned out it wasn’t disused. Only certain floors weren’t being used.

“Patients kept wandering onto the set. One guy came up to me and said, ‘Do you have a match?’ I gave him a box of matches. He put the whole box in his mouth and started chewing them. I just called for the assistant director and said ‘There’s another one here.’

“The worst story is real black comedy. We were shooting a special effect where Paul Clemens was about to turn into an insect. We had this series of heads. One had a giant tongue that came out of the mouth, big as an arm. It was so disgusting that the crew left me and the cameraman and the effects guy to shoot it. We were shooting away when I heard someone say, ‘Oh, My God!’. I turned around to see six women, absolutely freaked out. I’m sure they thought it was what happened to patients in this hospital; this was The Room.”

Post-production on The Beast Within coincided with the break-up of UA and its acquisition by MGM. Mora was given a crash course in movie politics and the ritual sacrifice of expendable hostages that accompanied each palace revolution. “They kept changing the head of the studio every month. You’d know another head had been chopped off by walking through the corridors of the Thalberg Building. You’d hear sobbing in the corridors. It was the secretaries. It wasn’t your normal introduction to Hollywood.”

Mora followed The Beast Within with A Breed Apart, about mountain climber Powers Bootee trying to steal rare eagle eggs from under the nose of an unco-operative Rutger Hauer. Financed by John Daly’s independent Hemdale, the film, despite the casting of Hauer and Kathleen Turner (before her Romancing the Stone fame) “is barely known outside the video market. Mora blames the lack of clout of a pre-Platoon Hemdale. “In those days films were financed by carving off rights: you’d sell the video rights here and something else there. By the time you got to theatrical, there wasn’t much collateral for a distributor.”

Hemdale also backed The Howling II, a sequel of sorts to Joe Dante’s stylish and sly tale of werewolves in the California of hot tubs, Est, and network TV. Alarmingly rough, The Howling II has a gamy charm for which Mora chooses exactly the right adjective. Borrowing a word that, in America, is redolent of unwashed locker rooms and discarded sneakers, he labels it “funky”. Funky – but fun. Hemdale had been offered a cheap deal on Prague’s Barrandov studios, built by Goebls to house German film production when Berlin came into range of Allied bombers. “Here I was,” recalls Mora, “walking through this art deco studio, bigger than anything in Hollywood. But it was trench warfare filmmaking. The crew didn’t speak English. I had 150 Czechs staring at me, and two translators. Hot lunch for the crew was one frankfurter each and a slice of rye bread.

“It was wild. The making of that film was a film in itself. For instance, they sent me monkey suits instead of werewolf suits. If you look closely you’ll see that in the wide shots it’s gorillas running about. I told the production manager that I needed a crypt. He said ‘How about King Wenceslas’s Crypt?’ I said, ‘Well, you know what happens in this scene. Christopher Lee puts a knife through a werewolf’s heart’. ‘Oh, that’ll be fine.’ So we go to this beautiful gothic cathedral and the priest takes us down to King Wenceslas’s crypt. I was a bit worried so I took him aside and said ‘You do understand - this is a werewolf film. There’s going to be murder and killings in the crypt.’ And the priest said ‘Fantastic! I’ve been trying to get a bishop down here for 10 years. They won’t let one in. But if you blaspheme and desecrate the crypt they won’t be able to refuse. I’ll cable the Vatican tonight.’”

Mora’s Australian films have had their share of controversy. In
November 1981, Mora started shooting the comedy The Return of Captain Invincible, from a script by Stephen B. De Souza (48 Hrs.) about a comic book superhero blacklisted by McCarthy and reduced to a bozo tramp. Ambiguities about the Australian pedigree of Invincible—Alan Arkin starred, with Christopher Lee in a supporting role—led to the film being granted a provisional certificate for tax relief but later denied full certification. The decision was reversed on appeal, but too late to push the film into the black. Invincible’s bad luck continued outside Australia. With trailers circulating and prints in the theatres, it was shelved three days before its American opening when distributors Jackson Farley went bankrupt.

Death of a Soldier, about Eddie Leonis, the GI “Brownout Murderer” who killed three women in wartime Melbourne was predictably controversial, not only for its casting of Americans Reb Brown (from The Howling II) as Leonis and James Coburn as his defence lawyer, but for its abrasive handling of US/Australian wartime relations. Mora showed Melbourne as a “Sodom and Gomorrah” (to use his words), with the two sides at one point shooting it out on a suburban railway station. The local uproar was predictable, and Death of a Soldier, though a success critically and financially in the US, flopped in Australia.

Few people knew how to take Mora’s next film. Also shot in Australia, The Howling III: The Marsupials, is peppered with oddities, like Frank Thring’s fruity Hitchcockian film director and a heroine with a pouch. Mora is frank about it. “I’d had it with horror pictures. I wanted to do a send-up of horror pictures. The Howling II had been a big commercial success, even though it was a very wild, far-out premise. So I thought it would be hilarious to have marsupial werewolves, and have human marsupials.” One also suspects the film is a poke in the eye at the stolid Australian film establishment, which didn’t get the joke. A big hit on video, with 85,000 tapes produced for its first release, Howling III had an erratic theatrical showing, partly, Mora suspects, because American producers didn’t know what marsupials were — ignorance the audience shared.

At this point, re-enter Whitley Strieber. Mora took the writer to lunch. “He was behaving oddly. You don’t want to pry, but he finally told me he thought he’d been abducted by little blue men. He was so sincere I didn’t burst out laughing in his face. I just thought, ‘Writer’s fantasy’ or something. He said ‘I don’t know whether I need a psychiatrist or a publisher.’ I said ‘You’d better get both.’

“There’s a disease called temporal lobe epilepsy, where people have delusions of grandeur and believe they’re Jesus or think they’re with aliens. At one point Whitley thought he might have that, and was tested, but he didn’t have it. Then he wrote Communion.

“He gave it to his publisher, Warner Books, and they said they didn’t want to publish it and he shouldn’t publish it. It would destroy his career. About five other publishers turned it down because they thought it was crazy. Then William Morrow said ‘We think this is terrific, whether you’re lying or not. But if you’re not lying, we’ll give you a million dollars, so take a lie detector test’. And he passed.”

Strieber reproduces the polygraph transcript as an appendix to Communion. The questions are puzzlingly, ambiguous: not “Did these things happen?” but “Do you think these things happened?” Mora doesn’t buy into the controversy over whether or not Strieber was really kidnapped. “He believes it happened — but he knows that it may not have. And he’s prepared to say it may not have. But he wrote it so well there’s a veracity in it, in the emotions.” The public agreed: Communion was the most successful book Strieber ever wrote, staying in best seller lists for most of 1987.

The $7 million Communion took two years to set up and shoot, partly in Hollywood and partly on locations in New York’s Hudson Valley and the Catskills. Understandably, Mora is optimistic about the film. “Anyone interested in sf movies will be interested in this. But I think the core audience will be the people who read the book, then it’ll cross over from there.”

But what about Strieber’s record as an author of a popular werewolf novel and a contemporary vampire fable, both filmed? Won’t this impair credibility? “It most definitely is not a horror picture,” Mora insists. “That was difficult for Whitley too, because he’d written two horror novels. Whatever happened to him was heightened by his horror imagination: I’ve no doubt about that. Whether it was psychological or a real experience would have been coloured through this filter — which is why the book is very scary.”

Was Whitley Strieber really abducted by aliens in the snowy night of 26 December, 1985? Probably not — but then there probably aren’t marsupial werewolves roaming outback Australia. And American and Australian soldiers probably didn’t shoot one another on a Queensland railway station during World War II. Did they?
Filmmaker David Caesar has several memorable and idiosyncratic documentaries to his name... His latest and most sophisticated film, Body Work, considers the funeral industry with its attendant myths and rituals, environments and personnel...

For David Caesar, the line between documentary and fiction is something to mess with. "When you try to draw that line your work becomes dry and distant," he says. Trace that concern through the 11-minute short, Shoppingtown, his final year project as a student at the Australian Film Television and Radio School (AFTRS); Living Room, a 20-minute, Australian Film Commission-funded film about the culture of housing; and Body Work, screening at the Sydney and Melbourne film festivals; and there is a sense of immediacy (a word he keeps returning to) in the performances, the images and the ideas.

"Ultimately film is a storytelling medium," he says. "What people want is a story and they want to believe it. They aren't that discriminating about documentary and fiction, but they stay away from (traditional) documentary in droves because it just doesn't stimulate them - that sense of finding an objective truth is alienating for most audiences."

Body Work is Caesar's most sophisticated work, sliding between conventional documentary modes and the strangest of fictions. (Other film work includes projects for the ABC, the BBC, SBS - the Australian Mosaic series - and music video.)

His subject in Body Work is the funeral industry, his 'characters' are the workers in that industry, and his inquiry is both informative and philosophical. It is arresting stuff: death as it is dealt with in the workplace; death as an everyday process. It plays on our morbid curiosity, our desire for knowledge about a subject that, at least in 20th-century Western culture, is collectively repressed, even taboo.

Researchers Chris Pip and producer Glenys Rowe approached Caesar to direct the film. Pip had done extensive research, finding answers to routine but rarely-asked questions: how do we distinguish the various stages of a corpse's decay; when does a patient become a body; what are the most common means of disposal; who does the 'dirty work'?

Caesar was given the facts and a list of 'bodyworkers', ranging from embalmers, nurses and pathologists to mortuary technicians, hearse drivers, funeral directors and, of course, gravediggers (one is delightfully Shakespearean).

But he has imposed on the initial idea his own rigorous structure and minimalist interview style, one which he began to develop in Shoppingtown, a stylized document of shopping centre culture. In that film, he said to the participants (shoppers, shopkeepers, workers): "What we want is like a still photo, but because it's a moving picture film, you have to stay still ... OK?"

It formed the basis for a longer-term project, a search for a certain look which, as Roland Barthes reflects in Camera Lucida, fiction does not usually allow. "Oh, if only there were a look, a subject's look, if only someone in the photographs were looking at me!" he mourns. "For the Photograph has this power - which it is increasingly losing, the frontal pose being most often considered archaic nowadays - of looking me straight in the eye (here, moreover, is another difference: in film no one ever looks at me; it is forbidden by the Fiction)."
Barthes identifies that look, a particular "air", in a photograph by Richard Avedon of an American Labor Party leader, Philip Randolph. Caesar, an admirer of Avedon's photography, has also selected his tableaux of characters in Body Work with an eye to how they will perform for the camera. He is not afraid to hold the camera on his subject, often for a painfully long period of time, in the hope of a story, a piece of information, a sign of character.

"If you can get through to people, past their defences, there's a story, even if it's one story," Caesar says.

The responses were varied: "Some of them had something they wanted to get across, they felt isolated or felt that people had weird perceptions about what they did, so they did it for themselves in a way. Others relaxed and just tried to answer the questions." In each situation, however, he was attempting to draw out a performance. "When people look into a camera, there's a performance quality, but also a vulnerability ... That vulnerability, combined with projection, is what gives it an edge." Something happens, he suggests, when you combine a fear of the camera and a belief in the story being told: "I think you can find a truth ..."

He hesitates, and then attempts to bring the discussion back to basics: "I think that it is important that people always remember that they're being filmed. It's important to remind the audience that there's a camera there, that this is a film, that these people are doing it for the camera."

There are indeed some extraordinary performances in Body Work; but they are more than just the telling of a story. Each performance is integrally linked to the workplace – it is tempting to regard some of the places as the result of masterful production design.

"The background has to tell you things," Caesar explains. "Like the fact that some people work in a white environment with fluorescent lights and no windows, everything is stainless steel. Now the cleanliness of that obviously affects the person, although on a small level they have some way of challenging that space, of affecting it.

"One of the things I tried to set up in people's minds was that they were going to see a dead body. So I tried to go against that by using tracking shots which made you think, 'Any minute now I'm going to see a dead body.' The pay-off is that you realize at the end you never do. The film is quite life-reinforcing because you don't. That for me is the pay-off in Body Work."

On another level, there is likely to be a good pay-off for Caesar in terms of the film's critical reception. It has been nominated for a Dendy award and looks set to run the festival circuit.

"The last drama I did at film school was a disaster... It really put me off. I couldn't handle the scope of making dramas so the next film I did was Shoppingtown with a crew of only two. I could understand it and control it. I thought small crews were the only way I could work but on The Big End, I had a crew of 20 and it was the most enjoyable film experience I've had."

Four years ago he began work on another 'fiction', based on David Malouf's short story, The Prowler. It was originally planned as a half-hour short but has since grown into a feature-length script. "I'm glad I didn't make it then," says Caesar, as he launches into a discussion of the script, and how to visualize ideas about paranoia, isolation, death.

"The threads of those earlier experimental documentaries become tangled in his explanation of how to create the prowler's environment, how to map out the territory and make us believe his story. That line between documentary and fiction is something he is quite clearly still negotiating.

Caesar has recently completed The Big End, a 12-minute drama, filmed in western suburbs of Sydney, though it could be any outer suburb on the fringe of large city. A possible counterpart to Margaret Dodd's wonderful This Woman is Not a Car (1982), it too examines sexual/power relationships in Australian culture and the car as an object of desire.

"If you can get through to people, past their defences, there's a story, even if it's one story," Caesar says.

Emphasizing that most of his ideas about film apply equally to documentary and drama, Caesar does however acknowledge that with The Big End, which he also scripted, he wanted to prove he could work with actors.

"It's like what I was trying to do with Living Room as well. A person's environment tells you an enormous amount about them. I am always conscious in the framing of the shots of getting close to people, not in terms of the camera, but emotionally closer, in terms of knowledge."

In one sense, the film is very structured; there is a logical progression from sequence. Before each section of the interviews, an image of decaying flowers fills the frame and voiceover gives a chronology of a corpse – from death to burial or cremation. Different narratives intersect: across personal, cultural, professional and emotional lines, heightening our expectation of finally seeing a body.

But there is, of course, a catch. Audiences, Caesar suggests, expect a 'pay-off'. It could be a visual trick, access to information, the solution to a whodunnit. In Body Work the pay-off comes through the manipulation of a common cinematic device.

"One of the things I tried to set up in people's minds was that they were going to see a dead body. So I tried to go against that by using tracking shots which made you think, 'Any minute now I'm going to see a dead body.' The pay-off is that you realize at the end you never do. The film is quite life-reinforcing because you don't. That for me is the pay-off in Body Work."

But there is, of course, a catch. Audiences, Caesar suggests, expect a 'pay-off'. It could be a visual trick, access to information, the solution to a whodunnit. In Body Work the pay-off comes through the manipulation of a common cinematic device.

"One of the things I tried to set up in people's minds was that they were going to see a dead body. So I tried to go against that by using tracking shots which made you think, 'Any minute now I'm going to see a dead body.' The pay-off is that you realize at the end you never do. The film is quite life-reinforcing because you don't. That for me is the pay-off in Body Work."

"One of the things I tried to set up in people's minds was that they were going to see a dead body. So I tried to go against that by using tracking shots which made you think, 'Any minute now I'm going to see a dead body.' The pay-off is that you realize at the end you never do."

He told the various people involved in the project that while the film was about the nature of work, he wanted to "go past external ideas of people in the industry and look into them as individuals, show them as people first."

"The background has to tell you things," Caesar explains. "Like the fact that some people work in a white environment with fluorescent lights and no windows, everything is stainless steel. Now the cleanliness of that obviously affects the person, although on a small level they have some way of challenging that space, of affecting it."

Caesar has recently completed The Big End, a 12-minute drama, filmed in western suburbs of Sydney, though it could be any outer suburb on the fringe of large city. A possible counterpart to Margaret Dodd's wonderful This Woman is Not a Car (1982), it too examines sexual/power relationships in Australian culture and the car as an object of desire.

Emphasizing that most of his ideas about film apply equally to documentary and drama, Caesar does however acknowledge that with The Big End, which he also scripted, he wanted to prove he could work with actors.

"The last drama I did at film school was a disaster... It really put me off. I couldn't handle the scope of making dramas so the next film I did was Shoppingtown with a crew of only two. I could understand it and control it. I thought small crews were the only way I could work but on The Big End, I had a crew of 20 and it was the most enjoyable film experience I've had."

Four years ago he began work on another 'fiction', based on David Malouf's short story, The Prowler. It was originally planned as a half-hour short but has since grown into a feature-length script. "I'm glad I didn't make it then," says Caesar, as he launches into a discussion of the script, and how to visualize ideas about paranoia, isolation, death.

"The threads of those earlier experimental documentaries become tangled in his explanation of how to create the prowler's environment, how to map out the territory and make us believe his story. That line between documentary and fiction is something he is quite clearly still negotiating.
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DOES THE 'EVENING BELL' TOLL FOR THE NEW CHINESE CINEMA?

CHINESE CINEMA IS BECOMING INCREASINGLY VISIBLE ON THE EXHIBITION AND FESTIVAL CIRCUIT. BUT DO WESTERN AUDIENCES UNDERSTAND THE CULTURE AND THE CONTEXT OF THE FILMS? AND WHAT DOES THIS VISIBILITY MEAN FOR THE FILMMAKERS? LINDA JAIVIN, A SPECIALIST WRITER ON CHINA, SAW A NUMBER OF NEW CHINESE FILMS AT THIS YEAR'S HONG KONG FILM FESTIVAL. SHE SUGGESTS THAT THIS INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION HAS ITS LIMITATIONS AND PITFALLS.

EVENING BELL (1988), directed by Wu Ziniu, is the most recent film from the Chinese New Wave to capture international attention — and a Silver Bear at Berlin. It tells the story of five soldiers in the Red Army at the end of World War II who stumble upon a group of stranded Japanese soldiers. The Japanese, who don't know that the war has ended, have been so degraded by desperation and hunger that they have even resorted to cannibalism.

This is most definitely a film about the big ones — Life, Death, War, Food — and yet it left me entirely unmoved, aside from a few profound stirrings of boredom.

The cinematography of the film is quite beautiful, displaying the kind of dramatic sense of composition and awareness of the potential of light and colour which has been typical of the new Chinese cinema in general. The narrative of the film is simple, the dialogue sparse. Yet Evening Bell does not, somehow, ring true. It lacks emotional power.

Its characters are essentially conduits for a message which is hardly universal and has been pithily summarized by a Chinese film journal: "Evening Bell shows how the Chinese army use their spiritual and moral superiority to defeat the Japanese". As the journal points out, the Chinese "maintain a peculiar psychology about the Japanese". But rather than actively examining this psychology — which boils down to a swirling yin-yang symbol of inferiority and superiority — Evening Bell simply gives it expression. One can draw parallels with the non-reflective patriotism of Red Sorghum, in which a group of lovable and heroic peasants drink their good Chinese wine, attack a convoy of wicked Japanese soldiers and die.

There are many critics who consider Wu Ziniu's pacifist message both courageous and provocative, particularly within the Chinese context. Indeed, the censors have never allowed one of his early films, Dove Tree (1985), to be shown. Yet Evening Bell and Red Sorghum are fundamentally different from those films which originally established the new Chinese cinema's original reputation — for example, Yellow Earth, Horse Thief, Swan Song, Black Cannon Incident and King of Children. These diverse films have in common a willingness to question and to provoke, to probe areas of acute cultural and political sensitivity, not just stroke Chinese national pride.

They sure aren't making New Wave Chinese films like they used to. Chen Kaige, director of Yellow Earth, Big Parade and King of the Children, isn't making them at all, at least for the moment. Chen achieved a fine reputation overseas, but at home his films remained politically controversial and, what's worse in terms of getting studio backing, unprofitable. Since mid-1987 he has been in the US, trying to come up with a script that will attract a foreign producer.

Tian Zhuangzhuang, who directed Horse Thief, is best known for his sullen explorations of marginality. His films have been received well enough abroad but widely unwatched at home, and he reportedly came under considerable pressure from his studio to make a commercially viable film. Rock and Roll Youth was the embarrassing result. The story of a young Peking breakdancer's struggle for love, individuality and true trendiness, Rock and Roll Youth limps along like a failed Flashdance.

Swan Song director Zhang Zeming also bowed to studio pressures and attempted a commercial film, Sunshower. The director's self-proclaimed and intriguing themes of repressed sexuality and lesbian love are unfortunately buried under gloss and sentimentality. Zhang has had trouble finding support for other, more congenial projects, and may spend the coming year in London with his English wife.

Like Zhang, Huang Jianxin, director of The Black Cannon Incident and its sequel, The Stand-In, has chosen contemporary, urban themes, and his latest film, Samsara, is one of four recent...
movies adapted from novels or stories by the Peking writer Wang Shuo. Wang’s stories capture the mood of contemporary Peking like no other writer, and are known for their streetwise savvy and clever dialogue.

One of the most successful of the four films based on Wang Shuo’s work is *Three T Company*, directed by the relatively unknown filmmaker Mi Jiashan. “T” stands for the Chinese word “ti”, to take the place of, and this fast-paced, entertaining film is about three young entrepreneurs whose business is to stand in for people when they’re in a spot of trouble. You can pay them to be yelled at by your wife, or meet your date if you’re delayed (they promise to send their homeliest partner on this task), or, if you’re a struggling author, they can even arrange a literary prize ceremony for you.

The film is extremely witty but is unlikely to enjoy the kind of success abroad that movies like *Red Sorghum* and *Yellow Earth* have had. One reason is that art-house audiences outside China have so far been unwilling to extend as warm a welcome to films reflecting contemporary urban realities of China as they do to films which exploit the more exotic countryside. Indeed, some directors conscious of their international reputation privately admit their reluctance to take on urban themes because foreign audiences - and festival juries - don’t find young Chinese people in jeans as interesting to look at as peasants in homespun.

Another reason that audiences outside China respond better to rural themes is that city folk talk a lot more than peasants do, and dialogue loses too much in the translation and everything in the subtitles.

Unintentionally hilarious subtitles are part of the fun, however, with *AIDS Patient*, a 1989 movie which foreign audiences are unlikely to see, although it has proved immensely popular with the home crowd and unconsciously reveals certain generalized attitudes towards foreigners in China.

Tony, a nice guy who once taught at a Chinese university, is just the kind of guy everyone loves to know and more than a few knew to love. Before the events in the movie take place, he dies of AIDS back in the US. The Chinese police have somehow obtained a videotape of Tony’s last words: his only regret is having slept with several women in China. Their hunt for the victims is on, and if this sounds like it’s in bad taste, it is. However, the good-hearted ineptness of the film, and strange campy moments like the one when our handsome young police hero consults a female colleague while lying half-naked in bed as she fixates (or was that me?) on his nipples, give it the potential to be a cult classic, or at least a Double Take redub. It was certainly more fun than *Evening Bell*. 
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MANY OF THE MOST ACCLAIMED OF RECENT CHINESE FILMS HAVE COME FROM XI'AN STUDIOS. WU TIANMING (ABOVE), STUDIO HEAD, AND HUANG JIANXIN, DIRECTOR OF XI'AN'S THE BLACK CANNON INCIDENT, DISCUSS THEIR APPROACH TO FILMMAKING IN THIS REPORT BY ADRIENNE MCKIBBINS.

XI'AN is one of a number of regional studios throughout China. It was established in 1958 and is situated in the northwest, close to the Yellow River and the great plateaus, an area said to be the cradle of the Chinese race and the birthplace of China's ancient culture. Because of this, Xi'an holds a symbolic quality, particularly to Wu Tianming. He was born in this area, in Shaanxi Province, and feels that nothing can capture the spirit of the Chinese as well as the landscape in which they dwell.

If there has been a dominant factor in the films of the Fifth Generation, it has been the use of landscape in contrast to the studio-bound product of the past. Old Well aptly demonstrates this. Wu has filmed his story entirely in the village of Shiyujiao in Shaanxi Province close to Xi'an. The village of 70 households and 380 people is 200 years old and its history as represented in the film is one of a search for water.

Xi'an is now regarded as one of the most progressive film studios in China, but it has not always held this position. Its reputation has grown with the emergence of the Fifth Generation of filmmakers, coinciding with Wu's period as studio head. Wu Tianming had directed only two features by the time he was appointed head of the studio. He would have continued directing but was faced with a considerable number of problems. In the year of his appointment, 1983, Xi'an was probably at its lowest ebb. It had sold fewer prints than any other studio in China that year. None of its films had been critically praised or made a great deal of money - three had made the list of the 10 films with the lowest box office in China.

Wu says he did not see the problems as insurmountable. He had a number of factors on his side. He was not a new face at Xi'an. "I had been there for most of the 23 years since I entered the training course in performing arts to study acting from 1960-62. I knew a great many of the workers at the studio and they knew what to expect from me. They knew I could be trusted and could expect what I promised to be carried out." Wu sees himself as a different type of studio head from those at the biggest studios of Beijing and Shanghai. His is more than just an open-door policy to the directors and the 4000 employees at Xi'an. He is outspoken about some of the practices in China and genuinely seeks reform.

Wu consciously balances commercial and artistic productions, deliberately pushing films like The Magic Braid (a low-budget kung fu adventure film which made an enormous profit) in order to finance the more adventurous and expensive films and to encourage the work of new directors. By 1985, Xi'an was selling more prints than any other studio, and between 1983 and the end of 1987 it received 20 national and international prizes. A film like The Black Cannon Incident, thought initially to be too obscure for the mass market, proved one of the most popular film of its year, returning a substantial profit.

Wu felt that there had been a number of misconceptions about the popularity of the new Chinese cinema. Because of stories of difficulties and changes made to some films, it was thought that films of the Fifth Generation were only appreciated outside China. This is not the case; while not all were popular, many had found substantial audiences - Red Sorghum, for example, had been an enormous success inside and outside China. He felt it was important to stress the growing acceptance of a more realistic and politically aware cinema in China.

