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If you've got film on the brain, keep us in mind.

If you've got a film project gnawing at your brain and want help, keep us in mind.

Because the newly formed Queensland Film Corporation is here to help. With finance, concessional transport and expertise. Plus many other tangible forms of film production assistance.

Give Tony Krimmer a call on (07) 224 7018 and find out more about putting pictures together in one of the most exciting and diverse film locations in the world.
The following questionnaire has been designed for the purpose of providing the publishers of Cinema Papers with information designed to aid them in producing a more informative and entertaining magazine. Your help and co-operation will be greatly appreciated.

N. B. THE FIRST 100 RESPONDENTS WILL RECEIVE A FREE COPY OF THE SPECIAL CANNES FILM FESTIVAL EDITION OF CINEMA PAPERS WHICH WILL NOT BE AVAILABLE IN AUSTRALIA.

1. How frequently would you like to see Cinema Papers published?
   Monthly □  Bi-monthly □  Quarterly □  Half yearly □

2. What is your opinion about the price of Cinema Papers?
   Too expensive □  Satisfactory □  Could charge more □

3. What was your reason for purchasing Cinema Papers?
   Educational □  Entertainment □  Professional □

4. How many people read your copy of Cinema Papers?
   1 □  2-3 □  3-5 □  5-8 □  over 8 □

5. On average how often do you attend the cinema?
   once per month □  2-3 per month □  3-5 per month □
   5-8 per month □  over 8 per month □

6. What type of films do you prefer?
   Festival/European □  Australian □  American □

7. Do you think Cinema Papers contains too much, too little or enough of the following:
   too much □ too little □ enough □
   Editorial (ie. articles and interviews)
   Photographs □
   Advertising □
   International content □
   Local content □
   Technical information □
   Australian television □
   Reviews □

8. What suggestions, if any, do you have to make Cinema Papers a better magazine. (please restrict reply to space provided)
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

9. How did you obtain your copy of Cinema Papers?
   Subscription □  Newsagency □  Bookshop □  Library □
   Friend □  Other ___________________________

10. Name other magazines regularly read.
    1. ___________________________  2. ___________________________
    3. ___________________________  4. ___________________________

11. What do you think are the best features of Cinema Papers?
    __________________________________________________________
    __________________________________________________________

12. READERSHIP PROFILE
    SEX Female □  Male □
    AGE under 16 □  16-20 □  20-30 □  30-40 □  over 40 □
    MARITAL STATUS Married □  Single □
    EDUCATIONAL Secondary School □
       Technical School □  Tertiary □  Post graduate □
    OCCUPATION Unemployed □
       Student □  Film industry □  TV industry □
       Self employed □  Office worker □  Factory worker □
    INCOME nil — $5,000 □
       $5,000 — $10,000 □
       $10,000 — $15,000 □
       $15,000 — $20,000 □
       over — $20,000 □

    Name (optional) ___________________________
    Address (optional) ___________________________

ALL INFORMATION IS STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL
Tape or glue this flap

Cinema Papers
143 Therry Street,
Melbourne, Vic., 3000,
Australia
A scream for love—
a howl for revenge!
The chant of Jimmie Blacksmith is the chant of the underdog.

A film by
Fred Schepisi

The Chant of Jimmie Blacksmith

WORLD PREMIERE: HOYTS CINEMA CENTRE, MELBOURNE, JUNE 19.
The Chasers and Squeezers...

The Brooks White Organisation is in business... the business of promoting and publicising Australian feature films.

What does this mean for producers? Simply a big load off their minds.

No more chasing after publicity when you want to concentrate on getting the product into the can. No more endless months of trying to squeeze that last little promotional drop out of your film when you want to get on to your next project.

We'll do the chasing and the squeezing.

We offer a full range of publicity, promotion and design services. The full gamut from pre-production visuals and media releases through unit publicity title sequences to total advertising and promotional campaigns.

We're an independent fee-based organisation. You'll know in advance exactly what all the promotional work we do for you will cost.

Kevin Brooks is a long-established graphics designer who has already had a lot of experience with Australian films.

David White has had 20 years' experience as a journalist and publicist. Along the way he's been a foreign correspondent, news executive, Federal Publicity Officer of the Australian Labor Party (1971-72) and Media Secretary to the then Prime Minister, Gough Whitlam (1972-74).

So we've done a lot of chasing and squeezing already. Now we're concentrating our professional energies on the Australian film industry.

The Brooks White Organisation
12 Eden Street
Crows Nest, N.S.W.
Telephone 922 7607
Do You Have Our New Catalogue?

All those movies you've always wanted to see, but didn't know were available on 16 mm.

WHo'S AFRAID OF VIRGINIA WOOLF? SECONDS MAD DOG MORGAN SEANCE ON A WET AFTERNOON A CLOCKWORK ORANGE PLAY IT AGAIN SAM Altman's BUFFALO BILL AND THE INDIANS BADLANDS THE TENANT MEAN STREETS THE LAST TYCOON CADDIE DAY FOR NIGHT THE GODFATHER Parts One and Two DEATH IN VENICE Altman's NASHVILLE O' LUCKY MAN CATCH 22

PYGMALION McCABE AND MRS MILLER ALICE DOESN'T LIVE HERE ANYMORE BETWEEN WARS THE GREAT DICTATOR MARX BROS., MAE WEST & W.C. FIELDS CLASSICS BLUME IN LOVE THE F.J. HOLDEN STORY OF ADELE H. LIVES OF A BENGAL LANCER SWASTIKA WHAT'S UP DOC? PICNIC AT HANGING ROCK AMERICAN GRAFFITI DISNEY AND WARNER BROTHERS CARTOONS

Get your copy of the new and revised A.F.H. catalogue, just $3 plus postage.

(Metropolitan area 75c, country areas $1.10)

SYDNEY: (02) 233 5211 BRISBANE: (07) 221 0033 MELBOURNE: (03) 328 4805

SAMCINE SALES

elemack

Spyder

The full range of Elemack camera dolley equipment with a second to none service back up is now available through Samcine Sales, the sales division of Samuelson Film Service (Aust) Pty. Limited.

27 Sirius Road, Lane Cove Sydney, NSW 2066 Australia

Phone: 428 5300
Alan Wardrope sells films not flags

product. Nobody goes to Cannes to sell flags, you go to sell films. The Commission goes to help producers sell product. There won't be a kangaroo in sight!
The support of individual producers' selling efforts directly or through their agents is the way we're moving."

"Speaking of moving.
The movement of Jim Henry's office from New York—the East Coast—to Los Angeles is overdue and I'm pleased it's now under way. We've been weighing it up, looking literally for the best office location for more than twelve months and I'm pleased to say, our industry will now have a base and direct representation in the middle of activity in the biggest English-speaking market and, clearly our biggest untapped potential—the North American territory. The West coast is essential to our marketing objectives and escalating budget realities. We went to the American Theatre Owners' Convention just last October and, believe me, Jim Henry and I lit some fires, the first shot fired in our planned approach to North America."

"But back to Cannes: the best product line-up we've ever had—we're screening at the Paris; we've had to queue up to get this excellent location. Jim Henry, Ray Atkinson will join me there along with Rea Francis and our bi-lingual office staff. The presentation is going to be strong—I probably don't have to say it again but—this year—it's big."
The film? Gevacolor Type 680.

When the makers of 'The Irishman' decided to film on Gevacolor Type 680, they were breaking a tradition; and they couldn't be happier with the results.

In the words of producer, Tony Buckley, “the Agfa-Gevaert colour has given our cameraman that extra dimension...rich in greens, browns and beautiful flesh tones...that wonderful Tom Roberts look of the Australian countryside”.

Consider Gevacolor Type 680; a high-speed, double-masked original negative film. After all, why stick with tradition?
RICHARD CHAMBERLAIN IN

THE LAST WAVE

SPECIAL JURY PRIZE Paris International Film Festival
GOLDEN IBEX GRAND PRIX VI International Film Festival Teheran
SPECIAL JURY PRIZE Avoiriaz Festival du Film Fantastique

Color processing and sound mixing by Atlab. Where you know you’ll receive professional care and attention.

GIVING QUALITY SERVICE TO THE MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY

Atlab Film & Video Laboratory Service, Television Centre, Epping, N.S.W. 2121. Australia. Telephone: (02) 85 0224
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Front cover: Scene from The Irishman (see review p. 355). Photograph by David Kynoch. Courtesy of Anthony Buckley.
AUSTRALIAN SEMINAR

During May 1978, the National Film Theatre in London was presenting a two-week season of Australian feature films, entitled "The New Australian Cinema." As a climax to this season, a series of lectures, "Australian Film: A Weekend Seminar," was held at the Australian Film Commission and the British Film Institute. The seminar will include excerpts from films, short lectures, and an open discussion. Several Australian filmmakers, including some attending the Cannes Film Festival, will be in attendance.

The main aim of the seminar is to provide a forum for debate on all aspects of the New Australian Cinema. After this study, Britain is about to embark on its own program of government injected finance in the film industry, and the Australian experience of eight government bodies should prove a basis for debate. And our purpose is to help convenors Tom Hayton and Peter Quatermaine, to come some clarification for both industries.

The seminar will be exclusively on feature films, it will include professional entitled "The Other Channel," which examines Australian television. "Finding and Fostering Talent," on the role of grants and film schools (experimental and 16 mm films will be shown); date "Workers and Directors," examining motivations, pre-occupations, the role and the potential of a filmmaking unit. The seminar closes with "Australian Self-Portrait," in which the New Australian Cinema will be analyzed for signs of perspective on Australian society. In large, it will be a debate between critics and filmmakers and could be the start of a continuing discussion line to Australian film-making. Hopefully, such a debate will be heard in Australia.

P.B.

AUSTRALIAN CINEMATOGRAPHERS' SOCIETY AWARDS

The "Australian Cinematographers Awards" for films made in Australia are presented by the Cinematographers' Society and are given to Australian Cinematographers and are members of the society. The "Milli Awards" for Cinematographer of the Year was awarded to Ditar Fill, A.C. S., for his cinematography of A Body of Still Water, a 15-minute film on one life in lakes and ponds. It was produced by

The category winners were:

Feature Film: Feature Children Of Alpine (The Getting of Wisdom). Dramatized Documentary: Dean Semler (A Good Thing Going On). Television: Peter Tait (Sydney Hobart Yacht Race); Fiction Drama: Richard Pratt (Follow the Leader); Current Affairs: Richard Baillie-Macle (The Racer) - merit award only together with the "Stewart-Cunningham Award" on behalf of the Victorian branch of the Society, judge J. O. Ward, photography by John Bowring.

HODSOON DOUBLE UPDATE

Following on the Quarter in the previous issue of Cinema Papers, "Hodson Report Update: Film, Exhibition, and Television Fund Distribution/Exhibition Survey results and the Independent Film Commission. Covering 1977 and conducted by the then consultant, Attilio Thomas, it states:

In July 1977 questionnaires were sent to 396 producers and distributors of feature films made within the State to the National Film Production Fund. Respondents were asked to report on the distribution and exhibition of their films. A total of 128 questionnaires were returned, which represents a response rate of 32.5 per cent.

The report contains the following sections:

1. Description of the Independent Film Production Fund
2. Distribution and exhibition of independent films
3. Hierarchy of the independent film industry
4. Distribution of independent films by major distributors
5. Australian film production

The report concludes that the Independent Film Production Fund has had a positive impact on the independent film industry in Australia. It provides financial assistance to filmmakers and supports the distribution and exhibition of independent films. The fund has helped to create opportunities for filmmakers to develop their skills and create their own films without relying on big-budget productions.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Dear Sir,

I noted with interest a letter earlier this month, March 15, under the heading "Tax Break Through." The reference to the Liberal Party's election announcement that major incentives for the establishment and expansion of film production were going to be introduced. In effect, the money is not going to be equal to the shadow, but is in effect a commitment for a further, and much needed investment in the Australian film industry. The financial incentive is a much awaited step forward. It is now a matter of awaiting the implementation and seeing if this financial incentive is in fact, will encourage private investment in an industry sorely in need of a new injection of capital.

I regret to say, however, that I cannot see this incentive as anything other than a small step in the right direction. I would like to explain to an investor that his loss on his private investment in the film industry would be written off quicker than in the past.

If the government is really sincere in its desire to help the infant Australian film industry it must look far beyond the original tax break. If it is to achieve its aim, the film industry must be encouraged to invest more in the future.

On the other hand, if a government's methods are employed to do a job competently, but he is not qualified to raise money, especially in the area of finance, and top quality people are used, it is most difficult to convince a private investor to risk a few hundred thousand dollars over the years. To raise this kind of money the time is not yet right for other channels.

The AFC has come to the rescue of some of these people and more credit should be given in this direction. It's the carriage money that starts the wheels turning. What is needed to do is encourage the private sector of investment?

The first place stimulus should be arrived at that will change the flow of some investment money. The government can do this by act of parliament changing the tax structure upon which the AFC is based. Its role could be expanded and facilitate private investment in the Australian film industry. The deduction could only be claimed if the film was released in Australia through the Australian Film Commission for use of the Commission at its discretion or by the producer's own choice through the AFC. The AFC would have the discretion to determine the most beneficial application of the deduction. The government would choose a little in the first place but gain a lot in the long run.

The Profits from a successful investment in a production that is a commercial success would produce a tax return all down the line, far in excess of the original tax that would be lost to the government in the first place.

Only half of Australia's technicians and actors are employed full time. There is little, if any, control of production by companies even with a success or two behind them. They have plans, but plans are prepared by others. World markets films must be made on world standards, which is often a difficult and expensive process. If the government can be induced to come to the rescue of Australian filmmaking, it is far more likely that a few hundred thousand dollars in the past, would lead to a much greater investment in the future.

I have received many comments from those who are interested in the film industry. They are: Is there anything wrong with making a feature film and just give it a go? Maybe it is aware we have more failures than successes commercially. It took John Gorton to make the first move towards the film industry which was in turn backed by private funds.

Almost without exception, we have state government funding which brings out more failures than successes commercially. Maybe it is aware we have more failures than successes commercially. What is needed to do is encourage the private sector of investment?

The first place stimulus should be arrived at that will change the flow of some investment money. The government can do this by act of parliament changing the tax structure upon which the AFC is based. Its role could be expanded and facilitate private investment in the Australian film industry. The deduction could only be claimed if the film was released in Australia through the Australian Film Commission for use of the Commission at its discretion or by the producer's own choice through the AFC. The AFC would have the discretion to determine the most beneficial application of the deduction. The government would choose a little in the first place but gain a lot in the long run.
A stiff of Nobuhiro Ohyabashī's House, which was shown at the 23rd Asian Film Festival in Bangkok.

24TH ASIAN FILM FESTIVAL IN AUSTRALIA

The 24th Asian Film Festival, which is to be attended by 300 Australian delegates and a similar number from Australia, will be held in Sydney for the first time, from October 1 - 6. The Films Minister, Mr Malcolm Fraser, will open the Festival at the Sydney Opera House on October 2. The 11 countries participating are: Singapore, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Thailand, Philippines, India, South Korea and Australia. There may also be guest participation by Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and some of the eastern states of the Soviet Union.

Each country represented at the Festival will present five feature films and five short subjects. The films will be sub-titled in English (if applicable), and screened continuously throughout the Festival at two city cinemas.

Before the official opening of the Festival there will be a three-day board of directors meeting and seminar of the Federation of Motion Picture Producers in Asia, which will be held in Sydney.

The AFC, which was represented at the 23rd Asian Film Festival in Bangkok by commissioner John McQuaid, will be involved in supporting the festival.

The criteria for WAFAC investment will be along the following guidelines:

1. Projects will be filmed in Western Australia.
2. Submissions by Western Australians will be given some priority.
3. With the exception of sound mixing post-production will be carried out in Western Australia.
4. A percentage of the crew budget will be spent on Western Australian technicians. This percentage of local crew involvement will increase as confidence and expertise develops within the state.
5. The Australian Film Commission in the selected projects will be a pre-requisite condition in the foreseeable future.
6. As a general rule, resident Western Australian actors, writers and production personnel will be given first consideration from the outset of the operation.

Perhaps the major difference between the philosophy of the WAFAC and the equivalent bodies in the eastern states is that of private sector administration of the fund locally. There will be no government involvement or representation on the council.

The administration of the Council will be funded separately through the Department of Industrial Development.

The Australian Film Institute

The Australian Institute of Aborigines Studies in Melbourne is to be a 46-day symposium on ethnographic film from May 12 - 27 in association with the University of Melbourne. The aims of the symposium are to stimulate ethnographic film-makers to consider further the development of new approaches to understanding human culture through visual media. Sessions will include screenings of new and significant works, panels and discussions, film presentations and presentations by participants from around the world.

The conference is funded by the Australian Institute of Aborigines Studies, the Creative Development Trust Fund, the Australian Film Commission and Film Australia.

The preliminary program consists of:

- Ethnographic Film in Australia (May 20; Ethnographic Film 1990-76, published 1980).
- Styles of Ethnographic Film (May 14; The AFI's publication policy, May 16.
- The AFI's publication policy, May 16.
- Western Australian Film Council

On January 22, 1973, the Premier of Western Australia, Sir Charles Court, announced the formation of the Western Australian Film Council. This interim body comprises: the chairman, Bernard Walberg; members, Russell Twogood, Syd Donovan, Brian Williams, Owen Burns, Bill Bowen and John Pye. Brian Williams has issued the following statement on behalf of the Council:

"The State government has allocated one million dollars over a five-year period to be invested in program film projects for distribution through cinemas and television stations. The entire allocation will be channelled into what are considered to be viable commercial properties through a Trust Fund.

"The administration of the Council will be funded separately through the Department of Industrial Development.

Government's wish that its 'seed-bedding' policy, together with the assistance of the AFC and the following confidence of the private sector, will enable the program film industry in the state to become a stable, self-supporting operation by the end of the initial five-year period."
Rowan Ayers — Executive Producer

In May 1977, the National Nine Network sent a six-man film crew to Africa to produce a documentary on contemporary Africa. Entitled The Africa Project, it was an ambitious first for Australian television. It is now in post-production in Sydney, and negotiations have been concluded with U.S. interests which will assure the series of international distribution and a profitable return — that in itself might be another first.

The subject, Africa as a continental whole, had been tackled only once before. More than 16 years ago, the American Broadcasting Company produced a highly credible, four-hour production, hosted by Gregory Peck. The weakness of this production, however, lay in the extensive use of commentary. The omnipotent voice-over explained and reinterpreted the on-screen events, and preempted any deep sense of involvement by the audience.

The Africa Project relies heavily on the voices of Africans, black and white, for its visual impact. They are the voices of men and women who hold presidential positions, women on oil rigs in the Sahara, fish in the Mozambique channel, or have seen the inside of South African jails. They are communist, capitalist and nationalist.

Africa is an immensely complex continent from every point of view. To distill that complexity to its elements, and then present it on hard, cold celluloid, so that it lives and breathes, and, more importantly, is understandable to an audience who have radically different social and cultural values, is the real challenge.

Moving a crew of six people, with more than 300 kg. of equipment through 15 countries, keeping them happy, is a problem of rather less aesthetic moment, but is equally vital to the successful conclusion of such a project.

Each production has a unique set of problems, or "opportunities for creative solutions", as an American production manager called them. The following is a discussion of some of those creative solutions:

"That was all right, and seemed quite interesting at the time, but events overcame that idea. We found it would be difficult — or impossible — to get into those countries. "The whole idea of Africa became a bit bigger then, and what we thought we would try to do was create an African tapestry, a background against which the events in Africa, and dictatorships like Idi Amin's, could be better understood."

"We put up the scheme, roughly along those lines, and it was approved with one or two minor caveats. It was defrayed for a while, for at that point the Nine Network was negotiating for the enormous cricket deal, and they didn't feel up to coping with another, though smaller, project."

"My original thought was that we should get co-production money up front because I knew it would be expensive. Fortunately, the Nine Network was able to dispense with that, and we were able to go ahead in February 1977."

"This, of course, could not be a one-man production; what I needed was a team who could cope with this rather curious and demanding task. We would be away from home for a long time, in countries of which few, if any of us, had any experience, dealing with problems which, at most, we might have read about in a travel guide book. In addition, we would be working in an area, programmatically of which we were not sure."

"We would, of course, be doing a lot of research, but if events did not tie into research, then the crew had to be flexible and creative enough to restructure the program on the spot."

"My first move was to contact an Australian director named Tony Wheeler. He had worked in my group of people at the BBC, and had done a number of interesting, slightly unusual and way-out documentaries. I had admired quite a lot of what he had done, and I thought he might be the sort of person who would bring something new to an African documentary."

"Wheeler had returned to Australia, so I asked him if he was interested, and he was. He and I then worked out the type of people we would like to get to join us. We then saw a number of people and selected a team."

"I think the largest single problem was distance. In the first instance, I found it very difficult planning the production so far from a place of which I knew very little. Australia is not particularly well served with material on Africa. There are only three diplomatic representations in Canberra which were relevant to countries that we wanted to visit: Ghana, Nigeria, and South Africa. As it was, we failed to get into Ghana and Nigeria."

"The research resources were very limited, and a few academics and students concerned with African history or economics, and the odd African migrant who was here, we could do very little about getting a feel for the place."

"Certainly for a program of this complexity, we had very little at our disposal."
Tony Wheeler—Director

Tony Wheeler was born in Brisbane, and after sharing an ABC specialist traineeship with, among others, Albie Thoms, Bob Ellis and Richard Brennan, he worked briefly with the ABC before going overseas — first to Hong Kong, later to the BBC.

School children in a Ugana village, Tanzania.

Tony Wheeler

Was “The Africa Project” the largest documentary you have ever handled?

Yes, though I think every project, in the way that you think about making it, becomes the largest. Each is unique and you have to go through a lot of processes to finish it. But in terms of logistics, the sheer amount of time spent, the amount of footage shot, and the problems, this was certainly the largest.

Africa is an immensely complex place. How did you learn about it?

I had lived in a house in London for about a year and a half with some people who were concerned with Southern Africa, so I knew a lot of what was going on there. I didn’t know the detail, but I knew the implications of it. I spent almost two months with Suzanne Cronje — sometimes for 14 hours a day — just talking about Africa.

What I was trying to understand were the principles — political and social — that existed in all the countries that we were going to, so that when something happened, big or small, I could see whether it was relevant to the film we were making, and how to shoot it to fit into that film.

Did you start with a formal structure in mind?

Originally it was going to be a four-hour documentary. I think I was trying to refine a principle that people are the most interesting thing — that is, people and the environments they inhabit.

There was no scenario as such. What I was trying to do was create circumstances where we could photograph a series of events in some people’s lives in a way that showed these events to be controlled by larger principles and forces. I wanted to see what their lives were really like, how they lived and what things mattered to them.

Did you often find you had to rethink your concepts?

I did, because unless you have lived in a country for a long time, you have to go on research. If you are going there cold, with only that research, you often find that outside people’s opinions don’t really tell you what is going on.

Also, things fall apart when you are on location on a job like this; and when things fall apart, you have to be able to do something else.

You know Louis Malle’s “Phantom India”, and the work of D.A. Pennebaker. Are you influenced by those films?

A long time ago I thought there were many really important things to be said by documentaries, and that in a lot of respects the documentary had been put down by television and the cinema. I wanted to make the documentary cut and look like a feature film; I wanted to use feature film conventions to explain what people were seeing on the screen. To that extent I was very influenced.

As a kid, my parents took me to the cinema a lot and I saw many films by John Ford. I was influenced pictorially and in terms of content. His films had people in them and they had cultures; you not only understood the characters, but also the characterizations.

I also felt there were similar things in some of the early Ealing comedies. If something was happening in a room, then I really had a feeling of what the room looked and felt like, more than just having bits of it shown to me.

I was also influenced by Peter Watkins’ early films — Culloden in particular, and The War Game. I worked with one of Peter Watkins’ cameramen, and I think that had a lot to do with the way I subsequently made films.

You tend to use the wide angle lens as much as possible. What does that lens offer you?

When I was at the BBC a lot of the directors were against the zoom lens. They felt it turned a camera into a gun platform: the cameraman standing in one spot and shooting away.

What we wanted was involvement with our subject. We had a very simple principle: if you can’t take the camera up to something, then it isn’t worth filming.

The wide angle lens offers me a more or less stable frame at a moment’s notice, and if you have a reasonably good cameraman, you can be confident of using almost every frame. I also like the depth of field because the audience can look directly at the central subject, as well as then letting their eye wander around it.

Often in documentaries, it is not just what is in centre frame that is interesting. The background can tell you a lot about the location and what other people are doing; how they react, can tell you a lot about what is going on.

There were no rushes available during the trip. Did this bother you?

When I started in television I was working in circumstances which made it virtually impossible to see rushes, so it didn’t really bother me. I rather like the idea of shooting right through to the end, then sitting down and making a film out of what one has. But I don’t have a hard and fast rule about rushes.

You are now three months into post-production. How is it shaping up?

We have six important films that I think are very relevant to Western audiences. They are partly about the impact of Western culture, particularly industrialization, in African countries, and partly about people.

I want the audience to come away with a sense of having met an African and feeling they know about life there. There are really no shattering revelations, but there is a very personal electricity that is lacking in everything else done on Africa.
Did you have any problems going from a feature to a documentary like "The Africa Project"?

What is important is that you psyche yourself into a particular channel. When you work as a director of photography on a feature, you work as a 'photographer-cameraman'. In a situation with someone as free as Tony Wheeler, who wants to get involved with the people as an ongoing thing, you take on a different role. You become more a Pennebaker-style cameraman.

I think it is very interesting to take someone as well established as Haskell Wexler: he can shoot a feature like Who’s Afraid of Virginia Woolf, or Medium Cool, yet work with Emile de Antonio on a film like Underground. These roles are at the extremes of the cinematographer's art and it took a real effort for me to adjust. It was due mainly to Vince O'Donnell, Tony and Peter Levy, who later became a full-time cameraman on the project, that I was able to psyche myself into the role.

Were you able to draw on your experience in India with Film Australia?

No. Bob Kingsbury [the director Mike worked with in India] I would call a dramatized documentary filmmaker. His work was so well researched that it was like working as a photographer-cameraman. It was the same on a film we did called Mr Symbolman, which was about this marvellous eccentric, an Austrian Jew, who with his mandolin got out of a Nazi prison, escaped to China, and finally ended up in Australia. He invented a symbol language which is used to teach retarded children.

The Africa Project was totally different from all of those, and the only way to make the film was to work on instinct.

How did you feel about not seeing rushes?

You are not sent away on a job as expensive as this unless you are proficient. The problem is not a technical one, but a conceptual one; it has to do with working with your director and the need to be able to discuss critically where your material is going.

Take the situation we had in South Africa. Vince had taken a crew of Tony, Peter and Jeff to Rhodesia, Rowan had gone back to London, and that left Danny and myself working in Soweto. We were working very light, and getting very close to the marvellous humanity of the people. We were in their homes and filmed many of the ordinary things about their lives. Now, if the crew could have seen those rushes they would have been in a better position to integrate the filming of the home life of the white African family in Pretoria with what Danny and I had done in Soweto.

There was another thing, too. We were in a country where there was apartheid, so you didn’t have the normal kind of relations with the people you were filming. There were all sorts of things going on, like recriminations, so your energy became misplaced and dissipated.

Seeing rushes builds up your confidence, and that confidence steers you; it shows you the direction you should be going in.

Does this apply to working in other African countries?

Yes, I think it does. Every day was a new experience, and a lot of energy went into relating to people. I think we could have used the support and direction that looking at rushes could have given us. I don’t know how we could have done it — it would have certainly doubled Vince’s problems. Probably there would have been censorship problems as well.

How about the footage itself?

I think some of the footage is the most exciting I have ever shot; in particular the material in Soweto, and the bits I did with Vince in the markets in Durban.
Vincent O’Donnell - Production Manager

Vincent O’Donnell is a former consultant to the Australian Film Commission’s Creative Development Branch. He has a background in production and direction in films and television, and has worked for several years as an editor.

“I know it is an over-simplification, but the traditional problems of a production manager are to keep the production on schedule, and on budget. The Africa Project presented no traditional problems, and my role was more of a charge d’affaires.

“The schedule was a very flexible one to allow for follow up on good material. The major costs were the wages, accommodation, allowances, equipment hire and travel. If you include in your calculations a daily allowance for stock, then the production cost, excluding post-production, is a multiple of the number of days spent in the field (to a first approximation).

“Allegations of bureaucratic inefficiency levelled against our public servants are insignificant when compared with the paper war we fought before we left London.

“Anyone who has mounted a production in an overseas country will know what I mean. Multiply that by 12 and the dimensions of the problem loom very large.

“Suzanne Cronje, our researcher, had initiated contacts through the London embassies of all the countries we planned to visit. This was done by April. When I arrived in early May, there had been little positive response; in some cases, Suzanne and her assistant Nicki were still trying to get their first letters acknowledged. It was not always tardiness on the part of the embassies, but simply that the bureaucratic machines grind very slowly, and perhaps nowhere more slowly than in Africa.

“We learnt that simultaneous approaches are necessary in some cases, in others, the approach is sequential. In all cases it was different from another. One’s correspondence may be dealt with by a clerk or a president, a minister or a consul, but it takes time, and time is, of course, money.

“The area which cannot be pre-arranged is customs clearance on equipment. Customs only becomes a problem when you arrive at the airport with your 300 kg. of gear. Carnets worked in South Africa (and the examiner wanted to see if the cables fitted the equipment). Cash bonds were required in some countries, and sureties, of one form or another, elsewhere. As one senior Zambian official said to me (and he isn’t in customs):’I cannot understand it. All customs think that at the first opportunity you will be selling your tools of trade to the first itinerant camel driver you meet. How could you make your film?’

“Accommodation was less of a problem than expected. In some cases the Australian High Commission or Embassy recommended places and made bookings on our behalf. Other times we made them by phone, or when there was doubt, one of the production crew arrived ahead of the party, checking out the hotels.

“Air travel was the least of our problems. I had open tickets for the proposed itinerary issued in London on British Airways stationery. Then it was simply a matter of making a booking and getting the details entered on the appropriate voucher.

“Anyone intending this self-planned travel should get a current World ABC or airline timetables.

“All our gear travelled as excess baggage. At the rate of one per cent of the first class fare per kilo, this is by far the most expensive way. But then it is about the only way you can be more than 50 per cent sure it will arrive with you. That is a universal observation. It applied just as well in Australia as in Africa.

“To pay for the excess baggage, I carried a wad of miscellaneous charge orders (MCOs), also on British Airways stationery. MCOs are negotiable only with IATA airlines, and you can get caught out on technicalities. Also, the official IATA exchange rate tags behind the market rate (in the airlines’ favor). So what you pick up in security and convenience, you lose in money terms.

“We each carried a quantity of travellers cheques, but the main sources of production cash were local banks on a letter of credit. This technique takes care of the currency control hassles.

“The letters of credit were set up through the Bank of NSW in London, either direct with agent banks in Africa, or through Barclay’s Bank International. Except for the blank smiles our letter evoked in Algeria, the system worked well.

“Ground transport was a real headache, except in Kenya and South Africa, and it would have helped if there had been a motor mechanic on the crew. Where cars for hire were scare; we used taxis. It is not cheap, but you spend a lot less time getting lost. Land Rovers or Kombi waggons were also hard to find.

“Communication can be a problem, but there was always the telex for regular messages, and the telephone for arguments. Most hotels had both, though the delays getting through were often intimidating. Every day was different and sometimes you didn’t feel confident about where you might be spending the night — bed, jail or wooden box.