I asked how the reaction of Western critics had affected this situation. Wu replied that he had mixed feelings when films were enthusiastically written about in the West. It seemed a lot of the comment was out of context; the writers and critics did not care about the culture or the history behind these films, although that tendency is changing a lot. On the other hand it has helped a lot of filmmakers.

"There is still resistance in some quarters to showing the truth or showing how lives were affected by events such as the 'cultural revolution'. But as these films have been praised and have won prizes overseas, the internal resistance is forced to shut up, especially when a good critical reception can mean the sale of a print. Economic factors are increasingly important," Wu Tianming

Wu Tianming's background makes him seem an unlikely candidate for head of a film studio. He was born in 1939 in Shaanxi Province, the son of revolutionary cadres. His father had joined the Communist party in 1936. Wu's very early years were spent moving about as his parents were both guerrilla fighters. At the age of nine, he was selling tea on the street in Xiyang. It was not until 1954, five years after Liberation, that Wu began proper schooling; in 1960 he was admitted into a training course for the performing arts at the Xi'an film studio. At the completion of this course he remained at the studio as an actor. Between 1962 and 1970 he played a series of roles in a number of films, none, it seems, of great historical importance; mostly,
Weilin, to buy the rights, but Wu Tianming persuaded the author to let him expected the audience to accept. Many Chinese films of this era was the falseness that filmmakers because of its artificiality. He still feels strongly that the problem with this is not the case. He co-directed with Teng Wenji a film called The National Library Film Collection) was his first effort at direction, although he had wanted to be a film director for a number of years and had managed to break into the industry it was not until he was 35 that he entered the Centre May 7th Art College to study film direction. On completion of the course he was able to work with established director Cui Wei as an assistant. Two years later, in 1976, he returned to Xi'an and worked as a log keeper and assistant director on a number of films.

Although he had wanted to be a film director for a number of years and had managed to break into the industry it was not until he was 35 that he entered the Centre May 7th Art College to study film direction. On completion of the course he was able to work with established director Cui Wei as an assistant. Two years later, in 1976, he returned to Xi'an and worked as a log keeper and assistant director on a number of films.

It is often stated that River Without Buoys (a film currently held in the National Library Film Collection) was his first effort at direction, but this is not the case. He co-directed with Teng Wenji a film called Kith and Kin, but in Wu's words the film was a complete failure, because of its artificiality. He still feels strongly that the problem with many Chinese films of this era was the falseness that filmmakers expected the audience to accept.

In 1983 he chose as his first solo effort a prize-winning novel by Ye Weilin, On A River Without Buoys. A number of studios had attempted to buy the rights, but Wu Tianming persuaded the author to let him as Wu puts it, playing a callow youth. In 1970 he wrote a one-act play, then shortly after completed a full-length piece, The Iron Tree in Blossom. All through this period Wu Tianming claims he had an ultimate goal - to become a film director. He claims he had been "film crazy" since he was 18. The first film to make a real impression on him was a Soviet film, Song of the Sea. He animatedly explains how he could not afford to see it twice. His only recourse, he decided, was to sell his shoes outside the cinema. He tried, but was unsuccessful, so he went further afield and sold them them to a nearby bootmaker. Barefoot in midwinter, he sat in an unheated cinema and watched it twice more.

Although he had wanted to be a film director for a number of years and had managed to break into the industry it was not until he was 35 that he entered the Centre May 7th Art College to study film direction. On completion of the course he was able to work with established director Cui Wei as an assistant. Two years later, in 1976, he returned to Xi'an and worked as a log keeper and assistant director on a number of films.

It is often stated that River Without Buoys (a film currently held in the National Library Film Collection) was his first effort at direction, but this is not the case. He co-directed with Teng Wenji a film called Kith and Kin, but in Wu's words the film was a complete failure, because of its artificiality. He still feels strongly that the problem with many Chinese films of this era was the falseness that filmmakers expected the audience to accept.

In 1983 he chose as his first solo effort a prize-winning novel by Ye Weilin, On A River Without Buoys. A number of studios had attempted to buy the rights, but Wu Tianming persuaded the author to let him

usual experience of working with the crew of choice with an average age of 28. (Until the mid-Eighties this would be seen as a very young crew.)

I asked Huang why he had decided to be a film director. He seemed amused, explaining that since making Black Cannon he had been asked this many times. "In the past," he said, "I tended to make up a story that was full of meaning and honourable intention to satisfy the question, but the reality is I really don't know.

"What I do know is how things change for me when I begin to work - the ideas just transform to images. When I am on location I always have excess energy and I am never tired. It is on completion of a film I start to feel restless. It is only because I am travelling that I don't have my non-filming symptoms." He equates the feeling to an explanation a friend gave when asked why he smoked. "I don't know," he replied, "except that I enjoy the satisfaction of a cigarette." Filming is like that for me, a fascination hard to describe and equally hard to give up.

When I posed this question to Wu Tianming he replied without hesitation, "I feel of all the media film is the most direct, the most popular (in China) and therefore the most powerful. I feel I have been lucky in the way I have become a creative leader. Film is as important to me as my life, and I feel sure my life would not have been as useful or significant if I had not made films. China is a nation that has experienced tremendous bitterness as well as moments of happiness and greatness. The feelings of her people are very deep-seated. She has a rich and complex 5,000-year-old civilization - it is these things I regard as the source and inspiration of my work. I want to continue to make films for as long as I am physically able."
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When Yuri Sokol was a child in the Ukrainian city of Kharkov, everyone assumed he was destined for a musical career as a concert pianist, following in the footsteps of his mother. For 11 years he prepared for that goal, practicing several hours daily. But suddenly, at 15, he decided he wasn’t sufficiently motivated to make music a lifetime commitment, so he closed the piano and never touched the keys again.

“I’ve probably changed aim many times in my life but one has to be flexible and keep re-examining,” he explains. Re-examination is a philosophy he’s put into practice: at the height of a very successful career as a cinematographer in Russia, he risked a reputation and a comfortable privileged lifestyle by applying to emigrate. On advice from one man, he changed destination from the established niche for filmmakers - the US - to go to a country with a barely established film industry about which he knew virtually nothing. Here, as his reputation as a cinematographer has grown, he has turned his energies into setting up a studio during a particularly volatile period in the industry. His next role may be that of a producer. Since that decision to abandon music, the one common denominator in his career has been film.

“I can’t say cinematography was always my dream. When I left high school I was interested in photography and technology - I used to experiment with making poison gas and explosives - and I’d trained so long in an art form: somehow all these components added up to film. And since I had to choose a specialization, cinematography combined the technical and artistic. I’ve never regretted it and continue to be fascinated by both,” says Sokol.

He set his sights high. Only seven or eight applicants out of thousands were selected for the cinema course at the National Institute of Film Art. It was a challenging course, but Sokol thrives on challenge.

When he was required to make a 10-minute graduation film he went to the outermost province of Khirgizia, on the Chinese border, with a direction student, Larissa Shepitko (who went on to become an acclaimed director, but died tragically on location several years ago). They made a feature, Desert Heat, inspired by images used by Eisenstein in Viva Mexico. It took 22 months to complete it in a studio where technical limitations virtually declared it ‘mission impossible’. The film won 15 awards at film festivals in the USSR and abroad.

Desert Heat was to set the tone for much of Sokol’s work. Artistically bold, almost experimental, surreal and stark in its images, it was also ideologically bold in its harsh portrayal of pioneer life, cultivating virgin lands without appropriate technology or irrigation. The critical exposure of one of the political failures of the USSR (the Soviet dream of the workers’ glory) was at first viewed critically by local authorities who later asked Sokol to stay to develop the studio and facilities. Ironically, it can also be viewed as an allegory of the filmmakers’ struggles to make the project - also an ambitious pioneering venture - without the appropriate technology.

The challenge of developing the studio from its rudimentary base of Film Art. Yuri Sokol has always enjoyed challenges, technical and otherwise. Setting up a studio is the latest, but certainly not the last.
spurred him on and he remained in Khirgizia for another four years, joined on projects by leading actors, scriptwriters and directors who had heard of his work. Sokol recalls how, on one of these films, he inadvertently set an actor friend on a new and illustrious career. Nikita Mikhalkov's participation in one of Sokol's films caused long absences and subsequent expulsion from acting school. He then enrolled at the National Institute of Cinema Art to study direction, and has since made a number of features, including two based on Chekhov's works, Unfinished Work for Pianola (in which he also acted) and Dark Eyes (which starred Marcello Mastroianni).

Sokol returned to Moscow in 1965, disillusioned with political corruption and intrigue among the filmworkers he had recruited. He found that by working in the provinces (which had seemed a perverse, if not masochistic move then) he had made up a lot of time; colleagues who remained in the city were still pushing dollies and working as camera assistants because they had to work their way up through the system. His impatience and pioneering meant he by-passed all that. The pattern was to be repeated. Quickly, he reached the top ranks of Soviet cinematographers, was awarded a State medal, and for the next 12 years worked for the leading studio in the USSR, Mosfilm, an enormous state-subsidized complex employing 6,000 filmworkers. It was very comfortable, well-paid and privileged lifestyle, by Soviet standards. The Soviet Filmmakers' Union is not a trade association, but membership is by invitation and reputation: as a member of this elite professional filmmakers' club he was entitled to special facilities and privileges such as free movies, medical and transport privileges. He worked on a wide variety of films - comedies, war films, courtroom dramas - and budgets posed no problems.

The status of the cinematographer, especially the director of photography, is quite high in the USSR, Sokol explains. There was little class distinction between his role and that of a director. All films were made under the state subsidized umbrella, and the DOP was involved from the pre-production stage. He was invited to contribute to meetings between director, producer and production designer, who all worked with the screenwriter from the earliest stages, often beginning with the synopsis. (He makes the qualification that although the position is highly respected the system is more rigid than ours, comparing it to a feudal system where roles are inflexible.)

He doesn't necessarily see that the Australian situation, where the DOP is seen in a more purely technical capacity, compares unfavourably. Here, where the DOP tends to enter the project at a later stage, coming in with a fresh eye can bring new perspectives. This is particularly useful, Sokol feels, when writer and director have been involved on many drafts of a script, and a detached contribution can be constructive. He cites Remember Me, directed by Lex Marinos, which starred Wendy Hughes and Richard Moir as a divorced couple. Here, an ambiguity could be created about the woman's relationship with her ex-husband by shooting them separately in frame so that viewers don't know whether the events are happening in reality or in her imagination.

Of course, he says, the level of contribution depends on the relationship with the director: it's important to be discreet and if the suggestions aren't accepted to retreat and support the director fully. Artistic and ideological freedom became a strong consideration in creating a growing disillusionment with making films in the Soviet Union. "Its absence slowly began to gnaw at me," he says. Quite early in his career he began to nurture ideas of emigrating though, at that stage the plans were as practical as "flying to the moon, and as likely". He denies any discrimination because of Jewish ancestry, adding that the State was aware he had relatives abroad.

"I knew the system was wrong but naively rationalized that I was a small pawn in a big game. I thought once I reached the top I would be able to communicate with people in decision-making capacities and..."
to make some impact. But I reached the top quickly, received the official seal of approval and was mixing with the top echelons who shaped, or at least contributed, to policy. That's when it hit me: even Brezhnev and the Minister of Culture were powerless pawns in a system where a pervasive fear paralysed thinking at all levels of the bureaucracy. The absence of ideals got to me.

He cites two examples to illustrate the effects of political interference and the gradual build-up of frustration. A courtroom drama, *And Nobody Else*, depicted a judge who on his deathbed admits he made a mistake in sentencing an innocent man. The film was at first banned, then had the last 10 minutes, including the confession, cut by the censors because of concern at the time with hooliganism and criminal activity. Basically the logic was that figures in authority were not allowed that level of humanity. “But how do you make poignant complex drama if everything must be simplified and diluted?”

His last film in the USSR was *Quagmire*, a moving drama about a young army deserter directed by Grigory Chubriaia. “We knew it as a controversial subject and were very surprised to receive phone calls of congratulations from the wives of Brezhnev and Minister of Defence Marshal Ustinov who’d viewed it at a private screening. They praised the emotional impact. Two days later we received another call from a Marshal Yeshpesh informing us that the film would never be released while he was in office. He kept his word – it was taken off the shelf a couple of months ago, after more than 10 years!”

“The futility and frustration finally got to me. That was the last straw. When you don’t know who’s controlling your life, who you’re working for and your contributions are treated that way. Physical comforts aren’t everything if you start to lose your soul. I felt suffocated by the grey bureaucracy and refused to compromise any longer.” So he took the irreversible step – applying to emigrate. He knew the chances of success were very slim but the risk was worth it, he felt.

Even when the Sokols (his wife Irena and two daughters) received the approval he recalls expectations of reversal right up to the day of their departure. His original destination was New York.

Enter Erwin Rado, then the long-time director of the Melbourne Film Festival, who had seen several of Sokol’s films and had invited to make some impact. But when I reached the top and had received the official seal of approval, it hit me that even Brezhnev and the Minister of Culture were powerless pawns in a system where a pervasive fear paralysed thinking at all levels of the bureaucracy.
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Shine Brilliantly My Star to Melbourne in 1976. When he heard of Sokol’s impending departure Rado sent a card saying, “Why Not Australia?” To date Sokol knew virtually nothing about the country, had only seen two Australian films, *Picnic at Hanging Rock* and *The Long Weekend*.

It was 1979, the time of boom and revival, of optimism for the industry. Sokol suspects the same pioneering instinct that sent him to Kirghizia also played a part as he gambled with the unknown again. Rado continued his role of mentor on Sokol’s arrival, introducing him to industry people and useful contacts, directors of commercials. One of these was Paul Cox with whom Sokol was to form a close and successful – “I leave you to judge that,” he interjects – collaboration.

Both were photography experts, both of European background and sensible, and both slightly ‘out of sync’ with their adopted country and as such observers with original perspective. Cox had already made one feature, *Kostas*, and several short films that raised the expectations of critics. Sokol describes the collaboration in glowing terms: “I enjoyed working with Paul immensely and hold him in very high regard. His approach and philosophy of filmmaking was so different from anything I’d experienced before. His passionate dedication and rejection of any commercial hype and circus (including a make-up artist) impressed me. To be honest I never expected to find such a pure soul in a capitalistic system,” he says.

“Stylistically Cox’s intuitive filmmaking was an enormous challenge for me as a cinematographer. With an aesthetic eye and fine tuning to performance, especially emotional action, he adopted a very bold approach to shooting, often with moving camera, capturing the intensity and essence in one, or at most three takes. Frequently he’d be happy with the first take and refuse to opt for more. I tried, especially in the early days, to plead with him but he was adamant; he was so confident he didn’t need extra cutaways or other angles. One has to admire that boldness of vision, especially as within the camera moves he wanted a variety of shots to combine in a very carefully choreographed synchronization of movement of camera and actors. The opening strip scene in *Man of Flowers* was an eight-and-a-half minute take, the central argument in *My First Wife* lasts 10 minutes, with the camera starting from the window at night, coming onto the bed and out the other side of the bed in one take.”

What happened when two idealists clashed? Sokol dismisses the question with humour. “His intuitive and spontaneous method of working with actors can pose problems for the cinematographer. It took a while to get around that but I became fascinated with how to adapt to his work; I’d resort to contortions and tricks, even espionage tactics, to find out what he was doing with the actor and how he was going to shoot the scene.

“When he was rehearsing he insisted on absolute privacy and would assure me that I could light and set up later. He probably was genuine in his intentions,
Sokol notes with satisfaction that Australian cinematographers use and appreciate a much greater variety of styles now than they did when he first arrived 10 years ago.

The Cox collaboration was closely followed by the studio era. The move to Sydney was prompted partly by his desire to set up a studio. Sokol says that he was appalled at the state of working conditions. "I found it ironic that in Russia the standard of living is low but the working conditions (not equipment and stock) in the film industry are high and here the reverse was true. Private living standards are so comfortable yet filmworkers tolerated conditions the same or even worse than in a third world country. I suppose it was the striving for the ideal especially since the stock and equipment were of very good quality. The idea was to establish a place that was conducive to work where every aspect of production was within arm's reach. I guess it was the drive for perfection, striving for the best of two worlds."

A few years ago he began to collect equipment and build lighting units that were unavailable from rental companies. The next stage was the search for a suitable property in Sydney. In the Waterloo complex there are three sound stages (plus one more on the drawing board), a full range of cameras (from 35mm to video) specially-built lighting, comfortable meeting rooms, mini-kitchens and other facilities able to accommodate any aspect of the industry-video, drama, features, clips, mini-series. Despite the scale of operations it's still a family business - managers somehow haven't worked out, so wife Irena runs the day-to-day operations, while he oversees things.

Timing has been far from ideal in the lowest ebb of industry activity since the beginning of the revival but Sokol prefers to remain optimistic: "We've had an enormous number of inquiries and significant bookings from the period August to November so it looks like things will pick up. I just hope we can accommodate all the work then."

In any case he doesn't see himself managing the studio for the rest of his life. He still returns to cinematography; as an efficient administrator, he likes the idea of working as a producer, there are couple of his own scripts he'd like to get off the ground, and though he shies away from the general idea of directing there is one special project (a black comedy about personal arms ownership) that he'd like to direct. "I didn't come here naive about the West. There are problems everywhere, but the scope and freedom to explore options has been amazing," he says.

Does he have any regrets now that glasnost and perestroika are introducing such sweeping changes? What does he think of the new wave of glasnost films? Sokol is sceptical about any fundamental transformation. He believes that the changes are rather cosmetic. "It's carefully orchestrated: basically the films are made on an old formula worked in reverse — a propaganda of openness." Generally unimpressed, he is critical of the thinness and lack of artistic merit in the 'glasnost' films he has seen. "The doors are open now, but they have nothing to say. The exposure of sex, nudity and drugs on screen may be revolutionary for the Russians but by Western standards it's rather naïve, in some cases poor imitations of what the West has been producing for years.

"But the people making films now are products of generations of restriction and I expect that not until the reforms bring a completely new generation of filmmakers will we see genuinely new, exciting films. So far there is no new Tarkovsky, no Parajanov. (The latter was jailed, declared persona non grata and prevented from working in film for some years because of his ideologically outrageous lifestyle, especially his homosexuality, which until recently was considered a criminal offence.) But now at least talents like him are permitted to work." Sokol believes that as more people are allowed and encouraged to work in the film world the results will be more exciting. He draws parallels with the period after the Revolution when the expulsion or emigration of some leading artists, thinkers and film experts left gaps that were filled by professionals from other fields: doctors (such as Pudovkin), architects (Eisenstein), writers and journalists (Dovzhenko), who brought an exciting influx of new ideas. "It may bring another era like that. Let's hope so." Sokol, however, has found plenty to keep him busy right here: in a time of flux in the industry, the challenge is still considerable.
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Four days of master classes, workshops and panel debates led by top international and Australian film and television professionals.

Featuring four prominent guests from England and the US, the conference will examine the state of the screenwriting craft in light of the enormous changes now impacting on our industry: internationalism and co-productions, the introduction of Pay/cable TV, getting writer-initiated projects produced and much more.
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Delegate numbers are limited to 190 on a first-in basis and deadline for registration is 28th August.
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Nth Carlton Vic. 3054
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A GREAT FACILITY FOR YOUR CREWS AND YOUR BUDGET

3 Sound Stages
Napoleon – 1300 sq m. (15,500 sq ft)
Wellington – 600 sq m. (6,450 sq ft)
Borodino – 450 sq m. (4,850 sq ft)

Each Stage with Production Offices, Art Department, Make-up, Kitchen.
Also Preview Theatrette, Props Storage, Construction Workshop, Laundry, Showers.
Undercover parking for 50 cars. No parking restrictions outside.
24 hour access, 7 days a week.

Waterloo Studios HAS IT ALL

Rental Hire
Camera Truck
Lighting Truck
Camera Equipment
Lighting Equipment

165 Phillip Street, Waterloo, NSW 2017
Phone: (02) 699 8755 Fax: (02) 698 5664

MASCARADE — a team of experienced, highly trained makeup designers and makeup artists geared to produce the face, the look, the feel you need . . . for film, television, theatre, video and still photography.

MASCARADE — competent specialists in Period Makeup — very natural ‘No-Makeup’ look, Special Effects Makeup, Fantasy, Prosthetics.

MASCARADE — the Makeup Agency in Melbourne for all makeup needs.

The agency has grown from the unique Metropolitan School of Theatre Arts, established in 1984 to ensure the highest standard of training for future makeup artists.

Enquiries for Agency and School: Shirley Reynolds on (03) 266 2087 or (AH) (03) 68 3435.
TWINS ARE BIG BUSINESS: TWINS IS THE ULTIMATE ‘HIGH CONCEPT’ HIT, BIG BUSINESS THE TOUCHSTONE-BETTE MIDLER VEHICLE. BUT THE TWINS AS ‘DOUBLE’ AND ‘OTHER’ HAS BEEN A CONSTANT PREOCCUPATION OF ART AND CINEMA.

HERE, SEVERAL EXAMPLES ARE CONSIDERED, BUT MOST NOTABLY DAVID CRONENBERG’S LATEST OFFERING DEAD RINGERS AND PETER GREENAWAY’S ECCENTRIC A ZED AND TWO NOUGHTS.

EVERY SCIENCE is a mutilated octopus. If its tentacles were not clipped to stumps, it would feel its way into disturbing contacts. To a believer, the effect of the contemplation of a science is of being in the presence of the good, the true, and the beautiful. But what he is awed by is mutilation. To our crippled intellects, only the maimed is what we call understandable, because the unclipped ramifies into all other things. According to my aesthetic, what is meant by beautiful is symmetrical deformation.”

This statement on the nature of science was made by Charles Fort, an American writing at the turn of this century. The aesthetic of ‘symmetrical deformation’ can be readily ascribed to David Cronenberg’s Dead Ringers and Peter Greenaway’s A Zed and Two Noughts. Both films are concerned with identical twins and, in distinctive ways, both have much to say on the nature of creation and the propulsion of the death instinct. What distinguishes them is a
matter of style: Cronenberg chose the modernist urban environment with all its sterile corporate-yuppie furnishings, whereas Greenaway went in for the neo-classical approach clustering together high style with pantheistic romanticism.

The study and philosophy of twins has preoccupied artists and thinkers for centuries. In the Symposium Plato described being as something whole and rounded: a universe of ball creatures. The story goes that Zeus put an end to the polymorphous pleasure experienced by these creatures by cutting them in half. According to Paul Foss, in his article ‘Tales Told Twice’, Zeus did such “a good job that afterwards they carried deep within them, more painful than the visible scar of the navel, the internal mark of this scission, the memory of their lost totality, a longing for the other half”. This longing for the other half of ourselves that is lost is the basis of every great (and not so great) love story. Otherness is at the heart of the grand search. Acceptance or separation from the difference and sameness of the other as double leads to a resolution of tension between competing parts. All separation is violence unless it is transition. And this is also painful.

The two here is copulation: love and aggression, giving birth to a diversity of beings whose nature is divine, human, monstrous. And it is thus, with this couple, that all narrative could begin. Couples are really the origin. Without them it was not possible to speak.

In Truman Capote’s masterful work, In Cold Blood, it is said that individually Perry and Dick would not have murdered the Clutter family. However, together they created a third personality and it was this personality that committed the crime. Cronenberg picks up on this mysterious idea of the third personality in Dead Ringers. The fictional story of twin gynaecologists Elliot and Beverly Mantle (Jeremy Irons) is a study in the concepts of wholeness and separation. As identical twins Elliot and Beverly have found in themselves a perfect working unit: Beverly does the research and Elliot presents it. Elliot is extroverted, Beverly introverted and reflective. The pair work in a perverse dualistic harmony until Claire Niveau (Genevieve Bujold) enters the scenario with a mutated cervix (she has three, not one). Her symmetrical deformation provides the initial impetus for the twins’ dual attraction to her. However, as with most Cronenberg plots, sex, woman and emotion are the cause of all chaos and violence amongst beings in search of each other. The twins’ living relationship becomes discordant as Beverly traces his emotional dependence onto Claire Niveau. But it is not necessarily the notion of twinnship that propels Dead Ringers. It is something more to do with the universal nature of the double; the couple, most hated by Foucault, is the prime source of exploration.

The idea of being one self is an outdated concept. Cronenberg is fascinated with the question of how long you can love someone who is changing. In The Fly this love is absolute and the greatest display of love is to kill the beloved in an act similar to euthanasia. In Dead Ringers the bond that ties Beverly to Elliot cannot be broken by Claire. She is outside. She is the other who cannot be reconciled as the other half. The notion of one-ness, of ‘me’, of ‘I’ (’I’/’I’ being similar figures in a hierarchy of importance), of self, has gradually ascended and declined in the Western consciousness. There is a strong reversion back to the classical notion of two-ness, or the metaphysical notion of two beings working as a harmonious one. (Reflect upon the third personality theory of In Cold Blood.) Although Claire is but one person she has three cervixes. This symmetrical mutation is a symbol of her suitability for the twins who, in their own way, are freaks of natural genetic grading. One woman with three cervixes can service two men with one nervous system? In Cronenberg theory , anyway. In practice the woman wants one man and one baby. The serial 1+1=3 (the tenet of reproduction) is replaced by the serial 1+1+1=1 which is the end result of this ménage à trois where Elliot plays the role of mediator, rival and obstacle in the relationship between Beverly and Claire. Eventually Beverly prefers to look into the mirror his brother Elliot provides: their relationship is essentially one of narcissism. Beverly cannot break the umbilical cord nor shatter the mirror.