“There is a fair amount of paranoia in that statement, but it is the mental tension more than any physical hardship that makes working in an unknown and unpredictable environment difficult.

“Many more things could really be said. From the production viewpoint, it is vital to realize that you can’t run the production as you might in Australia.

“For each country there are different rules and regulations, and different manners. You have to understand the difference, tune in to the manner, and pace of business, keep cool, and keep smiling. Everything went more smoothly when I learnt that.”
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THE PLANNING

At what stage did you become involved in the production of "Patrick"?

I came on to the production two or three weeks before shooting, with only one week of pre-production in Melbourne. So it was a dead run through the entire film trying to get everything ready in time.

Originally, when considering it from the U.S., the film didn't look very difficult, but when I got to Australia I had a great deal of difficulty in finding things. I must have spent at least 50 per cent of my time looking for things I would have at hand in the U.S., or building things I could have easily rented back home.

We have a scene in Patrick where an actor flies out of a room.

"Patrick" is a psychic thriller about a young man trapped in a coma. Starring Susan Penhaligon, Sir Robert Helpmann, Rod Mullinar and Bruce Barry, this $400,000 film is directed by Richard Franklin.

One of the striking features of "Patrick" is its complex special effects sequences, which vary from exploding cabinets, a doctor being flung through space and a couple being electrocuted in a bath. To create these effects, the producers, Antony I. Ginnane and Richard Franklin, hired American special effects expert Conrad Rothmann.

Rothmann has a long experience of effects work on projects ranging from the feature, "The Amazing Dobermans", to "Mary Hartman, Mary Hartman" on television. In the following interview, conducted by Dennis Nicholson, Peter Beilby and Scott Murray, Rothmann talks about many of the effects required in "Patrick", how he achieved them, and the differences and expectations of effects work in Australia as compared with the U.S.

In Hollywood, I can go to Joe Lombardi's Rental House and rent a flying rig, put the thing up and fly the guy. Here I had to go out, buy the steel and build the rig from scratch.

A number of things were like that. "Patrick" also required an air mortar, which is a large tank that is filled with compressed air. It has a quick release valve with a large aperture that releases all the air from the tank instantaneously, producing a soft explosion. You can load the muzzle with dust, peat moss, cork — all kinds of stuff. You get the effect of an explosion without high velocity projectiles. Again, this had to be built specially for the one shot.

What is your procedure once you get a script to read?

I go through the script and look for everything that needs special effects. Once I have decided on...
The scene where Patrick murders his mother (Carole-Ann Aylett) and her lover (Paul Young) by hurling a radiator into their bath. The burning hair (bottom right) was achieved by igniting smokeless rifle powder in Aylett's wig.

best approach to each effect, I try and calculate a maximum cost: what materials will be involved, and so on. I then have a figure for the whole film.

What was your costing on "Patrick"?

About $2500 for materials.

How would that compare with an average feature in the U.S.?

It's really hard to say because effects vary so much. In some features it is just bullet hits or explosions, and the materials might only run to $500. On other films, there might be a lot of involved effects; that would mean stuff has to be built — and that is expensive.

It would have been less expensive to do Patrick if I had been able to rent the air mortar, for instance. I can rent it at home for $18, but building it here cost almost $400.

Did you bring certain materials with you for "Patrick"?

Not really, just a few basic tools and those things I didn't think I could get here. I brought a few valves for the air mortar, for example, because I thought they would be too expensive here. Actually, I was so sure I could get just about anything here, I didn't bring a lot with me.

Did you find the costing in Australia higher than you expected?

It went both ways. We had a neon sign in the film and before I left the U.S. I costed it at $300 — I got it here for $100.

How would you describe "Patrick" in terms of the complexity of the special effects?

Some effects were very complex: for instance, an electric radiator had to be thrown into a bath where there were two actors. It couldn't be heavy, or metal, because they had to toss it around; so we used rubber. Because of the weight, we couldn't put batteries in it to illuminate the coil, and the idea of electricity bothered the actors. So we accomplished the gag with an approach similar to the Star Wars light swords.

We used the "Scotchlite" front-screen projection material to make the filtered coils on the radiator. Then we mounted a filtered light next to the lens on the camera and a 45-degree mirror in front of the camera lens — a 50 per cent reflective, 50 per cent transparent mirror. This angled the light down the lens axis to light the coils.

It is a technique borrowed from front screen projection. The reflective material returns 90 per cent of the light that falls on it within a two degree angle from the angle of incidence. It returns such a hot light that you don't have to send much light down the lens' axis to illuminate it. You can, therefore, wash out any spill light that falls on the rest of the set by adjusting the set lights.

How do you keep the coil within two degrees when the radiator is thrown into the bath?

The radiator will appear lit anywhere within the field of the camera lens if the light from that fixture on the camera is falling on it. Once the radiator goes into the water, due to the index of refraction of water being different from that of air, the reflective quality of the Scotchlite is altered.

This produces the effect of the coils being quenched.

What other effects did the scene need?

As the radiator was supposed to be hot, when they touched it, their hands had to begin to smoke. We used a material called A-B smoke. One component of this smoke is glacial acetic acid and the other is a 40 per cent monoethylamine solution in water. When the colorless fumes of these two materials meet in the air, they produce a white smoke.

We put the glacial acetic acid on the actor's hands and blew the fumes of the ethylamine through a hose to the radiator that was painted to look like an electrical
tissue in sulphuric acid and nitric
some and it turned out to be
finally found a formula for making
ash that you get when hair burns.
It burns with a kind of orange
draperies, which is a magician's tool.

That was another materials foul-up. I had planned to use flash paper, which is a magician's tool. It burns with a kind of orange flame and with the fine particles of ash that you get when hair burns. But I couldn't get any here. I
found a formula for making some and it turned out to be relatively complex: it was a
nitration process. You had to dip tissue in sulphuric acid and nitric
acid, keeping a proper check on temperature.

On the day of the shooting, we were still looking for a solution when I remembered that smokeless rifle powder burns that way, with a much cooler flame than most other materials. You can run your hand through these flames while it's burning. So we
rigged an electrically-ignited portion of this powder to the actress's wig, and that worked out very well.

What effects were associated with the radiator landing in the water?

We had flash bulbs rigged inside the radiator to flash. Fine wires were run down inside the fume
hose to fire the bulbs.

Do you regard that a complex affair?

Just more complex than average.

THE AIR MORTAR

What scene in the film required the air mortar?

Patrick becomes enraged in one scene and uses a cabinet full of medical supplies as a weapon. The doors fly wide open and the supplies explode out of the cabinet and fly around the room.

To achieve this, the air mortar was placed about two metres behind the cabinet. We removed the back of the cabinet and all the sharp, dangerous or heavy objects from inside. The cabinet doors we operated with monofilament fishing line.

The air mortar muzzle was then filled with five or six thousand pills of different types — plastic pill bottles, caps, tweezers, anything that wouldn't be a danger to the actress, Susan Penhaligon. To avoid any injury, Susan turned her back to it during the firing, and Patrick covered her eyes.

The mortar had about a 10 cubic ft. (0.29 cubic m.) tank, pumped up to about 801b pressure. It emptied in less than a second and blew the stuff right through the cabinet into the room. The air blast travelling around the room, lifted the objects and kept them in flight. The plastic pill bottles were light, so they flew around the room.

The scene was shot in slow motion, which enhanced the other worldly quality and produced a very nice effect.

BREAKAWAY GLASS

In a scene like that, would you do a run through before the actual take or just chance it?

In the final scene with the cabinet, we also had a breakaway glass shot. In that case, the economies prevented a run through.

The entire front of the cabinet was re-built with balsa wood and a breakaway glass commonly called candy glass. It used to be made out of sugar, but now it's plastic.

We estimated that glass, with labor and materials included, was worth about $500. I took one shot at it and that was it.

Besides, Susan wasn't too crazy about the air mortar firing at her back from a distance of only about three metres. To set her at ease, I
loaded and fired it at myself from about two metres so she could see what it was all about. But I knew she wasn't about to do it twice because, although it doesn't do any lasting damage, some of those objects hitting her stung you — there's quite a bit of velocity involved. So we went for it once and got it. We ran two cameras.

You had to get the glass made here . . .

Yes. The material used in the U.S. is PS2, a plasticiser fashioned in plastic. It was used in printing ink manufacture, but not any more. All the effects men in the U.S. who had any money and knew that it was being discontinued bought great mounds of it; it's no longer available off the shelf.

When I need glass, I have to buy finished articles — window panes, bottles, and so forth; I can't buy the raw crystals to make it.

Over here, they have been using something called Santolite, a Monsanto plastic which is similar, but is much more fragile and harder to handle. You can't cast as large a pane with it, and when you melt it to cast the articles, it gives off formaldehyde fumes, which are awful.

They are very destructive to mucous membranes, and burn the eyes, nose and throat. It's very hard to work with, but that's what we had to use. We just kept the fans running all the time, blowing the fumes away from us.

Chris Murray, an effects man from Sydney, has been having success with a Mobil plastic called Alpha Methyl Styrene Resin 18. It doesn't have the Santolite problems, but has a lower melting point and might be a problem with hot studio lights. He has given me a sample to try at home.

Did you make an arrangement with a plastics firm in Melbourne to do the casting?

No, I went to Monsanto and bought the plastic. I then built a casting table which was a 12mm thick aluminium plate slightly larger than the largest glass needed. The plate is heated up to about 325 degrees fahrenheit (163 degrees celsius) and the cellophane stretched on a wooden frame. The melted plastic is then poured on the cellophane on top of the aluminium plate.

It has to be done this way because if you tried to pour on a cold surface, the plastic would just gob up and not spread out. I doubt a plastics firm would want to bother with it because it's a small volume job and a pretty specialized technique.
Sweden often appears as an island, an isolated and flourishing province in which Swedish values dominate and where nothing is as good as being Swedish. This has to do with what Sweden looks like, what its films look like, and above all, with the organization of Swedish filmmaking. All these reflect the values expressed by Swedish film directors, whose thinking I have had the opportunity to reflect the values expressed by Swedish film organization of Swedish filmmaking. All these In the socialist countries, various methods have been tried (admittedly without much success) to make film production groups into a profit—loss account or a per project basis that is essentially financed from public funds. Inasmuch as I became one of the two administrators of the fund, I regarded it as a goal to create among available projects a certain production process. Rather, I want to present some other lessons associated with the experiences of the director and other creative participants in a specific context, and so on. It is conceivable that this is essentially correct, and the final results — provided one has an idea of the director's talents. But my intent here is not to depict the results of a certain production process. Rather, I want to present some other lessons associated with the expectations of the director and other creative participants in a specific context, and so on. It is conceivable that this is essentially correct, and the final results — provided one has an idea of the director's talents.

1. At the planning stage, it is customarily assumed that any film project is to be made within a certain budget, and the budget is not judged in relation to the estimate of the chances of success, but rather wholly in view of what other films have cost. The financial expectations of all films are deemed to be identical.

2. Since the financing is public, it is also usually assumed that the executive producer, who represents the Swedish Film Institute, has no control over the financial needs of the director's thinking, as Ingmar Bergman left the country, and resulting from the incapability of many of the so-called middle generation of directors to live up to the promise they showed in the 1960s. They still have, as has been said of Brazil, a brilliant future. But they have had one a long time.

3. Since the sums that are available are constant, or increase at a rate not in keeping with that of the depreciation in the value of the money, and since union and guild demands for increased pay have been abundantly satisfied, the number of films being produced is going to drop. The result is that most Swedish film scripts are still being written by directors, and of course that can be explained by the fact that Bergman almost always did so, too. But it is certain that Swedish directors are, like Bergman, both authors and directors.

To me, at least, the combination seems increasingly dubious (as a principle). But Swedish directors have doubtless experienced the same thing I have: that competent scriptwriters are hard to find. It is likely that films also reflect a deeper tradition that is deeply rooted in the local filmmaking. Swedish narrative is often psychologically convincing, but seldom dramatically exciting. This applies to literature as well as to the novel. There is an abundance of inner action and a dearth of outer, physical action.

Concluded on P. 381
The international reputation of the Swedish film industry has inevitably been linked with the career of Ingmar Bergman. His prominence is readily understood, yet one does not need to be a film scholar to recognize the significance of Swedish names such as Victor Sjostrom, Mauritz Stillar, Alf Sjoberg, Alf Kjellin, Jan Troell, Bo Widerberg, Greta Garbo, Ingrid Bergman, Max von Sydow, Liv Ullmann, Bibi Andersson, Gunnel Lindblom, Mai Zetterling, Sven Nykvist — the list of familiar names is far from complete.

Certainly, not all have achieved a maturity of their craft in Sweden, but their importance to the historical status of Swedish film ought to be noted.

The Swedish Film Institute has made considerable efforts to promote the “new Swedish cinema” over recent years. A season in January this year at the National Film Theatre in London, following another one in April, 1975, won public response and gave exposure to a number of films which suggest, despite Jorn Donner’s pessimism, that a rich film tradition has been passed on.

Gunnel Lindblom’s first film, Paradistorg (Paradise Place, 1977), calls attention to what appears to be a major theme in the new films — the examination of the private retreat, and its tenuous existence as a way of “pulling the blind” on the disturbing realities of contemporary society. In Paradistorg, those realities exist within a hidden machinery of repression which has set in conflict the values of the past and the movement for change.

They make no facile distinction between age, as representing the old way, and youth, the new. Nor do they simply identify the traditional way as the retreat from reality and the confrontation with that as positive. The world created by the film is far more complex.

Behind the credits, a series of pastel drawings evoke a childlike perspective on the country house in the Swedish Archipelago, the location for the summer holiday rendezvous of four generations of a middle-class Swedish family. The film’s first sequence then opens out the tensions which pervade the film — a middle-aged doctor, Katha (Birgitta Valberg), asserts her right to the comforts of her “paradise place”, complacently observing, in response to the criticism from her long-standing friend Emma (Sif Ruud), that “a leopard can’t change his spots”.

The two women share a generation, but are divided by their social positions and by the attitudes apparently attendant upon them. Katha has a comfortable practice, while Emma’s life is committed to the care of juvenile delinquents. Katha’s view of the world is clearly linked to the innocence of the drawings, while Emma’s sees them as a facade.

During the course of the film, we come to share Emma’s perspective: the family’s holiday is a performance of rituals whose familiarity serves to thrust divisions beneath the surface. The adherence to rule (the father’s daily hoisting of the Swedish flag, the communal baking, the family lunch around the long table in the garden, the afternoon walk) suggests the security of belonging to a traditional way, but also works against anything but the most superficial unity. The film’s function as parable for modern Sweden is unobtrusive but unanswerable.

Ironically, while it is the outsiders who disturb the precarious balance of the family relationships, they are linked by their desire to belong, to become a part of the warmth of the gathering, even as they recognize it as “a hollow idyll”.

Emma comes to visit, weary and disillusioned, in search of a haven: “I’m a hare with the hounds after me.” Privately she confesses her despair to Katha — “I surrender to the machinery” — at a time when Katha’s recognition that she cannot forever explain away the ailments of the world as “the pangs of adolescence”, or put them at bay with a prescription, indicates a conscience awakened by the sounds of reality.

One of the most attractive qualities of this film is its attention to the details of character, especially in the immensely sympathetic portrait of the two women sharing and sustaining an affection in the face of their potentially divisive social attitudes. The survival of this relationship, though it is thrust into the background in the film’s second-to-last image, is vital within the pattern of relationships established by the structure of Ulla Isaksson and Gunnel Lindblom’s screenplay.

In the absence of the desire for contact between couples and groups, though that contact is as likely to generate conflict as it is unity, the future will escape the control of those who should construct it. Those whose private anguish enforces a retreat from community and those whose commitment to the future is pursued alone are doomed.

Though Lindblom closes the film on a freeze frame of the isolated King, it seems to me that the thrust of the film has been towards Katha’s awakening. The future is not to be found in the unfathomable delinquency of the boy (such pessimism is inexplicable in the context the film has established), but in the sort of discovery through others which marks Katha’s progress in the film.

Norwegian director, Anja Breien, was
invited by the Swedish Film Institute to direct *Den Allvarsamma Leken* (Games of Love and Loneliness, 1977), based on Hjalmar Soderberg’s novel, *The Serious Game*. Thematically it is like *Paradistorg*, in that it seems to have been constructed as a response to the question (articulated by one of the characters in the film’s opening sequence): “Do you think we could create a world only for ourselves?” However, it is quite unlike *Paradistorg*; its style is far more distancing, its narrative elliptical, and its characterization little concerned with a rounded psychological verisimilitude.

Its formal ironies are most apparent as the film’s visual assertion of the importance of its central character, Arvid (Stefan Ekman), is set against the recurrent references to the significant moments in history (1894-1916) which occur around him. The sequences of images are constantly reducing wide shots to alternating close-ups or two-shots of Arvid and his women, while the narrative movement of the film places those intimate images in the broader context which dwarfs the significance they define less his personal hostility to his father than his frustration at the barriers to understanding himself, felt but scarcely understood. His affair with the nurse, Fanny (Maria Selbing), reveals to him the immediate inadequacy of his marriage, and, more, the fact that he is responsible for that.

His visits to the hospital become journeys into his consciousness, expressions of his resentment at his upbringing. His outbursts there define less his personal hostility to his father than his frustration at the barriers to understanding himself, felt but scarcely understood. His affair with the nurse, Fanny (Maria Selbing), reveals to him the immediate inadequacy of his marriage, and, more, the fact that he is responsible for that.

He is forced to see that it is his introspection, his inability to communicate, which destroys both his relationships. His tragedy is that, while grasping all of this, he is unable to change, his anguish becoming that of a strata of Swedish society quite foreign to that of Bergman’s articulate bourgeois, who, if they can do little else to help themselves, can certainly give voice to that which troubles them.

His place of work is filled with the everyday pettiness of people dissatisfied with their lives, albeit uncomprehendingly, a place in which the sullen Robert sees he does not belong, but from which there is no realistic escape. Like the murderer in Bo Widerberg’s *Mannen Pa Taket* (The Man on the Roof, 1976), like Jimmy in *Det Sista Aventyret* and King in *Paradistorg*, like the son in *Alfredo* to whom an attempt at emotional life explodes into violence. After Fanny leaves him, he returns to the cottage that had provided a home for their affair, and, in a particularly disturbing scene, vents his fury upon it.

Concluded on P.381
Where did the idea for the project come from?

I had directed several theatre productions when I suddenly felt very curious about making a film. I formed a group with some actors and writers, one of whom was Ulla Isaksson who had written Paradise Place, a well-known Swedish novel.

We decided on this story and started to work on the script. It wasn't easy to raise the money because many people felt no one would want to see a film about middle-aged women. So you see, even in Sweden the subject was thought unusual.

Finally we got Swedish television interested and were able to make it.

What assistance was Ingmar Bergman in getting your film made?

He said he liked the subject, and that is very important because people listen to him — it is more difficult to say “no” if he says “yes”.

Was he looking over your shoulder while the film was being made?

No, not at all. I was free to do what I wanted, which astonished me. But a week before I started shooting Ingmar had a problem with his tax and he left Sweden for Germany. I had to keep in contact with him by telephone. I don't know if that was good or bad, but fortunately I was helped by a very good crew.

Would you say that the way you respond to characters in your film has any similarity with the way Bergman approaches his characters?

No, I think we have very different approaches. He is much more interested in a kind of metaphysic; even though religion is in his past, he is very marked by it. We also come from very different social backgrounds, and I am probably more interested in social problems.

One of the things I found jarring in your film was the girl’s dream about Vietnam and the boy watching the Beirut footage on television. They seemed to me an unnecessary movement outside the film’s framework...

The dream is only a very simple way of telling of people who try to protect their own worlds, their islands, or, if you like, their privileges. The young girl is the one who has contact with the outside world; whereas for the boy television is a kind of stigma. He can’t live the family life he is supposed to live because he’s too hurt by influences from the outside world.

The film sets up two opposed points of view: Emma, who for a major part of the film is rejecting the machinery of repression, and Katha who is an embodiment of that machinery. Do you identify with either of those two
The film ends with the shot of the delinquent King, rather than one of Eva who, in many ways, is a positive character...

It depends on how you look at it. To me, King is a very important person; a sort of hope. He is very different from Eva because she is brought up in a milieu where people are aware and articulate about what is happening. King is quite different: he has no words for his thoughts and he reacts violently and aggressively. He doesn't accept the way he is treated and rebels; and I think that is very important.

The shot at the end is the film's only symbolic image. For me, the two women have surrendered, they are walking away, and therefore have no more rights to talk. One can view the summer house as a kind of privilege. The women have misused it and, therefore, must leave. So there is only one person left, but he is there because it belongs to him. Now we must wait and see what he seeks to do with it.

You see, those people on the island are a kind of elite and privileged people. They are educated and well off, and they know how to talk. That is why I always have them discussing things. I think it is a false attitude to say, "You shouldn't have people talking in films; film is not talk." If a film has something to say, you can use any method you choose to make clear what you want to say.

Are you suggesting then that "Paradise Place" is Sweden?

I don't want to be rigid about it, but it is possible to read it that way. I have tried to tell the story very realistically so that one could look at it in a larger perspective as well.

In Katha's discovery of Tomás' body, and her chase after King, I see an irony, in that she becomes aware only after it is too late; that just as Emma has given up, so perhaps Katha has just begun to fight...

I think it is possible to see it that way. Actually, the ending of the book is different, in that there is a kind of reconciliation between Katha and King. However, I found that impossible and false — I don't believe in that kind of optimism. So, in association with the author, I wrote a new ending.

Did Isaksson argue about that?

No, not very much.

What about Kiss? He is almost the idealized male, somebody who is outgoing and sociable and who can relate to all generations equally well?

Yes, Kiss is very free and kind, but he has chosen a way of living that is okay only for himself — he doesn't attempt to struggle, he just escapes.

In contrast, there is Anika's husband, Kure, who is in some ways a weak character, yet he comes back. Is that because he wants to belong to "Paradise Place" like everybody else?

Yes, Kure is very critical about the place, but he cannot leave it. It is the longing for security, of course.

When you made the film did you have a particular visual style in mind?

No, only knew that I wanted to tell the story as simply as possible. It is not very experimental in that sense.

I notice that in the theatre you have directed plays by people like Shaw, Strindberg, Chekhov or Brecht. Can you measure how they have influenced your approach to film?

First of all, what interests me very much about theatre is actors: I love them and I love to work with them. In fact, my only security on the film was that I knew I could work with the actors. I wasn't sure if my technical knowledge was sufficient, and I had to trust my crew.

I consider myself an actress and I work in the theatre much more than in films. And if you are used to working with Strindberg or Chekhov, writers who really have something to say, then you must be influenced.

I get very impatient with films that murmur; films that are too afraid to say what they are about.

In that respect, the theatre has had a very big impact on me.

Godard, for example, has taken Brecht into his own form. How do you respond to that sort of filmmaking?

Well, I think you can always use Brecht, and in one respect, "Paradise Place" is a kind of Brechtian film. I don't know if anybody agrees with me. I have even used Brecht in a Strindberg play I did in Copenhagen called The Father. I didn't even change a word of Strindberg, but it worked very well. And it always will if you go directly to Brecht and don't listen to his pupils.

I think Brecht is very much misunderstood because after having worked practically in the theatre he wrote his theories only because he felt obliged to. And as he was German it was difficult for him to write his ideas clearly. So, you have to read Brecht all the time with your heart and you will find he is not as cold as people think.

The story that Kure tells about the women on the train reminds you very much of the "zipless fuck" chapter from Erica Jong's 'Fear of Flying'. Was that a deliberate reference?

Well that story is in the book, and Ulla Isaksson was well before Erica Jong. No, it has nothing to do with Jong.

Apart from Isaksson, are there any women who have been major influences on you?

Well, it took a long time before I had the courage to admit that I was interested in directing. My education was as an actress and directors were always authoritarian and made me not want to do it.

I worked twice with Mai Zetterling and she was a great encouragement for me because of her courage. I played one of the parts in her first film in Sweden, Loving Couples, which had a very difficult script, and I admired her very much for what she was doing.

Have you any other projects that you are working on?

I am planning a four-hour film for Swedish television which we are going to make next winter. It is for the Swedish Women's Liberation Movement and should be very interesting.

Many European directors are turning to television...

Well, there are a lot of people watching and it is a fantastic opportunity to reach people who never go to the theatre or cinema. I think they are entitled to have something of value to look at.

The retreat of "Paradise Place" in Paradistorg.
Is "Mouth to Mouth" an original screenplay?

Yes. It began with the idea of four teenagers spending a night on the town, and just extended from that. I decided to try and make a film that would involve a fairly wide-ranging audience in the experiences of four sympathetic characters who are battling to get some kind of life going at the lower end of society. Characters whom the middle-class audience generally reads about as numbers in the unemployment figures, or kids in the juvenile courts. In all, I did 14 drafts of the screenplay.

Why was that?

Almost all the assessments I received were very positive, but the assessors at the Australian Film Commission felt that while it was a good script, it had limited financial potential. I think the film was knocked back three times on those grounds. The Victorian Film Corporation, on the other hand, was very helpful; I had several long and useful discussions with people there.

The material I write probably needs a lot of rewriting, and I believe The Trespassers could have done with another rewrite.

Do you feel a corporation is within its rights in pressuring a writer into reworking a script?

One criticism that has been voiced against "Mouth to Mouth" is that it is too determinist...

I don't accept that as a criticism. One of the most important qualities of the four characters is their terrific vitality and imagination. Given their environment, there aren't many options, and they certainly don't ever perceive themselves as having many. Yet, they do come out with some ingenious ways of solving their problems — the way they steal, for example. As well,
the places that they go to on the spur of the moment, are quite exciting and unusual.

But one of the feelings I was after was a real sense of inexorability in the way the action unfolds - the environment creates it. From the moment they escape from the youth training centre, it is inevitable that the girls will be arrested again. That is the pattern in reality.

On the other hand, the two guys are on the dole. I worked on a radio program for six months in which young unemployed people talked about their experiences.

One of the overwhelming impressions was the feeling of pessimism and of a basic lack of options. And the longer they were unemployed, the more entrenched those feelings were. It seemed important to get that kind of feeling with Serge and Tim - a growing sense of frustration.

Yet, one sees in the characters' actions a partial transcending of the limitations. The film is, therefore, very optimistic.

I certainly hope people will perceive the optimism which is crucial to the film. I wanted to generate a lot of warmth between

In "Mouth to Mouth" you highlight the characters' progression by subtly detaching them from the violence and noise of the soundtrack.

The soundtrack is very important, and I think Tony Paterson, the editor, has done a superb job in helping create that ugly sound environment.

The four live in a warehouse near a shunting yard, and there is constantly the jarring sounds of trains and carriages jolting into one another, or rushing past. Then there is the pub situation, with the grinding music in the background, and layers of loud pub ambiance.

The ways in which a soundtrack can enrich an image are becoming clearer to me. In general, Australian films have not widely explored the possibilities.

In Bresson's book, 'Notes on Cinematography', there is the much-quoted line: "If you can ever replace an image with a sound, do so."...

That is a good quote. An example of this is when Carrie, the girl who becomes isolated from the other three, walks into the park. She sits on a bench, near the Carlton football ground, and there is the sound of people cheering, wafting over the park. It mirrors the position of the individual in Carrie's isolation against a huge kind of social animal. The force of the image comes from the incredible noise.

Also, there is the cut to Carrie coming into the warehouse before the above scene, which is done on a scream from Jeannie. When one of the boys hits a policeman, she cries out and this sound blurs into a train whistle. Again, this has resonances linked with the use of trains and machines throughout the film, a world inhabited by generally anonymous people and machines.

In one scene, Carrie is picked up off the railway tracks by an old hobo. How do you see his role in the film?

Fred is a very important character. Earlier in the film, after the girls have escaped from the youth training centre, they are in a car with a group of guys. They drive past a derelict old man and the guys scream out abuse; this anticipates later events.

Carrie, by far, is the most desperate of the four, and senses in Fred the way she is, heading. So she shuns him. One night he finds her in the railway yards, curled up and drunk. He helps her home, and subsequently she is much warmer towards him. Later he is beaten up by Tony, with whom
Carrie has had a very self-destructive relationship. The violence of this act finally makes her see the sort of person Tony is and she breaks away from this obsessive relationship. Incidentally, Tony likewise is a kind of social derelict, and knows it. When the old man calls him a dero it's the worst possible insult. In dealing with feminist issues, and difficult ones like prostitution, did you ever find yourself in the situation of being false to yourself in order to avoid exposing a flank to criticism?

Not as far as I am aware. A friend of mine worked in a massage parlor for six months; I talked to her a lot about her experiences, and I suppose the events in the film have been colored by this. In no way was I attempting to make value judgment points on prostitution — I wouldn't want to. The events that occur in the film, and the characters' reactions in them, are generated by the momentum of the characters as I saw them.

One of the striking features about "Mouth to Mouth" is the performance of the four lead actors. How did you go about casting them?

I have come to think that casting is as important as the screenplay. I was looking for actors for these roles for about a year and did some fairly exhaustive testing. I spotted Sonia Peat (Jeannie) in a Sydney pub. She knew most of the people there and was buzzing around with this endless, speedy energy — she seemed just right for the part. On closing time I found out she was living in a nurses' home. Without using the line, "Do you want to be in a film?", I contacted her the next time I was in Sydney and we did a bit of testing.

What did this entail?

Mainly reading scripts. I would listen to her and then make some suggestions. For me, the most important thing in testing an actor is finding whether he or she can establish a rapport with others, and if he or she can get anything out of the suggestions that I make about delivery and character.

Sergio Frazzetto, who plays Serge, was working at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology as a van driver; he had never done any acting, but has great vitality, like the others, which was one of the prime things I was looking for. I thought I would try and get that onto film. The other two people came from agencies and they had some acting experience. Ian Gilmour (Tim) had done a television series nine months before and has done bits and pieces since. Kim Krejus, who plays Carrie, did a year at the National Institute of Dramatic Arts and is now doing some television work. They have impressive futures.

So, it was a combination of two totally inexperienced actors and two with some experience. They were great to work with and worked very hard. We had a two-week rehearsal period, and during the first week we went down the coast, to get to know one another. We worked intensively in the quiet, and it was very useful. I believe all four performances are really terrific.

You worked with more...
experienced actors on "The Trespassers". Did you have to change your directing style on "Mouth to Mouth", such as doing more takes?

To an extent one works differently with each actor. I value rehearsals very highly; I would prefer to over-rehearse people and find ways of recapturing the freshness, than try to get what I want for the first time in front of the camera. So we didn't need to shoot many takes on either film — we couldn't afford to anyway.

As to shooting styles, the camera movements in The Trespassers were often long, fluid, tracking shots complementing the long passages of dialogue. Mouth to Mouth was very economical with a lot more jarring movement and close-up work.

Also, a faster cutting pattern...

Yes, it is a lot more manic — as is implied by the speedier lifestyle of the characters.

You had planned to make the film on 35 mm and not 16 mm. Did the changeover affect the size of the crew or use of equipment?

I don't think we would have used a bigger crew, apart from one more on camera. We would have used a 35BL, so the size of the camera would have been very much the same, and we would have shot at a similar speed.

I am very keen on working with crews of the size we had on Mouth to Mouth, which was a little smaller than that on The Trespassers.

How many were on location?

Eleven, as opposed to 13 on The Trespassers.

Did the Victorian Film Corporation have any feelings about the size of the crew?