The facts, fictions, mythology and apocrypha on twins is limitless rich – two of everything, the search for your other half, mistaken identities, mirror imagining, substitution, the doppelganger, the lateral line and cloning.

- John Barth

- Paul Foss Tales Twice Told

- Peter Greenaway
In Greenaway’s A Zed and Two Noughts, the pregnant wives of identical twins Oswald and Oliver Deuce are killed in a freak car accident caused by a swan. Alba Bewick is the only survivor of the accident. She has her leg amputated. Like many amputated limbs Alba’s stump is eroticized. Her loss of symmetry makes her an object of desire to the twin zoologists. As in Dead Ringers, the woman with the symmetrical deformation makes love to identical twins concurrently. They finally accept a ménage à trois relationship which results in the pregnancy of Alba. A Zed and Two Noughts also shares with Dead Ringers a mad surgeon, Van Maegeren, who has a penchant for the aesthetic of symmetrical deformation inspired by the artist Vermeer.

The neo-classical and romantic approach in A Zed and Two Noughts contrasts sharply with the austere and psychologically sterile nature of Dead Ringers. Both films exude a kind of aesthetic terrorism upon the audience. A Zed and Two Noughts is overwhelming in its visual imagery to the point of suffocation; Greenaway confronts the double with everything at his disposal. The visual imagery of Dead Ringers is spartan and Cronenberg confronts the double with nothing. Each film resolves its narrative and psychological schemata with the double negative: the twins ultimately cancel each other out. However, the resolution in each film is ultimately different. Dead Ringers ends in violent separation after the twins’ mutual confrontation with the void, emptiness. The cathartic reaction this produces in the audience could be said to be one of negative attainment. The resolution of the narrative structure lacks positive motion. Dead Ringers is a dead end. The world view is one of barrenness: the possibility of reproduction within Cronenberg’s Weltanschauung is non-existent because women are either mutant, sterile or a form of lessness. The perfect double is at once the same and the other, the closest and the most remote, hallowing out a radical difference within identity. The more authentic, the more balanced, happily contemplating themselves, face to face, as with Plato’s ball creatures.

Paul Foss, Tales Twice Told

There is a limited stock of cinematic themes. The subject of twins is rich for an exploration of otherness and sameness, of multiplicity and oneness. As a theme, it is ancient. Research on identical twins had been the cornerstone of much genetic research until modern technology provided the tools to explore chromosomes and genes directly. As a subject identical and fraternal twins are contemporary and relevant for a number of reasons.

First, the ethical questions surrounding eugenics, social Darwinism, family planning and genetic engineering are far from being resolved. Simply put, eugenics is the practical application of genetic theory to strengthen the genetic material of the human species (positive eugenics) or eliminate genetic dross (negative eugenics). Recent studies show that much of Nazi racial policy, realized in the German Population Courts, was based on Hitler’s study of certain American states whose laws ‘concerning prevention of reproduction by people whose progeny would, in all probability, be of no value or injurious to the racial stock’ (see Otto Wagener’s Hitler: Memoirs of a Confidant, 1985). Secondly, cloning, robotics, bio-cybernetics and artificial intelligence have taken a special place in contemporary research and thinking, inspiring debate both philosophically (Baudrillard, Rovik) and cinematically (Bladerunner, Android, RoboCop, Making Mr Right). Thirdly, there is the general problem of alienation...
Alienation runs deep: we are as close to understanding ourselves as ever, which is very little, since the fate of all explanation is to close one door only to have another fly wide open. Fourthly, there is the apocalyptic imagination. In 1984 the future had caught up with us and despite the fact that Armageddon had not occurred, the apocalyptic mind (take Reagan, for instance) continues to espouse the second millennium. To Space Invaders we relinquished our fears of the oncoming invasion and to Star Wars we dreamt the magic of alien technology. It has been a cathartic time, the decade of the eighties. It is no wonder that 'art' films like DUNE featured in DEATH RINGERS, A Zed and Two Noughts and Bladerunner and genre films such as Twins, Big Business and Dominick and Eugene bring us back to earth and explore the possibilities therein.

Against such a background ancient themes are being explored in the dream factories. Establishing links with the archetypes and mythologies (the dream substances) of the past is imagined to be a line to healing the neurotic and schizophrenic present. The egomaniacal notions of total self-creation professed by the ‘me’ generation theologies of the previous few decades ignore the pantheistic, divine, shamanistic, mythological and animistic roots of humanity. Altered states of awareness are long forgotten (except by Timothy Leary!).


All these categories share a thematic in search of the Other: within and without. What makes the identical twins exploration so fascinating at present is the combined force of ancient mythology and new genetic and psychological research. The archetypal pair of twins, Castor and Pollux, the astrological Gemini, were born out of an egg from the union of a woman and a god disguised as a swan. The twins featured in DEATH RINGERS and A Zed and Two Noughts are the result of the union of myth (the swan) and genetics (the god).

Identical twins are formed by the splitting of a single fertilized egg. They are the equivalent of genetic clones. According to accepted theory identical twins can differ in personality only by nurture. Yet new studies in America on identical twins separated at birth and raised in different environments suggest that particular personality traits are inherited genetically (nature) and not socialized (nurture). This has set off the nature-nurture debate in academia. (For more see “To the Manner Born” by Winifred Gallagher in Rolling Stone, March 1988 and The New York Times, December 1, 1986). The concept of a genetic personality reeks of a hopeless determinism that could be used to justify negative eugenics if a political climate so engineered it.

To be one: Paradise! To be two: Bliss! But to be both and neither is unspeakable. —John Barth, Petition

As a grouping the films I have listed above all reflect on the transitional and shifting nature of personality and character. They represent a higher unity of ambivalence and over-determination in a world that has lost its pivot. A multiplicity of personality but not multiple personalities (except, of course, for Zelig).

The ambiguous double suicides of both sets of twins in DEATH RINGERS and A Zed and Two Noughts are basically irrational but predetermined acts based on a kind of schizophrenic logic. Their urge to individuate self from other (as in Nietzsche’s Apollonian principle) and to submerge self into the social (as in the Dionysian principle). The twins merge into each other, happily contemplating themselves (in a mutual self pity) as the death instinct has victory.

What distinguishes DEATH RINGERS and A Zed and Two Noughts from other ‘twins’ vehicles (Twins, Dominick and Eugene, Big Business) is that personal tragedy fails to be personal. Their experience is mutual: the failure of the mirror stage. This failure to isolate the personal from the social is what has lemmings running for the cliffs. Mass empathy equals mass suicide.

DEATH RINGERS and A Zed and Two Noughts are dice cast in the shadow of the hysteria that has extremists touting the Christian anxiety of the second coming and Armageddon (an issue radically dealt with by Adam Parfrey in his book, Apocalypse Culture, Amok Press, New York, 1987). These two films are contemplative pieces with a strong warning signal in the text — beware of false prophets! To make a definitive case of them is as simple and complex as Greenaway’s puzzle, “Is a zebra a white horse with black stripes, or a black horse with white stripes?” Maybe the zebra is a mutilated octopus? I leave this to your imagination.
HISTORY IN THE MAKING, 
THE RE-MAKING, THE FAKING? 
WHAT DOES THE TRUE BELIEVERS 
TELL US ABOUT A TURBULENT 
PERIOD OF AUSTRALIAN 
HISTORY AND THE BELIEFS 
THAT INFORMED IT?

It is becoming increasingly evident that if we wish to understand Australian society today, the decade from the mid-1940s to the mid-Fifties is an essential starting point. It was then that the battle of ideas about the sort of society Australia should become in the contemporary world was fought. The way that battle was resolved entailed the defeat of the preconceptions of a new order cherished by many in the 1940s, and laid the foundations of the national political economy that has shaped our lives since then.

The contest of ideas was not peculiar to Australia, but the drama with which it was played out was. It often seems to me that we have been so bemused by the American representations of those years – McCarthy as the icon of witchhunts, the romantic myths of beleaguered artists (predominantly writers and screenwriters) “blacklisted” from their professions (remember Woody Allen in The Front?) – that we have overlooked the much greater and much more dramatic schisms that the Cold War/Red Scare brought in Australian society. The Australian Royal Commission into Espionage was more focused and in some ways more startling than the American HUAC hearings, the roles played by – and effects on the careers of – our leading political figures had a tragic trajectory, and the near destruction of our oldest political party was unparalleled in analogous Western societies.

Elements of the Australian scenario have long been picked over by academics who have studied the Labor split, the formation of the Liberal Party, the “Battle of the Banks”, the nature of the post-war economy, the rise of consumerism, the articulation of liberal hegemony, and so on. But these have been written for specialist audiences, and have often worked only on isolated elements of the mosaic. We have lacked overarching interpretation. Above all, we have lacked attempts to interpret these events in a way accessible to the popular consciousness.

The series The True Believers, then, offers much: it attempts, by working through a popular medium, to rescue that crucial decade for the people. It is predicated on a recognition of the dramatic potential of the political contest of those years. It is resolutely Australian in its focus. And it promises attention to the nature of the beliefs that informed the struggle. If its ambitions are not fully realized, it is an interesting attempt, and its accolades (including the 1988 AFI award for best mini-series) suggest it is one of the strongest mini-series of recent years.

The True Believers works best as narrative and melodrama: it fails to deliver in helping us to understand the nature of ideas, and in reaching for an epic quality it neglects some of the more interesting human characteristics of its protagonists and so underrates all but the “heroes”. Some of these failings are perhaps endemic to the mini-series form – at least as practised in Australia. Let me elaborate on each of these features.

The storyline that can be drawn from the politics of the 1940s and Fifties is a strong one, and The True Believers is astutely managed to capitalize on that story’s potential. The story of the series is cast, as pre-publicity made clear, as the story of three men – Ben Chifley, H.V.
THE TRUE BELIEVERS IS A STORY OF THOSE UNIVERSALS - LEADERSHIP, AMBITION AND POWER - AND A STORY ABOUT WHAT AMBITION AND THE PURSUIT OF POWER DO TO THOSE WHO ASPIRE TO LEAD. THIS IS, THEN, A MORAL TALE AND ONE WHICH CAN EASILY BE GIVEN TRAGIC SHAPE.
And so the small-minded, the pragmatists, the cynics – in a word, the politicians – chip away at him until eventually, inevitably, they destroy him. All this is very moving. But this sort of sentimental heroization diminishes Chifley as a politician, misrepresents the strength of the Labor government, and short-changes every other figure in the series.

In this version Chifley is the steadfast saint around whom others mill and scheme. Whatever other script changes were effected in the course of production, it is evident that this accords with Ellis’s intention: he has subsequently described Chifley as “...the saintly hero... a lonely childless man of startling rural working-class intellect and forensic ability...”. Accordingly, Chifley is characterized chiefly by his saintly forbearance. Most of the time he is reacting, embattled, heading off disasters rather than initiating. Granted he is, above all others, the keeper of the flame, but his epic avuncularity prevents him from getting down into the gutter where mainstream politics flows. And so the small-minded, the pragmatists, the cynics – in a word, the politicians – chip away at him until eventually, inevitably, they destroy him. All this is verymoving. But this sort of sentimental heroization diminishes Chifley as a politician, misrepresents the strength of the Labor government, and short-changes every other figure in the series.

The True Believers diminishes Chifley not only by failing to show him as a tactician and ready to engage in “combat politics”, but also by failing to convey the content of his program. Chifley was not the sole author of this program, but along with his colleagues and a collection of brilliant bureaucrats (his “official family”), was a key progenitor of detailed plans for a new order. This was a time when Labor had a philosophy and a program, and could show the link between ideals and a pragmatic blueprint for society. The details are easy to discover – in the landmark White Paper on Full Employment (1945) for instance. The viewer, however, has a hard time discerning what in particular Labor was trying to achieve from The True Believers, where Chifley’s major speeches are inspirational, not programmatic. This emphasis on ideology rather than content misses a chief strength of the ALP in the Chifley period.

One of the most striking things about talking to people who joined the Liberal Party in the late 1940s is how strong the Labor Party was then seen to be: they joined because they feared the Curtin/Chifley-style ALP government would dominate for a generation. It is worthwhile calling, too, that the non-Labor parties’ hold on power in the early 1950s was precarious – electoral trends flowed steadily Labor’s way after 1949, with substantial improvement for the ALP in the 1951 federal elections; every State but South Australia returning a Labor government by 1953, and the widespread expectation that Labor would surely win nationally in 1954. The Petrov affair and the split in the ALP – on both of which the series is very good – changed all that. Still, it is wrong retrospectively to reinterpret the preceding years and suggest that Chifley’s was always a marginal and embattled government. The viewer, however, has a hard time discerning what in particular Labor was trying to achieve from The True Believers, where Chifley’s major speeches are inspirational, not programmatic. This emphasis on ideology rather than content misses a chief strength of the ALP in the Chifley period.

One of the most striking things about talking to people who joined the Liberal Party in the late 1940s is how strong the Labor Party was then seen to be: they joined because they feared the Curtin/Chifley-style ALP government would dominate for a generation. It is worthwhile calling, too, that the non-Labor parties’ hold on power in the early 1950s was precarious – electoral trends flowed steadily Labor’s way after 1949, with substantial improvement for the ALP in the 1951 federal elections; every State but South Australia returning a Labor government by 1953, and the widespread expectation that Labor would surely win nationally in 1954. The Petrov affair and the split in the ALP – on both of which the series is very good – changed all that. Still, it is wrong retrospectively to reinterpret the preceding years and suggest that Chifley’s was always a marginal and embattled government in the 1940s and that once out of office it was assumed banished for years.

The series takes the easy way out with Menzies, showing him as an oily and pragmatic opportunist, who justifies his ploys to himself as “just politics” while pontificating to Patie at home about being a truly moral man. Again, subsequent commentary by Ellis confirms that this was always his intention – he describes Menzies as “...the manipulating villain, a self-made lazy aristocrat and conscienceless villain... moved to heights of selfishness...”. Not surprisingly, this has stimulated outrage from his family, and an extraordinary defence from John Bonney (the actor who played Menzies) that “my moonlight flit through the hall of fame will surely be eclipsed by the dazzling sun of the real Sir Robert”. Such a representation cannot account for the affection and warmth for Menzies held by those who worked with him.10 More importantly, for a series concerned with belief, this approach emphasizes pragmatism at the cost of understanding the philosophy that would dominate the politics of the 1950s and Sixties.

The implication is that on the non-Labor side beliefs are unimportant: the imperatives of maintaining power will always override them. Of course Menzies did develop as a strategist and manipulator of the first order, capable as the series shows of capitalizing on the “Red Threat”, the Petrov affair and Labor’s internal dissension to destroy
the ALP’s chances of government. But to imply that he was no more than this is absurd to underestimate him and to miss the other side of the battle of ideas. The non-Labor side, too, developed a principled blueprint for post-War society, which was at odds with the Labor program. Again, the details are easy to locate—in the Institute for Public Affairs publication *Looking Forward* (1944), for instance. Menzies and his allies believed in this program. What is more Menzies was able brilliantly to convey the substance of that program into the public sphere, and in a way that won public assent. A notable instance of this was his appeal to “the forgotten people”, as Judith Brett has shown. Further, the non-Labor side, in parallel with the establishment of the Liberal Party, set about constructing extra-parliamentary networks specifically concerned with generating the ideas that would fuel their political rebellion. Yet this series sees “true believers” as by definition only in the Labor camp. There has been a tradition in Australian historiography that represents Labor as the party of initiative and non-Labor as the parties of reaction, but this tradition has been countered by work that shows how important ideas and the means of generating ideas have been in sustaining non-Labor politics. Even if the series is primarily concerned with understanding Labor politics in this period (and the self-destruction within the ALP), the larger context in which the party operated must be more faithfully rendered. For *The True Believers* to ignore this counter-revolution in historiography is to misunderstand our recent history and to misunderstand the nature of the confrontation Labor faced in the 1940s and 1950s. Yet all this is an effect of the way the series chooses to misrepresent Menzies.

The Communist leadership, and Edgar Ross in particular, is even more seriously impugned. Not only, as already shown, is Ross’s account of the 1949 miners’ strike given no credence whatsoever, but also Ross is portrayed as an unthinking extremist agitator, speaking only in slogans, and sacrificing everything to his fanaticism. This does not accord well with the Ross one finds in his books, or can still see in public performance. Further, the series takes considerable liberties with Ross’s broader relationships, portraying quarellsome confrontations between Edgar and his brother Lloyd (one of Chifley’s “official family”) and showing Edgar’s wife Tess taking Lloyd’s side against him when in fact Edgar and Lloyd had no contact at all during this period. Indeed, the series even makes Ross’ children younger than they were to enhance the supposed danger to which their father’s political extremism exposed them. What the series presents here is a stock melodramatic type designed to evoke a knee-jerk response from an audience, and this runs directly counter to later claims to be faithful to the broad historical record. Surely this is much more than a matter of “minor performance issues” (see below) as the ABC was later to claim in the face of criticism.

Evatt, too, undergoes some simplification in *The True Believers*. He is allowed to play in only one key: the cantankerous, irascible individualist with a messianic belief in his destiny as leader of the ALP in government. He was certainly all of these things, but he was more complex and more gifted than the series can allow. Nonetheless, as if to shore up the series’ interpretation, much subsequent commentary by people with a special interest in the series played up Evatt’s alleged “dementia”, and subsequent decline (perhaps, according to Ellis, into Alzheimer’s disease). Yet the extent to which his later illness affected his political leadership is still a moot point, and his biography does not sit well with the series’ argument. Some may recall a considerably more positive portrait in an ABC documentary, *Like a Summer Storm*, screened perhaps 15 years ago (and now in the National Library collection). Further, in late 1988 ABC Radio National ran a series called “The Doc”, consisting of reminiscences from those who knew Evatt, which—which coming hard on the heels of *The True Believers*—served to play up the many dimensions of the man and to show how limited the portrait in *The True Believers* is. I will suggest below that dramatic convention rather than biographical detail played its part in the way Evatt was represented in the series, but first let me note one more area where *The True Believers* works to diminish rather than to reveal.

The roles of women deserve comment here in terms of what the series implies about gender relations in the 1940s. Women are depicted only as supporters of strong men—wives or secretaries. Each of the key figures is represented in a tight partnership—Ben and Lizzie Chifley, Bob and Pattie Menzies, “The Doc” and Mary Alice Evatt, Edgar and Tess Ross. This ploy has dramatic purposes: the women are confidantes, to whom strategy and motives can be explained—and thus made clear to the audience. In their turn, they are represented as those who are capable of penetrating vain-glory and bluster to speak for common sense, and who register (for us) the real dangers and emotional ramifications of “boys’ games”. Chifley’s (fictional) secretary, Elsie, in particular stands for us as the (often silent) witness, signalling through changes of expression the inevitable end towards which he is being driven. Nonetheless, there is no space within this utilization of conventions for registering these women as strong persons, actors within this drama in their own right. Perhaps the intention is to indicate that women simply were more constrained in the 1940s. Looking at the struggles mounted by women’s movements in the 1940s would qualify this impression; the entry of women into federal parliament and the now well explained dynamics of a partnership like that of Joe and Enid Lyons should have given further pause to reconsider. Most particularly, the careers of these individual women have not been well-served by this representation. The scriptwriters must have known, for instance, that Mary Alice Evatt was a significant figure in Australian artistic circles, where she dragged “The Doc” along in her wake, or that women like Tess Ross had their own role in the Communist women’s movements. Heather Menzies complains of the representation of “a mother who was nothing like the sparkling character I knew”.

**IT SEEMS CLEAR THAT THE MAKERS OF THE TRUE BELIEVERS BELIEVED THAT THE STORY COULD ONLY BE MADE ACCESSIBLE BY PERSONALIZING, SIMPLIFYING AND PRESENTING HEROES, BATTLERS AND VILLAINS. SUCH AN APPROACH INEVITABLY EMPHASIZES THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE HEROES AT THE EXPENSE OF ALL OTHERS.**

**BACK ROOM BOYS:**

**B. A. SANTAMARIA** (JOHN DERUM) AND **ARCHBISHOP MANNIX** (NORMAN KAYE) WORK OUT THEIR STRATEGIES
So is it asking too much to expect a mini-series to give insight into the many-sided nature of the events which shaped our recent history? It seems clear that the makers of *The True Believers* believed that the story could only be made accessible by personifying, by simplifying and by presenting heroes, battlers and villains. Such an approach inevitably emphasizes the perspective of the heroes at the expense of all others. But to really understand the period we need multiple perspectives. Those who share the belief in the importance of that period and the necessity for it to be understood, may well feel short-changed, for the sorts of reasons mentioned in this article. In defence of the series, it has been argued that it captures what the period was like (by, among others, Fred Daly). It clearly appeals to the emotions of those whose first (pro-Labor) political memories are of that time (as Phillip Adams testifies). And from the ABC itself has come this defence: Mr Ellis, alleging inaccuracies, really deals with minor performance issues rather than serious distortions of fact which would destroy the worth of *The True Believers* as a broad historical record. What the drama hopes to achieve is a portrayal of historical events and personalities which, while perhaps not factual in every detail, will nevertheless convey the atmosphere and overall sense of events and personalities of the time... It is just one portrayal of the record of what happened. Changes certainly were made... almost entirely for economic reasons. For example, we combined some of the... characters... to form some composite characters... Whatever changes were made were accepted so that the series ultimately could be produced and not remain a fantasy lying in someone's bottom drawer.

None of these responses can account for the failure to deal with ideas, the caricaturing of Edgar Ross, the distorted pictures of Evatt and Menzies - all of which are matters of interpretation. The interpretation, as I have suggested, is undercut by sentimental heroization. The tenor of *The True Believers* brought to mind a distinction once made by a political scientist between "sun" parties and "moon" parties. The argument went that some parties are more concerned with power and the imperatives of staying in power (usually through having been in power for lengthy periods and knowing what it takes) than with philosophy. These become dominant parties, "sun" parties. Other parties are so wedded to a philosophy that they will sacrifice power to the "purity" of their ideas. Once out of power, however, they may become so concerned (and internally divided) about principles that they become even more reclusive: these are the "moon" parties. The Labor Party, in this series, bears the hallmarks of a "moon" party. It is the only party, as I have suggested, that is shown to have "true believers", the only one concerned with (and fatally divided over) ideas. There is always, within the Labor Party - and indeed all parties with an articulated philosophy intended to inform their programs - a tension between what philosophy dictates and what the contingencies of power demand. Can these be balanced, and if they cannot will ideals or pragmatism win? Clearly, appeals to "tradition" (always popular in politics - it's in a coffin. You have all the dignity of death plus a 21-gun salute) are comments like Bill McKell's "We think we are winning, but we feel of the contingent, the unpredictable (that is to say, of what it was of everyday politics to a tragic trajectory of inevitability. There is little feel of the contingent, the unpredictable (that is to say, of what it was really like) in *The True Believers*. And in case we miss the point, there are comments like Bill McKell's "We think we are winning, but we never do." The tendency is epitomized in the dramatic use made of Evatt, to whom, significantly, the final word is given. The final scenes are set in King's Hall, where Evatt delivers these lines to the journalist, Ron Tait:

> "Jerusalem", is of Evatt walking alone down the steps of Parliament House. How is this to be read, in the light of the defeats we have witnessed, and knowing that Evatt was to find no peace, with the end of his political career, but an inauspicious twilight period as NSW Chief Justice during which he was increasingly infirm and experienced the loss of his powers and competence? Is this not another version of the battle, brave but beaten, "the single most representative character" in the construction of national identity? Is this not, to pick up a strand from Ray Evans's previous article in this journal on *Shout!* another appeal to the "myths of... a dependent people who treasure the strings twang, but don't vibrate." The effect of a series like *The True Believers*, partisan as it is, is unwittingly a profoundly conservative one. It fails to engage with the substance of the battle of ideas - on both sides - mistaking inspirational rhetoric for content. It implies that there is a dichotomy between "true belief" and pragmatic action - an unmistakable indicator of a "moon party" mythology. (In this it is truly a product of the 1980s, when Labor governments have learned the implicit message this series encapsulates, and have to all intents and purposes sacrificed principles to the pragmatism of power: but the 1940s experience, when the ALP achieved a unification of ideas with a program might have been used to show that it does not need to be like that.) It suggests that there were heroes in politics in those days, and that they failed. It gives the impression that the major battles have already been fought. The message is unmistakably "We think we are winning, but we never do." What price social reform now?

**FOOTNOTES**

5. Ellis, op. cit. p12.  
7. Ellis, op. cit. p12.  
14. Fred Daly, "Felling it like it was", *The Guide*, Sydney Morning Herald, 27 June 1988; *Engineer* 12.  
22. Fred Daly, op cit.  
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INTERNATIONAL RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 1:</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Surface</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>97.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niugini</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>136.00</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 2:</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Surface</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>97.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>116.00</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 3:</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Surface</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>112.00</td>
<td>168.00</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 4:</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Surface</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>101.00</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>187.00</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 5:</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>Surface</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK/Europe</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>187.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>136.00</td>
<td>205.00</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUPPLIERS QUIET

DENNIS NOONAN, general manager at Samuelson's in Sydney, was trying to be optimistic about the slump in production. He estimated that both commercials and features were down 50% on last year - and last year wasn't all that good either!

He said that Samuelson’s size lets it ride out the bumps, but it looks as if significant change will not take place before September. Some of the recent problems have been cancellations, owing to the Sydney rain.

The positive side of this is that Samuelson’s has had more time to devote to modifications and R & D.