No, other than suggesting that it would be more appropriate to employ 16.

At this stage I haven't seen the blow-up to 35 mm, so I don't know whether spending an extra $25,000 to do it on 35 mm would have been justified. It doesn't seem very much money, but it is a lot when you are speaking of a budget of $129,000.

That is the final budget...

Yes, but $44,000 of that is deferredments. In terms of straight cash, the film took $85,000 to make — and that includes the blow-up.

It would have been nice to have had $150,000, and the film I want to do after Dimboola will probably have a budget of around $185,000. The only reason it will cost an extra $5,000 is because it needs a French or German actress.

For a hell of a lot of film subjects $150,000 seems an appropriate budget; there is no need to have much more than that.

Was it for economic reasons that you shot on 16 mm?

Yes, I couldn't find any more money at that time, though I could probably find it now with the contacts I have. But I had all the people lined up for the film and, because of their availability, it was essential to shoot when we did.

Do you think your difficulty in raising money was influenced by the lack of commercial success of "The Trespassers"?

Yes, I am sure it was. If The Trespassers had made a fortune, the people who had invested in that film would have been delighted to invest in Mouth to Mouth. So I hope Mouth to Mouth makes a lot of money; it will certainly make it easier the next time around.

"Mouth to Mouth" is one of the few films made on a budget of between $130,000 and $150,000, and the corporations, apart from the NSW Corporation with its special division for low-budget films, haven't expended much effort or money in that area...

I think it is a very exciting innovation by the NSW Corporation to set up their fund, because budgets of that kind seem to be much more in line with market expectations of Australia. If the film is good and is made for $200,000 or under, then in many cases you can get your money back in Australia. Don't you agree?

Perhaps, though isn't it sufficient justification that this type of filmmaking may produce films of an aesthetic calibre not achieved by more expensive features?

Provided that a film is competently made, and its story doesn't demand a lot of money, it doesn't matter how much it cost. Audiences are not looking for hairs in the gate, nor do they notice that there are only six extras in a pub scene instead of 50. A good subject will carry them along.

Your next project is "Dimboola", which playwright Jack Hibberd has considerably rewritten for the film...

It would be impossible to recreate on film some of the what the play achieves as a live-event. The audience as guests at a wedding reception are automatically implicated in the action; they can get drunk and dance, shout and so on, and it's all part of the show.

The screenplay covers three days, leading up to and including the wedding and reception: the play was simply the reception. It is a much more complex subject — an opportunity to celebrate a country town and its people.

Concluded on P.377
Poor Cinema

James Ricketson

Filmmaking is an expensive business. A major problem facing all feature filmmakers in Australia is how to recoup the money invested in one film and make sufficient profit to produce the next. It would be foolish to assume that government funding will continue indefinitely, and there can be no doubt that the industry, as it is presently structured, would die if the funding ceased.

One safeguard against the possible demise of an over-inflated industry would be the development of a Poor Cinema, one in which filmmakers work to low budgets with small crews, small casts, low shooting ratios and short shooting schedules, concentrating on content rather than technical excellence.

I use the term Poor cautiously; like all labels it should be viewed with suspicion. It refers not only to films made on $50,000-$200,000 budgets, but also to an attitude or approach to filmmaking that is as concerned with the content of films as with the economics of film production and distribution.

It is my contention that the encouragement of a Poor Cinema would: (1) make the Australian film industry more economically viable; (2) give rise to greater diversity in the films being made; (3) develop more discerning and sophisticated audiences; (4) develop the art (and not merely the industry) of film in Australia.

Working to low budgets has one distinct advantage for filmmakers, in that it allows them freedom from artistic constraints that come with bigger budgets, enabling them to take risks without fear of making mistakes, or of failing at the box-office.

Every film faces the possibility of box-office failure, especially those in which new territory is being explored. Attempts can be made to avoid this possibility by treating safe and well-trodden paths, doing what has already been done, copying and adhering to formulas. And I believe most feature films being made in Australia fall into this category. Hence the Hollywood-type product that is flooding the market.

It is not my intention to denigrate these films, but to point out that because of their expense, the film industry is a big business. Films have to make money at the box-office and hence become products geared to a known or predicted market. This film-as-a-marketable-commodity-orientation is more often than not an albatross around the filmmaker's neck; it limits the types of films produced and the way in which they are made.

We cannot, of course, ignore the economic realities of film production and distribution. But given the amount of money being poured into the industry by the Australian Film Commission and the state film corporations, it is distressing that so few adventurous, innovative or outrageous films are being made.

With the exception of the Experimental Film Fund (upper limit $60,000), we are not using our resources to explore the medium's possibilities. This results from a lack of nerve in filmmakers and over-cautiousness and conservatism on the part of the various funding bodies - all of which could be modified by a movement towards a Poor Cinema.

Film audiences have diverse tastes. At one end of the spectrum is a large audience that wants to be thrilled, held in suspense, made to laugh, cry, be entertained; to have their attention diverted from their everyday lives. I have no argument with these films, except that most of them have as their basis a very superficial conception of the range of possible human emotions and experiences; they rely on clichés and formulas that belittle life's complexity. A steady diet of such films in cinemas and on television is probably as damaging to psychic health as a steady diet of junk food is to bodily health.

At the other end of the spectrum there are films by Ingmar Bergman, Rainer Werner Fassbinder, Werner Herzog, Peter Watkins, Eric Rohmer and many others that explore the personal and social nature. The present is too damaging to psychic health as a steady diet of junk food is to bodily health.

As with other art forms, the primary reason for their creation is only marginally related to their commercial value. They are made for audiences who believe the unexamined life is not worth living, and should not — cannot — be evaluated in terms of box-office receipts alone. Films of this kind are not being made in Australia. I am not referring to 'art' or elitist films, but to those that deal with life — with what it means or feels like to be alive in Australia.

Many films have been (and are being) made, based on stories taken from our history, but few that deal with the '70s, that examine the structure and fabric of Australian society, that explore unionism, unemployment, migrants, underclass existence.

As with other art forms, the primary reason for their creation is only marginally related to their commercial value. They are made for audiences who believe the unexamined life is not worth living, and should not — cannot — be evaluated in terms of box-office receipts alone. Films of this kind are not being made in Australia. I am not referring to 'art' or elitist films, but to those that deal with life — with what it means or feels like to be alive in Australia.

Many films have been (and are being) made, based on stories taken from our history, but few that deal with the '70s, that examine the structure and fabric of Australian society, that explore unionism, unemployment, migrants, underclass existence.

The double bill of The Singer and the Dancer and Love Letters From Teralba Road, among others, has demonstrated that there is an audience for quality low budget 'non-commercial' films. Distribution of these films (and others that will hopefully follow) remains a problem, but not an insoluble one. Four or five years ago it was almost impossible to distribute an Australian film in Australia; now it is relatively easy. The same could be true for the low budget films that make up the Poor Cinema.
Volita deals with the way in which four characters respond to the milieu they find themselves in during the latter half of the 1970s: with the way they relate to each other, to their jobs, society and the world in general.

The film began with four characters, detailed and lengthy character notes, and only a germinal script — a framework within which the writer/director and actors could work.

It is quite acceptable and common for a theatrical piece to arise out of a workshop situation in which actors and director develop a presentation based on a writer’s, director’s or the group’s idea. The same principle could, I believe, be applied to film.

The choice of cast was determined by the actor’s ability to improvise scenes based on the character notes. I was more interested in the spontaneity, naturalness and overall feeling of performance than in an ability to work with set dialogue.

I did not want the film to be merely a reflection of my own ideas and intentions — I hoped that we would all learn about how to develop and make a film. And for my part, I found that I learnt more about writing dialogue in this way than from countless nights stooped over a typewriter.

The workshop took three weeks and proved to be invaluable from the point of view of performances, integration of scripted and improvised dialogue, and time saved on the set. Ideally, however, it should have been about three weeks longer.

Then came the filming and my decision to shoot the film hand-held. This arose out of my experience in making documentaries.

In a documentary, it is irrelevant whether or not a shot is entirely steady; it is the content of the scene that is of primary importance, assuming, of course, that the content is sufficiently interesting. While many films hide a paucity of content behind technical excellence or lavish sets and costumes, our decision to relegate the technical aspects of filmmaking to a secondary role, forced us to concentrate on the content.

The time saved by using only minimal lighting and by shooting the film hand-held, enabled us to complete the film in 15 days. For this, cameraman Tom Cowan must take the credit.

In order to minimize the need for artificial lighting, Kodak Reversal 7250 (ASA 400) was used for all interiors. This is a newsreel stock not designed for having prints struck off it. As the film is, at the time of writing, in the process of being edited, it is too early to say whether the time and money saved by using this stock is justified by the quality of release prints.

For my part, the exercise in making this film has been rewarding on a number of levels. I have been able to take risks I would not have dared take (or been allowed to take) if I was working to a large budget. The film has also provided me with a bridge from short narrative films into feature filmmaking.

All too often filmmakers with my type of background and experience are forced to jump from a $20,000 to a $500,000 budget, with no option to test their skills on films made to budgets somewhere in between these two extremes. It is this gap that a Poor Cinema could fill.
Steven Spielberg’s “Close Encounters of the Third Kind” is at present outpacing “Star Wars” at the box-office and may possibly become the biggest grossing film of all time. If so, Spielberg will have twice achieved that feat; the other time being with “Jaws”.

Spielberg graduated from UCLA in 1970 and went straight to Universal where he directed episodes for several television series, including: “Marcus Welby, MD”, “Columbo” and “Name of the Game”. He also directed two television features — “Duel” (1970) and “Something Evil” (1972) — the former becoming a cult film and being re-released theatrically in the U.S.


While in Denmark for the recent opening of “Close Encounters”, Spielberg spoke to Cinema Papers’ Scandinavia correspondent Gail Heathwood about the existence of extra-terrestrial beings and the problems involved in mounting this $U.S. 19.2 million project.

Since you are scriptwriter and director of this film, you must have a certain attitude to the UFO phenomenon. Do you believe in close encounters?

I believe in the possibility, in the 30 years of evidence. I am not 100 per cent convinced, and I haven’t had any direct experiences; my attitude has always been “Prove it”. But I am more convinced now than I was three years ago.

Was it your intention to make other people aware as yourself?

Yes; aware that this was one answer to the UFO mystery, that UFOs are extra-terrestrial entities and not just projections of the collective imagination of the world.

There appears to be a strong relationship between this and your other films, in that you take a horror that is always with us, and bring it out into the open, presenting it in realistic terms...

Absolutely. In every film I have made I have taken something which is very uncommon to our everyday lives, and therefore hard to believe, and tried to make it as believable as possible. I enjoy creating a reality from a kind of fantasy. In Duel, for example, there was the challenge of creating a character out of a truck and making it appear like the classic villain in the Western.

Generally, I am much more interested in those things when they affect ordinary people, than I am in, say, Spiderman or Superman.

How did you research “Close Encounters”?

I went to the magazine and newspaper section of the public library and read old copies of Life. For 40 years Life was probably the most popular magazine in the U.S. and it was very interested in UFOs. It followed them more closely than any other publication and printed large photos, as well as stories from different scientists. I traced these authors and discovered that many had written books. I read a number of them, and began to meet the authors. Then I talked to four or five pilots from major airlines, air traffic controllers, U.S. Air Force officers, even four security people at the Pentagon who, during the early 1950s, had worked in the intelligence corps and were around when UFOs buzzed the capital; there was a great flap in Washington. It sounds like a wonderful science fiction film, but Washington took it very seriously.

The best people I talked to, however, were the average family types who never expect anything extraordinary to happen until it actually does. That was the best part of the research, because it supported my feelings about the first two-thirds of the film. The last part is just my vision, my hope and philosophy. It never really happened.

The people who come out from the space ship are similar to drawings done by eyewitnesses. Was this intentional?

Yes. While collecting descriptions from all over the world I realized that everybody reported the same thing. You would think that somebody in the U.S. would report something more chrome-plated than someone in maybe Switzerland who would report something like a grandfather clock. But all the reports are the same — the vehicles, the spheres in the sky. And the extra-terrestrials looked like they do in film, rather than fire-breathing dragons.

Do you think that the film would have a certain impact on the UFO phenomenon?
have been stronger if you had not shown these extra-terrestrials?

Not for most people, because they would have been frustrated at not having seen the vision completed. A lot of people think I should not have shown the shark in Jaws, that I should have continued the mystery of the water, so that the water itself became the threat. But that’s my duality — the philosopher-filmmaker and the commercial-filmmaker-entertainer. I try to make those two things work for each other.

Did you consider not showing the creatures?

Yes, for a long time, and I personally felt a great disappointment in not knowing what pilot those things. In 2001 Stanley Kubrick considered the same thing because he shot many aliens — but he never used them in the final film. That was fine for 2001, because from the beginning it had promised an esoteric payoff; you didn’t ever expect to see an extra-terrestrial.

My film isn’t so technologically intellectual, and because of this it would be wrong not to show the creatures.

Why did you choose Dr Allen Hyneck as technical advisor on the film?

I knew of Hyneck when I first began researching the film because he was famous for saying how it was all a bunch of bunk. He had been hired by the Air Force to give easy explanations to complicated phenomena and he was very good at it.

Hyneck would say a phenomena was a meteor or swamp gas or Venus. The ocean was just a few months away, but there was still 20 per cent he couldn’t, and he became fascinated by it. Finally, he went to the Air Force and said, “Hey, I think there’s something here; this isn’t just plain paranoia.”

The Air Force got very nervous and told Hyneck to mind his own business and just do his job. He got very angry and quit. He then wrote a book attacking the Air Force; they gave us no cooperation at all. So when I was shooting the scenes with the army and air force, I had to do it the old-fashioned way and go into a costume store and buy the army suits and gear.

Apparently President Carter has seen the film . . .

Yes, Carter likes it very much. He has reported UFOs on two occasions, and I think he’s a believer. In fact, one of his campaign promises was that he would try and find out what UFOs were all about. But the minute he took office and was asked whether he was going to follow through the promise, he side-stepped the issue.

Since then, the White House has been very quiet concerning UFOs. It seems that every president, including Gerald Ford, who is interested in UFOs, stops being interested the minute they get to the White House.

There is something going on which many governments in the world feel that people should not be made aware of yet. France and Brazil are the only two countries whose governments have admitted that UFOs exist, and that they are interested.

Was it at any point a moral issue for you — that you might cause panic?

Not really. When Orson Welles did his famous “War of the Worlds” broadcast in 1938, he was not so much writing a radio program about Martians invading New Jersey as about America’s fear of invasion from Europe. War was just a few months away, but Welles’ invasion was not the Stuka, it was the Martian; it preyed on the vulnerability of that time.

Today it’s just the opposite. I knew that if this film was to be popular it wouldn’t be because people were afraid of the phenomena, but because the UFOs are a seductive alternative for a lot of people who no longer have faith in anything.

Did you require your actors to have a similar degree of belief as yourself?

No, Melinda Dillon believes, but Terri Garr doesn’t. Neither does Richard Dreyfuss nor Francois Truffaut. When Truffaut was asked if he believed in UFOs, he said, “I believe in the cinema.”

Who’s directing who? The two ‘directors’ — Francois Truffaut and Steven Spielberg.

The mysterious light generated by a UFO. While a mother (Melinda Dillon) is terrified, her son (Gary Guffey) is more trusting. Close Encounters of the Third Kind.
Why did you cast Truffaut?

It occurred to me that of all the French people I knew, Truffaut was the most humane. There is a humanist view of Truffaut that I have always held — of his films and of him as an actor in his films. He has the face of the young boy grown up.

Isn’t it difficult to direct a director?

No, because most of the time Truffaut knew what I was about to say before I said it. After a take that Truffaut and I didn’t like, I couldn’t even open my mouth before Truffaut would say, “I know, I know, too much over-acting; I’ll bring it down.” It was easier directing Truffaut than the others.

Truffaut wrote a book during the shooting called ‘The Actor’. Have you read it?

It’s not finished, but when it is, I’ll get the first copy. Truffaut often looked lost on my set because he was not used to 200 extras, 90 arc lights and all the noise and confusion. He is used to small, personal crews and casts; low budgets. When he came on the set it was the first time he had seen the old Hollywood being run by the new. I think if you had walked on the set of Close Encounters you would have thought of Busby Berkeley, because it was so technically confusing. Lots of technology, but very old-fashioned.

Is it difficult to always be in control?

It’s hard, but then that’s my job. Close Encounters was the first time I ever managed a production this large. Jaws was a very intimate film — just three men, a boat and a shark. This film was large from the very first day, and that’s what confused Truffaut. I am sure his book on the actor will have an extra chapter in it.

Given a lot of the film’s special effects were done in laboratories, were the actors often called upon to react to non-existent effects?

Yes, Richard Dreyfuss was very upset with several moments in his performance because he feels that had he seen the effects, he might have reacted differently.

Did you ever feel insecure about being in control of all these people and effects?

I never feel secure doing anything, especially a film like this. The problem is when you have a crew that large you have to repeat yourself. If you say it once, it will never get done. If you say it twice, there is a 50-50 chance it will get done your way. If you say it three times, it might be there when you want it. But if you say it four times, it will be there. Now if I have to say it five times, the person I am saying it to goes home on the next plane.

Did you change anything as you went along?

A lot. The script is only a blueprint. I plot everything ahead of time and before the first piece of film is shot; you can see the entire film on cards. So, when I eventually hired Doug Trumbull, all Doug had to do was look at the ships I had painted, the colors and structures, and duplicate them technically. That’s why I took a credit on the screen for visual concepts.

What scenes did you change?

In the original there were many more family scenes which I shot but didn’t include. There were also more encounters in the first half, but that was changed because I felt I had to save — I couldn’t have a jolt every 10 minutes because it would have hurt the dramatic construction. The elimination was necessary to concentrate on the final arrival.

Speaking of dramatic structure, do you have a special formula for creating tension? It seems that you rely on under-informing the audience, letting them be unaware of certain things . . .

Yes, I’d agree with that. I believe in not giving the audience what they want, because their collective imagination is much greater than mine. That was why in Jaws I decided to leave the ‘Enemy of the People’ part of the story not told. I felt the same way about Close Encounters. The military cover-up, for example, I didn’t want to beat to death because in the U.S. it’s passe. We have lived through Watergate, the CIA, and people already find them redundant.

Yet the film is made for an international audience, one not necessarily versed in American lore. Did you find it hard to decide where the point of balance was?

I always consider the international market when I make a film. It was obvious to me that I would discuss the film more overseas than in the U.S. In the U.S. I merely discussed the flashiness and the sound, the excitement, the phenomena. Here in Europe I am discussing the story and the philosophy, the symbolism.
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Jan Dawson

This year's Edinburgh Film Festival seemed freer of the factional in-fighting that had sometimes soured its atmosphere in the past. It was also closer to providing genuine sanctuary within which different ideologies of, and approaches to, "independent cinema" might peacefully co-exist for their mutual stimulation. All this in spite of the sinister shadow which so many television personalities cast over the festival's second week, as well as the worrying long-term implication of television choosing Britain's oldest established film event as the site of its economic and political muscle-flexing.

That there were no major revelations, and that the various retrospectives (of films by Wim Wenders, Ula Stockl, Marcel Ophuls, Ziga Vertov) proved stronger than any groupings of new works, was a reflection on the current state of international production Ict. Cannes, with which Edinburgh did not compare unfavorably.

As in past years, the groupings which formed the Festival's strongest suits were its selections of low-budget independent productions (predominantly North American) and its round-up of American exploitation films.

Most noteworthy among the former was, perhaps, Gregory Nava's The Confessions of Amans, a medieval love story shot in Spain on an American Film Institute grant and with a primarily British cast. Its story, of a young monk who becomes a wandering scholar in the East after fathering a child by his chatelaine he has been hired to tutor, unfolds with all the measured gracefulness of a formal ballad and the delicate precision of a series of miniatures. The conflicting aspirations of passions and intelligence, revealed primarily through the movements of hands and eyes, locate the film's real action as spiritual rather than historical. At the same time, through the hierarchical rituals glimpsed mainly as domestic details in the corners of the frame, Nava, like the Flemish painters, almost iconically portrays the ordered world against which his characters transgress. His actors' delivery is quite aggressively modern, his social details historical, his characters' inner conflict timeless.

Somewhere between an exploitation film and an independent production was the Canadian film Outrageous, written and directed by the Kentucky-born, off-Broadway playwright Richard Benner. It is a film which speaks out against all categorizations, and which admirably exemplifies its message.

Its improbable plot (based on a short story by Margaret Gibson, a real-life schizophrenic) concerns the growth of a relationship between a schizophrenic girl (newly escaped from an asylum) and a frustrated homosexual hairdresser with transvestite leanings. Encouraged by the girl, the hairdresser starts performing in drag clubs and eventually becomes an off-Broadway star.

The girl loses the baby she has been carrying but is nursed back to her own kind of unstable stability by the hairdresser who counters his metaphorical despair with the punch line: "You're not dead; you're alive and sick and living in New York like eight million other people."

The star of the film is a brilliant female impersonator, Craig Russell, who eschews playback and uses his own voice to recreate a dozen artists ranging from Marlene Dietrich to Judy Garland.

Yet, although his seven-and-a-half minute stage show is probably the film's high point, what makes Outrageous a lot more interesting than a drag show is the way it constantly uses sentimentality and melodrama and showbiz glamour to undercut one another to convey the impression that life is a mess but decidedly worth living.

Its portrait of Canadian provincialism (significantly, the hero has to move from Toronto to New York to make it as a performer) is less than flattering — a fact which the Canadian Film Development Corporation, who provided 60 per cent of the budget, seem to have overlooked.

Being of a squeamish disposition, I determinedly missed the gorier of Edinburgh's exploitation horror films (at any rate Robert de Niro; and, most vicious of all, Assault on Precinct 13, which establishes the toughness of its

A violent scene from John Flynn's Rolling Thunder. Written by Paul Schrader, the film has "worrying echoes of the National Socialist ideology.

Gregory Nava's medieval love tale, The Confessions of Amans, with William Bryan (Amans) and Susannah MacMillan (Lady Anne).
comedies of desperate manners; Hans and historical costume, and a radically separately below), his first film in Hindi with purity and the true America.

Swelling the Edinburgh collection was, at the one extreme, the Yugoslav film The Rat Saviour, by Krsto Papić — substantially more metaphysical than action-packed as it paints an oneric portrait of a nameless bureaucracy whose model citizens are actually rats in human form; at the other extreme was Rollover Thieves. Written by Paul Schrader who wrote the script of Taxi Driver, it explores the particularity of Schrader’s more worrying obsessions: the corruption and hypocrisy of modern city life (okay), the equation of women with flesh and fickleness (okay), the cure for murder as a form of purification (less okay), the death of the author (okay), and the consequences thereof (okay), the mixture of film styles and genres (from cartoon to low-key naturalism to stylized tableau), the creation of a film closer in style and spirit to the work of Berthold Brecht than to those of Ray’s previous mentors, the Italian neo-realists.

Once again, it is a crazed Vietnam veteran cleansing the world by shooting it up in a brothel; once again, there’s the implacable assumption that the dominant social classes and the people, if not whole races, deserve to die, and that their instant death sentence requires no additional judge or executioner than the Great American Conscience. The ease with which Schrader’s heroes prefer their guns to their women, and the simplicity of slaughter and complexity of life, has some worrying echoes of the National Socialist ideology. The director’s name this time is John Flynn.

The London Festival has always been presented as a Festival of Festivals — to be mulled over, dwelt on, the latest student work-prings. The Edinburgh collection was, by Krzystof Zanussi’s Camouflage, one of the few films ever to capture the human language all the complexities of intellectual conflict and conscience, with all the subtlety of Henry James, and a nostalgic, pastoral setting.

These film events — to be mulled over, analyzed, slowly digested and appraised — can in the short term only be damaged by their propinquity to the hollow pretentiousness of Rolling Thunder or the latest student work-prings. The London Festival no longer appears to celebrate the survival of quality in the cinema so much as the fact that the cinema (often in horrendous forms) has succeeded in surviving at all.

**THE CHESS PLAYERS**

An obvious first reaction to The Chess Players is that it marks a radical departure for its director, Satyajit Ray. Not only is it his first film in Hindi, but it is, as Ray himself has pointed out, its most splendid of all, Krzysztof Zanussi’s Camouflage, one of the few films ever to capture the human language all the complexities of intellectual conflict and conscience, with all the subtlety of Henry James, and a nostalgic, pastoral setting.

The tension within his films — corresponding to such objective factors as the incomparable pull of indigenous culture and imposed British influence, of the all-embracing, gentle tolerance of Eastern religion, and the brutal, death-dealing reality of Western economic systems — has found its subjective expression in a distinctive idiom miraculously poised between nostalgia and tough observation, between humor and tragedy, between a stark neo-realism and a no less rigorous stylization. Though their detailed, day-by-day study of thwarted hopes and wasted lives may owe much to Vittorio de Sica and his bicycle thieves, structurally Ray’s films owe still more to music than to any cinematographic antecedents. It is an arbitrary coincidence that Ray has always composed the music for his films. Their narratives are conceived and approached in fundamentally musical terms: they develop as variations on a theme and are played out in a series of conflicting rhythms which echo and express conflicting social pressures. This is not to say that Utopian past and an unthinkable future, between which lies only stasis, inertia — the quagmire in which individual lives and hopes must founder.

Ashani Sanket (Distant Thunder) already marked a turning point in Ray’s career, in that — as in his subsequent films — the tragi-comedy of domestic manners is linked to specific historic and political subjects, its deliberate recourse to such distancing devices as an ironic metaphor or a satirical metaphor. But that is neither here nor there. Once again, a musical analogy proves the most appropriate, the musical parallel, the musical antithesis, the musical antithesis. Critics were not slow to announce that Ray had embarked on a new, political path with this film, a path that would castigate him for his former virtues, finding now in his persistent humanism a lack of partisan commitment.

In synopsis, The Chess Players would appear to mark the start of a further stage of politicization, to the extent that political/historical events have this time moved into the forefront. Yet a glance at the film (as distinct from its table of contents) shows the advance to be less cut-and-dried. Once again, a musical analogy proves the most precise: politics exist, as always, in counterpoint to everyday domestic reality, this time incarnated in the title characters. For well over half the film’s screen time, the camera focuses on the obsessive chess games of Mr Mir and Mr Mirza, equally oblivious to the disintegration of their marriage or their society. It is not so much the proportions of history to ‘real life’ that have changed, as the tone in which the component parts are treated. Carrying the love of comedy to the verge of slapstick, Ray has — in Mir and Mirza — created a kind of philosopher’s Laurel and Hardy, as rich in symbolic value as they are in wealth. Dramatically, they function as the court jesters to a no less stylized figure, the King, of whose glorious higher vision their lives are but poor, pale shadows.

That the King, Wajid Ali Shah, is so frequently represented as part of a tableau vivant — set against a background of singers, dancing girls or ornate decorations — is in large measure a consequence of Ray’s determination to avoid screen villains. Tracing India’s present-day tragedy back to its sources in Victorian imperialism, he maintains his customary tone of more sorrow than anger, the stubbornness of the showdown in Lucknow less as a clash of wills or a show of force than as a collision of styles, the tacky, aesthetic, philosophizing East meets the philistine pragmatism of the West.

Like Jalsagar (The Music Room), The Chess Players is impregnated with a wistful nostalgia for a beauty that cannot survive the harsh material realities of the world. Unlike Ray’s previous films, it is of a kind and place to material suffering, but confines itself to tracing — in the form of a comic parable — the passing of suffering and the passage of time. The coupling is no less eloquently depicted in Ray’s earlier films. In the very tradition whose passing he here laments, Ray — ever the gentleman and philosopher — asserts his humanism by preserving, even in the face of despair, a sense of the finer ironies.

Copyright Jan Dawson

How long have you been working on the project?

Five years. In March 1973, Sue Milliken picked up the book (The Reckoning) in a second hand shop in Oxford St., Paddington. She read it, and thought it would make a good film. I also read it, and liked it very much. I thought the mood, and some of the social aspects of the story, would transpose very well on to film.

What was the major hold-up?

There were a couple. In 1973, I was employed by Air Programs International and we were working on a number of projects. I suggested The Reckoning to Wal Hucker and he agreed. It took nine months to sort out the rights; we also had to get a writer.

In 1974, I worked on The Removalists, which was another nine months out of my life. API waited for me to come back from The Removalists and then they contacted a scriptwriter.

Who did write the screenplay?

Peter Yeldham, an Australian writer. He went to Britain in the late 1950s and achieved some success working for television — he wrote something like 13 screenplays.

In late 1974 I heard that Peter was coming back to Australia, so I tracked him down and discussed the project. He went back to Britain but called me from London and said he'd love to do the adaptation.

At that time, I found the projects were building up at Air Programs and taking longer than I had thought, due to their particular marketing policy of "pre-selling". As a result, I was not really able to get on with the job of making films.

I decided to leave, and made an agreement with Wal Hucker to take over the rights to The Reckoning. Peter Yeldham wrote the script and delivered it to me around the middle of 1975.

What was your next step?

The first draft was submitted to the Australian Film Commission, but they regarded it as a television program. It then took another three rewrites before potential investors, like the AFC, realized that it did have cinema potential.

The South Australian Film Corporation were the first to come in, though the AFC were already involved because of their script-writing investment. John Morris (chairman of the SAFC) took first bite of the cherry by coming in as a co-producer, as well as putting up one-third of the finance. This happened late in 1976. Then in early 1977, the AFC followed with an investment of $200,000. With that sort of impetus, we were then able to approach a number of private investors.

Did you find the current tax situation, where film investment can be written off only over a period of 25 years, a stumbling block when approaching private investors?

We never approached them on that basis. We did have a plan for investors which was an encouragement to them to invest, but this was structured under the present taxation act.

The Federal Government recently promised to alter the taxation act to allow private investors to write off their investment over two years. Will this assist producers to raise private finance?

At present, private investors are hanging off because they want to see how the amendment to the tax act is written; whether it is going to be a new section to the act or just an amendment to the clause pertaining to the writing off of copyright. But I think this new legislation should encourage greater private investment in the future.

One problem that has caused a lot of nervousness over investment in films, particularly on the Government side, is overages. How did you end up?

We came in under budget, and those monies saved in production will be applied to our marketing expenditure. Sue Milliken (Production Manager and Associate Producer) is a terrific organizer; she keeps a very tight rein on things, with everything well planned and co-ordinated in advance.

We always try to spend money where it counts; if we feel that we can cut corners in other areas, then we do — particularly as regards shooting. If a scene only warrants two hours' shooting, that's all we will spend.

How long did you take to shoot the film?

Five weeks and two days, plus an extra day because laboratory problems ruined a day's shooting. It was a heavy schedule because, though we were working close to Adelaide, virtually every day was a new location.

The story is one of men on a manhunt, and we couldn't go back to a location if we hadn't finished that day; because the next day we just had to move on to a new location.

I generally approach a film with a fairly well worked out plan of how things are going to go each scene. This enables me to make quick decisions if something isn't working as I originally visualized it. I can then keep the film moving on schedule, though I must say, 95 per cent of the time the whole crew worked like bloody slaves.

The script required a good deal of night shooting.

It took us about four nights, which we did at the beginning of the shoot; it was a really tough way to start out on a film. We had other night scenes which we split with some afternoon shoots, starting, say, at 2 p.m., and working through until midnight.

You used actors of very mixed backgrounds, some theatrical, some television, some feature film.