The new CCD chips have improved the quality of video assists and the pivoting viewfinders on the Arri 3 doors have now been fitted with a flicker-free (at 25fps) manual iris, auto gain (with a high/low override) video split. It can be flipped in or out and there is no interference if run from the same battery as the camera. (Peter Hobson in Melbourne also mentioned that they now have the DENIZ colour CCD split for the Arri 3.)

They have added a swing-away bracket to the 6.6-inch matte box for easier lens changes and gate checks, and have changed the focus box on the Canon 600- and 800mm telephoto lenses, so that one revolution of the focus control wheel gives a full rack of the lenses.

They have also spent some time on the nose mount for the new Bell Jet Ranger helicopter. The remote control box will now allow a tilt during shooting, has full speed and iris control, footgate and camera speed and an on/off readout on the green-screen high-definition monitor. You can even shoot high-speed and control it all from the module that sits on your lap.

New rental items available from Sammies include the big Arri 12k HMI with the (wait for it) Arrivator motorized stand, which takes all the lug out of lifting the light up to its full height of around five metres.

Sammies has the new Betacam CVR-507, which is the latest CCD camera and SP recorder, and the CVR-35 portable VTR for record and playback. Both of these units give great pictures.

You may remember John Scale praising the Panavision Primo lenses in the last issue of Cinema Papers. There is a fully matched set of lenses in some unusual increments: 10, 14.5, 17.5, 21, 27, 35, 40, 50, 75, 100, 150 and 200mm. There is also a 17-75mm zoom.

Peter Hobson, manager at Sammies Melbourne, added that they also have the Tiffen Pro-Mist glass filters, which should take the place of the acrylic SupaFrost, of which I've scratched my share.

Peter said that he was getting good reports on the Panavision E Series anamorphic lenses that are being used on the Boulevard Films feature, Hunting. Boulevard is using the Panaflex Platinum camera. He also commented that Melbourne’s weather has been terrific. For further details contact Samuelson's Film Services in Sydney on (02) 43 1844, in Melbourne on (03) 646 3044 and Perth on (09) 362 4488.

DICK LEVERS from Atlab is hardly likely to admit to any difficulties in settling into the new Artarmon premises - he designed the new layout. Apparently the changeover has been smooth, and he reported that the staff are still getting used to having windows, after living in a bunker at Epping: even if the only view is of the three television towers on the hill. He is busy working on the Telecine and sound facilities, and the lab is putting on new staff - overall, it seems the mood is positive.

The Atlab address is 47 Elothen Parade, Artarmon, New South Wales, Telephone (02) 906 0100.

JOSEPHINE COOKE has taken a brave plunge with the opening of her new film editing and audio facility at (and called) Sixty-One Australia Street, in Camperdown. She has take over the Superfine Studios equipment and has tried to produce the kind of facility she wished had been available when she was sound editing. Believing that some of the available multi-track sound edit suites still have trouble handling 'sprockets' she has created an environment that allows clients to involve their own sound editors in the audio post-production. You can call Josephine on (02) 550 3535.

IT WAS PLEASING to see that Yuri Sokol has been recognized with the Milli Award for Cinematographer of the Year from the Australian Cinematographers’ Society. He also received the ACS Golden Tripod Award for the cinematography on Ben Lewin’s Georgia. His reported comments in Encore on mixing Fuji and Kodak stocks on the film made me wonder at Hanimex’s congratulatory ad in the same issue claiming that it was shot entirely on Fuji. I can only guess at what the reporter meant by saying Yuri used “Kodak for low-speed filming and then Fuji”.

Congratulations to all other ACS winners, including Jim Frazier, Paul Nichola, David Parer and Glen Carruthers for their Specialized Cinematography Awards.

I’VE BEEN LOOKING closely at the Super VHS equipment available and was pleased to be invited by the people from Ace Edit to a display of their range of S-VHS gear. Glyn Morris has pulled together a complete system from Bauer/Bosc which includes the full-size S-VHS CCD camcorder and the VHS-C version that has hi-fi stereo audio. There is the 45cm multi-input receiver-handling Composite/RBG/S-VHS, a title generator and edit controller. He also showed a flexible 1.5mm timebase corrector that will obviously be required to allow the S-VHS format to deliver its potential. Even if you missed the displays in Melbourne and Sydney you can get full details and prices from Ace Edit on (02) 398 9039 or P.O. Box 323, Bondi Junction, New South Wales 2022.

I HAVE ONLY NOTED the announcements of the death of Joe Roizen, who died suddenly in Paris on 1 March. Joe was one of the guests at...
Films have changed significantly since the thirties, but not film—We have had 35mm for a century now, and most of its specifications have not changed in more than 50 years. So what kinds of changes will a new format like Super 35mm bring to the industry?

Cinemascope is the name that survives to represent them all. These techniques make use of the full available frame area in the film, but use an anamorphic lens to broaden the image out to twice the width on the screen. This gives an aspect ratio of about 2.35 to 1. Naturally the same type of anamorphic lens is used to squeeze the image in the camera, so that a wide view is concentrated onto the negative in the first place. What projectionists and the public know as Cinemascope is known by cinematographers as Panavision, and it is this company that has performed the optical miracles of designing camera lenses that focus, zoom, and squeeze at the same time.

The other approach to wide-screen film presentation could also be called short-screen presentation. By cropping the top and bottom of regular academy frame image, the aspect ratio is automatically increased. Choosing a shorter focal length lens for the projector now widens the image and restores it to full-screen height. The commonly accepted standard ratios are 1.85 to 1 here and the U.S., but a slightly less dramatic 1.66 to 1 in the US and Europe. This format has the advantage of simpler optics both in the camera and the projector, but as it uses less of the available negative area, the image on the screen suffers from poorer resolution and graininess, and needs more projector illumination than a conventional academy presentation.

Over the past 30 or 40 years there have been many other approaches to the problem of getting more image onto the screen: these have ranged from Vistavision, in which the film was turned on its side like a still camera, to Techniscope, in which an even shorter frame height is used, together with a two-perf put-down. These other systems never became established as major production systems because of the substantial hardware changes required.

What is known as the Super 35 system is in a sense a synthesis of the successful wide- or very wide-screen systems under conventional 35mm four-perf film. Surprisingly it is not as new as many people might think. In fact the first use of Superscope was in 1954, in which an aspect ratio of 2 to 1 was obtained; in 1954 the frame dimensions were modified to give an image that was compatible with Cinemascope, at 2.35 to 1.
Interestingly, one of the major applications in the 1950s was for prints exported by Hollywood to South America. It turned out that higher ticket prices could be charged for wide-screen films, and so a number of conventional flat productions were reduped into a squeezed format for export.

However, in the 1950s, grain was a much more dominant factor than today, and the reduced negative area that was used by the Superscope system (as it was then called) led to unacceptably poor image definition, and the designers moved on to other approaches.

**REBIRTH OF SUPER 35**

In the years in between, negative emulsions have become finer and finer-grained. At the same time filming techniques have called for greater and greater versatility in camera set-ups. The idea of shooting image over the entire width of the film, including the sound-track area, re-emerged a few years ago, and was first seen in sections of the film *Greystoke: The Legend of Tarzan, Lord of the Apes*, shot by John Alcott.

A year or so later, the Western *Silverado* was shot by John Bailey using the same technique. It gave them the big, wide deep look of the old Westerns, with the width of 'Scope, but much more depth of field than we have been used to. A number of other productions followed in short order, and Australian filmmakers were as keen as any others make use of the technique.

A documentary – *The Last I Heard* – came first, shot by John McLean, followed shortly by two features – *Birdsville*, later retitled *Bullseye*, shot by Dean Semler, and Paul Murphy’s photography on *Dead End Drive-In*. Several other features have followed more recently.

Super 35 uses the full width of the negative area – from perf to perf – to record the original image, with conventional, or spherical lenses. An optical printing stage is used in duplication, to squeeze that wide image into the normal projection width, and to leave room for the soundtrack on the prints. If the print is to be released in Cinemascope, the the image is squeezed about 10 per cent and stretched to about 1.8 times original height, so that only the middle section of the negative – top to bottom – finishes up on the dupe neg for release printing. For a conventional 1.85 release, an initial reduction of about 10 per cent flat is used in duping. Seventy mm also works very nicely, with a straight blow-up onto 65mm intermediate negative.

On the point of image size, a normal 1.85 wide-screen picture uses a negative area of .388 square inches. An anamorphic extraction from a Super 35 negative, by comparison, uses .372 square inches – almost exactly the same area. However, the 'Scope print is much larger – an area of .638 square inches, so that much more light is available for projection.

The advantage of this technique is that the cinematographer is able to use conventional spherical lenses, allowing a much greater choice of lens type, focal length, zoom range and depth of field, as anamorphic lenses are commonly held to give less depth than corresponding sphericals. In theory this is a logical step: a lens that has to zoom over a wide range of focal lengths, focus sharply over a deep range of subject distances, and do all this with an anamorphic ratio of two to one is a tall order and I take my hat off to the optical people who can make it work, but the Super 35 approach means that the anamorphic element can be taken off location, and locked into position on an optical printer bench, where it can operate with a fixed focal length and a fixed copy ratio.

There is another apparent advantage in these days when any production has to have an eye to a TV release, or the domestic video market. To date, television is universally a 1.33 to 1 ratio, leading to the common difficulties of fitting a 2.35 wide image onto a narrow screen. Cropping and pan-and-scan inevitably lead to compromises, where a cinematographer has used the full width of the cinema screen only to end up with a video version that shows two noses talking to each other, or – arguably worse still – a beautifully composed shot with a series of awkward pans as the telecine operator chases the star around the screen. Although no one can make perfect composition for 2.35 and 1.33 in the same shot, Super 35 offers the cinematographer the opportunity to shoot a 1.33 image in the full height of the camera frame, but restrict important subject matter away from the top and bottom of the frame, so that they will not be lost in the cinema release.

---

**VICTORIAN FILM LABORATORIES PTY LTD**

Specialists in:

- 35mm TO SUPER 35mm
- SUPER 16 TO 35mm BLOW UP
- VIDEO TO FILM TRANSFER
- and of course Eastman, Black & White and Reversal Processes

FOR QUOTATIONS ON YOUR NEXT FEATURE, TELE-FEATURE, MINI-SERIES, DOCUMENTARY ETC. PHONE VFL THE INDEPENDENT LAB: (03) 818 0461 FAX (03) 819 1451

---
THE FRAMELINE - WHAT'S IN AND WHAT'S OUT?

Once the decision is made to use the Super 35 format, decisions must be made as to how the image is to be framed on film.

The first consideration is the light/right centreline. Most cameras have their lenses mounted on the Academy centreline - about 50 thousandths of an inch to one side of film centre - which is the normal frame centre of the final printed film image (allowing for the soundtrack on one side). Lenses zoom on this axis. Obviously the centre of a Super 35 frame is at film centre, not Academy centre. Most camera suppliers have chosen to re-centre lens mounts on cameras fitted for Super 35 to avoid the possibility of vignetting, and to centre zooms accurately.

However, provided these points are borne in mind it is possible to use an unmodified camera; and this may be useful in certain circumstances such as second unit work.

Much more critical is the matter of composition in the vertical plane. Four aspect ratios have to be considered: Cinemascope, wide-screen, 70mm and television. The obvious approach is to have all framelines marked with a common centreline. Important action is kept within the 2.35 limit, but the outer areas are kept free of unwanted items such as mike booms, matte boxes, or dolly tracks.

The alternative approach is to mark the various framelines with a common top line (CTL). It usually turns out that the most critical reference point in framing or composing a shot is not the centre, but the head line: it is preferable to have a character's head near the top of the frame regardless of aspect ratio. Furthermore, having only one top line minimizes the problem of avoiding zooms without upsetting the sound people.

When it comes to the television transfer, be it for broadcast or for video mastering, the difference between the cinema framelines and the full height of the frame is quite considerable. As it happens though, many telecine gates are unable to scan the full silent width of the film and so there is room for a reasonably elegant solution. The telecine is zoomed in slightly and re-centred so that approximately one-tenth of an inch is masked from either side of the image - on the one side because of the skid plate which normally covers the track area, and on the other side to give symmetry left-to-right. To obtain a true 1.33 to 1 ratio, the frame height turns out to be only slightly more than the wide-screen height. By cropping very slightly narrower than this, it is possible to use exactly the same vertical masking as the 1.85 ratio limits, so that once again it is possible to use a symmetrical or common top line approach.

The beauty of this result is that by careful framing, it is possible for a cinematographer to make full use of the wide cinema screen where the shot demands it, but not to be stuck with massive cropping or intrusive panning and scanning for the TV version. In practice, cinematographers have tended to frame for the cinema, perceived as the most important, and have left the other ratios - particularly the TV ratio - to be sorted out at transfer time. From the laboratory point of view, either approach is easy to handle - but please don’t mix different framing standards in one production. Not only does it require additional neg matching procedures, but also the potential for confusion and lost time is bound to lead to disaster.

As with any format, it is important to have a precise standard to work to - a set of dimensions agreed by the camera manufacturers, the laboratories and the theatres. Since the object of using the full width of the film is to maximize the size of the image, a camera aperture of 98 thou seems sensible. That is equivalent to the original silent aperture. However, it turns out that the some cameras have mechanical limitations that would prevent exposing right to the edge of this limit - for example, a claw mechanism would cast a shadow. Another point is that the area between the perfs and normal academy aperture has been set aside for an optical time-code recording system. (Although this has not been widely implemented, the industry has accepted this by agreement of a ‘recommended practice’ in 1983.) So it becomes necessary to trim one side of the image by about 20 thou. Masking the other side to give a maximum camera aperture of 945 thou (still wider than the Academy width of 899 thou). The maximum projected width - a shade narrower still to be sure that the camera gate edge is not seen on the screen - becomes 925 thou.

So at present two possible standards exist - 980 or 945 thou. Cameras exist for both dimensions, and both are vigorously supported by their proponents. Does this matter? What’s wrong with two alternatives? Well, this is where the laboratory comes in. Obviously if you have shot your picture 980 wide, you will feel cheated if the lab does a blow-up from 945 thou: apart from very slight cropping, the useful negative area is about 12 per cent smaller, which means a greater blow-up with correspondingly more graininess and less sharpness. Conversely, if your camera mask is only 945 thou wide, then a print that shows 980 thou will include a lot of messy camera mask shadows.

Now the point about the anamorphic lenses used by the lab for Super 35 extractions is that they will only work at one focal length and therefore one degree of magnification. It is not simply a matter of focusing the lens to suit a different negative size: you need a completely different lens. A new set-up for a new lens is not so easy either: focusing an anamorphic copying lens requires separate adjustments for vertical focus and horizontal focus.

So at present there is no agreement for a standard: the 980 thou group is keen to maintain full width for full quality; the 945 group cannot possibly accommodate this width, and the labs will be happy with either, but not both.

PRODUCTION METHODS

What about Super 35 in the laboratory? Naturally, negative processing is no problem - the raw stock is exactly the same as for regular 35mm productions. Since the system uses a smaller negative area than any other 35mm system - at any rate for cinema release formats - image sharpness and graininess are at a greater premium: accurate focus is a fundamental necessity, as anything slightly soft will fall apart through the duping stages. Fine-grained emulsions are preferable to high speed stocks, although well-exposed 5294 has been used very successfully on several productions. In general, it seems that a full, rich negative - about half a stop over normal - gives the best image, with minimal grain and best image contrast. Forced development is to be avoided at all costs, although there is little need of that with the range of emulsions available these days.

Rushes need to be planned for. The lab has no problems in printing open aperture work prints - it is done normally - but they need to be projected with a suitable mask in the projector. As the picture is off- academy centre, ideally the projector should be moved; in practice, this is unnecessary, since the rushes are usually screened for either academy or 1.85 ratio, with the screen tabs slightly wider open than normal. It is useful to run some focus and frame leader at the head of rushes rolls, to indicate the limits for 1.85. ‘Scope, or whatever format the produc-
tion is working to.

Editing presents no problems: flatbeds are available with open aperture, and in fact editors can work very successfully with conventional equipment.

After negative matching, an answer print has to be made. It has to be remembered that at this stage, the extraction to the final format has not been made, and so it is not possible to make a conventional cinema print from the original negative. The best option is to make a fully colour-balanced mute print and run it double head with the final magnetic mix. This print serves basically as a check on the colour grading, neg matching and so on. Once grading has been approved, it is possible to make a dupe neg, or a contact interpos, for release printing. During this duplicating process the blow-up, or squeeze, is introduced.

In theory it would be possible to squeeze either when making the interpos from the original negative, or at the second stage of making the dupe negative. Various laboratories have done comparative tests, and have reported various results, with one lab preferring the squeezed interpos, one preferring the squeeze at the interneg stage, and another saying they really couldn't distinguish. Colorfilm's experiments in this indicate that some scenes show marginally less material does not show any such differences.

More importantly, contact printing from the original negative is by far the preferable alternative for a number of reasons: firstly, the original negative is treated more gently on a contact printer and is less at risk, secondly, marks or defects are much harder to eliminate in any optical printing system, and so it is better to delay the optical stage until the image is on a one-piece, uncut, unhandled, one-light intermediate positive; and thirdly, a flat interpos preserves the options for release, allowing 2.35, wide-screen or 65mm negatives to be made from the protection master.

So the standard practice that has evolved is as follows:

First, a mute answer print from the original negative. Second, a contact interpositive from the original. Third, a squeezed dupe negative from that interpositive. Finally, prints from that squeezed dupe neg.

The same interpos can be used to prepare a flat dupe neg for a wide-screen release. This is in fact what is known as the super 1.85 technique. Again, the same interpos will serve for making either a blow-up 65mm neg, or a contact dupe neg for blow-up 70mm prints, although Australian laboratories do not offer 70mm facilities.

Finally, what about opticals and special effects? Here, there are two conflicting points of view. One is that super 35 is an ideal format for heavy optical effects pictures, the other that it is most unsuitable for this kind of work.

On the positive side, the advantage of Super 35 is that it is a laboratory process, applied to a final cut negative. Any full-width flat image can be used in the system. So all the variety of special effects rigs, such as front- or back-screen projection, motion control rigs, model or periscope work can all be shot using conventional lenses. Similarly, opticals, and in particular graphics and titles can run in a conventional format. All that is needed is an open gate, which most optical and effects cameras are fitted with anyway. The only note of caution for titles is that the text must be centred to film centre and not academy centre. Once the opticals and special effects are completed, they are cut in to the original in exactly the same way as they would be in a conventional wide-screen production.

On the other side, the extraction and anamorphic squeeze stage blows approximately half the negative area up to the full frame. Obviously this exaggerates any graininess and other image degradation that has occurred during the optical process. Major optical houses in the USA overcome this problem with conventional films by working in the larger formats such as Vistavision. However, in order to incorporate the resulting optical negatives with the original footage, another two stages of duping are needed, leading to final images that are seven stages removed from the original.

Two features that went through Colorfilm in the Super 35 format were The Time Guardians and The Everlasting Secret Family. Andrew Mason of Mirage was responsible for the extensive effects in Time Guardians; and he recommended the Super 35 for that reason. Mike Thornhill made the decision in Secret Family to avoid opticals completely, and even to produce fades and dissolves by A and B rolling the original negative. So the choice is there.

The latest release in Australia to have made use of Super 35 has been Incident At Raven's Gate, shot by Richard Michalak, who seems to have made particularly good use of the format. Otherwise, there has been little activity in Super 35 either in Australia or overseas, and it seems unlikely that it will become the universal format that its greatest fans have hoped for. But 35mm film must owe its long and successful life – at least in part – to the number of variations to the basic format that are all essentially compatible. Super 35 has evolved, and it will remain, as a useful option for production that will be the best choice in at least some circumstances.
GHOSTS... OF THE CIVIL DEAD
SHELLEY KAY

STRONG WAVES OF COMPULSION and repulsion savage GHOSTS... OF THE CIVIL DEAD and are hard to calm. It is a strange and powerful film that exhibits a rare balance of philosophical, aesthetic and narrative techniques without sacrificing its hardcore and unrelenting point of view on the discourse around the dense and often neglected political campaign over the prison system. For a budget of $1.6 million, Evan English (producer) and John Hillcoat (director) bought a lot of talent for a film which breaks some ground in narrative-documentary filmmaking by creating a hybrid of cinéma vérité and speculative fiction. GHOSTS looks like a cross-fertilization of Chris Marker’s 10-minute 2089 with Kubrick’s aesthetic sterilization in A Clockwork Orange and George Lucas’s early science fiction film THX 1138. Coming to the surface occasionally is an essence of Genet and Fassbinder with a gentle hint of mid-Eighties Cocteau Twins just to even things out.

In his book One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich, Alexander Solzhenitsyn uses the prison camps of the Eastern Bloc as a basis for a study in confinement. By rifling through and uncovering the past life of authoritarian control Solzhenitsyn discovers the mechanisms of the present. In GHOSTS the filmmakers speculate on a time-future which is presumably not too distant from the time-present. Between the philosophies of Ivan Denisovich and GHOSTS lies the difference between the social realism that is the trademark of the modernist movement and the speculative hyper-reality that signifies post-modernism. In GHOSTS the “future in containment” is an aesthetic nightmare of controlled environments: the superstructure of the prison building is high-tech with interior design surfaces reminiscent of the hypermarket, the raw PoMo brutalism of the newly-established public service complexes, the sterile conjectures of the high fashion house and the corporate fetish for the fine-tuned, air-conditioned, colour-coordinated skyscraper. It is a prison world where we can anticipate a degraded day when the inmates may well be referred to as “clients”.

GHOSTS is of the world of men: it is humiliating, degrading, psychologically brutal. Working with rock stars (Nick Cave and Dave Mason), ex-cons, actors (David Field, Mike Bishop and Chris de Rose) and an ex-cop (Tony Redford) the filmmakers were assured that they could recreate the tensions and conflicts the prison system perpetuates. Many of the participants felt the making of GHOSTS was like a trip to hell and back. One cast member never wants to see the film again. In the recreation of the act is the act. Evan English tells a story that clearly reveals...
the pain and anger felt by the cast and crew during filming at a converted government aircraft factory:

"To make it more inviting a wall was constructed and I painted a sign some 50 feet long that read, as you entered the building, 'Welcome to Central Industrial.' By the end of week one it was a bit tattered, by the end of week three it was falling down, by week four other words were appearing, two weeks from the end only pieces of the original remained and the sign now read, 'Welcome to Hell.' It was not an easy film to make. Within it is a lot of pain and anger."

The most haunting aesthetic tool employed in *Ghosts* is the juxtaposition of female voices on the soundtrack with the hardcore masculine preoccupations of the narrative. The original soundtrack, by Nick Cave, Mick Harvey and Blixa Bargeld, mixes an ethereal female voice with industrial noise for an uncanny, atmospheric effect. The woman's voice is ghostlike, alien. Women are alienated from the life of prison. Their presence is dissociated, cut off. The narrative process of *Ghosts* reconstructs this alienation using simple devices. The prisoners receive routine commands from recorded messages over a p.a. system. The voiceover is feminine but automaton-like, authoritarian but with a soft edge. Her voice rhymes with the kindergarten-like design of the prison recreation area.

By contrasting visual pornography with news footage of female reporters on television, a general (sexual) tension is built up. The juxtaposition of television porn and news, *Ghosts* makes its point cleverly by showing one process of legitimization (of the power of the State prison system to legitimize its need for maximum security prisons) via a legitimate narrative device (murder) to discredit and make "illegitimate" the process that legitimizes the prison system in the eyes of the general public. The argument for the re-evaluation of the prison system has never been as well articulated.


*HIGH HOPES*

MIKE LEIGH'S NEW FILM is an unflattering testimony to the recently celebrated decade of Thatcherism in which a caring society has been transformed into a nation consumed by greed, weariness, and class enmity. This new-look England, which bears an uncanny resemblance to an older, even more conservative society, is exemplified by the phrase "a place for everyone and everyone in his place," used by characters in the film as a form of abuse and ridicule. The phrase (from the same stable as "you've never had it so good") confirms the return to Victorian values which has been at the ideological centre of the present Conservative government's policies. What is so compelling about the film is how this enormous social change - many commentators refer to the impact of the Thatcher government over the last decade as a 'revolution' - is woven into the texture of attitudes, conversation and reactions to events.

*High Hopes* explores these broad themes through a story of a family and neighbours. As with Leigh's previous work, the film is a detailed view of these relationships which exposes the vulnerability and frailties of the characters in a way which is always tender, even compassionate. These qualities, however, are precisely the ones which the film suggests are lacking from the lives of Mrs Bender (stoically

**HIGH HOPES: EXPOSES THE VULNERABILITIES AND FRAILTIES OF THE CHARACTERS IN A WAY WHICH IS ALWAYS TENDER, EVEN COMPASSIONATE. BELOW: CYRIL AND SHIRLEY (PHILIP DAVIS AND RUTH SHEEN)**
prayed by Edna Dore) and her disparate family. Her son Cyril (Philip Davis) and his girlfriend Shirley (Ruth Sheen) are archetypes of the society left behind by the blue revolution, bewildered by where the old Britain has gone, still visiting Karl Marx’s grave for inspiration, promising to wear a tie “the day they machine-gun the Royal family”. Cyril’s sister Valerie (Heather Tobias) has tried to move with the times. Her life and surroundings are a display of kitsch ornamental glass, cliched fashion (multi-coloured stretch aerobic suit, exercise machine and Walkman in the living room) and a sadly comical sex life with her husband in which he should be Michael Douglas and she’ll pretend to be a virgin.