What we were looking for was a texture of people to tell the story. Each of the characters was quite separate in the sense that they represented a type of person. We, therefore, looked for actors who could represent those types, and who could play off one another in an ensemble situation.

The male actors found that they were able to come to terms with their parts quite easily. The two women, Melissa Jaffer (Vi) and Barbara West (Helen), found it less easy. They had very difficult roles to play, but they did a superb job.

In fact, on this film I found that I directed the actors less than I had ever done before; I like working with actors and I believe I am quite good with them.

One character I found very interesting was that of Bernie. I asked Graeme Blundell if he'd like to play this part. He read the script and said 'yes'. Even so, I
Kevin Miles (left) as the Police Superintendent, with Rob George (Constable Forrest) and Barbara West (Helen Caxton). Weekend of Shadows.

On the way to a beer and a bet. Knock-off time at the brickworks. Weekend of Shadows.

Graeme Blundell as Bernie, the "comic" character on the hunt for a murder. Weekend of Shadows.

TOM JEFFREY

was listed as co-producer, director and writer, I would not have an ability to retain an objective view of the project. However, since they have seen Weekend of Shadows, I think any doubts they had in regard to my ability as a director have faded.

I have already adapted the screenplay, so the only problem remaining is that of my involvement as a producer. But I see that only in terms of initiating the project, which will allow me to concentrate entirely on directing.

One of the exciting things I find about filmmaking is that it is such a social activity. A producer is dependent upon his or her director, a director is dependent upon the inputs of his crew, the actors, and the relationships between them all.

Another exciting thing about the Australian film industry at the moment, and certainly over the past five years, is the degree of enthusiasm and willingness that everybody has had — actors and crew, even the caterers — to put up with torrid conditions and still give 150 per cent effort. I rue the day when we start arguing about how much effort we put in and how much money we have to take out because then, to me, we will become like those problem-bound overseas industries such as in Britain or on the west coast of the U.S.

I believe "The Odd Angry Shot" is part of a package . . .

The leadup time to a film that is going to cost about $600,000 is about two years. One of the good things that the AFC agreed to do a couple of years ago was introduce its policy of assisting with package developments for the producer. There is a certain risk involved with this policy, in that certain ideas might never come to fruition. But Sue and I were fortunate in late 1976 to be given encouragement from the AFC by way of investment in a parcel of ideas, one of which is The Odd Angry Shot.

Our next film after that is hopefully an original screenplay written by Ted Roberts called Quartet With Strings, which is a slightly unusual love story. We felt that period dramas (a) have had their day and (b) were getting too expensive. Having to go away and stay on location is also becoming very expensive.

Ted had this idea for a light, romantic comedy, set in the city. It has an under-current theme of exploring some of the problems which people, men my age, face around the age of 40 when you tend to wonder where you are going. One gets a different perspective of life, and this affects one's relationship with women.

Women go through a changing relationship as well — with themselves, the people around them, and with their men. The film will have a background of elegance in the form of classical music, and we hope to begin filming in 1979.

We are looking now to the latter part of 1979 and 1980 for further projects. The package has allowed us to do this, and that has been a great advantage to us.

Music in Australian Films is often regarded as underdeveloped or excessive. How did you and Charles Marawood approach the scoring of "Weekend of Shadows"?

We have used a lot of music in
the film — about nine different themes. One theme is used twice, while there are three themes which are used up to 15 times throughout. It is a means of tying together characters, setting and themes. One theme is used twice, which are used up to 15 times throughout. It is a means of tying together characters, setting and themes.

I have known Charles Marwood for a number of years and I respect his work greatly. He is a very good composer and vocalist. During the final mix, we retained a separation of the music on three stripe, 35mm sprocketed tape to allow us full flexibility in balancing the music to the dialogue and effects. I think this was a great asset.

I think the music adds a lot of tension and drama to the story, but whether the audience will want it, I am not sure. Something that worries me is having music coming in and out like strings. That’s the difficulty, getting into and out of the music. However, I think we are close to solving it. There is about 45 or 50 minutes of dialogue and effects. I think this was a great asset.

I think the music adds a lot of tension and drama to the story, but whether the audience will want it, I am not sure. Something that worries me is having music coming in and out like strings. That’s the difficulty, getting into and out of the music. However, I think we are close to solving it.

Dean, who, in his own right, is a very good composer and vocalist. During the final mix, we retained a separation of the music on three stripe, 35mm sprocketed tape to allow us full flexibility in balancing the music to the dialogue and effects. I think this was a great asset.

I think the music adds a lot of tension and drama to the story, but whether the audience will want it, I am not sure. Something that worries me is having music coming in and out like strings. That’s the difficulty, getting into and out of the music. However, I think we are close to solving it. There is about 45 or 50 minutes of dialogue and effects. I think this was a great asset.

During the final mix, we retained a separation of the music on three stripe, 35mm sprocketed tape to allow us full flexibility in balancing the music to the dialogue and effects. I think this was a great asset.

I think the music adds a lot of tension and drama to the story, but whether the audience will want it, I am not sure. Something that worries me is having music coming in and out like strings. That’s the difficulty, getting into and out of the music. However, I think we are close to solving it. There is about 45 or 50 minutes of dialogue and effects. I think this was a great asset.

You’ve had a long association with the film industry...

Before getting into the feature film area, I suppose my major claim to fame would have been the way in which I worked with the ABC Television Drama Department. In 1969 I directed Pastures of the Blue Crane, which was an all-film serial for television with Jeannie Dryden, Harold Hopkins and Harry Lawrence. I then moved on to a series — a very expensive one — called Delta, which again was all film. I did about eight episodes out of the 23.

Then Dynasty came along, written by Tony Morphett. It started Kevin Miles, Ron Graham, Nick Tate and John Tate, Nick’s father, who came out from Britain to take the role of the father of the dynasty.

During 1971, we made one film which was a pilot for a proposed series called Devlin — it was one of my less happy experiences at the ABC. I was then offered a consultant’s job with the Interim Council of the Film and Television School. So I took leave from the ABC and did that job for a year.

In 1972, I resigned from the ABC and took up the appointment with Air Programs International.

In “Delta”, “The Removalists” and in “Weekend of Shadows”, there is a common theme of a person being pressured by his comrades, by his peers, to take a course of action that is regarded as common and usual by all of them, and which he resists. Is this a theme that particularly interests you?

It is difficult for me to analyze my work, but I attempt to do this from time to time. I sometimes wonder whether there is a thematic line that I am taking; I am not sure yet. But what I have come to understand is that what I am trying to make in my work is a plea for the individual.

So often, as individuals, we are forced to toe the line. We are told so often that something is impossible to do that we say, “All right, we will go with the mass, do what everybody else does and that’s easy.” As a consequence, we tend to lose our individuality, our ability to determine our fates, if you like.

Certainly in Weekend of Shadows there is this plea, but there are other things as well. Sergeant Caxton, for example, is a study of a person’s failure. He is a failed man and he fails absolutely. Also, the relationship of the men to their wives and how they can trigger the men to do certain things. But I don’t think that was an obvious theme I was pursuing.

There was a certain “aggression” theme in The Removalists which I was actually working against. The thing I liked about The Removalists as a stage play, which I thought should work as a film, was the way in which an individual, or a group of individuals, become a sort of a mass and try to destroy the authority or their influence over an individual.

The intriguing thing in the dramatic form of The Removalists, as David Williamson wrote it, was that the balance, the centre of authority, kept shifting. It would be first with Kate and her sister Marilyn, as we called it, then against Sergeant; then it would be the Sergeant and Kenny against the women; then it would be Kenny and the removalist against the Sergeant. Perhaps one of the reasons the film failed was because I didn’t quite come to grips with that. It is a film that I enjoyed making and I am sorry it didn’t do better — it should have.

Why do you think the film was basically unsuccessful?

There were lots of reasons. But I am glad the film is getting exposure now and a lot of people are enjoying it, though I would be worried if I was a producer and saw the exposure — but I wasn’t the producer.

If Weekend of Shadows fails, I have only myself to blame, which is the way I like it. I don’t want to kick anybody else in the arse.
There has been a much-vaunted upsurge in "women's films", a term used commonly to describe the sudden abundance of serious roles for women actors — from Vanessa Redgrave and Jane Fonda's laundered politics in *Julia*, Anne Bancroft and Shirley MacLaine's thwarted ambition in *The Turning Point*, to Diane Keaton's new-found sexual desperation of a young housewife. It was shot to women in work and at home); *Home* (made as part of the campaign to change the child welfare system, especially in relation to its treatment of teenage girls); and imported the American *Women's Film* for Discussion (questioning the narrow range of choices open to women in work and at home); *Home* (made per se, but the market for independent films is still largely a non-theatrical one, and people who are prepared to set up a projector in their home, school or hall, are still more likely to want to be instructed

The enthusiasm with which the 40 films and video tapes were received suggests that films exploring women's lives are in demand and that audiences are not overly discriminating about how they are made. Content, even if haphazardly expressed, is what matters. The chronology of independent women's production, in Sydney at least — and Sydney leads here, perhaps because of easier access to funding bodies — reinforces this leaning towards the supremacy of message over means.

The Australian founder of the film tradition to which the *Womenwaves* films are heir, is *Women's Day 28c*. The film, made in 1972 by four women, is about the loneliness and desperation of a young housewife. It was shot without sound, as cheaply as possible, yet six years later remains a powerful statement.

During 1973, Sydney Women's Film Group members completed *Film for Discussion* (questioning the narrow range of choices open to women in work and at home); *Home* (made per se, but the market for independent films is still largely a non-theatrical one, and people who are prepared to set up a projector in their home, school or hall, are still more likely to want to be instructed

The categories reflect convenience rather than precise definitions of content. Moreover, no value judgments were made, at least formally, when films were submitted for inclusion in the collection; this has led to an enormous divergence in style, content and technical proficiency.

In Sydney, there were a few cases of titles being shown at double-head stage or with opticals pencilled over the workprint. Yet, despite these flaws, the Co-operative cinema was consistently packed for the month-long season.
We Aim to Please, an erotic, feminist pot-pouri. Robin Laurie and Margot Nash.

than entertained.

So, it is largely "message" films which have found an audience, and maintained it, and while "Womenwaves" has so far been successful as a theatrical package, it will be interesting to see how individual titles fare in the rental market.

Some of the films explore the now familiar territory of the genre — consumerism, housework and self-image — while others reveal new preoccupations. Nearly half, for example, deal with relationships, sex, procreation (or its avoidance) and parenthood. A few also go to show how there are few things more boring than the filmmakers' best friends recorded on celluloid. Most films, however, are insightful, revealing or frighteningly direct.

In Liz Rust's videotape Definitions/Redeﬁnitions, the tapemaker and her ex-spouse reveal that their marriage has been a farce; in Barbara Levy's Paralysis, Levy explains her infatuation with her former lover and her breakdown on his departure. Part of the film consists of animated stills of a woman in various states of anguish, accompanied by the sound of her sobbing. While the acme of personal cinema, Paralysis is also a very general film, describing the responses of a great many women to emotional loss.

Similarly, Debbie Kingsland's All in the Same Boat is an individual rendition of a much-discussed dilemma. Covering similar ground to Woman's Day 20e and Graham Shirley's A Day Like Tomorrow, All in the Same Boat follows the daily routine of a western suburbs housewife, a mother of two small children who is trapped at home and frustrated with her role. Her husband regards her as a good wife, one who simply needs a bit of checking up on now and again. She regards him as a good husband, one who tries, but who can't understand her predicament. At night he slumps in front of the television and they converse during commercials. Her need for something which dulls the senses and quiets the nerves is revealed gradually and confirmed by a chemist counts out the tablets and types up the label — V.A.L.U.M.

Produced at Film Australia for the Health Department's drug education program, All in the Same Boat doesn't offer solutions, and anything other than long-term proposals would be inexcusably facile. Instead, it provides a kind of camaraderie between women sharing a common predicament. Hopefully it will be seen by many schoolgirls, for screening to high school students, to dispel the popular notion that a condom is worn "over two erect fingers". A combination of animated and live footage, Getting It On specifically for screening to high school students, to dispel the popular notion that a condom is worn "over two erect fingers". A combination of animated and live footage, Getting It On takes an eftervasive approach to one of life's most depressing subjects, and is unique in suggesting that men, too, have contraceptive responsibilities.

For those who missed Getting It On and are approaching motherhood, Barbara Chobockey's Gentle Birth (which like Gilly Coote's film was produced at the AFTVS), shows the birth of a child under the Le Boyer method. This method is intended to minimize the trauma for the baby, and the film, depicting a relatively easy delivery with beaming mum and docile child, elicits varying responses from women viewers: some are grateful for proof that labor and childbirth need not be crushingly painful for the mother, while others are adamant that since it might be, Gentle Birth is misleading.

Other depictions of sexuality offered by "Womenwaves" include Robyn Laurie and Margot Nash's erotic feminist pot-pouri We Aim to Please, a collage of doubts and assertions; and, conveying the life of a girl who doesn't make her own choices, Linda Blagg's Just Me and My Little Girlie which deals with father-daughter incest — his dominance of the teenager and her acquiescence to this extreme form of parental authority.

The remaining films span such diverse topics as contemporary dance (Dilys, Rosalind Gillespie), the depiction of women in rock music (Glenda Shaw's They Call Us Chickens) art (Sue Wilson's Boxes, Sarah Gibson's Ailsa — A Woman Sculptor) and the problems faced by women seeking higher education (Margot Oliver's Charlene Does Med at Uni, Sandra Alexander's Women Returning to Study).

Finally, lest anyone still thinks that "feminist" equals "dour", Jude Kuring and others parody the better known polemic in The Carolina Chisel Show, a loose amalgamation of cliches, political manoeuvres and music which has been curiously well received, considering that it has something to offend nearly every faction and tendency currently in vogue.

Inevitably, grouping 40 films together involves a degree of thematic repetition, but this, plus some intermittent technical sloppiness, especially in the sound department, is the most notable fault in the collection. Probably, given the purpose to which most of the films are directed, is a superficial one. The Sydney screenings were punctuated by two formal discussions which, while interesting, suggested that the audiences these films attract tend to be forgiving of technical faults, if not ideological ones.
During the following years, Bazin developed a theory of cinema. The new editor-in-chief was André Bazin, and, on Russian theories of montage.

Film realism to counteract the prevailing critical emphasis there were entire issues devoted to an analysis of various cinema as a valid art form, film journals began to appear in major European countries. In his manifesto, Bazin expounded his theories on the role of the ‘cinematic’ in the nature of the Hollywood film, and the establishment of a hierarchy of film directors on the model of Cahiers du Cinema.

Sarris also became editor of the Cahiers du Cinema in English which was published in New York from 1966-67, and included reprints of many earlier articles. In Cahiers du Cinéma, Bazin became known through the contributors to Movie in the 1962-63 series.

During the ’60s, Cahiers du Cinema concerned itself increasingly with structuralism, and as a result of the political events in Paris in May 1968, when revolutionary theories abounded, it made a complete break with its previous philosophy of film criticism.

The new policy was announced in an editorial in the October/November number of 1969, entitled “Cinema/Ideology/Criticism”. In a debate, Bazin castigated the contributors to The Cinema of Agar.

Cahiers du Cinema’s new stance was supported in short extracts from the dialogue of films, short articles, and interviews, reports of film events in France and overseas, directorial studies with filmographies, historical studies, reviews of new films with mini-interviews, lists of current releases and their critical reception, bibliographies, book reviews, reports from film festivals, notes of coming events, and film personalities from all countries, with an emphasis on French scripts.

The French monthly, L’avant-scene du Cinema, is a useful guide to the film scholar. It is not a critical journal in the usual sense, but a collection of descriptive material and articles of secondary nature. It is also a Theatre and Opera edition of this journal which publishes transcripts of stage scenes and photographs of actors and actresses in their stage costumes, with an emphasis on French scripts.

The scripts are generally accompanied by theme-related articles, and excellent illustrations. The journal also publishes a series, Anthologie du Cinema, with each number devoted to a film personality.

Cinema Francais, published by Unifrance Film, is glossy and expensive, and appears every month. The interviews and articles deal with current French productions and are well illustrated.

Apart from director interviews and reports on new actors and actresses, it also contains feature articles on producers and distributors, foreign imports. The notes on the economics of film are brief.

Cinema de France, on the other hand, is packed with industry statistics and production news. The economic strategies are well documented, and distribution in the various regions of France is carefully analyzed. The theatre designs (“la politique des complexes”) is also a concern of this distribution-oriented journal.

### ITALIAN

During the ’30s, in the era of Italian fascism, film journals were in the vanguard of the political activism. The most important was Cinema, a monthly which began publication in July 1936 under the editorship of Luciano de Feo.

In 1937, the Duce’s personal friend, Riccardo Muti, was appointed co-editor, but the journal did not become fascist, muti-far from it. In fact, it acquired an anti-fascist orientation, for political ferment went hand-in-hand with an aesthetic revolution.

Important among the young contributors to Cinema were...

### FRENCH

With continental Europe being the first to recognize cinema as a valid art form, film journals began to appear in major European countries. In his manifesto, Bazin expounded his theories on the role of the ‘cinematic’ in film art.

By 1926, the film journal La Revue du Cinema, which with many other film journals ceased publication with the Depression years of the early ’30s, is rarely found in Australian libraries. But this is not the case with the second series which began in October 1949 and continued until the death of editor Jean-Georges Auriol in 1950. These post-war numbers have much in common with the American journal Hollywood Quarterly (first published in 1945) in terms of scholarship and range.

La Revue du Cinema became Cahiers du Cinema in April 1951 and adopted an editorial policy favoring American cinema. The new editor-in-chief was Andre Bazin, and, during the following years, Bazin developed a theory of film realism to counteract the prevailing critical emphasis on Russian theories of montage.

The interest in theories relating to film criticism...
were Guiseppe de Santis, Luchino Visconti and the Italian school of Neo-Realism. Michelangelo Antonioni, who were later associated with Cinematografía, was set up in Rome in 1935 as an publishing Chiarini, the critic and film theorist who was responsible for the foundation of the Centro. Chiarini remained with Bianco a Nero until 1951, and in the following year founded the Rivista del cinema italiano. Bianco a Nero was a serious tone which makes it something of a counterpoint to Film Quarterly and Sound, and it carries lengthy, well-documented articles. The style of writing has been described as "indispensable (sic), baroque lascasage" (Letizia Miller), but this tendency to a florid, prolix style is characteristically Italian, and is equally present in journals of philosophy and art criticism. The journal has been traditionally conservative, but in a recent special issue (July/August 1973) it published reports and papers on Italian political cinema which had been presented at a confrontation of Italian film periodicals held in Bologna in December 1972. Early numbers of this journal (1933-43) became available in an Antologia di Bianco a nero which was published in four volumes in 1964. Filmcritica, first published in 1950, is a slim, film journal with short film reviews and analyses of current films, reports on Italian festivals, short interviews, extracts from scripts, and notes on film publications. It is frequently quoted by CTV: Cinema-Tv-Digest, of which this edition reviews. Filmcritica's Salome is fairly typical: "The corrosion of ritual takes on poetic form due to the awareness of the parallel and complementary dissolution of myth, exemplarily stated from the first sequence of the film...the anxiety for authenticity, negatively translated into the impossibility of a 'present' from the mythological universe, brings man to the deepest despair when his consciousness becomes flooded."

Many of the left-wing Italian film journals are less political. Cinema nuova, begun in 1952, is a respected leftist journal which also concerns itself with aesthetics and abstract philosophy, and is aimed at an intellectual audience. Cineforum, the journal of the Italian cineclubs, is published by the Federazione Italiana Cineforum, a non-commercial, Catholic-based organization with membership in northern Italy. It frequently publishes round-table discussions by film critics on topics such as "The New and Old in Hollywood Films" (February 1971). Cinema Sessanta (Cinema 60) is a bi-monthly with sociological interests ("Cinema in the School and University", "New Legislation and Cine city") that include industry reports and statistics, plus reviews of non-Italian films. Once or Rosa (Red Shadow) is a quarterly review which discusses films from a Marxist-Leninist and intellectual vantage point. It has featured articles on Argentine director Fernando Solanas ("Cinema as a Gun") translated and republished in Cinema, Autumn 1969), and on the Brazilian Cinema Nova. Cinema a cinema, which appeared in 1974, is a good mixture of film studies and interviews; the special number on the Italian cinema (September 1976) had material on Paolo Pasolini, Mario Monicelli, Franco Berioletti, Marco Ferreri, Elio Petri, Francesco Rossi, Dino Risi, Luigi Comencini, and others. Also included are studies on Russian intellectual productions and Italian film journos are Skop, which is published in The Hague, and Skrie, published in Amsterdam. Skop is a well-illustrated magazine with reviews, interviews, and discourses on film, which is distinguished by its concern with film history. The journal of the Norwegian Film Institute is Fant, a postcardial journal with a small circulation. Film a dobo (Film and the Epoch) is a Czech film journal with summaries in English, French and Russian. It features varied short articles and reviews, and concentrates on films from the Soviet sphere. Filmtkultura, the journal of the Hungarian Institute of Film Sciences which has summaries in English, Hungarian and Russian, contains in-depth articles. Ekran is a Yugoslav journal; it has articles, reviews and reports on producers, and film workers and directors are allowed to write about their current productions. The journal is a political and professional organ, which was suppressed by leftist and right-wing influence. There has been a full and useful discussion of Iskusstvo Kino in a 10-page article by Steven P. Hall, "Soviet Film Criticism", in Film Quarterly, Volume 14, No. 1, Fall 1960.
Still Lifes is a remarkable film. Through slow-motion and step-printing photography, it captures the beautiful movements of young dancers, at a ballet class and in open fields. Made on 16 mm and utilizing material previously shot on Standard 8 mm by its director Lisa Roberts, it succeeds in experimenting with movement and time in a more innovative way than, say, David Hamilton does in his short ballet film. At times, images resemble Marcel Duchamp and others, but it is the momentum of the cutting that impresses. Images click on, repeat, then disappear. The tone ranges from faint tinting to full color, and the superimpositions flicker in and out.

Lisa Roberts:
“I’m a painter more than a filmmaker, and it was that interest that led me to film — and partly explains why the film hasn’t a finished look. I simply wanted to see a series of images stretched out in time; yet the kinds of aesthetic and conceptual decisions made felt the same as in painting. Also, the subject matter (movement) had to be done on film.”
GUIDE FOR THE

AUSTRALIAN FILM PRODUCER: PART 9

MISCELLANEOUS AGREEMENTS

In this ninth part of a 19-part series, Cinema Papers contributing editor Antony I. Cinnane, and Melbourne solicitors Leon Gorr and Ian Baillieu discuss a miscellany of agreements which the producer will encounter during the course of production.

A. Location Release

Australian films tend to include more location shooting than those made by most other industries in the world. This is partly due to the lack of studio facilities within the country. In filming on location, the cooperation of owners or occupiers of premises hired or otherwise provided is vital. To forestall later problems, the producer should ensure his agreement gives him the following rights:

(i) to represent the premises by its own name or a fictional name;
(ii) to move in and out equipment and personnel and to build sets;
(iii) to present the filmed material in the completed film and to precede it and follow it with other filmed material; and
(iv) ownership of any still photographs taken during the filming;
(v) the right to bring (and if appropriate charge a fee for) spectators onto the premises to view the filming.

The owner of the premises, or his legal representative, will warrant that he has full legal rights to contract with the producer to indemnify him against any proceedings for liability or loss due to personal injury, (and/or death) omission or default of the producer.

In some instances, the owner may require the producer to provide evidence of his public liability insurance, or even to have the owner/occupier included on the policy as a named insured. Alternatively, the owner may require some security bond to be provided as a guarantee that the premises will be cleaned up or repaired after the filming.

B. Film Stills

Some problems arise in this area. Firstly, it might be wise for the producer to endeavor to obtain releases from any non-contracted persons who appear in publicity stills taken by the unit photographer in the event the producer's publicist proposes to have them published.

Secondly, the unit publicist will frequently invite journalists and photographers, as well as television cameramen, onto the set or location for promotional purposes.

It is important that any reporter who attends, and who uses film not supplied by the publicist, sign a photo-release which vests copyright in any photographic material featuring the film's personnel in the production company. This is particularly important if any of the film's actors are potentially merchandizable by way of posters. T-shirts and the like, as certain less reputable publications have been known to produce unlicensed posters, etc., which will put the producer in breach of any merchandizing agreement of the producer or the star.

The release form gives to the publication for which the journalist works a limited licence to use the photographic material in its pages, but not for any commercial gain.

C. Equipment Hire

There are a number of specialist film equipment hire companies in Melbourne and Sydney. The larger of these organizations generally have fairly standard hire conditions which they will not deviate from.

Generally, the producer will be given the option of accepting an insurance cover on the equipment provided by the hirer, or providing evidence of his own insurance cover.

Frequently, the producer will be able to better the rate offered by the equipment hire company under his total film insurance buy.

The equipment hire company's terms are generally fairly onerous and heavily weighted in favor of the renter. For example, the hirer is not entitled, without consent of the renter, to use camera equipment in a privately hired plane. The hirer will frequently claim that any equipment hired is in good condition when it leaves the renter's premises.

If the equipment is transported to the hirer's location by air, the onus is on the renter to establish that any malfunction or damage to the hired equipment took place during transportation.

The hirer's only power is his market place strength, and as most local film producers work on a one-off basis, this is not very strong.

D. Studio Rentals

In the U.S., the major distribution-production entities have their own studios in Hollywood and if they are involved in the financing of the production via a production-distribution agreement — or via other methods previously described — they will want any interior work on the production to be put through their facility. This enables them to provide work for their facility and in some instances to charge a "production overhead".

This is a variable percentage, often around 10 per cent, which is added to every bill the studio complex renders and is budgeted into the production. It is charged on top of the actual cost of studio facilities. Depending on their strength in the market place, the major studios increase or decrease their overhead from time to time, and in some instances remove it altogether.

In Australian studios and most non-U.S. facilities, the producer can structure a deal with an independent facility to meet his particular requirements. Generally, he can make use of some, or all, of the equipment or facilities the studio has to offer, or he can bring in his own gear and personnel.

The studio hire rate will generally vary between time actually spent filming and time spent constructing and striking (i.e., breaking down and removing) the necessary sets. Frequently, the construction and striking rate will be around 50 per cent of the filming rate.

Generally, Australian studios do not have a set hiring agreement, and rely on an exchange of letters. It is important for the producer to provide:

(i) that he can have access to the studio for a guaranteed period over and above his contracted period, if he gives notice by a certain time. (This protects him against scheduling delays);
(ii) that he can have access to it 24 hours a day with provisions for parking, etc.;
(iii) the question of power bills, phone access and billing, etc. need to be settled;
(iv) in a large multi-stage complex the producer will need to be protected from noise and interference from other productions;
(v) the extent of insurance cover (if any) the studio requires;

Concluded on P. 383

All the topics covered in this part are covered in more detail in the "Australian Film Producer and Investors Guide" and that as from this issue, no precedents or forms will be printed in Cinema Papers as part of the "Guide for the Australian Film Producer". See notice at right.
The Australian Film Producers and Investors Guide is now in production and mailings have commenced.

An updated and improved version of the continuing series of Cinema Papers articles entitled "Guide for The Australian Film Producer", the new Australian Film Producers and Investors Guide is available as a loose leaf, hardcover, regularly expanding and updating subscription service.

The Australian Film Producers and Investors Guide will be an invaluable aid to all those involved in film business, including the producer trying to set up his first film, the investor contemplating financial participation in a production, the writer about to sell his first script; the lawyer, accountant or distribution executive who finds himself confronted with new problems as the local production industry grows. A chapter dealing with the foreign producer in Australia will also be included.

Prospective subscribers should note that in most instances subscriptions to the Guide are tax deductible. The authors of the Service, all practitioners with experience in this field, will also draw on a number of specialist contributors. The combined information will provide, for the first time, a comprehensive reference work on the subject of film financing, production, distribution and exhibition in Australia. Set out below is an abbreviated table of the proposed contents of the Service that subscribers will eventually have at their disposal. This material will be progressively made available to subscribers by mailings at regular intervals. It is envisaged that all chapters will be substantially completed by June 1981, after which the contents will be updated when necessary.

**FINANCING A FILM, INVESTING IN A FILM**

**PRODUCTION**

**LEGISLATION**

**SUBSCRIPTION SERVICE**

**ORDER FORM**

Please record my order to The Australian Film Producers and Investors Guide. My cheque for $150, payable to Cinema Papers Pty Ltd is enclosed.

Name:

Address:

Postcode:

To: The Australian Film Producers and Investors Guide, 143 Therry Street, Melbourne Victoria 3000 Australia.
## Box-Office Grosses

### THIS QUARTER

#### 30.10.77 to 25.2.78

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>Distributor</th>
<th>SYD.</th>
<th>MLB.</th>
<th>PTH.</th>
<th>ADL.</th>
<th>BRI.</th>
<th>Total $</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Weeks in Release</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Last Wave</td>
<td>UA</td>
<td>238,602</td>
<td>183,606</td>
<td>45,388</td>
<td>103,535</td>
<td></td>
<td>571,133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Boy</td>
<td>SAFC/RS</td>
<td>71,516</td>
<td>98,149</td>
<td>183,289</td>
<td>21,002</td>
<td>9,191</td>
<td>473,147</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mango Tree</td>
<td>GUO</td>
<td>116,861</td>
<td>127,713</td>
<td>16,137</td>
<td>22,074</td>
<td>71,692</td>
<td>354,477</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Getting of Wisdom</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>107,580</td>
<td>135,740</td>
<td>105,584</td>
<td>9,874</td>
<td></td>
<td>371,575</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerfield</td>
<td>GUO</td>
<td>103,299</td>
<td>66,297</td>
<td>20,104</td>
<td>32,593</td>
<td></td>
<td>262,812</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abba — the Movie</td>
<td>FW</td>
<td>61,596</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>70,600</td>
<td>44,051</td>
<td></td>
<td>187,688</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Fire Lady</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>49,801</td>
<td>16,378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84,171</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don's Party</td>
<td>GUO</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>49,801</td>
<td>16,378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86,179</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey Among Women</td>
<td>GUO</td>
<td>6,035</td>
<td>17,225</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>18,208</td>
<td></td>
<td>41,171</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic at Hanging Rock</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>33,169</td>
<td>13,735</td>
<td>4,078</td>
<td>7,444</td>
<td></td>
<td>58,426</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Picture Show Man</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>6,578</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8,398</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,976</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer City</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside Looking Out</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LAST QUARTER

#### 2.7.77 to 29.10.77

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>Distributor</th>
<th>SYD.</th>
<th>MLB.</th>
<th>PTH.</th>
<th>ADL.</th>
<th>BRI.</th>
<th>Total $</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Weeks in Release</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Last Wave</td>
<td>UA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>571,133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Boy</td>
<td>SAFC/RS</td>
<td>278,528</td>
<td>388,941</td>
<td>19,926</td>
<td>70,289</td>
<td>77,953</td>
<td>1,308,784</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mango Tree</td>
<td>GUO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>354,477</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Getting of Wisdom</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>150,687</td>
<td>210,314</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,238</td>
<td></td>
<td>777,794</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerfield</td>
<td>GUO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>330,729</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abba — the Movie</td>
<td>FW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210,102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Fire Lady</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84,171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don's Party</td>
<td>GUO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210,102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey Among Women</td>
<td>GUO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>191,325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic at Hanging Rock</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>220,437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Picture Show Man</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>194,093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer City</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside Looking Out</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Australian Total

|                  | Total       | 745,236 | 692,268 | 554,127 | 243,496 | 250,925 | 2,486,052 | 776,718 | 951,351 | 258,880 | 178,750 | 252,966 |

### Foreign Total

|                  | Total       | 5,000,562 | 3,930,126 | 2,111,821 | 1,274,601 | 1,293,811 | 1,434,952 | 3,605,126 | 3,763,382 | 1,041,750 | 967,606 | 1,690,918 |

### Grand Total

|                  | Total       | 5,745,798 | 4,622,394 | 2,655,948 | 1,518,097 | 1,544,536 | 16,996,773 | 13,610,721 | 2,828,408 | 1,041,750 | 967,606 | 1,690,918 |

---

1. Box-office grosses of individual films have been supplied to Cinema Papers by the Australian Film Commission.
2. This figure represents the total box-office gross of all foreign films shown during the period in the area specified.
4. Releasing into next period.
Geoff Burton talks about photographing “Storm Boy.”
“From the beginning I knew what I wanted. To capture the calm before the storm. The wild, untamed...and the gentle. The warmth...and the cold, harsh reality.”