When Mrs Bender locks herself out of her London council house she unwittingly creates a family crisis - who will help her? Valerie gets her husband to phone Cyril, saying that mother has had a serious accident, and her next-door neighbour Laetitia Booth-Braine (Leslie Manville) asks the old lady if there are any neighbours who can help her. Suddenly being locked out is a metaphor for the disintegration of social relationships. In the new Britain Mrs Bender should help herself. This idea is amplified later when Laetitia tells her husband Rupert (David Bamber) that she has agreed to do some charity work and wants him to donate some cases of champagne. His immediate, irritated response is, “Who are we helping this time?” Rupert and Laetitia are part of the movement of upper middle class professionals into traditional working class areas. Their designer house, Saab and weekend country cottage are mysteries to Mrs Bender, and objects of curiosity for Cyril and Valerie ("Amazing what you can do with a slum," Valerie tells Rupert). What they have done with a slum is to show that while all property can rise in value, and class, the same does not apply to all people.

Some have no chance, as shown by an almost random character, Wayne (Jason Watkins) who arrives from the country to stay with his sister in London. Though he is only present for the first half of the film, his role as the vague, totally lost modern version of Dick Whittington is a counterbalance to the other characters who have adapted to the new Britain. Wayne believes he will find his sister ("She lives in London, do you know her?") and a job. Only Cyril and Shirley take pity on him; after spending a few nights on their floor, he is put on a bus and returned to the country town for his own safety.

The crisis over who will come with a spare key leads to an invitation from Valerie for Cyril and Shirley to attend a family birthday party for their mother. As one birthday is discussed by Cyril and Shirley, hewan
ter but it does bring Shirley, Cyril and his mother closer together. In the final scene they take Mrs Bender up to the roof of their flats to show her their garden (a few plants near a chimney stack) and point out the sights of London. She is amazed by the vision of the city from such a height, remarking that it must be "the top of the world." Only high hopes, it is implied, let you think the top of a slum is the top of the world.

Mike Leigh has only made two cinema features – the first was Bleak Moments (1971) and now High Hopes. Most of his screen work has been for television, where he has established a strong reputation for a wry directorial style and superb use of small ensembles of actors. Next to his very, quirky 1976 production, Nuts In May (BBC), this new film is his best work.


JOE LEAHEY’S NEIGHBOURS
NICHOLAS THOMAS

Those who saw Bob Connolly and Robin Anderson’s earlier New Guinea documentary, First Contact, would come to Joe Leahey’s Neighbours with high expectations. The earlier film used remarkable documentary footage of the initial encounters between highlands people and the prospecting Leahey brothers, but also made effective use of oral history and contemporary perceptions. There was something spectacular about the events which no film concerned exclusively with the present could recapture, but the sequel is in many ways a more complex and nuanced product.

The focus is upon relations between the local clanspeople and Joe Leahey, the mixed-race son of one of the prospectors and a local woman, who was brought up with his mother’s people, but acquired extensive experience with white approaches to work and commerce through work on coffee plantations. Before Papua New Guinea’s independence in 1975 he established his own plantation on land bought from the Ganiga, a group living about 20 miles from Mount Hagen town, and has more recently established another plantation on a share basis with some local people. The most striking and immediate fact is the enormous discrepancy in wealth and difference in lifestyle between Leahey and the surrounding tribespeople. Joe has children in Australian boarding schools, a substantial European-style house, a BMW and several other vehicles, and he watches satellite television in the evenings as his wife reads New Idea. Tumul, the big-man who provided Joe with land initially, and who is now aggrieved because promises to share the benefits and give him a car were not kept, lives in a small, traditional thatch house and has very little money.

But the film offers much more than a moral tale of a rapacious colonist appropriating the resources and labour of unfortunate native people. It does not avoid questions of morality, but divisions and complications among the Ganiga people themselves make taking sides rather difficult. One clan leader is a strong supporter of Leahey; Tumul, already mentioned, is initially bitter and resentful, but becomes tired and seeks Joe’s patronage again; younger men, more politicized, are more strongly opposed but clearly lack the resources to mobilize opposition. Or do they? These disputes emerge in several hostile exchanges, as well as in sections where characters express their perspectives to the filmmakers, but there is no resolution. In the later stages of the film, Tumul has been bought off with the gift of a clapped-out truck, and one senior man is suggesting that Joe replace a recently deceased strongman as...
the main leader, but discontent also emerges when other young men discover that they have been misled about the profit-sharing arrangements for the new plantation. The viewer is left speculating about what may have happened in the area since the film was completed.

Voiceover narration is kept to an absolute minimum, and in some sections what is said in argument comes almost too fast; it is difficult to absorb the subtleties of the claims being made about business and development, about 'our customs' as opposed to 'white customs'. It is clear, though, that Ganiga big-men are using development for their own objectives. Development is not just an external system which is taking over their lives, but a set of status markers which they are creating themselves. Our common perception might be that colonialism takes over indigenous societies, but the sense here is that it has been taken over by big-men, who may enhance their personal prestige through driving around in trucks and presenting cash as well as traditional valuables at marriages and funerals. These new strategies are added to older ways of gaining status through competitive feasts and warfare. This is a theme of much wider relevance for understanding colonialism, which had been too often perceived as the imposition of foreign values upon passive victims.

So although the film does show us people between two worlds, dealing with both the traditional and the modern, it also undermines this rather unsatisfactory dichotomy by indicating the purposes and uses of development for big-men in this particular case, and also the ways in which Leaky himself continues to make claims couched in more traditional terms. His attempts to turn a funerary oration into a sermon on the virtues of the plantation and the way of commerce is crass and unseemly, but nevertheless acceded to by some of the prominent men around him.

Although the most prominent actors are the senior men, the film also makes it apparent that these highlands groups are not simply patriarchal tribes in which men monopolize both public affairs and new business. At several points it is apparent that women control cash and make funerary presentations of their own. A problem which derives directly from the film's richness and lack of intrusive narration is that some of these events are not especially self-evident; although the film could certainly be seen and appreciated at one level by general audiences, there are many intriguing aspects of local culture and behaviour which could either be misinterpreted or really demand some further explanation. The nature of local Christianity, for example, appears to resist our usual understanding of what 'conversion' from paganism means. This emerges where hostile action against a group of enemies is being debated, and is opposed, of course, by the local (indigenous) preacher. An older man speaks for war, stressing that, although he is Christian - "the Catholic Church is my father, the Lutheran Church is my mother" - it is sometimes necessary to do 'Satan's work'. Warfare clearly retains a kind of social value and importance which has been redefined, but not entirely stigmatized or suppressed by the Church.

But the elusiveness of full understanding underlines the film's complexity and refusal to subordinate the situation to a unitary political narrative or anthropological generalities. Some viewers may look for another account of colonial villainy, and the facts of inequality are inescapable, but the complicity of some local people and the lack of obvious solutions should be equally apparent. Nor does the density preclude appreciation at a more general level, since the basic themes are indeed stark. So neither intricacy nor accessibility are compromised. There is concentrated engagement with people and their statements to the exclusion of the travelling style into which some ethnographic documentaries lapse. These conversations convey as much as one could pretend to know of the meanings and politics of a very tangled situation; one which is locally crucial, but with much wider implications for other histories. These are the accomplishments of Joe Leaky's Neighbours.


PHILIPPINES, MY PHILIPPINES

MARCUS BREEN

DOCUMENTARY FILM raises the question: What is the purpose of film? The answer to this impertinence is found in film itself and the relations that film has with its subject and with those who watch it.

The purpose of film is particularly mediated by politics when the social documentary genre is considered. Inevitably, the left has used documentary as a vehicle for information on a mass scale. This is nothing new, but it is important in relation to recent films by Australians about the Philippines, as well as films about Aborigines and Latin America.

Some of these films share a left perspective: Nicaragua: No Pasaran, South of the Border (David Bradbury); Bullets of the Poets (George Gittoes); How the West was Lost (David Noakes); Celso and Cora (Gary Kildea); Philippines, My Philippines (Chris Nash). Their purpose is to create an atmosphere around certain issues that can serve to undo the injustice that the film explains, or reinforce victories that have already been won.

This sort of film was originally called agitprop. It surges with the sense of achievement that must accompany such efforts. It developed in the Soviet Union in 1919-1920, when Dziga Vertov, Sergei Eisenstein and Vladimir Mayakovsky sought to politicize the civil war that followed the 1917 revolution, using documentary theatre and film in combat zones. In Marxist terms, agitprop is film that has a clear use-value for its subjects and a use-value for those who watch it. In other words, it reinforces the opinions and wills of the participants and informs and educates, even motivates to action those elsewhere.

Marxist sympathies are what make Philippines, My Philippines a good Aussie agitprop film. The film's strength is in its unfailing commitment to a cause - the liberation of the Philippines from the dual evils of foreign domination and radical land-owning conservatism. The latter, in particular, is inextricably tied to the Philippines government, which is just another puppet government dancing to the all too familiar tune of international capital.

The point is simply and repeatedly made in this film that President Cory Aquino is just another tap dancer on the hotplate of capitalism. Nothing has changed for the mass of the people since Ferdinand and Imelda Marcos fled the country in 1986. Unfortunately for Aquino, the country she governs is ripe for revolution, with a high proportion of its population either rural peasants or disenfranchised urban poor. Many of the latter are classifiable as lumpen proletariat, if they are lucky, working a subsistence existence on Manila's rubbish tip, reselling the junk they collect there to scrap merchants, so they can buy basic essentials like food.

The peasants suffer just as much. They work on land rented from either absentee or local landlords who keep up the pressure for rents, until the peasants are in massive, unpayable debt that becomes enslavement. It's an exponential downward spiral and one fit for the most basic, yet effective political education, leading to revolutionary action.

Interestingly, Philippines, My Philippines swings from a vaguely objective-looking stance - the countryside, ghettos, the masses, tourist scenery - to a committed, emotive stance. The material that covers the New People’s Army and the Philippines Communist Party takes a committed stance. It is engaged and enthusiastic. Scenes of local NPA activity in the countryside - political meetings in villages, military manoeuvres - change to pinhead military men in sterile offices. This is the people, this is the enemy, the subtext says.

Real life happens and this film shows it as a sensuous lived experience in the villages, paddy fields and ghettos. The technological coldness of F-18 or F-111 bombers, the pointless rhetoric of the army commander blabbering about "the evils of communism", contrasted with the warm confidence of the Worker’s Democratic Front spokesperson, Bobbie Malay, are comfortably intercut.

What does not fit with this analysis are the other lived experiences: the offensive subjugation of Filipino women and children, often by Australian men on sex holidays; Australian Government aid programs linked to an American strategy of low intensity warfare, where
minor solutions to major structural socio-political inequities are used to keep the populace "happy".

Indeed, if there is a failure in the agitprop of *Philippines, My Philippines*, it is that there is an enormous gulf between the exciting possibility of the Filipino people taking control of the country and the complicated images and problems of the present. They are all part of the same problem and of necessity appear in the one film, but war does not sit well with beauty contests. This is the problem that documentary seems so incapable of resolving — exciting stories of war, people's struggles and victory buoy us up, but what to do with the messy bits — those beautiful women exposing their bodies, the rice fields, the priests and the church! There are other possible ways to explain the relationship between the real and the ill-fitting messy bits, so that the orthodoxy of the Aussie agitprop does not become unnecessarily predictable. Put simply, it would involve more intense, personal involvement. I would want more debauchery — more naked men and women, death squads, military goons, articulate revolutionaries, beautiful fighters, filthy water buffalo, bare breasts, ugly Australians, male chauvinists, generals, Aquinos et al. I want them piled high on my screen like a McDonald's hamburger of gluttony, ready to be sorted into a dynamic mess of possibility.

It is superficially easy to put the oversexed statement of a Western male on the screen and let it speak across the surface of things. Such a statement confirms our opinion of such men, but moves virtually nowhere beyond its surface to explain the horror and degradation.

There is a sense in which the Aussie agitprop documentary cannot take the dirt from the locale in which the film is made and put that dirt under our fingernails, because Australian television is the final arbiter of taste, paying pre-sales for these documentaries, based on "broadcast quality" criteria which the filmmakers must meet in order to sell the film and go on to the next one. Nevertheless, *Philippines, My Philippines* is a convincingly constructed film committed to the struggle for socialism in the Philippines. More important, it presents hope for a better, more humane future, as the basic tenet of the struggle.

The film closes with a statement by Bobbie Malay that summarizes the situation in the Philippines from the left's point of view. The statement also, indirectly, acknowledges the film's position in inducing change: "The important thing is that the process has begun in patient work to change ways of thinking, mobilizing, getting things done. In other words, what we are really after is social change. This is going to take a long time whether we are in government or not." The purpose of *Philippines, My Philippines* is clear. Its optimism should be welcomed.

**PHILIPPINES, MY PHILIPPINES**

**SCANDAL**

**SUSAN CHARLTON**

**SCANDAL** hopes to render into film a particular moment in a particular time. A time when the last vestige of all that which seemed certain was exposed to the light of a thousand flash bulbs. A moment of startled innocence whence, it was believed, nothing would ever be the same.

The film spins a story out of figures and events involved in what became known as 'The Profumo Affair'. It is set in London in the early Sixties, when John Profumo, the Minister for War in Harold MacMillan's Tory Government had to stand down after accusations of sexual intrigue involving two teenage girls, Christine Keeler and Mandy Rice-Davies; an entrepreneurial society osteopath, Dr Stephen Ward; and Eugene Ivanov, a Soviet naval attaché.

The film begins with grainy blue-grey newsreel images sliding in slow motion beneath Sinatra's performance of "Witchcraft"; scenes of JFK, the Beatles, Martin Luther King mouthing the words "I Have a Dream", Khrushchev at the UN, and sundry British TV and movie stars bled into one another to evoke a homogeneous spirit of 'Just Before' to bracket the events which follow.

The films slows down all these elements so that we can drink in a deep sense of the times and isolate and maintain focus on the forces at play: as though a look could transform a nation, or that change could be embedded in the flesh of just one woman, foregrounded through the eyes of one man.

Christine Keeler. Her story is the story of how the Frothy Fifties became the Swinging Sixties, how the ideal of female beauty moved from Hollywood to London. Christine Keeler started the Longest Party — with all reputation gone, Britain had no stuffy standards to live up to and therefore could have the party with no holds barred. DON'T invite the neighbours! DON'T keep the noise down...

— Julie Burchill "Chelsea Girls " *Girls on Film*

In *Scandal*, a relationship is struck between the passage of film and the passage of time, so that qualities made possible by film itself are used to convey memory, sensuality
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dancing pin-up girls, 'call­
girls' or just "common girls [who] mingled, parted and slept with 'their better's'?"

When Ward (Hurt) steps out from the
opening montage into the streets of Sixties
London and purveys all that "wild, untu­

tormented, elemental beauty" to be found in girls
like Christine, his declaration that he "stayed at nothing when aroused" sets up an expec­
tation of one kind of sexual scenario within the audience and in Keeler as well. Ward
maintains this intensity of feeling, but how it evolves from the presumed to the ambiguous
is the success of the film and the triumph of
John Hurt's performance.

After a disaster like his recurring clown in
the otherwise interesting operatic omnibus,
Aria, it is easy to lose sight of the value of
Hurt's other acting work. In
Scandal he, like Ward, is completely rehabilitated, giving the performance of his career. Hurt has com­mented that producers never think of him as
a romantic lead. (He has appeared instead as
The Elephant Man, in Alien, as Quentin
Crisp in The Naked Civil Servant and as
Caligula in I, Claudius.)

In
Scandal, he is a new kind of romantic
lead, because this is not quite a love story. He
is both a romantic and a sexual man, but we
never see him directly engaged as either. He
is the instigator, yet on the periphery - con­
structing possibilities, encouraging experi­

ment, then reclining and enjoying the aban­
don of others. Hurt is allowed the warmth
and intensity of the romantic lead that is
usually denied him. It is all expressed in the
face, while the body remains an enigma.

Scandal enjoys the company of women
and infuses scenes with a playful narcissism
and practised allure, both splendid and comic.
Keeler, as played by Joanne Whalley-Kilmer
(Edge of Darkness, The Singing Detective, Willow), is perfect company for Hurt. Whal­
ley-Kilmer is able to suggest Keeler as we
already know her and as we wish to imagine
her. The film depends upon this. She is all at
once - kitten, older sister, and tragedian.

The figure of Mandy Rice-Davies is writ­
ten as petulant, brittle and self-seeking. Within
this small range of postures, Bridget Fonda
(Christine Keeler), Bridget Fonda (Mandy Rice­
Davies) and
and
Mondra Davies has to become Scandal's new
villain and scapegoat. Rather in­
elegant of the filmmakers really, who include first-time feature
director Michael Caton-Jones;

scriptwriter Michael Thomas
(Edgewise, Ladyhawk, Burke and Wills, Countryman) and

producer Stephen Woolley (co­
founder of Palace Video, a pro­
ducer on
Mona Lisa, Absolute Beginners and Shag).

Finally, Scandal is also no­
table for an appearance by Rol­

land Gift as a wronged lover with
a gun; a theme song called
"Nothing Has Been Proved" by the
Pet Shop Boys, sung by Dusty
Springfield; and an appalling hair job on Ian
McKellen, who takes the role of Profumo.
And keep an eye out for Britt Ekland as
Mariella Novotny.

Scandal Directed by Michael Caton-Jones. Pro­
ducer: Stephen Woolley. Executive producers:
Nik Powell, Joe Boyd. Co-executive producers:
Harvey Weinstein, Rob Weinstein. Associate pro­
ducer: Redmond Morris. Screenplay: Michael
Thomas. Director of photography: Mike Molloy.
Editor: Angus Newton. Production designer:
Sion Jones. Production designer: Simon Holland.
Music: Carl Davis. Cast: John Hurt (Stephen Ward), Joanne Whalley-Kilmer (Christine Keeler), Bridget Fonda (Mandy Rice­
Davies), Ian McKellen (John Profumo), Leslie
Phillips (Lord Astor), Britt Ekland (Mariella
Novotny), Daniel Massey (Mervyn Griffith-Jones),
Roland Gift (Johnnie Edgecombe), Jeroen Krabbe (Eugene Ivanov). Production company: Palace.

THE 'BURBS
JOHN BAXTER

H ELLS other people," said Sartre. Joe
Dante, director of The Howling, Ex­
plorers and Gremlins takes this proposition a
step further in his brilliantly malicious comedy,
The 'Burbs. Through the character of Ray Pe­
terson (Tom Hanks), the suburbanite who
shies the affairs of his eccentric neigh­
bours and comes grievously unstuck, Dante
and screenwriter Dana Olsen drag Sartre into
the late Eighties. Horror, they demonstrate, is
us.

"Us" in this case is the inhabitants of a
sleepy corner of the American suburbs - the
'burb. The film chooses it almost at random,
dropping out of orbit to isolate the mid­
Western town, the middle-class tree-lined
street, and the people themselves: Peterson,
his wife Carol (Carrie Fisher), and their neigh­
bours Art Weingartner (Rick Ducommun),
Walter (Gale Gordon) and Mark Rumsfield
(Bruce Dern).

Ray, idling away his week's vacation at
home, has time on his hands. He applies it to
observing his new neighbours, the Klopeks,
whose house is the
one bad tooth in the neighbour­
hood's otherwise gleaming smile.

Dana Olsen's clever script enlists us
smoothly in the locals' inquisitiveness about the Klopeks. Why
do they come out only at night? ("Nocturnal
feeders," volunteers a neighbourhood kid.)
Why do they surround their house with barbed wire? Why are they all digging in
their backyard? Obviously they're up to no
good. The lawn is unmown, the house
paint and crumbling. Howls and flares
emanate from the cellar at night. Worse, the
Klopeks are antisocial. They mow not, nor do
they water, weed or gossip. They don't care
if Walter’s poodle defecates in their yard. Unavailable for car pool, district beautification or backyard barbecues, they’re instantly suspect.

The next steps are straight from the Watertower manual: covert surveillance, then dirty tricks like anonymous notes under the door and a search of their garbage, and the final break-in which leads to humiliating exposure. Having failed to learn from the mistakes of recent political history, Ray and his co-conspirators are doomed to repeat them.

Dante tells this story with the genial subversiveness that characterizes the best of his work. This quality surfaced briefly in Gremlinus, particularly in the scene where Phoebe Cates described finding, at the age of she was nine, the corpse of her father in the chimney, clad in Santa Claus costume and with his neck broken. The ironies of that project were often obscured by the animated goblins from Chinatown, but ambitions to escape from fantasy and work with more believable people have lingered in Dante’s mind ever since.

After Inner Space, his last major fantasy, he developed a project about a boy genius called Little Man Tate, but dropped it when the studio insisted on a major female star as the mother. The Burbs came along almost by chance. Rod Daniel (Like Father, Like Son) had been set to direct it, but when he walked, Dante stepped in.

He agreed to make the film only if Universal gave him the run of its newest suburban street, where the studio has brought togeth­her all the famous houses on its backlog. Here Deanna Durbin’s old home now sits next to the Munsters’ Gothic mansion and opposite one inhabited by James Stewart and his giant invisible rabbit friend in Harvey. Sadly, the Bates mansion from Psycho is not full-sized but a scaled-down replica, and so remains on its hilltop, a popular stop on the Universal City tour. Using it for the Klopeks’ home would have put the capstone to a film about a Jewish family.

The Burbs is a leap into the dark for Joe Dante. But it’s one he had to take. Though he’ll be making Gremlins II later this year, he hopes his career will move in this direction rather than towards more vinyl vampires and plastic piranhas. This is water in which he swims well.


TORCH SONG TRILOGY R Affaele Caputo T WO MOMENTS. The first: Brooklyn 1952. A long shot of the New York cityscape steadily pulls back over a bird’s-eye-view of a cemetery into the household of a lower-class Jewish family. Off-screen a woman’s voice repeatedly calls out, “Arnold!” The camera then locates her in her kitchen, and then follows her movements as she marches around the apartment in search of her young son. Finally, both camera and mother discover Arnold in her bedroom closet, before a mirror, inexpertly spreading lipstick around his mouth while modelling his mother’s clothes and accessories. Caught in this act, Arnold turns to camera/mother and giggles. Cut to reverse shot of his mother, who at first momentarily giggles along with him when suddenly her face casts an expression of both horror and sorrow. The actor as different or aberrant, only to have it subsumed within a conventional framework – family and home – which is to say that “my difference which is different is the same.” In other words, if Torch Song Trilogy is in part a challenge to the disapproving glance not only of mother but of a heterosexual world, this challenge seems to be posed not so much from a homosexual world, but more from the moral and social hierarchy it wishes to challenge.

NEW INDEPENDENTS
Report by Anne-Marie Crawford

AUSTRALIAN feature filmmaking has often been described as culturally mediocre, as "an art neither modernist nor 'vulgarly' popular". Works on show at each of the past few years of the St. Kilda Film Festival make it clear that the same can be said of a good proportion of Australian independent films. The tensions contained in a financing system that simultaneously attempts to recognize the inherent creative worth of the independent sector whilst also aiming to develop new talent for the feature industry are painfully apparent in much of the work: films that attempt to be 'calling cards' for their makers, but still want to be seen in some way as 'innovative' or 'experimental' (experimentalism here reduced to a cute idea, a clever game or a hyping up of technical elements); films often characterized by reduced notions of form and aesthetics, homogeneous cinematographies, unadventurous mises-en-scène and a conformity to hastily constructed local formulas. The approach is obviously functional in a certain way, providing a showcase for the makers' technical capabilities whilst indicating a certain perfunctory 'worthiness' in their aims. Yet it is a very pale shadow of the vitality that can be the hallmark of independent cinema.

But amidst all of this, there exists a strong body of work more seriously engaged with the particular forms in which it is involved. It is this work that keeps the local culture artistically alive and makes the whole business seem worthwhile. So I want to give some devoted attention to just a few films from this year's festival that are concerned more with cinema than with the industry.

Among the many visions of suburban existence on display, David Caesar's experimental documentary Living Room stands out as something extraordinary. Formally it is very sparse, its structural elements simple and apparent, and its style minimal. The central images in the film are still, wordless shots of people in their home environments looking directly into the camera and out at the audience. It is not a comfortable film to watch by any means, for it (quite consciously) embodies many of the tensions inherent in attempting to represent on screen the lives of 'ordinary people'.

The subjects of the film do not seem to have suspected just how relentless the gaze of Caesar's camera could be. They appear for the most part initially confident, posing as in a snapshot. Yet as the duration of each shot is extended, smiles become strained and confusion appears. With the emotional nakedness and vulnerability of the people on screen, we too begin to feel rather self-conscious. Our voyeuristic position becomes disconcerting as a big black gulf opens between the social spaces of the cosy film festival audience and the Sydney suburbs. Because of the powerful dis-rectness of the subjects' stares, it is difficult for us to disengage ourselves and assume a posture of interested 'sociological' distance. Yet the film also disallows the kind of identification in which one can comfortably imagine that all the world is a kind of narcissistic extension of one's own feelings and responses. In evoking this rare and vivid sense of social difference, Living Room mobilizes a radical awareness of conflict in social relations.

Caesar's own uneasy position in all of this is also openly revealed. The 'artiness' of his style and his dubious entitlement to submit his subjects to such probing are other irreconcilable aspects of the film's abrasive social view. Here too the film is unflinching about displaying its processes.

Thematically the film deals with urban environments and the reactions of inhabitants to these spaces. The static camera is here not so much a passive recorder of social realities as a powerful metaphor for the way in which people's lives are heavily shaped by their physical surroundings. The juxtaposition of this leaden stillness and the silence of the subjects with the everyday sounds occurring all around the frame also suggests natural human energies stifled by the rigid determinations of their severe and inhospitable living spaces. In this sense, Living Room presents a very pessimistic view of modern life and a polemical statement about the way 'the system' ensnares and violates its human populace. (Perhaps the mysterious, abstract video images that appear throughout the film are a reference to these impersonal, unseen processes.)