Geoff Burton. Winner 1977 Penguin Award for Best Cinematography.

“Storm Boy”... shot on EASTMAN Color Negative film 5247.

Photograph by courtesy of David Kynoch.
Geoff Burton, Director of photography "Storm Boy."

"Storm Boy... first there was the book, with magnificent illustrations by Robert Ingpen. I loved his ink line drawings with their pastel colour washes. They were oil so evocative of the awesome and majestic wilderness area — yet incredibly romantic, in keeping with the story of a boy and his pelican companion.

So when the opportunity came for me to shoot the feature, I knew I wanted my pictures to look like his pictures. And I was absolutely delighted — though not surprised when Art Director, David Copping was just as impressed with Ingpen's work.

These drawings become the basis for our thinking. Photographically, we felt we needed to wash out the strong colours, reduce the overall contrast, generally and carefully control the density to achieve the time/weather progress throughout the film, building up to the final storm sequence. But I wanted more than that. I wanted the interiors to be warm and comfortable to contrast with the cold, threatening weather raging outside.

What I was doing most of the time was "down grading" the photographic image with the use of heavy filters, minimal light and extremes of colour temperature. To do that I had to start with three essential elements. And those three elements had to be of a quality and reliability I knew I could count on under extreme filming conditions.

The work the lab did speaks for itself, as does the excellent quality of the high-speed Zeiss Lens I used. What's not so obvious, is the third of these elements — the Kodak 5247 stock. But then film stock isn't meant to be noticed, it's just there doing its job letting you push it around as much as you dare.

I like to "use" the negative a lot. Work it to its extremes to produce a particular look or effect. It's just what I do. The Kodak 5247 stock was absolutely perfect for this style of shooting. In fact, I just couldn't imagine how I could have photographed "Storm Boy" on anything other than Kodak 5247."

KODAK (Australasia) Pty. Ltd.

EASTMAN Color Negative film

5247. An excellent, sensitive film.

KODAK (Australasia) Pty. Ltd.
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“Dawn!” is the personal life story of Dawn Fraser, the world's greatest ever woman swimmer.

Produced by Joy Cavill and directed by Ken Hannam, the film has been shot in a wide range of locations from Tokyo, Japan, to a Balmain pub; from the Melbourne Olympic Pool to the palm groves of Townsville.

Budgeted at $764,000, the film is now in post-production.

**PRODUCTION REPORT**
Joy Cavill has been involved in the film and television industry, in Australia and overseas, for 25 years. She produced two feature films before “Dawn!” — “The Nickel Queen” and “The Intruders” — and worked on several television series, including “Skippy”. Cavill’s writing experience is equally extensive.

With “Dawn!”, Cavill is handling a subject of great personal interest, and one she filmed before in a documentary made in 1964. This was at the time of Dawn Fraser’s car accident which badly damaged her neck. The press was sceptical that she would ever race again — but she did. And in that dramatic 100 m freestyle final at the Tokyo Olympics, Dawn Fraser achieved the “impossible” — her third gold medal.

In the following interview, conducted by Peter Beilby and Scott Murray, Cavill discusses working with director Ken Hannam, the story behind the film’s production, financing and marketing; she begins with the screenplay.

Joy Cavill
PRODUCER/WRITER

THE SCRIPT

To tell Dawn’s complete story would have taken six hours, so one of the hardest decisions was to nominate the most interesting period of her life. I selected the years 1955 to 1970. I believe this period tells in the most colorful and dramatic way the story of the individual. Perhaps bigger things happened to her before and after, but during this period she went through important changes as a person.

What balance did you strike between her life and sport?

I didn’t want to make a sporting film, I wanted to make the story of the individual; that she was a champion swimmer was of secondary importance.

As a producer, I could see the production value of the Olympic Games as the background, yet I was really only interested in that person as a character. This was one of the hardest things I had to overcome in raising finance, because every time I mentioned the name Dawn Fraser, people said sporting films were death at the box-office; that is one of the reasons why it took nearly three years to get the film off the ground.

Since Rocky, things have changed and everybody now wants to make the personal life story of a sporting champion. So, I think the timing has been good.

“Rocky”, however, does strike a balance between sports footage and personal drama. Can you afford to make a film about a sporting personality without a reasonable amount of sport in it?

My marketing sense said there had to be some sporting events, so I chose the ones I thought most interesting. Obviously her first gold medal at the 1956 Olympics was one, because it changed her whole life and opened up the world to her. I also included the Tokyo Games because that was where her swimming ended and her life changed again; suddenly, after years at being met at airports by reporters, it all cut out.

In between these two Olympics, I selected a few sporting events that had nothing really to do with her triumphs but with her personality, her behavior before and after races. So there is sport in Dawn!, and it is important. But it takes second place to the story of Dawn Fraser, the individual.

The high point of Dawn’s career was 1964. Since this occurs two-thirds the way through the film, don’t you run the risk of ending on an anti-climax?

No, I don’t agree. Up till 1964, Dawn’s whole world was swimming: suddenly, that world comes to a stop. She left school at 13 with very little education and her only qualifications are that she is the greatest swimmer in the world. That is what makes the last part of the film so interesting.

Then, it isn’t a down-beat ending . . .

No, anything but that.

THE FINANCE

When did you begin approaching potential backers?

I had just finished the first draft when I went to Adelaide to temporarily replace John Morris — he was sick — as head of production at the South Australian Film Corporation. I was there four months. When John came back he asked me if I would like to stay on and work for the corporation. I turned down the offer and said I had a script I wanted to produce. John read it and was very excited. He then offered to put up part of the finance: at that stage, $250,000.

On the basis of this SAFC money, I applied to the Australian Film Commission which subsequently put in $250,000. ATN, the Channel Seven Network, came in with most of the balance.

Did you have a director and key creative personnel when you talked with John Morris?

No, only the script.

And the AFC?

I had not finalized anything with Ken Hannam, but I did say he would probably be directing it. I had to be very honest with the AFC and told them they wouldn’t have any star names because it was becoming obvious we weren’t going to be able to find an established actress to play the role.

I think one of the main reasons the AFC committed themselves to the film in the early stages was my past record in the business. I have been making films for 25 years, here and overseas, and I believe I have a reputation for integrity, and for bringing projects in on budget. I feel they trusted me, despite having a loose package. I appreciated their confidence.

Did the SAFC request a production role in “Dawn!”, or were they merely investors?

They are basically straight investors, but have a credit as co-producers. The contractual billing is “Aquataurus Productions in association with the South Australian Film Corporation.” The SAFC put up the first money and handled the initial financing. Jill Robb was then at the SAFC and she was responsible for getting the ATN investment.

Other than that, they have not interfered. I think they feel, as I do, that it is a very personal film, and therefore better if I handled it individually. The SAFC and the AFC granted me complete and final creative control on the film.

The SAFC’s next major role, which will be a very important one, is in the promotion and marketing because that is the area in which I don’t profess any expertise. They, however, have chalked up some excellent results with their productions.

Was your deal with the AFC the
standard 70/30 split with the production company?

That is the sort of figure.

Is that also the deal you have with the SAFC and the Seven Network?

As far as the investors are concerned, their equity in the film is in relation to how much they put in. But there are the investors and the producers, and the producers are Aquataurus and the SAFC.

So the SAFC is getting a bit both ways . . .

They are, but then they are entitled to it. I appreciate there has been some criticism of this, but investors and producers are two different things and I think if someone is prepared to put up money as an investor, they are entitled to get their equity as an investor. Similarly, if they come in as a producer, they are entitled to their equity as one.

Is the Channel Seven deal an advance against a network sale, or an investment?

Both; they have a large investment plus they have purchased the television rights.

What is the hold-over period?

Three years.

Did the SAFC request you shoot in South Australia or employ a number of South Australian personnel?

They did ask us to do some shooting in South Australia. One of the main locations in the script was a pub in Balmain, NSW.

You can't easily shoot in city pubs because of the lost trade, noise, and so on. So we decided to make the pub a set, and this was built in South Australia at the Norwood Studios. Ross Major designed it.

Apart from the pub, we also did a number of location sequences in Adelaide, and were there for 10 days.

As for crew, I was asked to use as many people from South Australia as I could. That wasn't a problem; South Australian technicians are very good.

Shooting in a studio in Adelaide must have been more expensive than in Sydney . . .

It was, but I felt I had a commitment to do some shooting in South Australia. At the same time, the construction people did a magnificent job, and the set was faithfully reproduced. I can't say I regret the decision.

You have also shot in many different locations . . .

Yes. In one scene, for instance, Dawn meets her future husband in Townsville. There was some criticism of my shooting there, but I maintain that Dawn meeting Gary in Townsville created a different relationship than meeting him in Sydney. A number of people said it was ridiculous and that I should twist the story a bit and have them meet in Sydney. After all, people overseas, and here for that matter, aren't going to know where they met.

But I can assure you that Dawn meeting John Diedrich in the tropical setting of Townsville, with this Hawaiian shirt and 1964 pink Cadillac, creates an atmosphere that could not have been captured in Sydney. It is not a very long sequence, but it was worth every penny in the final analysis.

These are the sorts of decisions you have to make, despite the criticisms, because some people are inclined only to add up the dollars and don't see the value on the screen.

Australian films that have been logistically complex, like "Mad Dog Morgan" and "Jimmie Blacksmith", have gone drastically over-budget in the travel and transport area. How did you cope?

I didn't find any problems, but maybe that is because I have known Ken Hannam for a long time and worked with him before. I know this producer/writer role can be very restricting on a director and I discussed this with Ken before he took on the film.

I told him I would be on the set every day because, as a producer, I have to make sure that the vision style of shooting, and I pointed it out to him. He acknowledged it, thanked me and corrected it. I also sent him back to re-shoot some sequences because I wasn't happy with them — he was only too anxious to carry them out, being a very conscientious director.

So, I don't mean that once we started shooting, we just stopped back and had no interest — I followed it very closely.

Did you ever feel the need to be more objective, where your involvement as a writer conflicted with your role as producer?

I was always aware of it, but I think I coped. At the moment, the film is too long and some sequences have to be cut. So I have the struggle within myself of knowing that to keep the pace I will have to cut one of my favorite scenes. That is very hard, but deep down I am a producer first and a writer second.

Did you ever consider directing the film yourself?

It was strongly suggested by the AFC, the SAFC and several other people that I direct the film; I was very tempted, because if there was any film I could have directed, this would have been the one. Every shot was in my mind and I had lived with it for so long.

But that is the very reason you need somebody else to come in and bring their talents. I felt that between the writer and producer I needed a director, and I still believe that was the right decision.

Concluded on P. 347

---

WORKING WITH A DIRECTOR

There has been some criticism made of producers being writers. How do you react to that attitude?

I never tried to inhibit Ken when he was directing. In the U.S., for example, producers are gaining more control because they are no longer Wall Street money men but creative people who have the final responsibility for the overall film. A producer is also the only person who is really aware of all the problems and facets of a particular film.

I think directors need producers as a sounding board because — and I should be the last to say this — they can tend to get too close to a project. No one could be closer to a film than I am on Dawn! But I am also aware that when you employ a number of people for their creative talents, you have to let them have their freedom. I gave Ken complete rein, in that he could direct the script the way he wanted to; that was where he put his creative talent.

I let him edit the film to that direction, in collaboration with the editor, Max Lemon. It was only then that I looked at the film. I had been away for several weeks, so I think I returned with a fresh approach.

A film can only be cut according to the way it was shot. If you don't influence the shooting, how can you influence the editing?

That is not strictly true. A film can be edited in a number of ways, irrespective of how it was shot. A director who chooses a film which can be cut one way is dictating to the editor and thereby depriving him of his contribution. As a producer, I am strongly opposed to this limiting of talent.

As far as the shooting is concerned, I looked at the rushes and daily discussed them with the director. If I felt that a particular artist needed a little more care, I would say so.

At one stage, I felt Ken was unconsciously slipping into a television style of shooting, and I pointed it out to him. He acknowledged it, thanked me and corrected it. I also sent him back to re-shoot some sequences because I wasn't happy with them — he was only too anxious to carry them out, being a very conscientious director.

So, I don't mean that once we started shooting, we just stopped back and had no interest — I followed it very closely.
"Dawn!" is director Ken Hannam's fourth feature. After a successful career in television where he directed episodes for several series, including "Z Cars", Hannam returned to Australia to make "Sunday Too Far Away" in 1975. Critically acclaimed worldwide, "Sunday" was the first Australian film to be shown in the Director's Fortnight at the Cannes Film Festival.

In 1976 Hannam directed "Break of Day", a period love story written by Cliff Green. This was followed in 1977 by "Summerfield", also for producer Patricia Lovell. Scripted by Green, "Summerfield" has been the centre of a controversy in the film industry over the relationship between writers and directors, and the quality of Australian writing.

In the following interview, conducted by Scott Murray and Peter Beilby, Hannam discusses his attitudes to scripts and screenwriters, the problems of shooting a logistically complex film like "Dawn!", the role of the producer/writer in the Australian situation, and, finally, his previous three features.

**Did you contribute much to the screenplay?**

No, by the time I became involved, the script was pretty well finalized. There were a few things I felt needed attention, and Joy and I worked on them. We made a lot of minor changes.

**Was the film already financed?**

Yes. I was still working on Summerfield, and in fact Dawn! should have gone earlier had not Joy kindly waited for me. As it was, we were lucky and got only a very mild winter; otherwise, we might have been in a lot of trouble with the weather.

**One criticism you have made of Australian producers is that they often go ahead with scripts that aren't quite ready...**

A film cannot be a time and motion exercise, but in Australia they have become that. Instead, writers should be encouraged to keep working on a script until it is perfect.

If we are going to make important films - films that say important things - then we will have to work hard, often doing things we won't be paid for. And that's how it should be.

**Whose responsibility is it to decide whether a script is ready?**

A director shouldn't work with a script until he is sure it is right. However, there are many pressures put on a producer in this area. For instance, money is made available by government bodies and distributors for a limited period, and if the film doesn't get into at least pre-production in that time, it will be taken back. The producer is, therefore, often obliged to go ahead with a film that is not ready.

**This situation is possibly connected with producers raising money on first drafts...**

I agree, and that situation should change. Hopefully, a producer will also involve a director in finalizing the script before proceeding.

I think the problem could be due to misplaced benevolence by the funding bodies, which, knowing that producers don't get a fair return on the work they put in, keep backing new projects. The solution, therefore, is in making the producer's return such that he or she is not forced to rush into a new film. The same goes for writers: if they were paid more, one could expect them to spend more time on a script.

**How does one go about assessing a screenplay?**

It is very difficult. However, there is a tendency to assess scripts on the way they are written, and not on what they say; if a script reads as beautiful prose, it has a greater chance of getting money. There has been too much emphasis on presentation, though this situation seems to be changing.

**Ideally, who should assess scripts for the funding bodies?**

I don't know, but it is a shame if it falls into the hands of failed or bitter people, whether they are writers or not. I have similar feelings about directors assessing the work of other directors for the Australian Film Institute awards. It is very difficult to get a neutral panel, one that is informed and has a feel for commercial and dramatic potential.

**You implied earlier that Australian films fail to make strong statements. Why is this so?**

It doesn't matter whether you are making a skin-flick or an epic, the films that really mean something are those that show a passion in their making. It's not a question of social or political statements; if you have a burning desire to make a statement, it will come across.

**Take The Devil's Playground: this was Fred Schepisi's story and it had to be told. What comes over on the screen is the compassion and passion with which he tells it. Take also Peter Weir's rapid development between Picnic at Hanging Rock and The Last Wave; this was because he became his own man, and made his own statements.**

In Australia, we are at the stage of making films as if playing with new toys. Sure you have to go through that process, but we have reached the stage where we should have a pretty good reason for doing a film — otherwise, we shouldn't do it.

**Did you consider "Dawn!" a worthwhile script?**

Yes. Dawn is a living person: she is not someone we can escape; she is not a piece of history. The script makes no effort to white-wash her; it tells the other side of her story. People may not be shocked, but they will be surprised.

**"Dawn!" is a different type of film for you, in that it involves a lot of sport and action. Did you have any reservations about this?**

No. I like action films and I have done a considerable amount of action material on television. Certainly there is action in Dawn!, but I think you will be surprised by how little swimming there is.

**What generally interests me about films is the relationships between people. I am not a director on a vast landscape; such things interest me in other people's work, but not in my own.**

I think the main reason I was attracted to Break of Day, for example, was that I had been in television for a while and felt I had lost my cinema eye. Television is all close-up, and visually different to cinema.

**Break of Day** called on me to do two things: to work very...
Logistically, “Dawn!” must have been a nightmare with all its locations... I was greatly helped by our production department; I felt they were too tough when I was filming, but they had every right to be. During the last four weeks we were doing four minutes a day and still not up to schedule. It was an underscheduled film, and we were very lucky that the weather was as good as it was.

How closely were you involved in planning the schedule?

Well, you fight as much as you can. I have always worked with Mark Egerton as my first, except on Sunday Too Far Away, and he is remarkably good. He organized the schedule with the production manager, though we all talked about it and visited locations. I gave him my feelings, how long I felt a scene would take to shoot, then left him to it.

You tend to live in a fool’s paradise: you know damned well that it’s not going to be easy, but you con yourself into thinking you can do it. Sometimes it falls apart, but generally it keeps together.

When do you prepare your shooting script?

As soon as I can. I also like to go to a location as early as possible and just wander around, getting to know the feel of the landscape.

Did you have this time on “Summerfield”, which had an island location?

I had about a fortnight there, and the art department was based on the island. Mike Molloy came out from Britain to shoot the film three weeks before we started, and that was a luxury on an Australian film. But it’s no use bringing out a director of photography six weeks before the shooting if he and the director don’t have something to say to each other. So the first thing we have to do is to get to know one another better; once that is done we can be more honest and direct.

A person shouldn’t be afraid to say, “Excuse me, but I think you are misdirecting this scene.” I may chuck away what he suggests, but he ought to say it.

How far can such a collaborative approach go?

It’s difficult to judge. One doesn’t always have the time to make films as a communal effort, and I don’t think there is all that much to be gained, anyway. Somebody has to make the statement, and it should be the director on behalf of the writer and producer. Otherwise, there is a danger of the statement becoming grey.

That is part of the problem with the documentaries made here. A good documentary must have a degree of bias. If I don’t like you, and I am making a film about you, then I am entitled to let my feelings seep through. Somebody else can then make a film attacking me, if they like.

In Australia, there is a habit of following a bad remark with something nice, and all you end up with is a grey mass in which you have made a lot of statements, and said nothing.

Actually, I believe one of the reasons Joy wanted me to do this film was because she wanted strong statements — but nothing maudlin or over-emphasized. At the same time, the last thing she wanted was a documentary. The film is about Dawn, and at no time during her life does she stop and look back; she always plunges forward. That is part of her magic, part of why she survived so long as a champion.

The approach I therefore employed was to try and get inside her character.

THE SHOOTING

How did you handle the swimming sequences?

There are three swimming events. The first, the 1956 games, was easy because the Melbourne Olympic pool was still there. We opened this scene out in a big way, and managed to make some hundreds of people look like thousands by moving them around. It is very expansive and exciting.

We don’t cover Dawn’s swim at the Rome Olympics, but there is a sequence at the Fina carnival in Naples where she was forced to participate in an exhibition race. The third event is the Tokyo race. We filmed this as a swimmer would feel, see and hear it. To do this, John Seale (the operator) and Ross Erikson (the grip) spent several days developing a periscopic device for the camera, which enabled us to film under water without having to submerge the camera.

The scene starts with the girls above water, follows them as they dive in and then tracks along under water behind them. It is so good, in fact, that it is a bit of an anticlimax; you sit and think. “Oh yes, now we are under water.”

In leaving out important events, such as the Rome swim, are you running the risk of disappointing audience expectation?

No, I think Joy has been pretty cunning. Joy feels that if anything is going to attract people, it is a personal story about Dawn; the

Coach Harry Gallagher (Tom Richards) prepares Dawn (Bronwyn Mackay-Payne) for a race after a bout of illness.

Director of Photography Russell Boyd lines up the special rig designed by John Seale and Ross Erikson for shooting under water.
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swimming is something people already know about. So, although we don't cover the Rome swim, we cover other aspects of her trip there.

What about the other characters?

The character I am most fond of is Gary, Dawn's husband. It was very bold of him to allow us to tell his story; and though he starts as a sort of villain, in the scene where he leaves Dawn, he shows a real honesty. It is something all of us have at some stage wanted to do, but not had enough strength.

Len, the man who comes into her life later on, emerges as a somebody who is attracted to her but suddenly frightened by the intensity of her feelings. We never know whether he is seizing an opportunity to get out of the relationship, or whether what he says is true.

MARKETING

How do you feel about the way your previous films have been marketed?

Marketing is the area that has still to come of age. It is strange that many distributors are willing to invest in films, but are hard put to know what to do with them once they are finished.

If people suspect a film is going to be hard to sell, they should put it out and avoid the situation where films have been thrown into the market place with a helpless shrug of the shoulders. No wonder they often disappear without trace.

Dawn! is a very commercial film and should appeal to a wide age range. What Joy and Hoyts have in mind is to run separate campaigns geared towards various facets of an audience. It is going to be very interesting to see if they pull it off — I am sure they will.

SUMMERFIELD and BREAK OF DAY

"Summerfield" and "Break of Day" don't always indicate the passion you talked of earlier. Was that because the films needed to be low key?

I think Cliff was brave with "Break of Day"; what he did was very interesting, but perhaps he underestimated it. It is a funny thing about Cliff's writing, but his heroes and heroines don't have anything to say, while his subsidiary characters never stop talking.

What I admire enormously in "Break of Day" — which, incidentally, I think is my best film — is Sarah Kestelman's performance. Her role was a very difficult one because she had no more than 60 or 70 lines, and most of those were "Thank you", "Goodbye" and "Pleased to meet you".

Yet her character is supposed to be terribly liberated, have a marvellous sense of humor and be very sophisticated. She says nothing to indicate any of these things and nor does anyone else till her friends arrive — and even they don't say much.

Cliff also left the bohemian group for us to develop. What I imagined was that she had had an affair with John Bell, but left the commune when she found the group so influencing her work that she was no longer sure of its value.

Her move to the town was a transitory experience, and she was selfish enough to imagine that he would feel the same — but he was not used to meeting people like her. So, when she found the key to her painting, with his help, she was happy to move on. I don't think she saw her action as selfish.

What people miss about "Break of Day", and perhaps this is because we didn't do it well enough, is that it is about confrontation. It doesn't matter whether the audience wants the two women to confront one another; they can't — because of the period, the place and the circumstances in which they live. So it's got to be bloody low key, doesn't it?

Yet, an audience may ask if this lack of confrontation is deliberate or whether there should be something happening that isn't . . .

Yes; we were all aiming at something that didn't quite come off. I don't know where we went wrong, but it did need a bigger energy flow, and a flow that was generated by action and dialogue.

Did that experience modify your approach to "Summerfield"?

Summerfield is a film that interested me greatly. The problem was that the script wasn't quite ready — it should have had six months more work on it. However, Pat Lovell (the producer) was in a position where she had to go; the people funding the film thought the script was very good and wanted her to start. Again, probably because of my ego, I thought it might be able to strengthen the things I felt were weak. I don't think I was able to, but it was a good learning experience — for me at least.

I am always glad when audiences enjoy Summerfield. I think the actors, indeed everybody connected with the film, put in a tremendous amount of devotion and love.

"Summerfield" is probably the most consistently acted of the recent Australian features. John Waters' performance, in particular, is excellent . . .

And Nick Tate, who had a thankless part. Simon is a very ordinary person, not particularly good at anything, who blunders into a situation and makes a great cock-up of it.

John's part was easier, and very nicely tailored for him — and he did it extremely well. Nick and Elizabeth Alexander, however, had very difficult roles and they worked like demons to achieve what they did.

"Summerfield" is a film that sharply divides audiences; "Break of Day" doesn't . . .

That's true. The most disappointing thing about Break of Day is that it can be said to have made no impact at all.

When talking about Summerfield, I must point out I am not attacking anyone but myself. If I felt the script needed more work, I should have said so. Then it would have been up to the producer and writer to agree with me, or choose someone else.

Many critics have found the ending of "Summerfield" unrealistic. The Abbotts are obviously very wealthy and could have moved interstate overseas to protect their name . . .

I suppose the ending is a device. In fact, it was not the way Cliff had written it, although I heard Cliff agreed with what I did.

In the original, after Nick had returned to the island and seen through the window, John rushed out, shooting madly into the night. Now, I don't think a man who was so gentle and meek as he could suddenly become a mad killer.

If the ending was going to work, I felt we had to convince the audience his act was purely momentary. If he stopped and thought about it for another 10 minutes, things may have been different.

Finally, given your feelings about scripts, do you have plans to find a subject and develop it yourself?

I have two projects I want to work on, and if I am strong enough, that's what I'll do. If I do another film, it will be because I really want to do it. ★
How would you define your role on the film?

A production designer should co-ordinate the look of a film. But on many Australian films, one is the art director as well. This means you are designing and supervising.

Ideally, you should have a separate art director whom you brief, just as you do the wardrobe or make-up people.

The designer also has the responsibility of viewing the film from beginning to end and you can assist the look and flow of a film greatly by keeping your backgrounds fairly even.

On Dawn!, I tried to simplify a lot of these backgrounds into plain areas of color, and on locations I tried to paint everything I could. This way I could keep the background moving at an even pace instead of jumping.

We see Dawn’s house, for example, over a period of 15 years; so by grading the colors, I subtly altered the background without it ever being obtrusive. When you cut back to a house, people have to recognize it at once, otherwise they get lost.

I guess you could call this a simplifying process.

Did you also control moving colors, such as costumes or cars?

Not as much. A lot of the clothes were, of necessity, certain colors — uniforms and so on. What I tried to do was put them against a background that didn’t clash.

The wardrobe created the period more than my backgrounds because I used very few true 1950s interiors. Dawn’s parents, for instance, had lived in their house for many years, so it looked more 1920s or 1930s. There was the odd 1950s furnishings, like new curtains, but the period comes from the hair and wardrobe.

In terms of color, I found the 1950s a particularly unco-ordinated time and, anyway, I don’t like too strong a design for a background. It becomes a little twee if you start matching scarves to wall colors, and that kind of thing. So long as something didn’t clash violently, I didn’t change it.

Did you use foreground color as a way of isolating something within the frame: Dawn, for example, in a crowded games stadium?

Lighting is a help in those sorts of situations. But Dawn was the biggest help, because in Rome she insisted on wearing a white track suit, which was contrary to regulations. She is an attention-getting lady — I don’t mean that unkindly — and she often placed herself in such situations. Apart from that, we did watch colors in track suits and so on, and made sure hers stood out.

**PRE-PRODUCTION**

When did Joy Cavill approach you about becoming production designer?

Twelve weeks before filming. Then, with about eight weeks to go, I started on the pre-production.

In retrospect, I don’t think this was long enough because I didn’t have time for the kind of supervision I would have liked.

For example, Judith Dorsman had more or less started on the wardrobe when I came along, and though we worked very happily together, I might have taken a slightly different view of it had I had more time.

If most of the key personnel could start a little earlier, you would save time and money. You could also, for example, find new solutions to location problems — like filming more on shooting stages.

Did Cavill define a look for the film?

In a way, but it was more a question of me letting Joy know the kinds of things I wanted to do.

Two pertinent questions I asked at the outset were: (a) Was she making a documentary? (to which she replied no); and (b) Was she looking at an international market or just the Australian one? Both affected the way I approached things.

What was your involvement with cameraman Russell Boyd?

Russell only started a fortnight before shooting; by then most of our locations had been established. What I tried to do was talk to Russell on a day-before basis. We still had a great deal to be done as we were shooting, because Dawn! wasn’t the kind of film you could line up completely beforehand.

Did you participate in the selection of locations?

Yes, though a lot of swimming pools had been teed up with councils beforehand. I then went to these pools, photographed them and selected those I thought the most suitable. Later, I went around again with Ken.

**THE PUB SET**

What sets did you design for the film?

The Balmain pub is the only set in the film; the rest are more supplements to a location, like the addition of a wall. The set is also seen over a period of 10 years and because it was based on an actual pub, it had to look realistic. That was quite a problem, so as soon as I started on the film I measured it up and sent the drawings down to Adelaide for costing.

The set wasn’t constructed in Sydney?

No, it was entirely built by Herb Pinter in Adelaide. The building period was four weeks: fourteen men full time, plus the odd tiler and glazier.

Did you use the same materials as in the pub?

To a degree. Old-fashioned tiles, for instance, aren’t readily available, but you can duplicate...
the look. The Balmain tiles are light cream, yet they appear much older and darker from years of smoke and grime. On film, however, they would have been too light, so I had to use darker ones to get the same murkiness and tone. They also helped Russell in lighting the set.

To what extent did you design the set to suit Russell Boyd?

The pub is sited on a corner, facing north, so the sun comes in all day. This gives it a lovely feeling and it was obvious we would light the set the same way. I just made sure during the building that there was enough space behind it to place the main light source.

From all accounts, the set is a perfect replica. What techniques did you use to achieve this?

You have to treat a set as if you were building it from scratch. Then you duplicate the little bits and pieces that add to the overall effect; light conduits on walls, window fittings, plugs and so on. You also use real materials because you can't get away with fake tiles or windows on 35mm. The more real things you use, the greater the chance of getting the reality of the set across, which was important in this instance as the pub was the only set in a film of real locations.

What about pub fixtures or glasses?

We got some old counter units and bar fittings from the breweries in Adelaide. As for glasses, I always wonder about the necessity of having every detail exact in a period film. As long as they are obviously not wrong for the period, I don't tend to bother.

Did you use old building materials or new ones which you had to age?

I didn't do any ageing in the film. It doesn't matter if the materials aren't the same, as long as you get the right effect. The heavy architraves were stained and varnished to get a worn look without ageing, and I aged the interior of Dawn's house more by the choice of furnishings. I chose old and shabby pieces, but ones that had a well-loved appearance. I avoided breaking down walls and architraves, or dirtying around light switches; I didn't think it was necessary.

In Rocky, for example, a lot of the ageing of the sets was very bad — you could pick it up instantly — because it tended to make things look dirty, rather than old and shabby.

Does a set designer subtract rather than add?

I subtracted quite a bit on Dawn! because of the plain wall areas I wanted, which is in direct contrast to films like Picnic at Hanging Rock and Caddie where there was detail everywhere.

If, for instance, we had a shot where the operator wanted to move a picture to get a better composition, I would prefer to take it out. I try to keep things as minimal as possible.

Were you on the set all the time or did your responsibilities as designer mean you had to be elsewhere?

I went to Adelaide a number of times to see the set being built, but I was mostly at other locations. This is not an ideal situation and I would certainly prefer to spend all my time next to the camera.

BUDGETING

On "Dawn!", you controlled your departmental budget. Do you find that extra responsibility demanding?

Yes, though sound is a great help; you can shoot a scene with 12 people close, but when you mix in 2000, it has an entirely different feeling.

Do you get a master shot of the stadium?

You do, but on the day before the race. Then you cut to the event.

Dawn goes through the film in a lot of wide shots, but as her life is swimming, I think it is quite valid to go in close.

STAGING THE OLYMPICS

You restaged the 1956 Olympics in Melbourne. How did you do that?

First, I looked at all the available footage and that made me realize there was no way we could copy it. The people, the flags and all the paraphernalia were too much. Fortunately, the original pool in Melbourne was available.

As for the Rome and Tokyo sequences, Ken decided to concentrate on the swim, and the Tokyo swim was actually done in the Melbourne pool. Of course, the building was not like the one in Tokyo, but I wasn't trying to recreate it. Sometimes you have to forget the overall and concentrate on the details, and if you make the small elements very accurate, the audience tends to forget that on a wider scene it may not be quite right.

Mr and Mrs Fraser (Ron Hadrick and Bunney Brooke) in their Balmain home. The period is 1950s. Dawn!

I went to Adelaide a number of times to see the set being built, but I was mostly at other locations. This is not an ideal situation and I would certainly prefer to spend all my time next to the camera.

Were you involved in deciding the budget, or was it given to you as a fait accompli?

It is a demanding but necessary responsibility. You should always know how much you have spent, otherwise you don't know how much is left.

By keeping a running cost of the staging, it became apparent very early on that the budget was too low; but this wasn't a problem because I kept everybody informed. Then as costings came in, we would change things to suit. For example, I reduced the estimate on the pub by taking three metres out of the middle.

Were you involved in deciding the budget, or was it given to you as a fait accompli?

The budget had been set, but from the outset I think even Joy felt it was a bit low; she probably needed someone to come and talk with her about it.

Did you find yourself restricted by the limitations of your budget?

Not really. In fact, I wouldn't even mind working on a low-budget film provided everybody involved was aware of the inherent limitations.

What budget should a film like "Dawn!" have for sets and props?

Ideally, $30,000. We started at $23,000 and ended up spending $29,000, which does not include salaries or location hire. Location hire alone was an additional $7000.

Basically, I think a producer should speak to a designer when he or she is doing a budget, just to talk things out. A lot of art directors are given an amount of money and have no say in the figure.

However, things are improving all the time and art direction is an area in Australian filmmaking that is now being taken seriously.

In Major's pub set, drinkers celebrate the birth of Dawn's daughter, Dawn!
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Olympic Village, were really hard to find. I had to look for buildings in Sydney that architecturally could be Japanese, or whatever.

For the 1960 Rome Olympics, I looked for very modern buildings, because one always feels Italian architecture is much more advanced than ours.

What were the problems involved in shooting in Japan?

Working through interpreters — it took ages to have an instruction translated. We had a scene in a police station which was an existing set. I re-dressed it slightly, and fiddled as much as I could. I wanted to put a lot of pens and pads and pencils on the desks — the kind of paraphernalia one would expect — but the Japanese just didn’t understand. They don’t personalize objects like we do; for them it is a completely different approach to set dressing. But once they understood, they were very helpful and amicable.

How was your relationship with Ken?

Very good. We talked about the film at length before we started filming, then he left me alone. Having spent a lot of time in advertising where I am so used to people being critical, of people asking you to constantly justify your decisions, I couldn’t believe my ears when nobody said anything negative or otherwise about the sets. It was a nice surprise, because compared with advertising, film people are much more positive; you are hired for your decisions, I couldn’t believe it.

In advertising, storyboards are often used. Would you like to see storyboarding introduced into features?

Yes, but you are talking about more pre-production time and Australian films are not into that. To do it properly, it might take six months. From a designer’s point of view, it would be really fantastic to design a film with the director and cameraman, scene by scene, frame and frame. I won’t say it’s an indulgence, but it’s certainly a luxury in Australian production.

Actually, I tried to storyboard the film as we went along. I had all the photographs of the pools on my wall, and after a while I got quite potty about swimming pools. The Sydney Olympic pool, for example, is an amazing piece of work with its art deco relief work. All pools have individual characters, but there is something about each that is the same. And this sameness provided the visual link.

Do you find that production designers and art directors in Australia are limited by the availability of resources?

Special effects in Australia is a very weak area, although I think there are very good. The painting done for films like Earthquake is impeccable, and this is a technique that could be used for period films. In Caddie, for example, you could have changed the whole Sydney skyline by putting tops on buildings, while leaving bottoms as they were. This would save money and give far greater value on the screen.

Do you have a new project to work on?

I will go from here to an advertising agency to hustle for some work. It is very hard once a film ends, because if you are unemployed, you are unemployed. I would like to see productions involve their designers for a longer period which, as I said earlier, could save the producer money. Also they pay them more, so that they don’t have that awful feeling of having to go out and get work straight-away — you ought to be able to cope for a few months at least. I think the industry owes that to its people.

Dawn!

CAST:

Brownyn Mackay-Payne ........ Dawn
Tom Richards ............................. Harry
John Diedrich ......................... Gary
Bunney Brooke .......................... Mum
Ron Haddrick ........................... Pop
Gabrielle Hartery ...................... Kate
Ivy Kantis .............................. Len
David Cameron ........................ Joe
Kevin Wilson ........................... Bill
Lindall Burrow ....................... Edie
John Clayton .......................... John
Go Mikami .............................. Ken
Judith Fisher ......................... Chappie
Reg Gillum .............................. First Board Member
Bill Charnock ........................... Bill
John Armstrong ...................... Judy
Judi Farr ............................... New President
Wynne Anthony ....................... George Customer
Richard Hill ............................ Ken
John Jameson ........................... Reporter
Robert Davie ........................... Second Board Member
Piere Von Arnim ....................... Carl
Kevin Munster ....................... Official
Audie Leith ............................ Tony

CREW:

Director .................................. Ken Hannam
Executive Producer ..................... Sandra McKenzie
Producer .................................. Gary Pexon
Associate Producer ...................... Russell Boyd
Editor .................................... Max Lemon
Production Manager .................... Ross Matthews
Art Director ............................. Ross Major
Production Secretary ................... Tony Tosolini
Costume Designer ...................... Judith Dorsman
Location Manager ...................... Beverly Davison
Sound Recorder ....................... Ken Hammond
Sound Editor ............................ Bob Coggan
Prop Master ............................. Martin McEwan
Assistant Directors .................... Mark Egan, Penny Chapmain
Camera Operator ....................... Scott Hick
Focus Pullers ............................ David Williamson
Grip ..................................... Ross Eriksen
Boom Operator ......................... Joe Spinelli
Gaffer .................................... Tony Tegg
Set Dresser .............................. Greg Bryan
Set Construction ....................... Herb Fander
Stunts ................................. David Kyrou
Technical Advisor ..................... Dawn Fraser
Research ............................... Sue Wild
Hairdresser ............................ Jenny Brown
Make-up .............................. Peggy Carter
Production Accountant .............. Jean Findlay
Cast ....................................... John and Lisa Faulk

DISTRIBUTING AND MARKETING

Who will be distributing the film?

Hoyts. It will be one of their few imports. They have a market, and, in a funny way, the U.S. I know every producer says he will crack the U.S., but I am hopeful with Dawn!

There are obvious big market and that was proved by the interest when we were there shooting. They all remember Dawn from 1964 and are anxious to see the film.

Germany is also becoming a good market for Australian films.

And, strangely enough, when I was in Moscow 18 months ago, I spent a lot of time at the Mosfilm studios, and one of the leading directors I met there was fascinated by the story; he had never heard of Dawn Fraser, but that didn’t matter, he loved the character.

Last week, I heard that the AFC had received an inquiry from Moscow. They had asked if the film was finished, because they were interested in seeing it. This could be quite a breakthrough.

Joy Cavill
Continued from P. 339
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PRODUCTION REPORT — DAWN!
Tasmanian Film Corporation
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64 Brisbane Street, Hobart 7000 Tasmania.
Phone 308033 Telegrams Tasfilm Hobart

MISE-EN-SCENE

A consultancy service for film and theatre.

From complete production co-ordination to researching a single idea.
Comprehensive files on locations, casting, properties and wardrobe.

CAN YOU AFFORD TO BE WITHOUT SUCH A COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE?

DAVID SEARL . . . MISE-EN-SCENE
Suite 2, 2b Tusculum Street, Potts Point, NSW 2011. Phone: (02) 358 2371

JOHN BARRY GROUP

MOTION PICTURE EQUIPMENT
SALES • RENTAL • SERVICE

If you shoot handheld, you need
The Academy Award Winning*

STEADICAM

Because with STEADICAM, Cinema Products’ revolutionary film/video camera stabilizing system, the handheld moving camera finally comes into its own — recording dolly-smooth, jitter-free, handheld moving shots with a steadiness of image never before achieved on the screen.

*Class 1 Academy Award for Technical Achievement for the 1978 Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. (The first to be awarded for ten years.)

105 Reserve Road, Artarmon
Sydney, N.S.W. 2064
Telephone: 439-6955
Telex: 24482

All correspondence: P.O. Box 199
Artarmon, N.S.W. 2064 Australia
Crowley, Jarrat, Gulpilil.

SYNOPSIS: A young woman discovers illegal activities in two of the houses.

The MOVERs

PROD COMPANY: South Australian Film Corp Director: Bruce Beresford
Producers: Matt Carroll, Peter Weir
Screenplay: From the novel by Devlin McNeice

SYNOPSIS: A story about the SAS who paint on a year's leave of duty in Vietnam.

SIMMONDS AND NEWCOMBE

DIRECTOR: John Phillip Law
SCREENPLAY: John Phillip Law & M. L. Pye Ltd
Producers: Sally Matthews, Paul Mackay, Jack French, Paul Anstey
EDITOR: Tony Palmer
PHOTOGRAPHER: George Berney
COSTUME/WARDROBE: Trudie Styler
SOUND RECORDIST: John Waddell
STILL PHOTOGRAPHY: John Waddell
Catering: Richard Ford

THE ODD ANGRY SQUIRREL

Producers: Tom Jeffrey
Producers: From the novel by John Waddell
Director: John Phillip Law
Screenplay: John Phillip Law
Producers: Sally Matthews, Paul Mackay, Jack French, Paul Anstey
EDITOR: Tony Palmer
PHOTOGRAPHER: George Berney
COSTUME/WARDROBE: Trudie Styler
SOUND RECORDIST: John Waddell
STILL PHOTOGRAPHY: John Waddell
Catering: Richard Ford

SYNOPSIS: The story is about a SAS unit who paint on a year's leave of duty in Vietnam.

The following text appears to be a list of credits or a bibliography, possibly for a production survey or a similar document. It includes names of individuals, roles, and other production details, but without proper context or formatting, it's difficult to extract meaningful information.
The full range of Landcruisers, 2-3 tonne moving vans (easily adaptable to portable dressing room or make-up vans), 1 tonne Hi-Ace vans for that extra equipment, buses from 12 - 22 seaters and air-conditioned cars and station wagons; all available when you need it, wherever you need it. For all your location shooting, anywhere in Australia, Eastbern's got the right vehicles at the right prices.

Short or long term rentals or even leasing arrangements (to take advantage of that 40% Tax Investment Allowance) are all only a phone call away. On your next budget, don't leave out Eastbern Rentals, when just a phone call will get you exact costs for all your rental requirements.

Ring Darryl Howard right now on (03) 877 5022 for immediate and obligation free quotes for your particular requirements.

(03)8773133 (03)8775022

Please Supply me with literature regarding the rental of your fleet of Landcruisers, commercial vehicles and air-conditioned cars and station wagons.

Name:.................................................................

Company:................................................................

Position:..............................................................

Address:..................................................................

...the friendly alternative.

279 Whitehorse Rd, Nunawading, Vic. 3131 a.h. (03) 720 1161

We've got all shapes and sizes at...
THE SPECIAL LOVE STORY OF PADDY DOOLAN AND HIS FAMILY. THEY WILL BE TORN APART BY PROGRESS.

Starring MICHAEL CRAIG • ROBYN NEVIN • SIMON BURKE with GERARD KENNEDY • LOU BROWN • TONY BARRY
Produced by ANTHONY BUCKLEY. Written & Directed by DONALD GIOVAN
Adapted from the novel "THE IRISHMAN" by ELIZABETH O'CONNOR
A Forest Home Films/South Australian Film Corporation Production
CAST AND CREW TRAVEL TAX - "THE IRISHMAN" NOW AVAILABLE IN PAPERBACK.

RELEASED NATIONALLY THROUGH GUO FILM DISTRIBUTORS

SURRENDER IN PARADISE
DIR: PETER COX MUS: RALPH TYRRELL PHOTO: DON McALPINE

TOMORROW BELONGS TO THOSE WHO CAN SEE IT COMING
PADDINGTON TOWN HALL CENTRE (02) 31 9025
THE IRISHMAN
Susan Dermody

The Irishman is a film that lovingly recognizes, frame by frame, certain Australian ways of life, and their accompanying bric-a-brac, that are all but locked in the recent past. It carries out its richly furnished and often working world with an exquisite care, and if you share the film's fascination with early 20th century technology, transport and streetscapes, richly set in resonance with northern Australian countrysides, then you will feast, frame by frame.

The Venus Battery, the corrugated houses on stilts, the outlook through wood-slatted verandahs, the shade-wells of shop awning and town interiors — they are not just set in but set off by the ragged shapes of Australian trees, odd hillocks and boulders, sleekly-curved sandbanks, banks and streams of cloud in the bluest possible sky.

If you were to see The Irishman in another country in the middle of winter, you would want to come home immediately; but there is so much hunger of the heart in it, because it is a world you cannot come home to. It is a past that can hardly ever be pried open again for the eyes or the imagination. And, consequently, there is a kind of quiet exotica not available through the film; exotica that has to do with pastoral and artisanal elements of Australian life lost in our transition to the centralized, consumerized, Priestered present.

The narrative of The Irishman, however, tends to slip too frequently back to the status of pretext for the powerful picturesque essence of the film. And this is unfortunate because the film is structured towards narrative. It promises the expected set of gratifications and then too often fails, falters, or tries too hard, leaving the audience grumbling and vaguely deprived, even willing to get nauty about the way the rich pictorial and historical values have been approached. (“What a cheat — they just used the one camera angle down into the street in the town, again and again... Nothing really happened!”)

In fact, much has happened — whole cycles of people’s lives went by — but plainly, too plainly, the audience could see the over-careful cogs of script within those cycles, could sense the occasional jolts and resistance of the parts, and became embarrassed and unforgiving. Obviously, you can’t just apply narrative to rich, almost literary material like this.

The story has to be urgently present, exploding outwards so that it doesn’t merely display the riches of this particular conjunction of life, landscape, and human bric-a-brac, but is impelled to go further, striking almost symbolic resonances and relationships between objects, landscape and story.

The most obvious comparison is The Picture Show Man, and the most obvious contrast, Caddy. In each one is placed at one or more nostalgic remnants from the present. But while The Irishman seems to me more densely peopled and detailed than The Picture Show Man, and while the superseded life that is its subject has more body, it is missing the simple fail-proof ‘drive-mechanism’ plot of Caddy.

Caddy has a central figure, a lone woman battling and surviving the odds, with traits and human-interest fascination for its audience. The Irishman would appear to share some of these plot characteristics; instead, it is about a slow fading of a life (and way of life) into the landscape.

Furthermore, this process is decentered by focussing on the two sons (and to some extent the wife) of Paddy Doolan, the Irishman, the last teamster in the gulf country. In particular, it follows Michael, the younger son, as he necessarily shifts to the status of pretext for the powerful Dalgleish (replacing untrustworthy Irish with dye-straight Scots). Will, the elder son, reflects his father’s pig-headedness back at him in a way that Paddy cannot tolerate, driving him to a near murderous attack on his son. This, in turn, becomes the wedge that drives Paddy away — or, we are asked to believe.

This is the most dislocating and unmotivated development in the plot; one that severely undermines the sense of understood-why because-understood family bonds. The opening scene of the story has meticulously built up — particularly in the finely hand-opening sequence which takes us through the return of Paddy with him teams and up to nightfall of that day. Suddenly, the plot asserts that Paddy is at heart the kind of Australian father whose allegiance is not to family but to something else — in this case, something incompatible like 14 Clydesdales and the life of the roving teamster. But the characterization of Paddy has left us unprepared for this development — possibly because it has been relocated into the point of view of Michael (and the characters of both sons) — but not quite consistently or with enough certainty.

What is certain is that this crucial plot development appears to be unacceptably lacking in psychological motivation in a film that has set out to be a kind of psychological study. How can Jenny, or Michael, or the audience, abruptly accept that there is for Paddy, nothing to come back to? (The device of Michael (and the performer of Simon Burke) saves the film from becoming completely unhinged by this shift. But it is only if you notice that the film is not about the colorful, obstinate, time-locked Paddy, but about his non-heroic son Michael, who looks, listens, and takes to heart in a way that is slightly gauche and immensely graceful.

The death of his father turns out to be the platform from which his maturity can spring, and Michael rides off towards the job with Dalgleish, but on one of the Irishman’s Clydesdale horses.

All four leading performances are excellent, though Robyn Nevin and Michael Craig suffer from the film’s inability to decide between its grounding in the pictorial, and its pull towards story. The part of Jenny, and of the Irishman himself, tend to belong to the first, but dragged along by the second. They are well cast, but Craig — and Robyn Nevin in particular — seem to have too much energy and potential to be confirmed as they are.

I am not sure that this split between the narrative and the visual is sufficient to account for the failings of the film as a story — especially since there seems to be so many good consistencies of the story and quite richly worked scenes within it. Or the opening sequence I have already mentioned, that so well articulates many of the film’s themes. Or the use of the two grandparental introductions to a peculiarly apt mixture of black comedy and real mortality. Even the minor notes, such as grandmother Mary, are complexly worked in.

Perhaps there is danger in channeling the film through Michael’s adolescent viewpoint, in that it seems to eliminate too many important facts, or possibilities of plot, as if a G-rated world view had been created, safe for all ages. But again, this sense of being somewhat confined to a cramped and unexpansive view of the world within the film may result from the priority it gives to the pictorial record, rather than the narrative possibilities, of its material.

Either way, the pictorial values of the film emerge as its greater strength, and if this unbalanced film, then it is still a pleasurable way to lose one’s balance.

The use of golden-toned Agfa-Geva-color seals the film into the past like a patina of age on the images. Composition within the frame is at once highly formal in its arrangement of tones, and meticulously casual in its framing of objects — like the paintings of the Heidelberg School to which it so often alludes (even down to the Tom Roberts-style tents in so many back­grounds).

The cinematography is particularly sensitive towards the way that light falls within the cavernous corrugated-iron interiors of the film, picking out tea-towels strung up to dry, and walls and objects slightly out of plumb, as if everything is settling slowly with the earth.

It seems to me to be reasonable and defensible that a film should occasionally spotlight this role — of lovingly putting on record some aspect of the visual store of the immediate past — even at risk of slightening its narrative force. We are a society that is too light on memory, and quick to discount what we have as being of little value.

Films like The Irishman, with a sense of historical seriousness towards the visual store they’re prising open, may help locate Australians in their own country. It is culturally boring to live in a society that remains vague and mistrustful about its past, and cynical about any version of the future, as if Australia is just a temporary measure for maximum short-term profit.

To quote the Irishman, “that’s about as much good to anybody as tis on a bull.”


Paddy Doolan (Michael Craig) leading his team of Clydesdales. Don Crombie’s The Irishman.
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MOUTH TO MOUTH

Jack Clancy

"You say you've seen it in the movies: This movie's just begun."

The lyrics that accompany the ending of John Duigan's new film are true enough, in one sense; we have seen stories of "young love" before. But in another very important sense, we have not seen anything like this in Australian films.

Before MOUTH TO MOUTH one had to search very hard to find an Australian film with this combination of compassionate observation, social concern and behavioral truth. One thinks immediately of Pure Shit, then perhaps 27A, Office Picnic and Touches of The Reminiscents or Don's Party. But it is impossible to find an Australian film which so boldly tackles a subject of urgent social concern, and so triumphently brings it off.

The subject is the young unemployed and, more especially, those who get into trouble with "authority".

Carrie (Kim Krejus) and Tim (Ian Gilmour) in the abandoned power station they make their home. MOUTH TO MOUTH

The performances, particularly of the four principals, are directly relevant here, and in his four youngsters Duigan has discovered, and made use of, what are potentially considerable talents.

The performances seemed to me, not surprisingly, to achieve degrees of excellence in proportion to the demands the roles made on them. Kim Krejus as Carrie is extraordinarily good, with Sonia Peat, Sergio Frazzetto and Ian Gilmour almost equally so — as are the others in the cast, particularly Michael Carman as Tony, the former boyfriend, and Walter Pym as Fred, the old "derro" who shares the place with them.

Having established the four teenagers in this precarious, vulnerable domestic arrangement, the film moves forward with a sense, if not of doom, then of inevitability. The girl's temporary jobs and the boys are still unable to get work. The girls steal food and clothes from stores, the boys copy them; the girls, again with attitudes of bravado, begin doing escort work. The boys resent it but cannot stop it. Carrie can't bring herself to continue. Carrie does so, defiantly.

With the old man's death, and the arrival of the credibly unsympathetic police, the delicate structure of mutual survival (this, as well as the sexual overtones, is suggested in the film's title) is broken apart.

One can foresee possible objections to this film. The film's realist mode can seem too like a television style; yet the reply is surely that we could do with more television, or film, drama with the feeling and acute observation to be found here.

The film is bound to encounter charges that it encourages too great an identification with its characters; the sort of criticism made of Pure Shit, and an equally misconceived one. There will probably be an opposite claim that the film is not sympathetic enough — another charge emerging from failure to perceive the delicate balance of deceit and sympathy.

One's hope is that middle-Australia, with its dole-bludger mentality, at least gets a chance to make up its mind on this question.

There are minor criticisms to be made of aspects of Duigan's treatment of his script. Besides the heavily pointed spatial arrangements of particular scenes, the sequence on the beach evokes one of the heaviest of romantic and anti-romantic cliches. And I wasn't too happy with the end-title song; its refrain "the more you love, the harder you fall" seems intended ironically, but its foregrounding takes it well beyond the level of the transistor "junk" that has been recurring throughout as an index of the characters' view of reality.

Honesty and concern are not guarantees of a film, though they are necessary prerequisites. When combined as they are here with perceptiveness, satisfying dramatic structure, and a visual quality that would be admirable in a film with four times this one's extraordinarily modest budget, they are a cause for rejoicing.

This is a nostalgic film, in style, subject and sensibility. It employs the technical skills of today to evoke the recent past, exuding that air of knowing rectitude characteristic of the early Fred Zinnemann in The Seventh Cross, The Search, and Act of Violence.

With Alvin Sargent's dutiful screenplay under his arm, the 70 year-old director gallantly escorts fellow septuagenarian Lillian Hellman, as impersonated by Jane Fonda, back into a rose-colored afterglow of recollection.

Not altogether surprisingly, Julia is a very nice-looking exercise in wedge of romantic melodrama of didactic mien. It is based on an episode in Penimento, the second volume of Lillian Hellman's autobiographical trilogy in which she recalls a heroic friend, identified only by that first name.

Julia (Vanessa Redgrave) was a very rich American who studied at Oxford and then with Freud in Vienna, became "a premature anti-fascist" and was killed by Nazis shortly before World War 2. She is seen to be as knowingly certain of her path as Lillian is confusedly hesitant — although the writer responds when the whips of conscience crack.

If this indicates a certain ambivalence of attitude, it is a characteristic reflected in Zinnemann and Sargent's approach to their source material, evident from the opening sequence of the film. Over a shot of Fonda's silhouette hunched in a fishing dinghy (presumably in the present day), she is heard quoting the first paragraph of Penimento: "Old paint on canvas, as it ages, sometimes becomes transparent and it is possible to see the original lines . . . the old conception, replaced by a later choice, is a way of seeing and then seeing again." A few scenes later, however, in another voice-over extract from the book, she says: "I have always known about my memory. I know when it is to be trusted . . . and I trust it absolutely about Julia."

This contradiction gives rise to a suspicion that Zinnemann is trying to have it both ways — a charge also flung at Ms Hellman in the flurry stirred by Scoundrel Time, the third volume of her memoirs. Zinnemann is affected by the money-smuggling mission and Julia's martyrdom. The film retains a scene described by Ms Hellman in which she reacts angrily to a sneering suggestion that their attachment is sexual.

Manifestly, Julia represents Good — selfless, self-denying, unequivocal — pitted against Evil. Her dedication and untroubled rejection of riches and comfort are contrasted to Hellman's own musings about whether she should spend her royalties on a sable coat or "give it to Roosevelt." (Most of Lillian Hellman's plays concern struggles between good and evil in the human personality.)

What Zinnemann and Sargent might have developed further is the teacher-pupil nature of the relationship, particularly in its adolescent phase. They do, however, suggest how Lillian's outlook is affected by the money-smuggling mission and Julia's martyrdom. Although the film is less than briskly paced, some things are skipped over that might have been elucidated — the Right-wing attack in which Julia was maimed and
the Nazi persecution of university Jews were not exactly the same; Lillian bawls at Hammitt: “It’s OK for you Dash, you’re famous!” — but not everyone has owned and remembered the credits of The Maltese Falcon.

The only significant departure from Hellman’s own narrative backdates Julia’s death so that the narrative immediately follows the smuggling episode, giving a false (but dramatically-sharpened) impression of cause and effect.

Inevitably, the film says a lot more about Lillian than Julia (she remains a shadowy figure). Reference to her in the epilogue which returns to the opening shot, Lillian says of the two people who did so much to shape her life: “I am stubborn, I have not forgotten either of them.” Their importance to Lillian is emphasized, especially Hammitt subtly underlines her indirect and “even” on anyone’s written in a long time”, Julia advises: “Don’t let people talk you out of your anger.”

Hellman’s play, the film’s basic schematic concern is with the moral implications of human conduct. When Hellman tells Lillian, distressed by the cold-bloodedness of the death sentence of Julia’s grandparents: “They were only interested in her money!” he might be describing the vocal characters of The Little Foxes and Another Pas of the Forest, who subordinate everything else to wealth and power.

Zinnemann establishes a nostalgic aura of modestly-muddy recollection, in that peculiar vein of Hollywood-verse which pays due regard to the salient features of the period without quite achieving verisimilitude. (I had much the same reaction to Hal Ashby’s Bound for Glory.) The scenes in hotels, trains, ships, stations, cafes and the hospital — all photographed with florid richness by Douglas Slocombe — are all too much, though some of Anthea Sybert’s striking costume designs have a foot in two epochs. (Here one can’t but be reminded of Hellman’s immoral rebutt to the McCarthyites: “I cannot and will not cut my conscience to fit this year’s fashions!” — although of course she wasn’t talking about apparel.)

Despite passing obsequies to commercial imperatives, the film is a thoroughly well-intentioned evocation of liberal humanism in the face of totalitarian extremism. In the twilight of his career, Zinnemann, the European filmmaker who fled the spreading Nazi shadow for a safer Miller, achieves a certain poignancy of his own.

THE MANGO TREE

Brian McFarlane

So much of The Mango Tree is very attractive that it seems a pity to begin on a sour note. The trouble is that what goes wrong is at the heart of the film — or, rather, where the heart of the film seems meant to be.

As in several recent Australian films (The Getting of Wisdom, The Devil’s Playground), an adolescent’s response to the pains of growing up appears to be the central preoccupation of its director (here, Kevin Dobson).

This is certainly true of the Ronald McKay novel on which the film is based, but the film never decides whether Jamie Carr (Christopher Pate) is to be a spectator or a participant in the film’s action. It never new clear how he is meant to be changed by his observation of, or his involvement in, the incidents which make up the film’s struggling plot.

Neither Michael Pate’s screenplay nor Christopher Pate’s performance help in this respect. The screenplay wanders disconcertingly from one episode to the next, from one point of view to the other. One is usually more interested in what is happening to someone else than to Jamie. When Mrs Plover (Carol Burns) is taken off to the “loony bin”, for example, it is the woman’s blank disorientation and her daughter’s angry held-in grief that interest — and move — us, not what the observing Jamie makes of it.

But if Pate père cannot adjust his focus to give the film a logical coherence, neither can Pate fils persuade us that anything much is going on behind his characteristically furrowed brow. Things happen to him and around him, but nothing seems to happen inside him. Only in the obligatory scene of sexual initiation (with Diane Craig’s touchingly willing French teacher) does he suggest an authentically adolescent clumsy gentleness, and the scene is done with tact and restraint.

As he leaves Bundaberg at the end of the film, I thought (and probably unfairly) of Paul Morel at the end of Sons and Lovers. It is unfair to compare a modest film with one of the great English novels of growing up, but the comparison does point out the film’s weakness.

For all the novel’s faults, Lawrence makes us feel that Paul’s sensibility is its centre — however much we may resist the overwrought introspectiveness of some of the writing — and people and incidents take on a special importance inssofar as they work on that sensibility.

Christopher Pate looks too old for 18 (“the devil’s year”), not that anything very devilish happens to him and doesn’t make us care what becomes of Jamie at what are presumably the crucial moments of his adolescence. He is too limited an actor to fill in the gaps in the screenplay, let alone pull its episodic narrative habits into line by creating a sense of a developing consciousness.

All the drama about the crazed preacher (extravagantly overplayed by Gerard Kennedy) is dispensable. At first his hellfire proclamation that “the devil works in all things” promises an interesting moral tension between its brutal life-denial and the evidence of luxuriant life that Brian Probyn’s camera so lovingly details. After that, and until his violent death in the mill, the sub-plot involving him, his niece and her boyfriend, is peripheral to the film’s — and our — main concerns, and is indeed gratuitously melodramatic, providing the wrong kind of excitement for an essentially gentle film. It is never made to seem part of the texture of Jamie’s life, or of the life surrounding him.

But let’s turn to the credit side of the film. Visually, it is ravishing. Bundaberg in 1917 looks an idyllic place to grow up in. Probyn gives us beautifully muted interiors (with stained tongue-and-groove walls, a dinner table gracefully set beneath a kerosene lamp), sandy streets with weatherboard houses that make one think of growing up in a kerosene lamp), sandy streets with

Geraldine Fitzgerald as Grandma Carr in the performance that is The Mango Tree's strength — and weakness.
Australian films, but the industry urgently needs something tougher and more coherent.

THE LACEMAKER


The Lacemaker is also the portrait of a child—woman, but it is, of course, limited by the nature of the subject matter. Goretta happily avoids too much emphasis on the girl's home life with her mother—much of which could easily have sentimentalized the little-girl side of Pomme. I found the short insert (mother with daughter at First Communion, mother kissing daughter in bed) somewhat superfluous, but these are minor blemishes on an otherwise beautifully executed work.