Yet the film is not glib in its pessimism. Caesar's living rooms are microcosmic sites for very tangible struggles between the determinations of the spaces (an idyllic family scene on a poster in a display home demonstrates clearly the design for living) and people's resistances to these forces (a child jumping on a new sofa; the defiant angry stare of one of the camera's silent subjects). The film is thus a dynamic and convincing analytical document of social conditions in action. Living Room gives remarkably original expression to Caesar's vision of things. It's a rare instance of the kind of impulse that also makes Philip Brophy's Salt, Saliva, Sperm and Sweat an extraordinary film. In fact, I can think of no other recent Australian films that venture so courageously into such disconcertingly unfamiliar terrain. They belong to a realm of the cinema described by Ross Gibson as "the ethical avant garde" – a genuinely cutting edge, where safety is
A profound level of meaning is found in the sensual materiality of the individual self-determination is Sue Brooks and Alison Tilson’s *An Ordinary Woman*. In response to her husband’s apparent enthusiasm about her career potentials, a voice behind the camera presents the making of a character: Jackie. As a small child with her mother behind her in the distance, Jackie is constructed for the woman in a fragmented manner variously suggested from childhood (an angry mother; waiting alone after school), and a number of (fictional) characters describing her for us. Memories are created for the woman in a fragmented manner variously suggesting moments of brief but vivid physical sensations (a hand stroking duckling fur; bedsheets billowing vigorously on a clothes line; a brightly coloured garden chair), encapsulated dramatic moments from childhood (an angry mother; waiting alone after school), and snapshots from her past (photographs that are artificially constructed for the film as well as some from the actress’ ‘real life’).

When Jackie’s friends and relatives speak of her it is almost entirely in terms of social relations and very rarely of what might be her own internal desires and motivations. In response to her husband’s apparent enthusiasm about her career potentials, a voice behind the camera asks, “Is that what she wants or what you want?” As in Corinne Cantrill’s *In This Life’s Body*, there is a sense of the self being captured and defined by other people’s framings. There is a recurring image of Jackie as a small child with her mother behind her in the distance. During the course of the film she examines the image repeatedly, each time imposing her own views of what it represents: she likes her solid position in the foreground; she muses that the distance between herself and her mother is about as far as she was able to venture at that time; and she is reminded of her early desire to be an opera singer (a transformed expression of this desire being her current job singing in a club). Yet whilst *In This Life’s Body* powerfully affirms the impulse to active self-determination (the autobiography is ultimately created by the filmmaker herself, the framing of the images finally her own in the series of mirror self-portraits), *An Ordinary Woman* presents identity as more heavily shaped by external processes of socialization.

However this sense of things is not lamented in any way. The most profound levels of meaning are found in the sensual materiality of the immediate present, vividly expressed in a series of shots of a baby being washed and of Jackie singing joyfully in the shower. Domesticity is exalted as a realm of rich life experience. This is highlighted towards the end of the film by Jackie’s list of major life desires: “love, immortality and the perfect carrot”.

So the quest for the singular soul of the ‘ordinary woman’ is finally abandoned, and the deception of the documentary shape of this fiction becomes symbolic of the bogus nature of the mission as a whole. Yet the tantalizing spirit of the perfect self still haunts the film as it has haunted a history of cinema from Maya Deren’s *Meshes of the Afternoon* to Mary Lambert’s *Siesta*. There is (as in Lambert’s film) both a denial of the mystical entity and an implicit engagement with it; both an impulse to deflery and an invocation of its powerful charms of seduction. Perhaps then the question of the immortality of the ‘ordinary woman’ is partly answered in this film through its processes of collaborative creation: it lies not in her transcendent individuality, but in the power of her shared experience.

A commitment to a cinema of simplicity and humility is clear in Brian McKenzie’s *Kelvin and His Friends*. It’s a documentary about a real life ‘ordinary’ person, revealing an intense engagement with the quiet dramas of everyday life and the idiosyncratic amidst the banal. There is neither driving voiceover nor any other overt explanatory device operating in the film. Rather, its patient documentations are contained within a subtle narrative structure which slowly draws us into the tangible world of the protagonist.

The vision of human existence painted in the film is one in which the individual drifts emotionally isolated in a predominantly hostile world. Kelvin’s relations with the people around him arise almost entirely out of the coincidence of the crossing paths of their lives. His closest companions are his landlady, a man he met in passing on St Kilda pier and an old school acquaintance. Conversations between them in the film are striking for the almost complete lack of empathy they seem to have for each other’s thoughts and feelings. If there is humanity to be found in their relations, it lies much more in their sharing of everyday experience – in the little chores that Kelvin does for this landlady or the endless cups of tea and coffee they drink together. Along with the extreme personal rituals and beliefs he adopts, these fragmented human connections form part of a network necessary to Kelvin’s ongoing survival. His life emerges finally as a vivid enactment of the struggle to create meaning for oneself in a world where it seems absent.

Underlying all of this, there is a profound impulse in the film to record the smallest material details of life, from the messy intricacies of street locations to a brand of dishwashing detergent. The subjects’ reactions to the presence of the camera, their subtle performances of their own ‘naturalness’, are part of the document. Implicit here is a faith in the potency of the photographic image, particularly in its relation to ‘real life’. Mirroring this, the personal stills shown to us by the people in the film stand as emblems for a fragmented past, and provide keys to the depth and soul of the present.

It’s been said before that McKenzie’s work bears a spiritual tie with Italian Neo-Realist films of the 1940s and 1950s. There is in his work a very deep involvement with impulses of documentary and fiction, not so much as stylistic curiosities, but as serious, even ethical, questions of cinematic form. Whether in the meticulous recreation of a documentary sensibility in an overtly fictional form, as in his earlier film *With Love to the Person Next to Me*, or in a storytelling documentary like *Kelvin and His Friends*, he works very close to a point where the two impulses become organically fused. Neither the ‘truth’ of the film nor its artistic vision are dissipated in this process. Few local filmmakers have the heart for such exploration.

Films like these are so often lost in the few lines allowed for each work by more comprehensive festival reviews (and of course there were other films in this festival that deserved discussion too). The lack of serious attention given to independent films is another lamentable recurring phenomenon. The local cinema of better faith is worth a more dedicated consideration.

NOTES


The nearest equivalent is *Australian Independent Film*, compiled and edited by Victoria Treole in 1983 and also published by the AFC (but now, unfortunately, out of print). *Signs of Independents* draws some of its material from the earlier work, at the same time updating and expanding its contents.

The new publication provides a complete listing of all films and videos produced with the assistance of the various funding schemes administered by the Creative Development Branch (now Unit) since it took over the Experimental Film and Television Fund in 1978. This is the first time such information has been generally available. It encompasses the output of the Creative Development Fund, No Frills Fund, Women’s Film Fund, Documentary Development Program and Documentary Fellowship Program – 484 projects in all. The listing includes title, filmmaker, genre, gauge or format, length and year of completion and, while it occupies a comparatively small section of the book, it represents considerable labour. The requisite “detective work” in relation to “many mysterious titles” is acknowledged by the editors but, even so, the publication of such a listing never adequately reflects the effort involved in its compilation.

Extended profiles of 100 selected titles form the major section of the book, and these include detailed synopses and background information; the occasional favourable press quote; cast and crew credits; AFC funding and distribution sources; TV sales (if any); and listings of awards and/or Festival appearances, both local and overseas. It appears that the editors have tried, in this section, to make a balanced selection of different genres and formats ranging over the past 10 years. Observing the various strands of quality filmmaking juxtaposed in this manner, it is difficult not to see it as other than a rich and vital body of work – a judgement less likely to be made from a perusal of, say, a *Cinema Papers* Production Survey at any given time. As well, the impressive number of Festival/Award entries for each title signify how well-travelled and decorated many of these films have become since 1978.

These, of course, are not the only measures of a funding scheme’s or an individual film’s success and indeed *Signs of Independents* stops just short of celebratory mode in the essays which precede the film profiles. Co-editor and the then Director of Creative Development at the AFC, Megan Murc­hy, writes candidly on the set of “inherent contradictions” which have from the outset plagued the low-budget funding schemes. In similar vein, Ross Gibson draws the distinction between ‘modernization’ and ‘modern­ism’ in relation to 20th-century Western work and, more particularly, the local film industry and AFC literature.

Such pieces remind one that, of the many public faces of the Film Commission, it is the Creative Development area which has always seemed most willing to expose itself, warts and all. Or as Meaghan Morris (in *Filmnews*, Feb 1989) puts it, the CDF:

...has proved capable of absorbing, sometimes to a disturbing degree, any number of attacks, justified and otherwise, on its fundamental principles, practices, and even its reasons for being. (p.16)

In this context, the McMurchy and Gibson essays both see post-1985 CDF guidelines as offering genuine hope for a diverse Australian film culture achievable in part through bold funding decisions – assuming of course that Government support is maintained. Similarly, Susan Demody, while acknowledging in her essay the difficulty of writing in the late 1980s about ‘women’s film’, suggests that neither it nor the Women’s Film Fund which has done so much to nurture this area should be regarded as “dead horses fit for public flogging”.

Apart from the industry/culture dilemma, the lack of suitable distribution/exhibition outlets for low budget films has long been a running sore. Jennifer Stott’s essay, ‘Decent Exposure’, contends that in many ways this is still the case: the closure of the Co-op, the mainstream exhibitors’ ‘No Boring Shorts’ campaign, the continued indifference of commercial TV networks to most independent product, and the diminished purchasing power of government film agencies and educational institutions – these and other factors have continued to frustrate the best efforts of those seeking wider dissemination for this material. But here too
there has been the odd victory: some of the longer documentaries and low-budget features have secured theatrical release through the arthouse "circuit"; the ABC and SBS have accepted more independently-produced local material, including films which would previously have been considered too "difficult" for television broadcast, than at any other time; newer cultural events such as the Australian Video, Fringe and St. Kilda Festivals and organizations like MIMA have provided important forums for promoting innovative, low-budget work; and traditional champions of the independent sector such as Ronin Films have continued to seek new ways - including home video - of promoting non-mainstream product.

It would be unfair to criticize Signs of Independents for failing to tackle in detailed fashion other hardy annuals which help make up the fabric of CDB/CDU history. The focus is rightly on the films themselves. But one of the great unwritten tales of post-1970 independent film practice I suspect might centre on those films which didn't receive funding (and perhaps weren't made, or completed). Most local filmmakers have colourful assessment stories to relate, and many of these are from regional perspectives. Apart from some minor comments in Megan McMurchy's essay, regional considerations and assessment practices are not emphasized in this publication, although its select but useful bibliography does cite literature relevant to these topics. I should, at the risk of sounding parochial, also draw readers' attention to Adrian Martin's short but affectionate piece on 'Fat City' - his tribute to Melbourne film culture which, apart from being depicted as somewhat different from that of its northern counterpart, is, as Meaghan Morris has observed, in a sense not at all pertinent to an overview of the Creative Development Fund.

For those wishing to pursue particular titles listed in Signs of Independents, the directory of distributors included as the book's final section will be helpful. It is a pity that such valuable directory assistance was not extended to those titles omitted from the 'Major films and videos' section. I imagine space, time and cost factors governed the editors' decision to limit the amount of information allocated to the 'non-major' (minor?) films and videos in the complete listing section. But whatever the reason(s), it fails to do justice to many fine films which, if not highlighted in this publication, are unlikely to be better treated anywhere else. And despite the Editors' desire to present a balanced listing of major titles, the selection remains quite arbitrary. To take some obvious examples - David Bradley's Frontline is in the 'major' section, but Public Enemy No 1 isn't; Tom Zubrycki's Peru isn't; Peter Tammer's Solrun Hoas, Philip Bull, etc. etc.

This is not to deny the validity of any of the "major" entries in Signs of Independents but rather to stress the need for circulation of adequate documentation for all funded films - and especially those most likely to be marginalized by exhibitors, historians and film theorists alike. If such work is to endure, the availability of detailed and accurate information is as important as the accessibility of the films/videos themselves. This little book is an important step in this process. Let's hope others are willing to continue the "detective work" that necessarily goes with it.

---

NIGHTMARE MOVIES
Kim Newman, Bloomsbury, 255pp. $34.95 pb.
MICHAEL HELMS

Nightmare Movies, by English writer Kim Newman, is a most welcome text indeed. Some readers may remember an earlier version of this book that appeared in 1984; the intervening years have allowed Newman the time to thoroughly revise, update, expand and re-present his work in a manner that befits the nature and importance of the whole enterprise.

For the past decade intelligent and critical (a key word) writing on the contemporary horror film has been almost entirely confined to certain segments of the press: from photo-stat fanzines and more glossy but still largely self-published ventures, to the works coming out of American University presses and other independent/specialist publication houses - in other words, material that is hard to gain access to, especially in Australia.

These texts cover a range of styles, formats and tones of voice; what is impressive about Newman is that not only is he acutely aware of the industrial, thematic and social histories of the horror film but he also demonstrates a vigorous working knowledge of all the above-mentioned writing types. He kicks off the whole shebang with an introduction that makes it clear that his book reflects changing times: his generation has "a new pantheon of greats, from George A. Romero through to Sam Raimi". He has an eye for detail, a healthy appreciation of irony and a voice that remains conversational and never pedantic. I found myself entertained and informed before I had even finished the introduction.

After stating that the main purpose of the book is to write a history of the modern horror film by tracing links between different sub-sets of the horror film via largely auteurist methods, Newman pauses to point out that time has reordered the way horror films - and all films for that matter - are produced, exhibited and viewed. The new generation of horror fans - who only know VCRs, Jason Vorhees, Michael Myers, Freddy Krueger and the special effects creators who dominate current horror film productions - will, in time, write yet another history. He predicts:

"Some kid out there has grown up with Freddy and Jason rather than Dracula and Frankenstein, and is graduating to the books and films of Stephen King and Clive Barker. He or she knows Empire and Troma better than Hammer and Corman ... probably prefers Return of the Living Dead to Day of the Dead, and is too young to remember when you could legally rent a Lucio Fulci film on video in Britain. Some day, I hope that kid will write a book subtitled 'A Critical History of the Horror Film, 1988-2008' that contradicts everything you're about to read. (xiii)

A safe bet, but one would be hard pressed to find a similar work that covers as much ground in one volume and is as consistently interesting as what follows.

Nightmare Movies is divided into 14 chapters with a postscript (the previous edition consisted of 13). The first chapter is devoted to a lengthy analysis of George A. Romero's Night of the Living Dead and its perceived far-reaching influence. Night of the Living Dead is then used as a touchstone throughout the book against which many later works (including Romero's) are contrasted and compared. His use of Romero does not mean he regards the director as infaillible. He has this to say about Romero's little seen Jack's Wife:

"George A. Romero's Jack's Wife (1973) inverts the theme of Rosemary's Baby by presenting witchcraft as an avenue of escape for its housewife heroine. Made after the failure of There's Always Vanilla (1972), a romantic comedy, the film is not quite able to mix disenchanted social realism with horror film rituals as successfully as Martin's. With the aid of displays of hisomniscy, self-revealing monologues and lines like 'I thought insensitivity was n't the personal drama seems more stylized than the black magic scenes. (p.42)

Besides chapters on Devil Movies (from which the last quote is extracted), Ghost Stories, Urban Psychos, The British Horror Film, The Texas Chain Saw Massacre or, as he describes it - The Down Home, Up Country, Multi-Implement Massacre Movie, Authors (with the inclusion this time of Dario Argento) and Classical Gothic Horror Films, Newman also gives some attention to the much neglected but very active Chinese and Italian horror/exploitation industries. Aus-
tralian horror films are also afforded some space too.

The scope of *Nightmare Movies* is actually much wider than that simple chapter listing suggests. You will find single films discussed in here that you might not expect. But this situation serves to illustrate the book's title and support his opening contention that conventions of the traditional horror film are continually merging and mutating into other generic areas of the cinema. Take, for example, Newman on some more recent big budget films that may be familiar:

During the post-modernist confusion of the late 1980s, as genre barriers fell apart, the Devil made something of a comeback in the unexpected forms of Tim Curry, in Ridley Scott's *Legend* (1985), Robert De Niro, in Alan Parker's *Angel Heart* (1987) and Jack Nicholson, in George Miller's *The Witches of Eastwick* (1987). Meanwhile Philip Yordan rejigs some of the themes from his *Cataclysm* script for *The Unholy* (1987) and there's a similar build-up to apocalypse in *The Seventh Sign* (1988). All these films bend over backwards to avoid being stuck with the 'horror movie' tag: the results are predictably scrappy, shot through with pretension and generally smack of creative energy being misapplied wholesale. De Niro's Louis Cyphre and Nicholson's Darryl Van Horn are likeable characters and 73-75 Davis Avenue : 266 5877 (Secondhand LPs and Cassettes)
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86 INT/EXT TOW TRUCK GINBORAK MAIN STREET DAY

We're in the cabin of the tow truck, riding with ASTA, LIZZIE and TIM as they come into the main street, past the pubs and the shops. We see what they see.

There are still enough vehicles and MEN in the street and on the hotel verandah to make the street something of a gauntlet. As soon as the truck appears, there are shouts, born toots and a couple of empty beer cans sail over the cabin of the truck, another bounders off the door. LIZZIE, in her freshly ironed dress, hair brushed, instinctively ducks. DANNY, BOBBY, WAYNE, BRIAN, LITTLE STEVE watch from the verandah. Up ahead now, the Ginborak Police Station bakes in the Sandee arvo heat. A station wagon, "GINBORAK COMMUNITY HOSPITAL" painted on its side, is already parked there.

69 EXT GINBORAK POLICE STN. STREET AND VERANDAH DAY

ASTA and LIZZIE slide out of the tow truck. On the other side, TIM opens his door.

LIZZIE: Don't... come in, Dad. Things I'll have to say... Don't want you to....

TIM nods - upset but grateful.

Up on the Police Station verandah, LORNA, still in her 'checkout chick' uniform, stands waiting. ASTA and LIZZIE begin to ascend the steps. TIM exhales heavily - and can't help sliding down in his seat a little, checking out LORNA's brother DAVE and LORNA's MOTHER down at the kerb, DAVE seems to reach a decision. Down there, the tiny figures of ASTA, LIZZIE and the BOYS drift out behind him, some with beers in their hands. WAYNE jumps up onto the boot of the Fairlane. 

DANNY: Let the Sergeant play policeman and we play... Right?

BOBBY: We're gonna need that lawyer again...?

DANNY: Nothing. We stay calm. Andy, you and Steve go home, but nobody does a disappearing act - right?

The boys gathered round DANNY.

DANNY: That's all right, mate. We'll get him. Won't we, Andy?

BRUCE: Now what do we do?

DANNY: What do we do?

BRUCE: What do we do?

DANNY: Nothing. We stay calm. Andy, you and Steve go home, but nobody does a disappearing act - right?

The boys nod, hanging on DANNY's even' word.

The Police Station is half a kilometre away, but it can be clearly seen. The tow-truck and the MATRON's car are parked outside.

LITTLE STEVE's about to concentrate on his beer when a movement down there catches his eye. He slides off the car and runs up the steps to the door of the bar.

LITTLE STEVE: They're coming out!

He goes and leans on a verandah post and looks down there to the Police Station at DANNY, ANDREW, WAYNE, and BOBBY drift out behind him, some with beers in their hands. WAYNE jumps up onto the boot of the Fairlane. Down there, the tiny figures of ASTA, LIZZIE and the MATRON stand on the verandah of the Police Station.

71 EXT POLICE STN. VERANDAH AND STREET DAY

LIZZIE sits onto the bench. She's trembling and sniffing back tears. She starts out into the street. The MATRON bends over LIZZIE and pat her hands, speaking gently.

MATRON: You're a brave girl. Be strong, dear, be strong.

LIZZIE manages to glance up at her and nod, then goes back to staring. ASTA and the MATRON move down to MATRON's car.

ASTA: Thanks very much for your help, Matron. MATRON: Hin - won't say it was a pleasure, Miss Cadell. (CHEERY, TO TIM) Mr Curtis... (BACK TO ASTA AND A GLANCE BACK UP TO LIZZIE) We think she's clean. No V.D. Little bastards. Someone should try sticking it in them where it hurts... anyway. Back to it. No rest for the wicked. (OPENS HER DOOR, SLIDES IN) Motorbike, eh? You should get married. Hou-rrr.

And she backs out at frightening speed and drives off with a merry toot of her horn.

ASTA looks at TIM. He shakes his head - "That matron - she's a character...."

Then they both look towards the steps. LIZZIE is slowly coming down. TIM slides out of the truck. LIZZIE lifts her eyes and manages a smile.

TIM: How... how d'you feel, Liz?

LIZZIE: I feel... better.

They all get into the tow truck.

72 EXT HOTEL FRONT & P.O.V. TO POLICE STN DAY

A hard cut in tight on the BOYS gathered round DANNY. ANDREW swallows hard. BRUCE has joined the others.

BRUCE: Now what do we do?

The tow truck drives past.

DANNY: Nothing. We stay calm. Andy, you and Steve go home, but nobody does a disappearing act - right?

The BOYS nod, hanging on DANNY's every word.

DANNY: Let the Sergeant play policeman and we play along. Everybody knows what to say?

A not very convincing series of murmurs of agreement from the BOYS:

BOBBY: We're gonna need that lawyer again...?

DANNY: That's all right, mate. We'll get him. Won't we, Andy?

ANDREW (SCARED): Yeah.

DANNY: This... Asta baby, she probably does... (SHRUGS) custody and that... Our guy could run rings around her. Right?

Again, the others murmur agreement, grinning with DANNY.

73 EXT CURTIS PLACE FRONT DAY

A W.S. of the whole Curtis place, baking in the sun. The tow truck is clearly visible in the doorway to the workshop. And Mrs Rodolph's white Mercedes is parked in front of the house.

74 INT CURTIS PLACE LOUNGE/DINING ROOM DAY

A cheap print showing cool green waves breaking on a white beach hangs over the fireplace.

MRS RODOLPH is seated in an apparently relaxed manner. NORMA stands drying her hands on her apron, somewhat bemused at this visitation that her mouth almost hangs open. TIM is seated on the couch. He's been working and is in his greasy overalls, wiping his hands on a
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The end of the fight. The listeners vote without another word. TIM stands there. He blinks. He puffs out his cheeks and scratches his head. TIM: (SLOWLY): There’s no trouble here...
LIZZIE: I'll get that, will I? (POINTS OUT SIDE) a pretty fair idea that he got into a fight because of her.

TIM: Nothing. How'd you get on with the detective bloke?

LIZZIE: Tell me ... looks up. laughing in the rear courtyard.

TIM is hard at work under the bonnet of a car, straining at the scene is calm, and were it not so utterly normal, idyllic. But then, far across from us, behind the trestles of the bridge, we make out a police car. And, emerging from underneath the bridge, FISHKIN, attended by a UNIFORMED POLICE-WOMAN and a plainclothes DETECTIVE. ASTA is just behind them. We're too far away to hear what's being said, but it is Lizzie showing the police where it happened. The scene is calm and, and is it not usually, idyllic. But then, far across from us, behind the trestles of the bridge, we make out a police car. And, emerging from underneath the bridge, FISHKIN, attended by a UNIFORMED POLICE-WOMAN and a plainclothes DETECTIVE. ASTA is just behind them. We're too far away to hear what's being said, but it is Lizzie showing the police where it happened. n

FAY (LAUGHING AT THE GROUND) When it's nice.

LIZZIE: Yeah. He did.

DULCIE: It hasn't meant a damn thing. We may not get an injunction. If we do, it may stop them, it may not. And they'll have their bloody lawyers.

It usually isn't -- for FAY.

ASTA grabs the front of Lizzie's blouse, twists it a little. Lizzie starts to look frightened.

DANNY, ROBERT, BRUCE, LITTLE STEVE. With them are MRS RODOLPH, NORMA, TINA, RITA, FAY and DULCIE. TIM stands back, still beside the car he's working on, but listening along with the others. ASTA's just told them what she did.

LIZZIE: Oh, Gee. You fixed them all right.

Lizzie's beam, swept up in the excitement, in having a powerful protector. But her smile seems to irritate ASTA.

LIZZIE: Yeah, sure. They'd like that. That's really admitting they got you scared.

The WOMEN look anxious and confused now. LIZZIE stares at ASTA, bewildered by ASTA's hard look.

DULCIE: Might be best to get out of town for a bit.

TIM: Give the kid a break.

LIZZIE: Why? Do you think she's going to get a break out there? (POPPING OUT OF TINA) Do you want to hear some pretty stories about women who laid charges?

LIZZIE: Anyway, I'm not scared ... Not with you around. Lizzie looks at her, an increasingly exasperated expression on her face.

LIZZIE: What about you, Lizzie? What about you standing up for yourself?

LIZZIE: I will. I can. I'll grab the front of Lizzie's blouse, twists it a little. Lizzie starts to look frightened.

LIZZIE: Can you? What if there's no one? I think you'd just get ... (POPPING OUT OF TINA) No, I wouldn't.

ASTA (PUSHES HER ROUGHLY): You're ready! Eh?

The others look bewildered and anxious.

TIM: Hang on -  you're ready on ... What you're ready for? What are you ready for? You're ready for hurting her, but needling, provoking -- a hard, almost sneering expression on her face.

LIZZIE: Stop it. Stop it, will ya ... (PAUSE) If you want to push Lizzie CHICK, you're ready! (POPPING OUT OF TINA) Lizzie: You're my friend, Asta! Stop it!