The last shot, especially, has a painterly quality of its own, without any obvious striving for such an effect as in, say, Rohmer's Marquise von O... Her smile, the angle of the face, the absence of background detail, the lighting, and the

Inge Pruks


Goretta is interested in the modest and the unexceptional in life, and it is not surprising to find that some of his favorite writers are Maupassant, Gogol, Chekhov, Malmut, Pavese, Ring Lardner and Scott Fitzgerald. Among filmmakers he admires, he has named Vigo, Renoir and Becker.

In his films he concentrates on what the French call the "quotidian", the details of every day reality and the tensions which often lurk behind the curtain of all that is mundane. The tone of his films is one of understatement, and it is created by a certain refusal to engage fully in either the comic or the tragic, to caricature or to overdramatize. He is a documentarist at heart.

The Lacemaker is about a crack-up, to quote one of Goretta's favorite Fitzgerald stories. The process is slow and undramatic ("Of course all life is a process of breaking down," says Fitzgerald), but it is nonetheless painful and devastating for both characters in the film.

Beatrice (Isabelle Huppert) is an apprentice hairdresser, and we first see her contrasted with Marylene (Florence Giorgetti), an older and more experienced girl who works at the same salon. Beatrice, also nicknamed Pomme, is gentle and withdrawn, while Marylene is business-like, bright and talkative. Even in these early scenes with Marylene, Goretta is preparing us for the force of the final image of the lacemaker, contained in the last close-up as well as in the closing words of Pascal Laine's novel: And so he passed by her, just next to her, without seeing her. Because she was one of those souls who make no sigh, but who need to be patiently questioned, whom you have to know how to look at. An artist in another age would have made her the subject of a genre painting. She would have been a seamstress, a water carrier... or a lacemaker.

In other words, Pomme is cast as a "secondary" character, lacking the individuality of a Mona Lisa or a Madame Recamier, or even the girl in Greuze's "Broken Pitcher", but possessing a gentleness, a willingness to serve which links her to all the youthful maidens who posed in anonymity for painters who needed a model for their minor works.

Pomme's scene is repeated again and again and again: it is part of her job to sweep up the hair on the salon floor. Goretta contrasts this lightly with Marylene who collects the tip from the client at the door. At Marylene's apartment, Pomme is asked to fetch the shower cap. She also answers the telephone, and even holds it for Marylene (who is luxuriating in the bath).

In another scene she asks Marylene, who has thrown her huge teddy bear out of the window in a tearful crisis, whether she wants her to get the bear. Leaving this scene in the air, Goretta quickly cuts to another where the same idea is carried over: Pomme is bringing a handful of melting icecreams for her workmates. There is nothing ignoble about this servility, and Pomme enjoys the role. She willingly peels a peach for Francois (Yves Be Antony) during their first meal together.

However, there is something unpleasantly condescending in the word used by Francois's mother to describe Pomme: "honnête". It is a word you might apply to the female servant of a "secondary" character, lacking the emotional depth and lack of imagination and intuition. Pomme, on the other hand, is almost a mute character, and in this respect it is not unlike the central character of The Invitation, the man who invites his office colleagues to his beautiful chateau. Often conversation with Pomme becomes irritating for audience and Francois alike—she offers nothing but a "yes" or a "no", and rarely initiates a dialogue.

Goretta sometimes sympathizes with her though, as is evident in his slight caricaturing of Francois' friends and their pseudo-intellectual jargon. And yet it is through nervousness, lack of social graces, or even intellectual jargon that Pomme remains silent—she was just as quiet with Marylene. She just does not seem to feel the need to talk, and it is finally this character trait, rather than class or education, which sets her apart from Francois.

Her inarticulate being-ness is more than Francois can bear. Is she happy? Is she unhappy? What does she hope to get from life? Isn't she interested in anything? These are questions which she never answers for Francois, and the break comes quietly, without drama. In fact, Goretta avoids the confrontation by cutting Francois's speech in the room with scenes of Pomme wandering through a fruit market. At one stage Francois even addresses himself in a mirror; Pomme is always absent.

Rarely has a love story been set in such desolate surroundings, and this adds to the feeling of doom and emptiness—especially when accompanied by long periods of silence on the soundtrack. The hotel room with its embarrassingly thin walls, the run-down cafe, the empty beaches, the American cemetery, the windy portrait, the grey and cheerless Parisian outskirts, the rain and mud of the season's end. Does it all reflect the inner landscape of these two ill-assorted lovers? It is hard to tell, because Beatrice-Pomme never opens up to Francois, and only momentarily perhaps to the audience.

Ironically enough, Pomme is at her most lucid in the hospital, when Francois visits her. Amid the sadness and yet serenity of the fallen leaves and empty park benches, Francois asks banal and irrelevant questions about Pomme's life after she leaves him. She answers him mechanically, tells him what he wants to hear, fabricating details about a holiday in the Greek islands. For once it is she who initiates conversation, recalling their first night together, recalling too the one moment of attention bestowed upon her by Francois when she had gone to get her shawl for her. It is the only moment in the film when Pomme is not-as-shot demanding attention, and it is the only time in the film when Pomme asks for something for herself.

The Lacemaker is also the portrait of a child—woman, but it is, of course, limited by the nature of the subject matter. Goretta happily avoids too much emphasis on the girl's home life with her mother—much of which could easily have sentimentalized the little-girl side of Pomme. I found the short insert (mother with daughter at First Communion, mother kissing daughter in bed) somewhat superfluous, but these are minor blemishes on an otherwise beautifully executed work.

In the last shot, especially, has a painterly quality of its own, without any obvious striving for such an effect as in, say, Rohmer's Marquise von O... Her smile, the angle of the face, the absence of background detail, the lighting, and the
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BLUE FIRE LADY

Scott Murray

Ross Dimsey's first feature as director, Blue Fire Lady, is a pleasant surprise, and while not the children's film Storm Boy is, compares favorably with recent Australian releases.

The story is simple: Jenny Grey's perpetuation of his dead wife's memory is drawn, and how this has been hampered his handling of Jenny, the memory is drawn, and how this has been bundled off to boarding school, for example, Dimsey cuts into a quick farmyard montage, and then back to another visit next door by Jenny.

At times, however, this montage technique is over-used and in the early scenes is rather clumsily employed to evoke time passing. After Jenny's argument with her father about visiting and the music track over the early morning training which aurally links with the snorting of the horses.

The compression is too severe, and the inevitable "Pack your bags young lady", is resolutely limp. And in this case it is dramatically damaging because Dimsey, during previous scenes, has been building towards an audience identification with Jenny.

After first threatening Jenny with dismissal; here it shows a new strength, and one which is understood by the audience. In an environment where pornography has had some trouble making meaning, in which it was laid forth as a "goodie", the bond develops with Jenny is convincing.

There are many other good things about Blue Fire Lady: Dimsey's performance as Mrs G., Vincent Monton's classic photography, Dimsey's occasional use of the striking low-angle — and several flaws — a few awkward performances, a too deliberate opening, an over-quiet soundtrack and the odd structural flaw.

Part of Dimsey's style is to use montages, and the best of them gave potted histories of the background of horse training, the preparations involved in a big race day meeting, and the jungle-like rule of thump of big time racing.

These montages are well complemented by Mike Brady's music, two good examples being the military type introduction to the boarding school sequence, and the music track over the early morning training which aurally links with the snorting of the horses.
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same seriousness with similar interests; but this time they combine to produce an extraordinary piece of work. This is b'Tio means a unanimous opinion — feminists were enraged, censorship aroused, and many people just left grumbling at having spent 10 francs on 30 minutes of trash.

Of all these reactions, that the film was at one stage threatened with seizure seems rejected by the storyteller. Une sale histoire could be described as 'just' a film about people talking. Literally and exclusively talking.

The story is certainly in dubious taste, as they say, but we only 'see' the telling and listening of the story, and this 'representation' aroused more official interest than any real porn palace has for some time. In this sense, the film's social reception bears out rather curiously a number of assertions made within the film about the story itself.

At this stage I should say what Une sale histoire is about, or at least what the story is; but the film defies linear description. An innocent viewer who has read nothing about the film might start walking out half-way through, because Une sale histoire is made up of two 'films', each complete with titles and credits, presenting the same situation, the same story, told in almost the same words, and yet not the same.

In the first film, a man (Michel Lonsdale) recites a story to help a filmmaker friend, who provides the room and the audience. The tale is of a time some years earlier when the character played by Lonsdale frequented a cafe near where he lived, and where he had to make a lot of phone calls.

Comments made by the barman, and advice from a professional pervert friend, lead him to discover that there is a hole — a kind of hole — at ground level in the building where he works, and that women who pass will drink lots of tea or beer, then they follow them down to the cellar, where he (Michel Lonsdale, Jean Douchet, Jacques Burloux, L'Hiver, The Mother and The Whore). Distributor: none as yet. 35mm.

The proceedings were written up and given to Lonsdale and professional actors as a script which they then realized, thinking that theirs was the real and only film. The two films were then juxtaposed.

Whether the story of the making of Une sale histoire is true, one has as little way of knowing as with the tale itself. In other words, Eustache manages to make a small masterpiece out of the most banal paradoxes of contemporary non-commercial cinema: fiction and reality, acting and acting oneself, and the paradox that the paradoxe doesn't matter.

I emphasize 'words' deliberately, because it seems to me that one of the triumphs of the film is the way it imposes the difference — as a film which one might tend to describe, and just how loosely the film itself locates, as a film 'made-up' of words — between the emptiness of descriptive discourse about cinema and the fullness of the specifically cinematic.

Writing fiction and reality is, I insistently want to add 'buthal' and 'sale'. Une sale histoire I simply want to see it again. This is not a way of paying semantic homage to the story and the film's identification, what seems to me, an essential element in its construction. The juxtaposition of the two films also juxtaposes what constitutes identity in writing — the script — and difference in cinema. Apart from the 'words', everything is different: lighting, decor, make-up, gestures, intonation and thus emphasis, the physical substance of the film itself. Here I thought I would like to bring to light the unspoken, the literal, how everything in it which traditional film writing would describe in a kind of borrowed scientific language, psychology, atmosphere, connotation — is produced by precisely those elements in film which share nothing with literature.

Lonsdale/Piq (cultivated, sophisticated) is not the same "character" as that of the first part, and so his identical story is not the same. He emphasizes different aspects of the story, his gestures are different and filmed in a different way, and yet not the same.

Another obvious difference is in the reception of the film. Without 'being filmed' of the second half are animated, aggressive, talk at once; the "acresses" of the first part interpret their lines gently, politely, seriously, try to make contact. Their position, as defined by the story, is very interesting — they are repeatedly named by the teller as the desired receivers of the story, and just as repeatedly described as incapable of receiving it properly, and of course in the event all the women's consent to what they want immediately, in the polish of the first part, of Lonsdale-effect which carries over from the roles that an actor plays in such classic avant-garde films as Duras' India Song and Marcel Hanoun's L'Hiver, and which signifies from the beginning that what is about to follow will be, and so his identical story is not the same. He emphasizes different aspects of the story, his gestures are different and filmed in a different way, and yet not the same.

In an interview in Cahiers du Cinema (No. 284 January, 18) Eustache gives the distinct impression that his desire to make the film was of the same order as that of the teller to tell it. This is particularly undiplomatic in which he humiliates a beautiful woman ("a luxury object") who annoyed him by finding out, that he hoped, that her sex is "horrible", and lets her know he looked.

These lordly lapses aside, the dominant characteristic of male desire in Une sale histoire is its closure — the only relation to its 'every literal' object is one of imposition and intrusion. That is the only source of pleasure, and any response from the object spoils the effect.

But the object absolutely has to be the female, and if the film is to be any closure, it is where the need to tell the story seems to have replaced the act. The women are to listen, not perform, to be told, afterwards, that they can have no part in which their presence is indispensable.

In this sense in Une sale histoire is its closure — the only relation to its 'every literal' object is one of imposition and intrusion. That is the only source of pleasure, and any response from the object spoils the effect.

But the object absolutely has to be the female, and if the film is to be any closure, it is where the need to tell the story seems to have replaced the act. The women are to listen, not perform, to be told, afterwards, that they can have no part in which their presence is indispensable.

In this sense in Une sale histoire is its closure — the only relation to its 'every literal' object is one of imposition and intrusion. That is the only source of pleasure, and any response from the object spoils the effect.

But the object absolutely has to be the female, and if the film is to be any closure, it is where the need to tell the story seems to have replaced the act. The women are to listen, not perform, to be told, afterwards, that they can have no part in which their presence is indispensable.
LISTEN TO THE LION

Basil Gilbert

From a market research point of view, *Listen to the Lion* is something of a paradox, for it seems intent on breaking every rule of commercial success.

For a start, the film is a 53-minute short. This means that, like many of the Australian films made with the assistance of the Experimental or Creative Development funds, it must compete on the open market with petrol company travelogues which can be hired for a nominal fee or obtained gratis.

Secondly, the Eastmancolor print is in the 16mm 'substandard' gauge which sees the old men as picturesque moving shapes set against a contrasting urban barrenness. He has also tried to create a kind of visual beauty from the ugly and commonplace by wetting down the back alleys of his Sydney locations to give them a more romantic "Melbourne look".

Certainly, the night scenes, well lit by Malcolm Richards, with their glinting surfaces and harsh, sharp-edged contrasts, help in giving the film a surreal dimension, and set the tone for the more bizarre moments in the film.

*Listen to the Lion* is a hard film to categorize, for it oscillates between a realistic documentary style based on a careful observation of the derelict community, and a personal, subjective point of view based on the fantastic world of the imagination. Unfortunately, these two polar opposites are not always comfortably integrated into the episodic structure of the narrative.

The highlight of the film, however, and a minor masterpiece of mechanics and special effects, is when Hunter the Lion, just before his death, imagines himself able to fly like a bird and escape from his refuge shelter prison. Here the direction and camerawork is impeccable. One interesting point is that this scene was shot by Safran when he returned from shooting *Storm Boy*, and in it there are suggestions of a new control and maturity.

The music for *Listen to the Lion* was written and played by Canadian Michael Carlos, who also composed the music for *Storm Boy*.

The mood of the film and its title had originally derived from a track from *St. Dominic's Preview* by American-Irish composer, Van Morrison, but copyright problems, and the insistence by the American Musicians Union on the use of American musicians to perform the music, prevented it being used. Little seems to have been lost, for Carlos' abstract themes and use of the electronic synthesizer give the film a soundtrack which is particularly effective in the more dramatic moments.

There has been a demand by film critics lately for Australian films which show the Australian environment and ethos without being overtly provincial. *Listen to the Lion*, with its blend of the local scene with the more universal qualities of suffering and compassion, comes somewhere near to fulfilling this ideal combination.


Library. 16mm. 53 min. Australia 1977.

27TH MELBOURNE FILM FESTIVAL

ONCE A YEAR CHANCE

JUNE 2-17

Exclusive screenings of great current films from the four corners of the earth. 160 films for $35.

Booking now open and filling fast — seats allocated strictly in order of receipt.

Apply now for application form.

P.O. Box 357, Carlton South, 3053.

Phone 347 9538, 347 4828.
Music Worries?

AUSTRALIAN SCREEN MUSIC PTY LTD

Specialising in Music Tracks — Canned or Original — For any type of Production.

For information on this long overdue service give Garry Hardman a call and discuss your requirements — even at script stage.

Think music — Think ASM

P.O. Box 176
Crows Nest NSW 2065
(02) 922 6833

SOUND STUDIO FOR HIRE

Suitable for Film, Video and Stills at:

FILM SETS
88 Warrigal Road,
Oakleigh,
MELBOURNE 3166

Studio 75' x 46' with 14' to lighting grid.
Large three sided paintable fixed cyce.
Good access to studio for cars and trucks.
Design and set construction service available.
Dressing rooms, wardrobe, and make-up facilities.

STUDIO BOOKINGS, PHONE:
Alex Simpson, (03) 568 0058,
(03) 568 2948
AH (03) 25 3858

THE DESIGNERS ASSOCIATION
IN THE PERFORMING ARTS
AND THE SYDNEY OPERA HOUSE TRUST

Presents
DESIGNING MINDS
An exhibition of film, theatre and television design from 30 Australian designers.
8th April — 21st May
Exhibition Hall, Sydney Opera House
Reframed from Australian Government Gazette

FILM CENSORSHIP LISTINGS

NOVEMBER 1977

FILMS REGISTERED WITHOUT ELIMINATIONS

For General Exhibition (G)

Anarkali: Filmmat, India (4701.84 m)
The Bible as History: Neue Tele Contantl, W. Germany (2517.00 m)
The Claim (16mm): Film Australia, Australia (912.49 m)
Come Fly With Me: Yang Sheng Film Co., Hong Kong (2248.00 m)

For Restricted Exhibition (R)

The People That Time Forgot: (16mm) (1928.00 m)

For General Exhibition (G)

The Picture Show Man (sub-titled Italian version)

For Restricted Exhibition (R)

Madonnella:

For General Exhibition (G)

The Goodbye Girl:

FILMS REGISTERED WITHOUT ELIMINATIONS

Not Recommended for Children (NRC)

Bruce Lee—Tie Story: The Silent Film Co, Hong Kong (2056.20 m)

Fantasies Behind the Pearly Curtain:

Osh мая, Prok/Anatole Daumans, Japan/France (3821.00 m)

Doorway Girls: A. Brunner, W. Germany/Denmark (2860.05 m)

All sniper fire (16mm): G. Goen, U.K. (3861.46 m)

Live Like a Cop, Die Like a Man: M. R. Mann/Saltlake, U.S.A. (2550.00 m)

Because of You: B. Jarrett, U.S.A. (2560.83 m)

Oh God (Revised version) (a):

Wages of Fear:

El Alamein:

For Restricted Exhibition (R)

Bilitis:

Sex And The Office Girl (Reconstructed version) (a):

The King's Speech:

The Turning Point:

Rush Hour:

The Turning Point:

FILMS REGISTERED WITHOUT ELIMINATIONS

Not Recommended for Children (NRC)

Bruce Lee—True Story: The Silent Film Co, Hong Kong (2056.20 m)

Fantasies Behind the Pearly Curtain:

Osh мая, Prok/Anatole Daumans, Japan/France (3821.00 m)

Doorway Girls: A. Brunner, W. Germany/Denmark (2860.05 m)

All sniper fire (16mm): G. Goen, U.K. (3861.46 m)

Live Like a Cop, Die Like a Man: M. R. Mann/Saltlake, U.S.A. (2550.00 m)

Because of You: B. Jarrett, U.S.A. (2560.83 m)

Oh God (Revised version) (a):

Wages of Fear:

El Alamein:

For Restricted Exhibition (R)

Bilitis:

Sex And The Office Girl (Reconstructed version) (a):

The King's Speech:

The Turning Point:

FILMS REGISTERED WITHOUT ELIMINATIONS

Not Recommended for Children (NRC)

Bruce Lee—Tie Story: The Silent Film Co, Hong Kong (2056.20 m)

Fantasies Behind the Pearly Curtain:

Osh мая, Prok/Anatole Daumans, Japan/France (3821.00 m)

Doorway Girls: A. Brunner, W. Germany/Denmark (2860.05 m)

All sniper fire (16mm): G. Goen, U.K. (3861.46 m)
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Sex And The Office Girl (Reconstructed version) (a):
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The Turning Point:

December 1977

FILMS REGISTERED WITHOUT ELIMINATIONS

For General Exhibition (G)

A Bigger Splash: Popular Music Int'l, Australia (2530.00 m)

Farwell To A Warrior: W. Germany (2861.53 m)

Free Ride (16mm): B. Donelan, U.S.A. (151.45 m)

Hershele: J.M. Pallardy, U.S.A. (921.46 m)

Jack The Ripper:

Northeast Cemetery Massacre (b): D. O'Callahan, U.S.A. (2526.80 m)

Northwest Cemetery Massacre (b): W. Pfeiffer, U.S.A. (2526.80 m)

Search For The Lost: W. Germany (2861.53 m)

Sleeping Dogs:

For Restricted Exhibition (R)

The Amorous Adventures of Don Quixote and Sancho Panza:

Cinderella: C. Bard, U.S.A. (2553.00 m)

Confessions from a Holiday Camp: G. Smith, U.K. (2413.35 m)

Distorted Women: O. Im, Korea (3767.94 m)

Executive From Shasling: R. Howard, Hong Kong (2840.00 m)

Fingers: G. B. Burke, U.S.A. (2448.00 m)
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BARGAIN OFFER
Rare copies of film souvenir programs.
The Heroes of Telemark $2.50
Oh! What a Lovely War $2.50
(Discount for multiple orders)
Ben-Hur (1959) $7.50
The Blue Max $5
Nicholas and Alexandra $10
Grand Prix $5
Most Pages in Full Color.
Ring first then write: PJG Productions
Moorabbin P.O.
Moorabbin, Vic. 3189.
Phone: (03) 97 6982
It is advisable to send orders by certified mail.

FILM REVIEW
INFORMATION SERVICE
Looking for information on a film? The George Lugg Library welcomes enquiries on local and overseas films. On receipt of search fee (one dollar for two enquiries) and S.A.E., synopsis and reviews will be supplied for each title, additional material on request.
All enquiries to:
The George Lugg Library
P.O. Box 357
Carlton South
Vic. 3053
The Library is operated with assistance from the Australian Film Commission.

Widescope Publishers/Visa Books are pleased to announce the forthcoming publication of a new Australian book.

Resource Book of 16mm Educational Films

Educational Media Australia have published what is perhaps the first Australian produced Resource Book of 16 mm Films of its kind.

Over 2000 films are listed, with a summary of each film's contents, the running time and recommended grade levels for study purposes.

The Resource Book contains a comprehensive Subject Index Listing, classifying each film under the appropriate Subject Heading or Headings.

Many of the titles are available for rental. Details of rental terms and conditions are set out in the Service Information section of the book.

ORDER
To The Rental Librarian, Educational Media Australia, 237 Clarendon Street, South Melbourne, Victoria, 3205.

Please supply copy/copies of the Resource Book of 16 mm Educational Films
Enclosed is payment of $...................
Plus postage of $...................
PAYMENT MUST ACCOMPANY ORDER.
NAME............................................................Date........
ADDRESS ........................................................................
Postcode ...............................................................
The only experience offered by most television is the experience of watching television, the system operates to keep things that way. — Dai Vaughan.

... realist has always presented itself as a certain way of coping with reality. As if reality were on one side and language on the other, as if reality were unconnected to language and the latter’s task were somehow to pursue the former until it had caught up! ... — Roland Barthes.

Realism is a central aesthetic practice to television, particularly to networks like the ABC, BBC and CBC. News reportage, documentary, live coverage, the immediacy of the real event, give substance to a mythic broadcasting tradition of objectivity, a style of clarity and directness.

The ideal television language is one of transparency — a language that denatures substance; a means solely for revealing the truth of the world, unadorned and untampered with, anterior to any language which might seek to re-present it.

The television monographs produced by the Educational Advisory Service of the British Film Institute particularly address this language/relational relation, either in aesthetic terms, or from a social/political/ideological perspective.

All the pamphlets are concerned with the mediating role of language — that television does not simply copy, but signifies, orders and structures meanings — and is merely presenting a version of reality.

It matters little whether that "reality" is a football match, a general election or today's news; what is always being told is a certain story, a narrative of the "real" event.

... although events may dictate aspects of television coverage, the coverage itself is made intelligible by television and not by some other medium. (Andrew Tudor in *Footballs on Television*)

The story told by British television of the 1974 soccer World Cup, for example, was different to the story told by German television which viewed the match from a great distance, seldom cutting-in close-up of players or action. The British television coverage was more dramatic — more a matter of performances, of stars and individuals, not of structure or team play.

Yet the story told by its presuppositions of television is that it is not telling a story, rather it is telling the truth. The supposed impartiality of the BBC authenticates the meaning which it broadcasts, while the veracity of the messages vindicate the impartiality of the broadcater.

The stress in the pamphlets on the signifying work of language — the coded, structural aspects of all communication — not only place doubt on BBC neutrality, but point to the myth of such objectivity as a primary ideological operation of television.

A consistent practice of British broadcasting to support and proselytise for the status quo (which indeed I believe to be its chief function), and an important strategy in naturalising the whole laud in visible which pari passu is to describe it as an activity of impartial presentation of the truth. (Richard Dyer)

... the audience's belief that what is reported is true and right ... is built up in the closest possible association with existing political institutions, the State and the parties. The possibility of pursuing, finding and stating the truth is identified with the institutions of liberal democracy, the less and the procedures whereby these institutions are sustained. (Trevor Pateman)

For Nicholas Garnham, good taste and objectivity are class or Establishment values, aspects of the bourgeois state which function as ideological cover for a broadcasting institution whose structure is "essentially authoritarian, hierarchic and undemocratic.

Even light television entertainment "does not seem to have evolved forms which link the expression of the utopia of entertainment to the present situation of the audience, in such a way that you can see how the present can be transformed toward and construct their critiques of the aesthetics and ideology of British broadcasting. The monograph by Dai Vaughan is the single exception to the genre."

Vaughan is concerned that language — any language — is an impoverishment, a diminishment, the construction of something less than the real.

... it may well be that we are witnessing the emergence of a new strategy on the party of television management ... to encourage a mode of response in which the element of reference (as opposed to pure signification) is more important than its anterior reality, will be effectively negated. Management may seek to falsify the world's untruthfulness by reducing it to the signification of a studio drama ... television as an institution, by its impoverishment of a documentary's reference to the world profits us in effect an impoverished world to which it invites us, by construing it as the world, to render absent."

If a transparent language is a television myth, Dai Vaughan holds it as a television ideology. The supposed transparency of language clogged with discourse which dominates and over-determines reality.

 Vaughan stresses the fullness of the real — rather than as something neutral awaiting the signifiers of language to give it meaning — but that the real already embraces the language. The "nature" of reality is to signify, to generate meanings, meanings that would be lost in a thin line of significance bestowed upon it, in this case, by the language of television.

The other writers wish to make evident the processes of the televisural language, to mark its presence and stress its artificiality.

"I emphasise the viability of processes and criteria of selection, because I think that the greater the invisibility, the less the Television Election appears as a cultural activity or product, involving fallible, partisan, ideologically structured choice at every point, and the more it appears as something which could not be other than it is, and, consequently, something credible and authoritative — the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth ..." (Trevor Pateman)
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CASTING YOUR NEXT MOVIE?

M.A.M.

MAD MAX
DAVID CAMERON
REG EVANS
JOAN LETCH
PAUL YOUNG

PATRICK
ROD MULLINAR
JULIA BLAKE
HELEN HEMINGWAY
WALTER PYM
FRANK WILSON
PAUL YOUNG

MOUTH TO MOUTH
IAN GILMOUR
PETER FINLAY
JOAN LETCH
WALTER PYM

LET THE BALLOON GO
MATHEW WILSON

THE MANGO TREE
GERARD KENNEDY
GARY DAY

RAW DEAL
GERARD KENNEDY
ROD MULLINAR
bethany lee
REG EVANS
SEAN MYERS
GARY DAY

THE GETTING OF WISDOM
JAN FRIEDL
KERRY ARMSTRONG
JULIA BLAKE
MARGO MCPLENNAN
GERDA NICOLSON
NONI HAZLEHURST
DOROTHY BRADLEY
TERENCE DONOVAN
KIM DEACON

DAWN!
GABRIELLE HARTLEY

THE LAST WAVE
FREDERICK PARSLOW

THE IRISHMAN
GERARD KENNEDY

ELIZA FRASER
GERARD KENNEDY
SEAN SCULLY
LEON LISSEK

THE YELLOW PYJAMA GIRL
ROD MULLINAR

PICTURE SHOW MAN
SALLY CONABERE
ERNE BOURNE

BREAK OF DAY
MAURIE FIELDS
SEAN MYERS
BILL NAGLE

SUMMERFIELD
ADRIAN WRIGHT
JOY WESTMORE

NEWSFRONT
GERARD KENNEDY

THE CHANT OF JIMMIE
BLACKSMITH
IAN GILMOUR
JILLIAN ARCHER

HARNESS FEVER
MARY WARD

DON'S PARTY
CLARE BINNEY

IN SEARCH OF ANNA
GERDA NICOLSON
MAURIE FIELDS
MARY WARD
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Barrymore, Fatty Arbuckle, Errol Flynn, Rudolph Valentino, Ali Khan, Clark Gable, John Garfield, John Gilbert. But Ms. Wayne is a skilled performer and can do more than just talk, although all will delight in the photographs; the critiques are much less superficial than in some previous volumes.

Halliwell’s Filmguy’s Companion by Leslie Halliwell, London, 1977. $39.95. A companion in his Filmguy’s Companion, this equally massive volume concentrates on films rather than people—800 of them. Each film is listed with running time, date of release, color, production company, director, writer, source, director, photographer, designer, and, a short synopsis, excepts from contemporary reviews, and the author’s own opinion. This is the ideal reference book.

International Film Guide 1978 edited by Peter Cowie, London, 1977. $8.95. The format and contents are the same as last year’s HFG. This is an invaluable source of information about foreign films, usually non-theatrical films in the U.S. and such esoterica.


The World Encyclopedia of Comics edited by Maurice Horr, New York, 1977. $15.95. A big undertaking, well researched, with the close-up shots that comic strips are known for, and the black-and-white. Comic-strip characters and their creators are listed, and there are sections on animators and companies in the films.

**Theory**

The Shadow and Its Shadow: Surrealist Writings on Cinema edited and introduced by Paul Hammond, London, 1977. $29.95. A fascinating little anthology, packed with information and insights, including a spirited defense of the original King Kong by Jean Ferry and a well-argued recommendation by Ade Akyrou to “learn to go and set the ‘worst’ films, they are sometimes sublime.”

**Individual Films**


The Magic Factory: How MGM Made An American in Paris by Donald Knox, New York, 1977. $9.95. Knox has taken full advantage of his knowledge of the enterprise, and a large part of this book is involved. Their candor enables us to appreciate the intricate and ably abrasive relationships that mould a film. This book is essential reading for film students and filmmakers.


**Ephemera**

Bill Collins Book of Movies, Sydney, 1977. $9.95. Bill Collins is not a film critic but a very informed film buff with a photographic memory and a forceful enthusiasm. The high-quality of the reproduction of old lobby cards (especially those in color) make this quite a pleasure reading.

Mountains of Desire: The Golden Years of Paramount Pictures by Leslie Halliwell, New York, 1977. $19.95. Unfortunately, this is not an annotated history of Paramount, but a difficult-to-follow (which is complete absence of an index and even more difficult) survey of that company’s press advertisements.

The Movie Buff’s Book 2 edited by Ted Sennett, New York, 1977. $29.95. A collection of books and magazine articles and illustrated, with some light articles and lots of photographs—usually a good thing.

**Review**

American Film Posters 1906-1960 is the first in a series of books and monographs to be published by the Australian Film Institute.

$7.50

Available at all leading bookstores and select cinemas.

AN OUTSTANDING COMPILATION OF POSTERS, DAY BILLS AND PHOTOGRAPHS, COMPLETE WITH COMPREHENSIVE NOTES, COVERING 54 YEARS OF THE AUSTRALIAN FILM INDUSTRY.

INFORMATION RESOURCE CENTRE AUSTRALIAN FILM INSTITUTE
81 Cardigan Street, Carlton, 3053.
Trouble is the Perth Institute of Film and Television is working in so many areas of film and television that people who know our work in one category often aren't aware of many of our other projects. Film distributors don't know we're film producers. Film producers may not know of our extensive education programme. And so on. To set the record straight, we are active in:

**Education**

The Institute’s education programme ranges from 8mm community-oriented courses to advanced 16mm workshops; from informal meetings with visiting film-makers to film law seminars. Recent visitors participating in such activities included Philip Jones, Tony Buckley, Bob Hill, Rosemary Anne Sisson and Stewart Fist.