TINA: All right -- you made your point ...

(IGNORING TINA) You can't count on anyone, Lizzie.

57 EXT CURTIS PLACE THE WORKSHOP DAY/ LATE AFTERNOON

TIM is hard at work under the bonnet of a car, straining at getting the head off the engine. His face is set and he seems to have been at it for a long time. He has a small bruise under one cheekbone and still wears the torn overalls from the fracas in the pub. Lizzie leans on the other side of the car, trying to get TIM to look at her. He won't. The sounds of the WORKMEN and the working are heard.

SFX: PHONE RINGS INSIDE THE HOUSE. TIM looks up.

TIM: One of those women gonna get the phone ... (POPPING OUT OF TINA) Nothing happened, Dad!

DULCIE: Nothing.

TIM: Lizzie.

TINA: Tell me ...

DULCIE: Tell me ... Something's wrong with the detector bloke! LIZZIE is looking directly at DANNY, just turning her head very slightly in his direction. LIZZIE: (COLD) This time you are going to gag.

The cold finality and absolute certainty of ASTA's voice make the gums of the BOYS' faces freeze. DANNY looks at her with loathing. BRUCE and LITTLE STEVE, at the window, look worried.

ASTA: (PAUSE) Oh, George, Wal Cuddy. Could you slip back to the station? We've -- uh -- got a request for an injunction... The Justice of the Peace has been apprised of the matter. Sorry to trouble you, sir, but the constables are interested.

LIZZIE: Yeah, he did.

DULCIE: Might be best to get out of town for a bit.

TIM: Give the kid a break.

LIZZIE: Why? Do you think she's going to get a break out there? (POPPING OUT OF TINA) Do you want to hear some pretty stories about women who laid charges?

LIZZIE: Anyway, I'm not scared ... Not with you around. Lizzie looks at her, an increasingly exasperated expression on her face.

LIZZIE: What about you, Lizzie? What about you standing up for yourself?

LIZZIE: I will. I can. I'll grab the front of Lizzie's blouse, twists it a little. Lizzie starts to look frightened.

DANNY: (IGNORING TINA) You can't count on anyone, Lizzie.

LIZZIE: I'll grab the front of Lizzie's blouse, twists it a little. Lizzie starts to look frightened.

LIZZIE: Can you? What if there's no one? I think you'd just get ...

(POPPING OUT OF TINA) No, I wouldn't.

ASTA (PUSHES HER ROUGHLY): You're ready! Eh?

The others look bewildered and anxious.

TIM: Hang on -  you're ready on ... What you're ready for? What are you ready for? You're ready for hurting her, but needling, provoking -- a hard, almost sneering expression on her face.

LIZZIE: Stop it. Stop it, will ya ... (PAUSE) If you want to push Lizzie CHICK, you're ready! (POPPING OUT OF TINA) Lizzie: You're my friend, Asta! Stop it!

TINA: All right -- you made your point ...

(IGNORING TINA) You can't count on anyone, Lizzie.
ASTA: You heard me.

MRS RODOLPH (PHONE; ICY): I believe you've applied for a transfer, Sergeant? Well—jolly good luck...!

ASTA: Goodbye. (HANGS UP, STANDS) Well, how was it in gaw? A bit of excitement for you, was it?

ANDREW winces at the sarcasm, but he doesn't let her see the effect on him. She moves to him—and the drink cabinet. He shrugs.

MRS RODOLPH: Graham'll be here tonight on the plane. He says, from what I was able to tell him, it doesn't look good... But if you were to co-operate with the police, say the others forced you to...

ANDREW walks away from her, sipping his drink. MRS RODOLPH: Andrew—what do those town boys do to you? When you've got everything? After all that trouble before... (PAUSING) I'm really trying to understand, darling. Because I can't...

ASTA: What do you want me to say?

MRS RODOLPH: ANYTHING! HELPLESSLY! That girl— why? She's all right. She's looking good— If that's all you want, take some money, drive down to Kal...

He turns to look at her with withering contempt, tossing his car keys in his hand.

ANDREW: I'm going out, Mum.

MRS RODOLPH: Your father fucked the factory girls—he didn't need to... Andrew!

But he has walked out, not looking back at her.

MRS RODOLPH stands at the empty doorway. She begins to cry, overwhelmed with self-pity.

87 IN GINBORAK R.S.L CLUB NIGHT

A table with six empty beer jugs. A foot goes up on the table and one beer jug crashes to the floor, smashing.

DANNY: Yeah—what if there's six?

LITTLE STEVE, junior macho, shrugs indifferently.

SUZIE: You wanna have a dance, Steve?

SUZIE and RACHEL. The tables either side of them are empty. When CUDDY looks away, BOBBY gives him a two-finger sign. Meanwhile:

FISKE and MORGAN are two of the last at the bar. FISKE comes away with a jug of beer in each hand. He and MORGAN cross to DANNY's table, where BRIAN is now with ANDREW. WINNIE is talking to BOBBY, GARY, and even undergur STAN LEVE. GARRY in his cowboy hat sits on a reversed chair.

But apart from the core group, DANNY's bunch seems to’ve swollen. MEN and BOYS at nearby tables, leaning against the wall.

GARRY (TO BRIAN): How'd you go?

BRIAN: 'Sposed to be meeting ‘these birds down the sports ground—and they never show...

FISKE: Here you go, boys...

BRIAN takes one of the jugs, drinks straight from it. BRIAN: Something's got into these women...

SUZIE: 'Somethin'? Bloody Lizzie Curtis...

GARRY: Whole family think they're bloody Christmas... Head shake. MEN and BOYS are looking around for something, someone... Suddenly DANNY gets to his feet. He stands in the centre of the room. GARRY: Yeah—bugger 'em. Bugger the lot of 'em. Why don't we all go for a drive! It's a nice night....

FISKE grim at MORGAN.

89 A HUNTER'S HOTEL FRONT NIGHT

A long row of cars, buses and motorcycles parked diagonally, nose into the kerb. MEN and BOYS silhouetted against the night sky and the street lights as they move towards their vehicles. SUZIE and her GIRLFRIEND stand on the verandah, watching. A great roar and revving of engines.
LIZZIE is coming out of her bedroom, sleep-tousled, pulling on a dressing gown, her eyes wide with fear. ASTA rushes into the room, brick in hand, trying to smash her way through. He is flung against the wall by NORMA's strength on the doors, TIM and NORMA get them closed. They are not the only light about the kitchen. The attackers go about their business. From outside, a car revs up. Laughter and more pounding on the door. Then:

ASTA: Hang on!

LIZZIE: Hang on!

Laughter and pounding on the door. NORMA pulls the big engine. The sound of things being smashed in the kitchen. NORMA and TIM try to shut the door. The sound of things being smashed in the kitchen.
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DULCIE's ute slowly bumps along a dirt road near the river. The headlights pick out the paper bark trees out of the darkness. MELINA and MRS SULLIVAN start the back of the ute rolling into the darkness. НоRMA: MRS Curris!

108 EXT PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE NIGHT
Dark figures of several townspeople walk along the bridge. Torches pierce the darkness below. Occasional calls.

117 EXT ALONG THE RAILWAY LINE NIGHT
NORMA's jammed into the middle of the tow truck seat. Her nose is bleeding and there's a cut on her cheek. NORMA: Good! Guessed little bastards... BRUCE (GETTING WORKED UP): Christ - what we're gonna do with her? NORMA: You're gonna do nothing! Bimbo! I'm gonna get her back.

She gets an arm free and swings a punch at BOBBY. BRIAN struggles to control her. BOBBY: Fighting back, are you Gra'ma! Don't look at me like that.

NORMA spits in his face. BOBBY wipes off the spittle - and suddenly grins.

BOBBY: Now don't do that again, Grannie -  maltin' all that noise. Don't you w'ant to have some fun?

FAY: In the hospital, Norm. Hurt, but OK... OK.

NORMA stares at the detectives. It'll be right, love -  it'll all be right in the end. NORMA spits in his face. BOBBY wipes off the spittle - and suddenly grins.

NORMA: Asta! Asta! Where's my Lizzie!

DANNY: Help! Hee-llppp!

The Police siren louder, but still in the distance -  as ASTA appears. The place itself is ablaze with light. There are TOWNSPEOPLE all along the footpath, sitting on the fence and the station steps. BOBBY peeks into the house -  any house will do. Now the lights are on -  somebody, anybody -  come for her? Cautiously, and suddenly grins. ASTA's holding a bike, moving in on her...

The Fairlane screams off, DANNY at the wheel. We see the Fairlane's lights -  both of them. The place itself is ablaze with light. There are TOWNSPEOPLE all along the footpath, sitting on the fence and the station steps. Raised voices are heard from inside as GAVIN and the DETECTIVE come out, followed by several townspeople. MR and MRS HEMMINGWAY come down the steps and a scuffle breaks out between MR HEMMINGWAY and DANNY. MRS SULLIVAN, in tears, is led down the steps by her HUSBAND, who looks mortified.

GARRY sits on the bonnet of a car with SUZIE and RACHEL. ROSS and PENNY sit on the tray of their truck, watching the snarls. The place itself is ablaze with light. There are TOWNSPEOPLE all along the footpath, sitting on the fence and the station steps. Raised voices are heard from inside as GAVIN and the DETECTIVE come out, followed by several townspeople. MR and MRS HEMMINGWAY come down the steps and a scuffle breaks out between MR HEMMINGWAY and DANNY. MRS SULLIVAN, in tears, is led down the steps by her HUSBAND, who looks mortified.

TINA is off the bike, mns up the steps too, stops...
ASTA: Tell me or I will break your neck.

ASTA (THE EYES FILLED WITH RAGE): You know - and goes to push past her.


There's just enough space for CUDDY to open the rear door of the ute and get in. Inside he finds ANGE ANDREW slide out. The other CONSTABLE is third to get out. Now ASTA's next to CUDDY. She takes in DANNY's face: a calm smile with a touch of his sweet, innocent 'gee, I don't know what all the fuss is about'.

CUDDY, cutting off MRS RODOLPH and the LAWYER. GAVIN appears at the head of the steps and the steps are jammed.

ASTA holds the dead body of LIZZIE and weeps, her cries at first only the sounds amongst the dawn birds. But then we become aware of the sound of engines... From high up on the dam wall, we see the CROWD growing to the car... Ginborak is coming out to look. TOWNSPEOPLE are getting out, moving forward, lining up on the dam wall against the sky.

Some are awed, touched - but for many, after the night, there is a sense of alarms and excursions, there's a bizarre, carnival feel in the cool dawn air. We see FISKE and HEMMINGWAY - almost pleased with themselves. But we also see RITA, LORNA, PENNY, BATTY and the MEATWORKERS. The big motorcycle lies askew in the dusty road. The camera comes off it, craning up and finding a dead tree, stark against the pale morning sky, close by the wall of an empty dam. Down on the side of the dam, two sets of tracks - one of running feet, the other as of someone who's dragged and crawled themselves... A figure in black sits rocking back and forth, cradling a body in her arms.

Now CUDDY has moved so that he is on the side, and CUDDY on the other. ASTA, TINA, RITA, PENNY, DULCIE and FAY - and beyond them again, DAVE and ROSS.

Now CUDDY has moved so that he is on the other side, facing the crowd. Behind CUDDY, GAVIN, and then the CROWD, the people of Ginborak. NORMA sinks to sit by the body, looking down at the covered body. ASTA looks at CUDDY. She can't speak.

Now NORMA, a blanket round her shoulders, stands by LETTY and ROSS and PENNY walking either side. NORMA looks at the face of her dead grand-daughter - of the ute. DULCIE and FAY help her up. HEMMINGWAY comes out to look. TOWNSPEOPLE move, but are stopped. MRS RODOLPH's voice pierces the silence like an icicle:

NORMA: You see this, you people? You see?

CUDDY: Pity she didn't finish you off... "mate"...

SUZIE on one arm and RACHEL on the other...

GAVIN appears to take no notice of this whatsoever. ASTA has never taken her eyes off DANNY.

And the peace breaks like a wave, blankets swept aside.

Now NORMA, PENNY and ROSS still with them. The CROWD presses closer. NORMA stands by the ute, gripping the wall, looking down at the covered body. Beyond her, but blurred and turned away, TINA, RITA, LORNA, PENNY, DULCIE and FAY - and beyond them again, DAVE and ROSS.

Now CUDDY has moved so that he is on the other side, facing the CROWD. Behind CUDDY, the crowd, the people of Ginborak. NORMA sinks to sit by the body, huddled against the ute's cabin, her eyes down on the body. ASTA can't bear it. She lifts her eyes to find CUDDY looking hard at her. He is lost in anger at himself and a helpless frustration. He takes it out on ASTA:

CUDDY: Weiser - I hope you're bloody satisfied.

Then NORMA lifts her eyes to look at CUDDY. She reaches out a hand to cover ASTA's. Then TINA, RITA, PENNY, FAY, LORNA, PATTY, BETTY and the MEATWORKERS... all of them stand with ASTA. Beyond the WOMEN, ROSS and DAVE and the POWER.

NORMA: No, Wal - we're not bloody satisfied - not by a long way - "mate"

The WOMEN look steadily at CUDDY. It's not personal. It's just what NORMA says - they're not satisfied and they say they intend to do something about it.

CUDDY takes it in. He drops his eyes and nods - "Fair enough".

NORMA: LORNA: Sergeant... He looks at her.

LORNA moves around the rear of the ute and up to CUDDY. She's scared. She moves quickly to his sister, not to stop her - not this time. LORNA swallows hard. She knows everyone is listening.

LORNA: Sergeant... I'll be looking for you at nine o'clock. "Ray" I'll be laying charges... "n' this time I'm not running away.

CUDDY's eyes to DAVE, who stands right behind LORNA. And DAVE just looks at him. CUDDY nods. He'll be there.

And the CROWD and MEATWORKER #1 are in the cabin of the ute. DULCIE starts the engine. The ute starts to move.

A space is left between ASTA and the women, on one side, and CUDDY on the other. ASTA, PENNY, PATTY, BETTY, FAY begin to move as a group after the slowly moving ute. ROSS joins PENNY. LORNA and DAVE join this group. Then LITTLE SUZIE... then ELIZA...

They move toward camera. The shoot develops till we have almost a single on ASTA - her face streaked with tears, but her head up, the other WOMEN with her.

FREEZE FRAME

THE END
of her paper. Unaware of Diane’s plans her married lover Barry Robbins, the Minister of health, has similar ambitions and plots the demise of the current Prime Minister.

**DOCUMENTARIES**

**CHOCOLATES, GIANTS AND PEACHES**
**ROALD DAHL LIVE IN MELBOURNE**
Prod. company TV Ed Productions/ Min. of Education Victoria
Producer Lily Steiner
Director Lily Steiner
Camera Noel Penn
Audio Anthony Armann
Editors Mark Williams
Lily Steiner
Prod. assistants Jayne Catterina
Judi Latham
Synopsis: This series of three programs was recorded live at the Dallas Brooks Hall during Roald Dahl’s recent visit to Melbourne. He recalls anecdotes, reads from his books, and answers questions from the children in the audience.

**COVER TO COVER – ROALD DAHL**
Prod. company TV Ed Productions/ Min. of Education Victoria
Producer Lily Steiner
Director Lily Steiner
Camera Noel Penn
Audio Anthony Armann
Editors Mark Williams
Lily Steiner
Prod. assistants Jayne Catterina
Judi Latham
Synopsis: The ‘Cover to Cover’ series looks at children’s authors and illustrators. This program was recorded during Roald Dahl’s recent visit to Australia.

**DOWN FROM DARWIN**
Prod. co. Ordinary Miracle Pictures
Producers Bruce Ready
Brenton Harris
Director Tony Le Maistre
Scriptwriter Mike Sexton
Photography Bruce Ready
Prod. manager Brenton Harris
Length 50 mins
Gauge 16mm to 1” video
Synopsis: A look at the top end of Australia and debris that remains after World War II.

**GIANTS OF TIME**
Prod. company Juniper Films
Dist. company Juniper Films
Producer John Davy Tristram
Director Ian James Wilson
Scriptwriter Nadine Arndol
Photography Garry Maunour
Sound recordist Ralph Steele
Synopsis: A celebration of humanity, wisdom and the spirit of old people.

**HAEMODIALYSIS**
Prod. company Flinders Media, Flinders Medical Centre
Producer Mike Davies
Director Mike Davies
Scriptwriter Mike Davies
Based on the idea by Mike Davies
Sound recordist Andrew Ganczarzyc
Editor Janet Todd
Composer Robert Kral
Exec. producer Bronte Turner
Assoc. producer Rod Lacombe
Camera operator Janet Todd
Art director Alan Bentley
Music performed by Robert Kral
Sound editor Andrew Ganczarzyk
Synopsis: A dialysis patient with end-stage renal failure demonstrates a satisfying lifestyle and demonstrates a satisfactory lifestyle and demonstrates haemodialysis.

**IN MORAL PANIC**
Prod. company Cinelit Productions P/L
Dist. company Devillier-donegan Enterprises USA
Producer Frank Heimans
Director Frank Heimans
Scriptwriter Paul Rea
Photography John Thornton
Sound recordists George Weiss
Hugo De Vries
Synopsis: In Moral Panic examines the social history and psychology of punishment, comparing Australian methods with those overseas.

IT’S NOT ALL RUBBISH
Prod. company Ministry of Education/ TV Ed Productions
Producer Ivan Gaa
Director Ivan Gaa
Scriptwriter Bob Phelps
Photography Nicholas Sherman
Sound recordist Catherine South
Editor Ivan Gaa
Composer Rex Watts
Assoc. producer Dallas Kinnear
Boom operator Tom Kantor
Make-up Jane Catterina
Narrator/presenter Rob Gell
Still photography Don Porter
Laboratory Edit Decision
Company Pty Ltd
Length 28 mins
Gauge 1” video
Shooting stock Fuji BVP
Synopsis: A 28-min. documentary filmed at Brunswick East High School. The program is about how a group of cross-aged high school students empower themselves with knowledge and skills they will need in order to successfully organize, in a democratic manner a recycling program in their school. The program will be presented by Rob Gell, the well-known weather presenter on Channel 9, who is also an expert conservationist.

**PARENT/TEACHER**
**INTERVIEW SKILLS**
Prod. company TV Ed Productions/ Min. of Education Victoria
Producer Lily Steiner
Director Lily Steiner
Synopsis: A drama that focuses on communication skills necessary for successful interaction during parent/teacher interviews in skills.

**PARENTS HELPING CHILDREN TO READ**
Prod. company TV Ed Productions/ Min. of Education Victoria
Producer Lily Steiner
Director Lily Steiner
Synopsis: A drama that aims to provide parents and relatives with useful insights and ideas for helping children who are learning to read.

**POSTCARDS FROM ITALY**
Prod. company Colosimo Film Productions Pty Ltd
Dist. company Octopus Worldwide Media Enterprises
Producer Rosa Colosimo
Director Luigi Acquisto
Based on original idea by Sonia Leber
Photography Luigi Acquisto
Editluigi Acquisto
Exec. producer Rosa Colosimo
Prod. manager Kellie Romain
Prod. assistant Diana Cavusso
Camera operator Vladimir Osherov
Camera assistant Sonia Leber
Publicity Kellie Romain
Length 55 mins
Gauge 16mm to 1” video
Shooting stock SP Betacam
Cast: Justin O’Brien, Jeffrey Smart, David Malouf, Princess Niki Borgshe, Anna Calandra, Bernard Hickey, Franco Nero, Desmond O’Grady, Lory Whit, Rod Dudley.
Synopsis: For decades Australian artists, tourists, writers, academics and adventurers have come to Italy to spend a few weeks.
or months absorbing the country's ancient culture and lyrical beauty. Many of these casual visitors end up settling in Italy. This documentary looks at the other side of the 'migration' coin — emigration, rather than immigration — and asks why an increasing number of Australians opt for a different lifestyle in Italy. The emphasis is on interesting and fascinating personalities.

**UNDER SOUTHERN SKIES**

Prod. company: Our Secret Australia
Dist. company: Beyond International

Producer: Mark Falzon
Director: Michael Edols

Synopsis: *Under Southern Skies* takes the viewer on a journey of discovery and explores how man lives and moves within his fragile environment by combining the beauty and uniqueness of our plant life with the natural elements that created this vast land we call Australia.

**WITH FLYING COLOURS**

Prod. company: AFTRS
Exec. producer: William Fitzwater
Director: Sara Hourez

Camera operator: Chris Fraser
Editor: Sara Hourez
Length: 20 minutes

Synopsis: People with disabilities can compete on the same level as the rest of the community and achieve success. Some with flying colours.

**SHORTS**

**THE COLOURED PENCILS**

Prod. company: Film Australia Pty Ltd
Dist. company: Film Australia Pty Ltd

Producer: Sonia Humphrey
Director: Matt Scully

Scriptwriter: Judith Alexandrovics
Based on the short story by: Kay Arthur

Photography: Roma Baska
Sound recordist: Rex Watts
Editor: Steven King
Composer: Peter Croeside
Prod. managers: Dennis Smith
Continuity: Judith Alexandrovics
Casting: Belinda Alexandrovics
Casting consultants: Sheila Florange
Camera assistant: Kate Clancy
Key grip: David Casarr
Gaffer: Rosy Timonie
Electrician: Peter Alexandrovs
Boom operator: Peter Clancy
Art director: Georgina Campbell
Art assistant: Camilla Cattarach
Costume designer: Richard Naylor
Make up artist: Vivienne Hollar
Hairdresser: Les Jenner
Wardrobe: Silvia Petrovic
Special effects: Paul Newcombe

Neg. matching: VFL
Musical director: Peter Croeside
Music performed by: Peter Croeside
Sound editor: Rex Watts
Still photography: Stine Baska
Animation: Funny Farm

Synopsis: A film about the benefits of encouraging their employees to serve in the Defence Reserves.

**THE BOMB IN YOUR BACKYARD**

Prod. company: Film Australia Pty Ltd
Dist. company: Film Australia Pty Ltd
Prod. company: AFTRS

Producer: Sonia Humphrey
Director: Matt Scully

Scriptwriter: Judith Alexandrovics

Production designer: Peter Croeside
Editor: Jacqueline Walker
Exec. producer: Paul Hamm
Photography: Richard Ryan
Sound recordists: Ken Hammond
Rick Creaser

Synopsis: A short recruitment film to be shown to potential applicants, influencer groups and those already expressing an interest in a career as an Army officer. It details the career of an officer up to the rank of Major in all the major corps, and methods of getting there.

**ARMY OFFICER CADETS**

Prod. company: Film Australia Pty Ltd
Dist. company: Film Australia Pty Ltd

Producer: Sonia Humphrey
Director: Matt Scully

Scriptwriter: Judith Alexandrovics

Production designer: Peter Croeside
Editor: Jacqueline Walker
Exec. producer: Paul Hamm
Photography: Richard Ryan
Sound recordists: Ken Hammond
Rick Creaser

Synopsis: A short recruitment film to be shown to potential applicants, influencer groups and those already expressing an interest in a career as an Army officer. It details the career of an officer up to the rank of Major in all the major corps, and methods of getting there.

**ARMY RESERVE EMPLOYER MOTIVATION**

Prod. company: Film Australia Pty Ltd
Dist. company: Film Australia Pty Ltd
Prod. company: AFTRS

Producer: Sonia Humphrey
Director: Matt Scully

Scriptwriter: Judith Alexandrovics

Production designer: Peter Croeside
Editor: Jacqueline Walker
Exec. producer: Paul Hamm
Photography: Richard Ryan
Sound recordists: Ken Hammond
Rick Creaser

Synopsis: A short recruitment film to be shown to potential applicants, influencer groups and those already expressing an interest in a career as an Army officer. It details the career of an officer up to the rank of Major in all the major corps, and methods of getting there.

**EMPLOYER MOTIVATION**

Prod. company: Film Australia Pty Ltd
Dist. company: Film Australia Pty Ltd

Producer: Geoff Barnes

Researcher: Emma Gordon
Exec. producer: Janet Bell
Prod. manager: Catriona MacMillan
Prod. secretary: Jane Benson

Prod. acct.: Waldemar Wawryzniuk

Marketing/promotions: John Swindells
Publicity: Mark Farrow
Length: 10-12 minutes

Synopsis: An essay series on blind prejudice and justifiable fear.

**THE BOMB IN YOUR BACKYARD**

Prod. company: Film Australia Pty Ltd
Dist. company: Film Australia Pty Ltd
Prod. company: AFTRS

Producer: Sonia Humphrey
Director: Matt Scully

Scriptwriter: Judith Alexandrovics

Production designer: Peter Croeside
Editor: Jacqueline Walker
Exec. producer: Paul Hamm
Photography: Richard Ryan
Sound recordists: Ken Hammond
Rick Creaser

Synopsis: A short recruitment film to be shown to potential applicants, influencer groups and those already expressing an interest in a career as an Army officer. It details the career of an officer up to the rank of Major in all the major corps, and methods of getting there.

**ARMY OFFICER CADETS**

Prod. company: Film Australia Pty Ltd
Dist. company: Film Australia Pty Ltd
Prod. company: AFTRS

Producer: Sonia Humphrey
Director: Matt Scully

Scriptwriter: Judith Alexandrovics

Production designer: Peter Croeside
Editor: Jacqueline Walker
Exec. producer: Paul Hamm
Photography: Richard Ryan
Sound recordists: Ken Hammond
Rick Creaser

Synopsis: A short recruitment film to be shown to potential applicants, influencer groups and those already expressing an interest in a career as an Army officer. It details the career of an officer up to the rank of Major in all the major corps, and methods of getting there.

**ARMY RESERVE EMPLOYER MOTIVATION**

Prod. company: Film Australia Pty Ltd
Dist. company: Film Australia Pty Ltd
Prod. company: AFTRS

Producer: Sonia Humphrey
Director: Matt Scully

Scriptwriter: Judith Alexandrovics

Production designer: Peter Croeside
Editor: Jacqueline Walker
Exec. producer: Paul Hamm
Photography: Richard Ryan
Sound recordists: Ken Hammond
Rick Creaser

Synopsis: A short recruitment film to be shown to potential applicants, influencer groups and those already expressing an interest in a career as an Army officer. It details the career of an officer up to the rank of Major in all the major corps, and methods of getting there.

**EMPLOYER MOTIVATION**

Prod. company: Film Australia Pty Ltd
Dist. company: Film Australia Pty Ltd
Prod. company: AFTRS

Producer: Geoff Barnes

Researcher: Emma Gordon
Exec. producer: Janet Bell
Prod. manager: Catriona MacMillan
Prod. secretary: Jane Benson

Prod. acct.: Waldemar Wawryzniuk

Marketing/promotions: John Swindells
Publicity: Mark Farrow
Length: 10-12 minutes

Synopsis: An essay series on blind prejudice and justifiable fear.
The Antarctic is an area of intense scientific interest, being the southernmost region of the world. It is a place of great beauty and mystery, but also of great danger. The researchers who work in this region must be prepared for anything, including the unexpected. But despite the challenges, they continue to push the boundaries of knowledge and discovery, as they explore the many mysteries of this ancient continent.
Synopsis: Set in the small rural community of "Wandin Valley", the series deals with medical and social issues, through the major characters and the local Bush Nursing Hospital. It also dramatises the lives of the community and the National Park Ranger.
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MARCH 1989

G (GENERAL EXHIBITION)

Felix The Cat The Movie: D.Oriolo/J.Schenk/C.Schneider, Poland/USA, 79 mins, Village Roadshow

Makota Sisters, The: Tomoyuki Tanaka/Kon Ichikawa, Japan, 136 mins, Quality Films

Skier's Dream: J.Long/J.Angrove, Canada, 71 mins, Filmpak

PG (PARENTAL GUIDANCE)

Chances: M.Lobell, USA, 105 mins, Fox Columbia, V(i-m-j) L(i-m-j) O(adult concepts, sexual allusions)

Daisy and Simon: P.Borain, Australia, 105 mins, Hoyts, L(i-f-j) O(adult concepts)

Farewell to the King: A.Ruddy/A.A.Morgan, USA/Malaysia, 116 mins, Filmapic, Holdings, V(i-f-j) O(adult concepts)

Fletch Lives: A.Greisman/P.Doughlas, USA/Poland, 93 mins, UIP, L(i-l-g) V(i-l-g) O(adult concepts, sexual allusions)

Floating Clouds (main title not shown in English): Toho Company, Japan, 120 mins, Quality Films, O(adult concepts)

Hotel Terminus - The Life and Times of Klaus Barbie: M.Ophuls, USA, 266 mins, Village Roadshow, O(adult concepts)

It's A Mad Mad Mad World III (said to be - Title not shown in English): D.Poon, Hong Kong, 94 mins, Cinematown Cinema, L(i-g) V(i-g) O(adult concepts)

Klaus Barbie: A.Morgan, USA/Malaysia, 116 mins, Filmclub Cinema, V(i-m-j) L(i-m-j) O(adult concepts, sexual allusions)

My Demon Lover: J.Long/J.Angrove, USA, 87 mins, Filmapic, O(adult concepts, mild horror)

Positive I.D.: J.Dayton/J.Hunter, USA, 92 mins, UIP, L(i-m-j) V(i-m-j) O(adult concepts)

Red Scorpion: J.Abramoff, USA, 103 mins, Vestron Cinema, V(i-m-g) L(i-m-g) O(adult concepts)

Ruthless Law: Liberty Poon Co., Hong Kong, 91 mins, Yu Enterprises, V(i-m-g) O(adult concepts)

Salaam Bombay!: M.Nair, India, 111 mins, Denzil Cinema, L(i-m-j) O(adult concepts)

See You In The Morning: A.Pakula/S.Solt, USA, 118 mins, Village Roadshow, L(i-m-g) O(adult concepts)

Sing: C.Zadan, USA, 98 mins, Fox Columbia, L(i-m-g) O(adult concepts)

Skin Deep: T.Adam, USA, 100 mins, Fox Columbia, L(i-m-g) O(sexual allusions)

Slaves of New York: I.Inemi, Yugoslavia, 97 mins, Hoyts, L(i-m-g) O(adult concepts)

Slaughter: R.Dayton/R.Green, USA, 108 mins, Village Roadshow, L(i-m-g) O(adult concepts)

New York Stories - Life Lessons/Life Without Zoe/Oedipus Wrecks: R.Greenhut, USA, 124 mins, Village Roadshow, L(i-l-g) V(i-l-j) O(adult concepts)

Police Academy 6 - City Under Siege: P.Platansky, USA, 84 mins, Village Roadshow, L(i-l-g) V(i-l-j) O(adult concepts)

M (MATURE AUDIENCES)

Chief Zabu: N.Leigh, USA, 82 mins, Village Roadshow, L(i-m-g) V(i-g) O(adult concepts)

Crazy Companies II: J.Dayton/R.Green, USA, 99 mins, Village Roadshow, L(i-m-g) V(i-m-g) O(adult concepts)

Following (main title not shown in English): Golden Harvest/Paragon Films, Hong Kong, 92 mins, Cinematown Cinema, V(i-m-g) S(i-m-g) O(sexual allusions)

Hellbound - Hellraiser II: C.Figg, UK, 93 mins, Village Roadshow, O(horror)

Long Arm of the Law Part 3 (main title not shown in English): Not shown, Hong Kong, 104 mins, Chinatown Cinema, V(i-m-g) O(adult concepts)

Maniac Cop: L.Cohen, USA, 81 mins, CBS/Fox Video, V(i-m-g) O(adult concepts)

FILMS REFUSED REGISTRATION

MAN Behind the Sun: Fu Chi, Hong Kong, 104 mins, Yu Enterprises, O(extreme cruelty)

APRIL 1989

G (GENERAL EXHIBITION)

Ashik Kerib: Georgia Films Studio, USSR, 76 mins, Trade Representative of the USSR

PG (PARENTAL GUIDANCE)

All About Ah Long (main title not in English): R.Wong, Hong Kong, 97 mins, Cinematown Cinema, V(i-m-j) L(i-m-j) O(horror)

Appointment with Death: M.Winner, UK/Israel/Italy, 102 mins, Hoyts, V(i-l-g) O(adult concepts)

Experiments, The: J.Keach, USA, 93 mins, UIP, L(i-l-g) V(i-l-j) O(sexual allusions)

Fountain, The: M.Hunt/E.Elbert, USA, 96 mins, UIP, L(i-m-g) O(adult concepts)

How The West Was Won: A.Schapiro, USA, 90 mins, Village Roadshow, L(i-m-g) V(i-m-g) O(adult concepts)

Maneater: V.Cecchi Gori, Italy, 106 mins, Fox Columbia Tri Star, L(i-m-g) S(i-m-g) O(drug use)

Never Say Die: G.Murphy, New Zealand, 103 mins, Filipac, L(i-m-g) V(i-m-g) O(adult concepts)

Peacock King (main title not in English): Golden Harvest, Hong Kong, 83 mins, Cinematown Cinema, V(i-m-g) O(horror)

Robotech: H.Koch, USA, 94 mins, Village Roadshow, L(f-m-g) V(i-m-g) O(adult concepts)

Slaves of New York: L.Merchant/G.Hendier, USA, 124 mins, Fox Columbia Tri Star, L(i-m-g) O(adult concepts)

They Came to Rob Hong Kong (main title not in English): C.Ford/C.Lau, Hong Kong, 97 mins, Chinatown Cinema, V(i-m-j) L(i-m-j) O(adult concepts)

Un Hombre de Exitio (A Successful Man): H.Hernandez, Cuba, 103 mins, New Era Films, L(i-m-g) O(adult concepts)

When Tat Fu Was Young: S.Shin, Hong Kong, 97 mins, Chinatown Cinema, S(i-m-j) O(adult concepts)

R (RESTRICTED EXHIBITION)

Boost, The (a): D.Blatt, USA, 95 mins, Hoyts, O(adult concepts)

Dead Pitt, The: G.Everett, USA, 101 mins, Village Roadshow, O(horror)

Dream Team: The (a): D.Blatt, USA, 95 mins, Hoyts, O(adult concepts)

Criminal Law: J.Crosby, USA, 101 mins, Village Roadshow, O(adult concepts)

Dead bang: S.Roth, USA, 118 mins, Village Roadshow, O(adult concepts)

Ghosts of the Civil Dead: E.English, Australia, 91 mins, Outlaw Values Marketing, S(i-m-g) V(i-m-g) O(adult concepts)

Man Behind the Sun (b): Fu Chi, Hong Kong, 104 mins, Yu Enterprises, O(adult concepts)

Manifesto: M.Golan/T.Globus, USA/Yugoslavia, 96 mins, Hoyts, S(i-m-j) O(adult concepts)

Tougher Than Leather: V.Giordano, USA, 86 mins, Hoyts, V(i-m-g) L(f-m-g) O(sexual allusions)

(a) See also under Films Board of Review and R (Restricted Exhibition) March 1989

(b) See also under Films Board of Review and Films Refused Registration March 1989

FILMS BOARD OF REVIEW

Boost, The (a): D.Blatt, USA, 95 mins, Hoyts, O(adult concepts)

Dead Pitt, The: G.Everett, USA, 101 mins, Village Roadshow, O(horror)

Decision reviewed: Classify R by the Film Censorship Board

Decision of the Board: Confirm the decision of the Film Censorship Board

Man Behind the Sun (b): Fu Chi, Hong Kong, 104 mins, Yu Enterprises, o(adult concepts)

Decision reviewed: Refusal to register by the Film Censorship Board

Decision of the Board: Direct the Film Censorship Board to register and classify R
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WHAT DOES CANNES MEAN TO YOU?

SUE MURRAY: Director of Marketing, Australian Film Commission

Cannes attracts a fantastic mix of people – the media, festival directors, filmmakers and buyers. It is where films are debated in cinematic terms, national film cultures are analyzed, films are bought and sold, where having a profile can be extremely important, where locating people can be a nightmare. In other words, it’s a must.

In terms of the AFC, it means a lot of work: setting up office facilities, assisting producers with their marketing strategies, producing information booklets, setting up festival activities for the next year, co-ordinating screenings and promoting Australian films. It is both an endurance test and a challenge to allocate limited financial resources in order to achieve the best possible exposure for the Australian films.

PAUL COX: Director of Island, (screening in the market)

Well, it must certainly not be regarded as a proper film festival. This is a political set-up. If you look at all the films in all the categories they are there for certain reasons, political reasons. It’s not a celebration of the cinema – it used to be. Now it’s all money and greed. It’s a product like shampoo here, and all the way around the world, yet we still celebrate the great Cannes boulevard, we are still seen along the Croisette avec les croissants.

The competition has *A Cry in the Dark*. It has been released and bombed out in two countries. It’s representing Australia in the competition. I’ve nothing against it, but it’s ludicrous – it’s in the main competition because they wanted Meryl Streep here.

A screening in Cannes is also the most dreadful, harrowing thing on earth. Everybody has to walk in and out because they have to go to the next show. It is really like modern life, like consumerism. But it’s quite handy for me to be here because of the financing of the next film. A few discussions have been taking place and that usually results in something going on after the festival. So that’s why I came.

ALAN FINNEY: Dir. Marketing/Distribution Village Roadshow

We’re not running around this market or any other market desper-ately looking for the big film. The reason for that is that our supply lines are intact, our relationships are longstanding, they usually go back a number of years. So for us it’s a very different exercise, it’s a question of coming and speaking with these people and having a meal and a drink and saying hello. So for us Cannes is more a touching base exercise than heavy negotiation in a smoke-filled room.

KIM LEWIS: Kim Lewis Marketing (principally representing *The Prisoner of St Petersburg* and *Celia*)

Cannes is pretty important for Australian independents because it’s both a festival and a market. The American Film Market and Milan aren’t festival oriented and, apart from Berlin and Montreal, most of the other festivals don’t have a strong market. But you can cover all the ground here. You can sell your film to a film co-op. or you can sell to a studio here. It has the biggest range. The biggest difficulty is contacting them, because there’s no register of any reliable kind, and no full calendar of films.
I come here for my future more than anything else. Last year Mapantsula was an official selection but usually I come to meet people, to renew acquaintances and talk about future projects. I don't need any other market, but Cannes is essential to me.

BOB WEISS: PRODUCER OF GEORGIA

I've always brought myself to markets because I thought it was an important thing to do. I think anyone who is a serious filmmaker can be able to get $10,000 to find out what the rest of the world is doing.

But Cannes is essential to me. Last year I didn't need any other market, but Cannes is essential to me.

It's a very important experience for a filmmaker to come to a market like this and see how these people appreciate what they are doing. It's basically a communicative medium and if we get stuck in a production phase without getting any feedback from the distribution phase, it's a pretty isolated and alienating experience.

There's a sort of quixotic attitude on the part of some of the filmmakers that distribution is part of the dirty world of money and commercialism and we're artists and we don't need to address that. It's very naive, because film is that very strange mixture of art and commerce. It's a very expensive medium to work in. It's not a sellout to find out whether the intentions with which you started a project are realized.

DANIEL SCARF: PRODUCER: THE PRISONER OF ST PETERSBURG, AND LOVER BOY

This is my first time at Cannes, my first time at any market. It's very enlightening meeting people, seeing how things like the press are handled. I've met an incredible number of people, a broad range of producers, buyers, distributors. It's a very important experience for Australian independents to come to a market like this and see what the real world's about.

HOW DID YOU PREPARE FOR THE FESTIVAL?

KIM LEWIS: It is difficult for a single producer or a new company, because it takes two to four years for people to know you're around, and where you're based, and whether or not your product is reliable. A lot of people come here and try to get everyone into their screenings; that's not only difficult, because screenings are expensive, but it's also worthless gunning for all those big companies if you're handling specialty product. If you run a film through the Palais markets and it's a new film, the first screening's free, and subsequent screenings are $70 to $100. If you run it through the AFC it's $400 a screening, outside the Palais, in the cinemas. You might get only 30 or 40 people to a screening, or as few as 15 to a morning screening. It's better to show a film that's got some trade in it a minimum of three times, up to as many as five or six, because people just keep missing screenings in this place.

Ideally you let everyone know your film is on long before the festival and get your bookings made early in the year. You try to get your actual screening times into the bumper issue trade ads, but you don't always have that information in time yourself. If you're a regular, then it is not so difficult to get that important information out to people, because you know them and they will respond to you and will make contact with you. If you have a film screening in the official selections, you really need to have a public relations person, a press co-ordinator.

The festival runs for 12 days, so you've got to survive that period of time. You've got to pace yourself in a way that allows you to get through that time in the best possible physical condition. Cannes is not Hobart — it is not a place that closes at midnight, so you've got to be careful that you don't overdo it or you can blow the next three days' business. If you get 30 seconds with Menahem Golan and you think you've really got a picture for him, then you've got to be in reasonable shape.

SUE MURRAY: In terms of the market, we book the cinema, accommodation, office space and local staff; assist producers with their accreditation and discuss marketing strategies; and create a new campaign each year, including producing a new catalogue and promo reel. For the festival, in February we preview all the available films to Pierre Rissient (who is the delegate for Gilles Jacob and the selection committee). Once a film is selected we co-ordinate the translation and subtitling and work with the agent and producer on the presentation of the film. The marketing staff who attend Cannes also try to see as many of the new Australian films as possible so that we can discuss the films with buyers. The AFC doesn't sell films, so the emphasis is on providing as much information as we can so that buyers can identify the films they are interested in seeing. We also set up meetings in advance so that we can plan our annual festivals and special events strategy, identify potential pre-sale and co-production partners for Australian producers and keep informed as to buying trends and prices. This contact with the market is essential for our marketing advisory role. Preparing for Cannes is a continuous process — we started planning for 1990 at this year's festival.

NATALIE MILLER: DISTRIBUTOR-EXHIBITOR

For the first-timers at Cannes, there's not a lot that can prepare you for it. You have to be focused, you have to know what you've come for, and not try to be all things to all people. If you're trying to sell a film, send your material out to your targeted buyers beforehand; if you're going to hold a function, send the invitations well before you come, that way people will focus on you. And stay somewhere central, it doesn't matter where — that's one of the important things.

ALAN FINNEY: What some Australians tend to feel they have to do is to hype the Aussie film. The trouble is that it can increase that discrepancy between expectation and delivery. There are some films that should be hyped in reverse. You should go around saying, "It's only a little film," and then people may be surprised. I find that in a marketing sense people are often more impressed if they think they think they've discovered something. That's what you have to do when you're distributing films, you have to be very careful to cue people's expectations in an accurate way that allows them to feel they're part of the process. I think this reflects the confusion in all our minds about the kinds of films we should be making. On the hand there are the Crocodile Dundees, and on the other hand the smaller films of more limited scope and ambition — but people come to a market like this and try to see those films as though they're Crocodile Dundee. You can't have it both ways. You don't bring a cat to Cannes and sell it as a lion, you sell it as a nice little cat, and there are a lot of people that want to buy a cat.

TRISTRAM MIALL: PRODUCER, FORMERLY WITH FILM AUSTRALIA, ACCOMPANYING MALPRACTICE

I don't think that there's any golden rule of how to prepare for Cannes. If you have a film then what you can do is have masses of leaflets and you work the press gallery and if you're an American multi-millionaire producer you can have planes flying around outside every lunchtime. But most of that can only happen once you're here. You make sure that people like Bill [Bennett] and Ian [Gilmour] come along, because people here are really more interested in directors and actors than in marketing people.

If you have a production in development that you want to get interest in, you really have to think a long way ahead. As far as I can see there is very little point in coming here without at least a first draft script, a budget and key elements, actors and so on. And you send that to your targeted people beforehand, so that when you finally meet, they've read it, and you can sit down and have some good useful discussions. That's the textbook way of doing it. I don't know how many people actually achieve it.

Evan English: Producer, Ghosts... of the Civil Dead

Basically I just take some time and figure out my targets. In this case it was certain territories, like Spain and Germany. I feed out information, sales spiels and screening times, and send out information to everyone in the territory I can think of, not just buyers, but producers, friends, everyone, because that's the network.

Then you have to figure out what sort of publicity you're going to do. We can't afford to advertise in the trades, so we go different ways. We do a guerrilla poster campaign, which is always really important, because people talk about it, and we do invitations and then blitz the place. The other important point is to contact the trades, Variety, Hollywood Reporter, Business of Film, Le Film Francais and Screen International, and make sure that you get some stories printed in the bumper editions or the daily.
Robert Weis: I think individual producers need to spend more money and more effort on their profile in this market. When you come to a few you realize that if you haven’t worked out your strategy three months before you arrive, written letters and contacted the people that you wanted to see, and worked out exactly what it is that you wanted to achieve, then you end up having beers with Australian colleagues and talking about the weather. At this festival, anybody can come, and does, and it takes a few markets to realize who is just full of shit, and who is a real player. And the difficulty is that somebody who is a real player one year is full of shit the next.

From a support point of view I think the State and Federal bodies provide good infrastructure, particularly the AFC. The State bodies have been a little confused over the years about what their role is and whether there is a conflict of interest between them and the Federal body and whether they ought to be plugging into the Federal body’s initiatives or doing something separate.

**HOW DOES THE FESTIVAL COMPARE WITH OTHER YEARS?**

Natalie Miller: I’ve been coming here at least 12 years. In the early days there weren’t nearly so many films screening, and the independent arthouse distributor could pick up really top specialist films for very low prices. When I first came there were only about five Australians here altogether. This year I’ve found films that I liked, but unfortunately they were either pre-sold, or the majors have bought them. A few years ago, for example, I bought Jim Jarmusch’s Stranger Than Paradise. Now, with his third film, Mystery Train, the asking price is just enormous for an independent, it’s too much of a risk. What has changed it a lot is video. A lot of the big companies buy all the rights, and don’t care if it doesn’t do a lot theatrically – but the rights have gone. And there are companies like Troma Productions, with their titles like Rabid Grannies and Teenage Ninja Turtles on the Moon. The place is full of that as well.

Bob Weis: There’s tremendous interest in genuine co-productions this year. When the drive towards co-productions first happened, it was a way to finance films and the concept seemed unimportant. People were putting together a French and a German and Italian and Australian element because they thought they could find the money, and that’s always a fairly disastrous recipe for film production at the end of the day. It’s only worth doing a co-production if there are creative elements which drive the deal. But there’s been some interesting as well as some wacky projects pitched to me this time.

Kim Lewis: It’s a slower market, better for buyers than sellers because there’s lots of product around and not many people making offers. There’s an argument that there are too many markets, and this one is very close to the American Film Market, so there’s not a lot of new product that wasn’t at the AFM. A lot of serious buyers have acknowledged that it’s basically been a four-day market covering an 11-day period.

Having the AFC space at the Hotel Carlton was obviously a godsend this year because it allowed everyone to stay on ground level and get details. The AFC is a curious beast: it helps to facilitate better relationships with buyers, to a greater degree for the official festival organization. But it’s sometimes awkward for individual marketing reps and the AFC, because no one really knows how it works. They tend to think that the AFC is the marketing representative and be unaware that there is an agent for the film, because not many other organizations work in this way.

Rea Francis: Publicist, representing Silver Lining Entertainment

This year is certainly not so packed peoplewise, probably because it’s becoming so expensive. Consequently it has been much easier to manipulate the market. I don’t think anyone can complain about the talent line-up, but the business side of the market is slow.

Pierre Rissient: Festival delegate. I think this year in competition there have been more daring, more adventurous films, and these have been about the most successful, the best received. I think it will encourage Cannes to go ahead with these kinds of films.

**WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THE AUSTRALIAN PRESENCE THIS YEAR?**

Bob Weis: That’s a very complex question and it works on different levels. I think think the AFC provides a very good service for Australian producers and one which I notice the British and the Americans have tried to emulate this year.

In terms of films, Australia’s back. But where I think the Australians fall down is in international marketing. Partly it’s a perception of where Australian films haven’t worked as product lines for the distributors in the various territories. Australian films are still considered to be at the bottom end of distributors’ schedules, or difficult, or special, regardless of the fact that the occasional film has broken through in a big way. And a lot of our stuff, even when it is appreciated critically, is not considered good commercial fare. So I think there’s a problem of perception that we have in creating a market for our films, and possibly also something that we have to address in terms of our filmmaking.

David Hannay: I think that the people at the AFC at the moment are terrific and I like the way they run things. When I first came here years ago, everyone was waving the nationalistic flag and saying, “We’re here.” We don’t have to do that any more, everyone knows we’re here. One year there was the most appalling promotion with the slogan, “Our product’s got great legs” [and a graphic to match]. It was tasteless and gross – thank goodness we’re not doing anything like that any more.

Paul Cox: Australians have a tradition to come here every year and promote their films. I don’t know how they promote them, that’s none of my business, but I just wonder how much it costs and is it really worthwhile?

Pierre Rissient: In 1986 there were a few Australian films, especially a few shorts of Jane Campion, and 1989 is a kind of consequence of 1986. The fact that Sweetie exists and has got into competition is a kind of result of 1986. With Jane in that year there was Scott Murray [with Devil in the Flesh] and Bill Bennett [with Backlash] and that was good because it meant three young directors could emerge at Cannes, and this year there is Jane Campion, Ian Pringle and Bill Bennett again. It should remind us that if people come with good fresh things, then they can succeed.

Natalie Miller: I remember some years it was enormous, in the year of Picnic at Hanging Rock, it was like Captain Cook discovering Australia all over again, everyone was talking Australia, it was just this huge, huge buzz. With Gallipoli we had people on horseback riding up and down the Croisette, and everyone was talking about it. That’s what’s missing this year – it’s been a better festival than usual, there have been a lot of good films, but there’s not that buzz.

For Australia, this year has been better than the last few years, with Sweetie in competition and Prisoner of Petersburg in Un Certain Regard and a Paul Cox film here. I just think the pizzazz of promotion has been less. The Australians have a nice profile here and good controversial word of mouth on Sweetie – some like it, some don’t – and I think that will set the film for some sort of success.
Due to the ever increasing demands of the entertainment industry, we have been forced to expand into larger and more modern premises.
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We choose to fly **Australian**
After 100 years of making motion picture film, Eastman Kodak Company ushers in a new era of creative freedom.

Introducing the family of Eastman EXR extended-range colour negative motion picture films.

Films that offer exceptionally wide exposure latitudes and increased range of speeds.

Films that offer you freedom to shoot in bright or dim lighting conditions. From daylight to tungsten, HMI, or even fluorescent illumination.

Films that are not only more light sensitive, but provide better colour, sharpness, and finer grain.

Films, in short, that extend the vision of every cinematographer and director. Opening new doors. Creating new possibilities.

Because at Eastman we believe your imagination should know no bounds.

Now being introduced:
- EXR 5296 film: EI 500 Tungsten in 35 mm
- EXR 7248 film: EI 100 Tungsten in 16 mm
- EXR 5245 film: EI 50 Daylight in 35 mm
- EXR 7245 film: EI 50 Daylight in 16 mm
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For further information please contact Kodak (Australasia) Pty Ltd