**Production**

Under the auspices of the Australian Children's Film Foundation, PIFT is active in the area of children's film and television with sales to Channel 9 (Perth) and ABC National Television of short children's documentaries and dramas. Several children's T.V. serials and films are currently in pre-production.

**Resource Centre**

Special Projects

The Institute services the local film and television community through its extensive 16mm production and post-production facilities. Projects being planned include an exhibition of Video Art, and a festival of student film, video and photography.

**Film Exhibition**

We run a commercial 143 seat cinema, a 60 seat 16mm cinema specialising in Australian films and a "Moving Pictures" travelling film festival in country areas of Western Australia.

Stay tuned. There's more to come.
In the previous issue of *Cinema Papers* 20, there was a report on the Seminar in Children's Film and Television held at the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal in Melbourne from October 12-17, 1977. Printed below are the Seminar's recommendations:

### Australian Children's Film and Television Seminar

In the previous issue of *Cinema Papers* 20, there was a report on the Seminar in Children's Film and Television held at the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal in Melbourne from October 12-17, 1977. Printed below are the Seminar's recommendations:

1. **Introduction to Content**

   - A new classification 'C' — for children, be instituted.
   - A differentially classified 'M' may be applied to content which is informative or educational, and would be unsuitable for the ages of six and twelve (inclusive).
   - The seminar also considers that a 16mm film should be classified as a subject to the Australian Film and Television Classification Tribunal (FACTS).
   - Dissent by FACTS

2. **Screening and Production**

   - The screening and production of program-makers has been strongly encouraged by the seminar.
   - The seminar recommends that the screening and production of program-makers be carried out in a professional manner.
   - Dissent by FACTS

3. **Research and Development**

   - The seminar acknowledges the importance of research and development in the field of children's film and television.
   - The seminar recommends that research and development should be a priority in the field of children's film and television.
   - Dissent by FACTS

4. **Funds and Resources**

   - The seminar recognizes the need for funds and resources to support children's film and television.
   - The seminar recommends that funds and resources be made available for children's film and television.
   - Dissent by FACTS

5. **Education and Training**

   - The seminar recognizes the importance of education and training in the field of children's film and television.
   - The seminar recommends that education and training programs be established for children's film and television.
   - Dissent by FACTS

6. **Summary and Conclusion**

   - The seminar concludes by stating that the recommendations made are in the best interests of children's film and television.
   - The seminar recommends that these recommendations be implemented by all relevant bodies.
   - Dissent by FACTS
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5. **Education and Training**

   - The seminar recognizes the importance of education and training in the field of children's film and television.
   - The seminar recommends that education and training programs be established for children's film and television.
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**Sharmill Films**

Personalised distribution of connoisseur films...

Proudly Announces
Outstanding Films For Hire

- **Hester Street** (16mm and 35mm)
- **Bernice Bobs Her Hair** (16mm; non-theatrical hire only)
- **Antonia, Portrait of a Woman** (16mm)
- **I Can Jump Puddles** (16mm and 35mm)
- **Wives** (35mm)
- **27A** (16mm)
- Many Bunuel Classics

For full catalogue, write or phone:
Natalie Miller, 27 Stonnington Place,
Toorak, Vic 3142, Australia.
Telephone: (03) 20 5329. Cables: Sharmilms Melbourne.

---

**Ross Dimsey**

is an

INDEPENDENT

Director, Writer, Producer.

of

FILM

Commercial, Documentary, Feature

(03) 96 1109

---

**Question:**

**When is a bear not a bear?**

**Answer:**

**When it’s a Koala**

Koala (which really isn’t a bear at all) is one of the Australian Wildlife Film Series made by Film Australia. Enquiries welcomed at Film Australia P.O. Box 46 Lindfield 2070 Telephone 467 0111

Australian Film Commission
The increase in film study courses in Australian educational institutes is stimulating demand for accurate information held in private and government film libraries. Two recent titles, provides date of release, country of origin and recent credits. Members not advertising are listed only by name. Copies are available from the Australian Writers’ Guild, 197 Blue Point Rd, North Sydney, NSW, 2060.

The 16mm Feature Film Catalogue is an indispensable resource for schools and film societies. The new edition has a number of improvements and a number of deficits. Many of the errors widely scattered throughout the second edition have been corrected (In God’s Name is now correctly listed as an American film, not Australian and its length has been corrected from 20 minutes to 57 minutes), and the sections of the catalogue — distributor, disc and title — are now distinguished by color. There are more than 1000 new titles listed.

On the negative side is the reduced size and illegibility of the poorly printed text with its computer-style typography, and a continuing number of inconsistencies in the presentation. Some entries are listed merely by surname, while others have Christian names or initials. This has led to mistakes in the director listings, such as The Cross and the Switchblade and Summer Shadows, both being credited to Murray. Yet the first was made by Don Murray and the other by Scott Murray.

As well, the elimination of the approximate rental costs in the alphabetical list means that price discrimination between the Film Study Collection Working Title List is impossible. In the second edition, Le Chien Andalou by Luis Bunuel was listed at $5 and $25 for two different distributors. Now there is no way to decide.

One hopes the Government will provide a sufficient subsidy for a complete re-editing and checking of the fourth edition. The third edition costs $25 (plus tax) and is available from the Australian Council of Film Societies, 20 Crathie Ave, Park Orchid, Vic. 14.

The pamphlet, Film: A Guide To Reference Books (compiled by Brian Reis, Griffith University, Queensland, $25.50), is an important addition to every film study library. The 23 pages of text are organized by subject categories — encyclopedias, study guides, filmographies, surveys of film, etc. — and each entry has a succinct, critical synopsis.

The Little Blue Book, as the Australian Writers’ Guild Members’ Directory 1977 is affectionately sub-titled, is a handy reference guide to Australian scriptwriters. Those listed are members of the Guild, and there is a list of award winners.

In the paid-advertising section, the information includes addresses, writer preferences, number of years experience, and recent credits. Members not advertising are listed only by name. Copies are available from the Australian Writers’ Guild, 197 Blue Point Rd, North Sydney, NSW, 2060.
LOW BUDGETS, HIGH QUALITY IN LOCAL FILMMAKING

National Times, July 25, 1977

Brian Brown and Linden Wilkenson in Volita directed by James Ricketson.
(Made with assistance from the Film Production Fund).

THE CREATIVE DEVELOPMENT BRANCH
of the
AUSTRALIAN FILM COMMISSION

Provides assistance for filmmakers to:
— INNOVATE
— DEVELOP FILMMAKING SKILLS AND TECHNIQUES
— MAKE THE FILM THEY REALLY WANT TO MAKE

All Filmmakers are eligible to apply — whether employed in government/commercial production or independents; whether fully professional or less experienced.

If you have a film project that you want to get off the ground discuss your proposal with a Project Officer from the Creative Development Branch before submitting an application. To arrange an appointment contact Curtis Levy (Film Production Fund), Richard Keys (Script Development Fund), or Albie Thomis (Experimental Film and Television Fund) at Sydney (02) 922 6855. Melbourne applicants for all funds should contact Greg Tepper at the Australian Film Commission Office, 8th Floor, 140 Bourke Street, Melbourne (03) 663 4795.

Application forms and guidelines for the funds are available from:
The Chairman
Australian Film Commission
GPO Box 3984
Sydney, NSW 2001

FILM PRODUCTION FUND provides assistance to experienced filmmakers for innovative projects which have potential to further the applicant's development as a filmmaker.

SCRIPT DEVELOPMENT FUND assists experienced and promising writers and directors who wish to devote their full time to develop a film or television script over a specific period of time.

EXPERIMENTAL FILM AND TELEVISION FUND provides assistance to filmmakers with lots of promise but limited experience. The fund favours projects which are innovative in form, content or technique and supports experimental and avant garde work.
NOT NON-NARRATIVE

"What would be the narrative of a journey in which it is said that one stays somewhere without having arrived, that one is departured, one arrives or fails to arrive?"

Roland Barthes

This is the first of a regular feature in Cinema Papers devoted to a certain kind of film for which there are no names except those we wish (literally) to de-nominate."

In 1975, a submission was presented to the National Library in Canberra for the consideration of a core collection of films primarily for use in film study. (The collection was not assembled, but the submission seems to have served as a kind of guide to piecemeal acquisitions.) Albie Thoms drafted the proposal for the avant-garde film which he defined as having "always drawn its inspiration in opposition to narrative-fiction films." (My italics)

Narrative is the great discursive mode of the cinema. Most films produced are narrative, and the histories of the cinema are those of the narrative cinema. But that state of affairs has not been uncontested.

Godard disrupted the anthropomorphism on which narrative depended, the importance of unified, coherent characters, "persons with names, with a biography, a chronology, 'real' motivations. He placed single characters in multiple fictional worlds and divided characters within a single world.

Robbe-Grillet brought forward the element of narration within the narrative so that its levels intersected and interrupted each other, became contradictory, mutually de-signified. The stability of objects, of events, of actions was made uncertain by the plurality of narrational sources. Straub dismantled the smooth, homogeneous, illusionistic surface of fictional film realism by a stress on multiple, differential, opposed levels of reality—"that reality of its representation are never singular.

These films are not narrative and they are not non-narrative. They position themselves within the genre of narrative cinema, but in a position of critical struggle, with texts, the production of meanings, and the ideology of forms of production—in particular, the ideology involved in narrative practices.

A film tradition, primarily American, dating from the works of Maya Deren in the early 1940s, and having its most direct expression in the films of Stan Brakhage, from 1953 to the present, counterposed itself to the commercial, narrative film, as an 'alternative,' non-narrative cinema.

Brakhage wanted to start at a zero-signification outside the figures of meaning of cinema practice—"Forget ideology... Abandon aesthetics... Negate technique."

"Imagine an eye unruled by man-made laws of perspective, an eye unprejudiced by compositional logic, an eye which does not respond to the name of everything but which must know each object encountered in life through an adventure of perception."

The films were personal, interior, subjective, and literally self-centred. "Myself as medium," wrote Brakhage. The films were hostile to language, names, received structures, the logical, the general, the conventional, and the historical. Experience was posed against thought, poetry against reason (a rather singular view of poetry), vision against logic.

Once again, largely in the U.S., a different kind of film began to appear in the mid-1960s, one more objectively structured, more concerned with the material substance of film than with personal 'light,' and more interested in structures of perception than with visionary space. These films had obvious implications for narrative, and though they developed codes quite unlike those customary for the narrative of the Hollywood film, or even those of Godard or Straub, they did not, by that token, less narrative, or non-narrative.

The recent films of Hollis Frampton have been described as narrative. His early Zorns Lemma is a play with linearity and thematic reception based on a duration and sign pattern derived from an early Manchali.

Michael Snow has described his film Wavelength as narrative: the 45-minute interrupted room across a studio floor, "a tacking place in space, a measure of events, and of the camera event which produces these events, which narrates and which is in turn narrated.

His films, including La region centrale, are concerned with the centre of narration, the narrative source, from which the one film pulsates back and forth, and around which the other quiche literally revolves.

In Australia, the color separation studies of Arthur and Corinne Cantrill examine the effect of light and duration on the perception of event and object. Their films The Devil's Advocate and Alidental, which recorded and made films of aspects of Aboriginal culture in Central Australia in the early 1940s, work to narrate already narrativized images of an Aboriginal past. The films retrace a double trace of history, and of the production of that history, in the cinematic images of Baldwin Spencer.

John Dunkley-Smith, who works in Melbourne, has made precisely ordered films which work in an area of expectation through patterned repetitions of images and of their duration. Expectation is produced by a structure; events in the film are the play and activity of that structure. His work echoes many of the structuralist concerns of the London Film-makers' Cooperative.

"Non-narrative" is not an adequate category for these films; nor is any other which limits the activity of film to a name or model. This feature will emphasize practice rather than nomenclature. It will try to see films in their work of signifying, of constructing sense, of experimenting with problems; problems such as narrative modes, the relation of material filmic modes to the relation of the film text to its source and centre.
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GUN RENTALS
COLLSHOOT SALES

Dealers in Antique — Military & Collectable Firearms — Related Items

Offers a Specialised Service to
The Film Making Industry via rentals of . . .
- Most Every Type of Antique Firearms
- Most Every Type of Modern Firearms
- Edged Weapons (Swords, Knives, etc.)
- Military Items (Uniforms etc.)

ANYTHING relating to the above fields.

FREE
Advice concerning the correct type of firearm(s) etc. to correspond with the period of the film.

Shop Address:
3 Elizabeth St., Coburg, Melb. Vic. 3058
Phone: (03) 354-6876

David Coggin
Caterer to the Film Industry and the Light Car Club of Australia
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Patrick
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ABC Series

First class food • Quotes given
- Willing to travel
- Fully mobile kitchen available

46 Queens Road
Melbourne 3004
Phone: (03) 515284
"Patrick" — Special Effects

Continued from P. 305

THE FLYING RIG

One effect you touched on before was a rig for the scene where Patrick thrusts a doctor out of a room and into a doorway by psycho-kinetic power. Could you describe how you executed that?

Actually it’s an overhead trolley, a monorail, supported from above with four bearings riding on a single pipe, and a pulley arrangement to lift the actor. The actor wears a harness belt which goes around his waist, with straps that run down under the groin and others up over the shoulders. On the sides of the harness are metal reinforcing wires which attach piano wire with eye-hooks at one end and a winch on the back of the harness, and running that to a big piece of timber. We then had four people pull on it.

Originally I had tried to build a jerk ratchet — another item readily available in the U.S. This device is a long, reinforced board with 20 to 30 strands of heavy bungee or shock cord attached to eye-hooks at one end and a winch at the other.

You just wind it up like a giant slingshot, attach the harness cable, then fire it.

It’s generally used for shotgun effects, for someone being blown against a wall; but in the available time I was unable to locate anything but 6mm bungee — and the machine would not operate properly.

Does a special effects man often have to overcome the fear of actors?

Yes, though I have found that, other than by demonstrations or delayed instruction, an off-hand or humorous approach usually does the job. A lot of times I’ll ask things like “Is the ambulance ready outside?”, or “Has the emergency room been notified?” That kind of approach seems to set actors at ease.

Dimboola is probably the most successful theatrical event in Australia’s history. I understand it has been seen by more than 350,000 people. Because it’s been so universally well-liked, I think a large number of the people who have seen the play will want to see the film. This is a good start. Obviously we want everyone else to see it too.

Isn’t there a danger that they will be expecting a film version of the play?

They probably will, and in publicizing the film we will have to indicate that it is going to be very different to the play. Basically it is comedy, and if it works it should have very wide appeal. However, I would also like to capture some of the feeling of films, like for example Amarcord and The Fireman’s Ball, and the play Under Milk Wood — although a bit more roistering than these, I see the film as having much broader possibilities than simply a Bazaar-style okker comedy which some people seem to be expecting.

In the city, people associate generally in groups of their own kind. In a country town, the population is too small for this and there is generally a greater mixing. I would like to try and capture this diversity of types — in a heightened reality certainly, but one that doesn’t lose touch with its naturalistic roots. I hope we can create a good deal of warmth and energy — as we tried to in MOUTH TO MOUTH.

Are you shooting on location?

Yes, it will be filmed entirely in Dimboola. We have been up there looking around the place and the town is excited at the idea. Dimboola, the play, was taken there a couple of years ago and played three sold-out nights. Everyone liked it, and looks forward to the film putting Dimboola on the globe.

Have you finalized a budget for the film?

Yes, $350,000 — which is a lot of money. It is very difficult to pare it below that, simply because of the cost of the cast and the associated expenses of accommodating, transporting and feeding that number of people. There are more than 30 large speaking parts, and a lot of extras.

Have you raised all of the money?

Most of it; there is still some private money to chase.

Will the crew be of a similar size to that on "MOUTH TO MOUTH"?

A bit larger in the Art Department/Costumes/Props area, but a number of the same people: Tom Cowan will be off in my own hair. She thought it the sound, Vicki Molloy will be production manager.

Probably seven or eight people from MOUTH TO MOUTH will be working on it — the crew on MOUTH was very good. I was delighted to work with Tom again and we had worked together once on Bonjour Balwyn in 1970.
Short film reviews...
Feature film reviews...
Latest film library news...
Film society and festival news...
Films for the specialist...

Federation News has all the answers

It is the quarterly journal of the Federation of Victorian Film Societies now published with the assistance of the Creative Development Branch of the Australian Film Commission.

For over 20 years, Federation News has become recognised as an essential reference journal for the non-commercial use of 16mm film...film societies, schools, adult discussion groups, specialists who use film and plan programmes.

Federation News is now published in March, June, September and December.
1978 SUBSCRIPTION: $16.00 inc. postage from:
F.V.F.S., 4 Stanley Grove, Canterbury, Victoria, 3126.

FILMNEWS

FILMNEWS, a monthly newspaper of Australian independent cinema, is published by the Sydney Filmmakers Co-operative Ltd. FILMNEWS contains news and reviews, interviews, technical and production notes, gossip and opinion. Essential reading for anyone interested in the development of Australian film.

Subscriptions — $8/year (Aust) or $10/year (foreign). Send to FILMNEWS, P.O. Box 217, Kings Cross, NSW 2011, Australia.

CAMERA MISSING

1948 Arriflex Model A
(Serial No.: 1066)
Complete with:
28mm lens (Serial No.: 11183328),
50mm lens (Serial No.: 82999169),
and 6 inch lens (Serial No.: 2147129)
Plus two 400ft magazines

$100 reward for return of above

Please phone: Palm Beach Pictures
(02) 919 4622
Steven Spielberg
Continued from P.321

But I had to make this film pretty much from my understanding. There comes a point where you have to forget the audience and try to please yourself.

I get a lot of letters from people who have seen the film five or six times in the U.S., and who tell me about things they missed the first or second time and got the fourth or fifth time.

That’s very good for the film . . .

Yes, it is. It’s a miracle if you can encourage people to see any film more than once.

How much money has the film made?

Seventy million dollars.*

What percentage of that is yours?

About 15 per cent, but not 15 per cent of the $70 million. It is only after distribution costs, after the studio has taken its share, the exhibitors theirs and so on. It’s a racket. Everybody gets their money first and when it’s time for the filmmakers to get their piece, it’s hardly a mouthful. That’s how it has always been.

When a filmmaker starts distributing his own films, that’s when he can make a profit, and that’s what I will start doing in the future. But then I am not really concerned with how much money I can make from the film — I never have been.

Don’t you want to be your own producer?

Yes, very much; but the reason I wasn’t my own producer on this film was because I knew it would be a gargantuan project, and I knew I needed somebody who could handle the studio and the paperwork. I didn’t want to spend my time at home doing that when I should have been planning my next day’s shooting. I’ll be my own producer on a very small film, like my next one. It has a budget of only $1.5 million, with a five-week schedule.

So you are still capable of working on a small film as opposed to a monolith . . .

Sure, I am going back to my roots with this next film. It’s about what happens when you are eight to 14 years-old, and what you do between leaving school at 3 o’clock and having dinner at 6. It’s about today’s children, not when I was a kid, because today’s children are much more advanced than I was when I was 11 years. They are reaching puberty, and discovering women and their own self-importance much earlier.

When do you start it?

In May, and it will be out at Christmas. I can do a very small film because my appetite for the big ones has been... I am full! I feel like I’ve had fish with Jaws and meat with Close Encounters — now I want a light dessert.

In “Close Encounters” you worked with five great cinematographers.** How did that work out?

They never actually worked together. I should explain that I make films in an unorthodox way. I shoot the bare, essential script first, then I stop and look at it. I then see if it needs, say, a new opening or more explanation in a scene. Sometimes I go out months later and shoot two more days. And then a month beyond that I shoot another two days.

When I was shooting some of the additions, John Alonzo was available, but Vilmos Zsigmond was making another film and couldn’t wait for me to be whimsical about adding extra scenes. Later on I got another idea and Laszlo Kovacs shot a few days for me. That’s how it works. I don’t believe that a film should stop when the schedule says “last day”.

My problem is I should be handcuffed to the wall. On this film, I was still cutting only days before it was released, I took seven minutes out a week before it opened. And if I had to do all over again, I’d take another seven minutes out....

Wasn’t it difficult for the cinematographers to adjust to the style of the previous man?

All cinematographers in the U.S., like all directors, are great friends. William Fraker and Laszlo Kovacs, John Alonzo and Vilmos Zsigmond are very close. We often have dinner or go to parties together. So they know each other’s styles very well — that’s all they discuss. And before each additional cinematographer came in work with me, they looked at the film that had already been photographed and matched that style.

How did you get the child to react so well?

By adopting him: we were inseparable for three months. I knew what he liked and didn’t, and how to get him to smile. I would describe what he was letting himself in for. As much as I adopted the little boy, Truffaut adopted the creature. You’d find him standing there talking to this inanimate object in French. He is a wonderful man, but I don’t understand all of him. I spent a year with Truffaut, but I really don’t know him. Very nice, but very mysterious.

Was it difficult for Truffaut to understand the film and his role?

Yes, Truffaut wanted to know more about Lacombe because in the film I suggest that the story stops for a musical where the story stops for a song. Lots of heavy tap-dancing, smoke coming out of the shoes. The problem is that films were as influential in the 30s and 40s as television is today. Because of Fred Astaire, parents forced their children to learn tap dancing. But tap dancing has not been in vogue for two decades, so when you make a musical you can’t find any tap dancers. It’ll be hard casting.

SPIELBERG FILMOGRAPHY

TELEVISION FEATURES

1970 Night Gallery (ABC Movie of the Week)
1970 The Psychiatrist (ABC Movie of the Week)
1970 God Bless the Children (ABC Movie of the Week)
1971 Duel (released theatrically outside the U.S.)
1972 Something Evil

TELEVISION EPISODES

1970 Name of the Game
1970 Marcus Welby, MD
1970 Columbo

FEATURES

1973 Sugarland Express
1975 Jaws
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**Vilmos Zsigmond, Laszlo Kovacs, William A. Fraker, John Alonzo and Douglas Slocombe.
CAMERA:
16mm double system production: ECLAIR, NPR.
16mm hand held: ECLAIR, ACL.
16mm single system: ECLAIR, ACL, SS.
35mm double system: ECLAIR, CAMFLEX.
35mm hand held: MOVIECAM.

SOUND:
STELLAVOX SP8.2: dual track sync recorder.
AMI-48: 5-channel mixer.
MAGNASYNC: transfer recorders, insert, dubbers, reproducers, displacement, recorders and reproducers.
MICRON: radio mike transmitters.

GRIP:
LOWEL: link location systems.
MATHEWS and RDS: for gobo's, stands, flags, cutters, pole cats, scrims, nets, sun screens, clamps and grips.
MILLER and QUICKSET: tripods.
TVP: dollys. LOWEL and TVP: sound booms.

LIGHTING:
Flicker free HMI fresnel and open face focusing heads: LTM 200, 575, 1200, 2500 and 4000. KOBOLD fill lighting 575 and 1200. Portable lighting systems LOWEL TOTAL and QLD "yellow heads". LOWEL SOFT lights and OMNI lights. Battery driven KOBOLD HMI sungun. Colour control and diffusion by ROSCO cinegel.

STUDIO:
Grid and hanger systems by RDS and LTM.
Studio lighting fixtures by RDS, LTM. Colour effects by ROSCO SUPERGEL. TVP studio dollys and booms.

SETS:
Paint by ROSCOPEINT. Cladding by ROSCOTALIX. Drapes and costume effects by ROSCOGLAME. Mosaics by ROSCO SUPERGEL. TVP ROSCOLENE. Breakaways by ROSCOBREAKAWAYS.

LAB:
NEILSON HORDELL & OXBERRY for effects and step printers, liquid gates by OXBERRY. Test equipment by HOLLYWOOD FILM CORPORATION. Standardisation by SMPTE test films.

POST PRODUCTION:
PREVOST 16/35 combination editing tables, MOVIOLA flat bed and upright editors, ACMADE pic syncs, EASTON synchronisers and winders, HFC and CIR splicers, Mylar and acetate splicing tape, horses, benches, trimbins and scissors.

EFFECTS:
OXBERRY animation stands from super 8 to computer controlled master series with aerial image. NEILSON HORDEL super trick front projection systems and animation stands with aerial image. FAX 16mm low cost animation stands.

TALENT:
A.R. "Andy" GIBSON.
HUGH KINGSLEY.
ROSS OGILVY.
IAN MCAULEY.
sydney 26 1981
melbourne 62 1133
brisbane 52 8816
perth 325 2910

LOCATION:
H.O. 8 dungate lane sydney 2000. telex.
77 city rd, sth melbourne 3205.
28 baxter st, fortitude valley 4006.
121 hill st, east perth 3205.

AA 26664
AA 30912
AA 42054
AA 93582
Jorn Donner
Continued from p. 309

American films, at their best, function on both the physical-action and the psychological-excitement levels. But there are filmmakers who are not interested in psychological chains of events. For these people, American films can still work, because the physical action can be followed without an understanding of action on other levels.

It may be a sign of change that three books by the late Per Wahloo, whose works are action-filled and socially critical, were filmed within one year. First, Mannen pa taket (The Man on the Roof), directed by Mats Arehn; and, most recently, Lastbilen (The Truck), directed by Arne Mattsson.* This may show that Swedish film is not an isolated island after all; that bridges can be built to the world, that Swedish films other than Bergman's can reach out to other eyes. From that viewpoint, it feels exciting to produce films in Sweden.

Moreover, a majority of Swedish films are made with the financial backing of other countries. Public financing in other forms exists in many other places. The number of gifted people in any given country seems to vary enormously. There are countries in which it would be theoretically possible to produce much, much better. But nothing is happening.

In Sweden, some 20 to 25 films a year are being made. At present, resources do not permit one to do one for — while, at the same time, understanding the prison that such a fear creates — "It's like a sack being drawn tight." A Snappy poster on his wall serves as an ever-present reminder of the process of ageing: "Once ever, I have now done it."

In marked contrast to Troell's metaphysics, in which the process of self-questioning becomes an end in itself, Vilgot Sjoman's Tabu (Taboo, 1977) aspires to lay bare the reality of the anguish of sexual minorities. Drawing 90 per cent of his material from "research on reality", Sjoman constructs his drama as "a film about a girl who gets fooled by a false revolution... a reformer projecting his own neuroses on to the world".

The girl, Sara (Licka Sjoman), provides the link between the 'normal' world (that of the audience, of course) and Sjoman's 'catalogue of the all the various perversities'. Hers is far from an erotic story, as the moves from infatuation with "the reformer", a lawyer, Kristoffer (Kjell Bergqvist), to a recognition of his hypocrisy and an empathy with those he has been exploiting. We are able to recognize his inadequacies long before she does, and thus our perspective on the events in the film is outside those she presents, either in the voice-over commentary or in her role in the drama.

While the sincerity of Sjoman's declared commitment to the cause of sexual freedom is beyond question, the film and his comments about it place his position in doubt. The growth of Sara's insight into the film's sexual underworld is asserted by the closing scenes, which were made without the knowledge of the Swedish Film Institute, and has worked as producer on numerous recent Swedish films. His most recent feature is Man Rape.

Ingmar Bergman doesn't live here any more.

Continued from p. 309

Jan Troell's Bang! (1977), perceptively described by producer Bengt Forslund as a "life symphony", orchestrates a number of variations on reality and fantasy, its movements both comic and serious. A stylistically elaborate film, its central concern is the artist — here, the Sleeping Composer attempting to transcend his mortality.

Working as a music teacher, Magnus (Hakan Serner) lives in fear of his death — "When you no longer expect a fairytale over the hill, then you're done for" — while, at the same time, understanding the prison that such a fear creates — "It's like a sack being drawn tight." A Snoopy poster on his wall serves as an ever-present reminder of the process of ageing: "Once ever, I have now done it."

Unlike Den Allvarsamma Leken, which also concerns itself with a quest for a "fairytale", the final film by the same director is treated with considerable sympathy. There is what would appear to be a degree of identification by Troell with his artist-hero: once a schoolteacher himself, his artistic aspirations and eventual success parallel Magnus' abandonment of teaching as his "sounds" symphony is about to receive its first public performance.

Troell balances Magnus' construction of this symphony, drawn from recorded sounds of the everyday world, against the composer's reluctance to face the human side of these sounds. Magnus' life is a constant retreat into the privacy of his creation: to connect himself with life is to concede its transience, though it is also a possibility for rebirth; to reconstruct that life in his own image is to keep its transience at bay, though it is also to retreat from it and its possibilities.

*See also The Laughing Policeman (Stuart Rosenberg, U.S.)

Diana Kjaer and Jorn Donner in Donner's Tenderness — Pieces From A Marriage.

All Sjoman does is impose upon him a cruel irony, heavy-handed in its directness. Kristoffer's self-image is underlined by the name Sjoman gives him, and his lack of self-awareness and the sense of guilt which he challenges a maturing Sara, now disillusioned by him, with the charge that she is suffering from "a severe identity crisis".

A less didactic, more generous commitment to the object of his desire — "I hate seducers... preachers... revolutionaries who want to save Mankind, but who, in reality, are more concerned with acting out their own chaos than helping people... might have to be admitted — to Octavio Paz — to be to be. It remains the most ambitious of the Swedish films we have discussed, but one of the least successful.

Biographical Notes

(1) Anja Breien: Born in Norway in 1940, she studied at the French film school, IDHEC, from 1962-1964, then worked for television and as an assistant director; was originally assigned to (Salt Hunger — 1966) — before directing Rape (1971) and Her Marriage (1973). She was invited to Sweden to make Games of Love and Loneliness when director Per Blom fell ill during rehearsals.

(2) Jorn Donner: Born in 1931, he worked there as a film critic, a career he pursued when he went to Sweden in the early 1960s. He made a number of films including, The Cuckoo (Fock Off! Images From Finland — 1971) and is a member of the exhibitionist who decides not to appeal against his sentence (thus denying Kristoffer the further opportunity to make public his confession). He has worked as a film critic, a career he pursued when he went to Sweden in the early 1960s. He made a number of films including, The Cuckoo (Fock Off! Images From Finland — 1971) and is a member of the exhibitionist who decides not to appeal against his sentence (thus denying Kristoffer the further opportunity to make public his confession).

(3) Lasse Forsberg: Has worked primarily for Swedish television making over 50 films in 10 years. He has two features (to my knowledge) to his credit: Misshandlingen (The Assault — 1970), and Masangkan Med Fanny (Robert and Fanny — 1977).


(5) Gunnell Lindblom: A well-known Swedish actress who is best known for her work with Ingmar Bergman in Sven-Bertil Taube's The Seventh Seal (1957), Smultron-stallet (Wild Strawberries — 1957), Nattvardsgasterna (Winter Light — 1963), Tystnaden (The Silence — 1963) and Seenner ur ett okonskurs (Scenes From A Marriage). Lindblom has, since 1968, been a director on the staff of Stockholm's Royal Dramatic Theatre.

(6) Vilgot Sjoman: Perhaps the most controversial of the mainstream Swedish directors. His first film, Alskatinnan (The Mistress), was made in 1962. He was assistant director on Winter Light (1963) and since then his work has been concerned with sexual mores and instruments of social repression: 491 (1964), Kanal (The Dress — 1964), Sisindlade 1782 (My Sister, My Love — 1966), Jag ar svart skriva (I am Curious — Yellow — 1967), Jag ar nyfiken — gul (I am Curious — Blue — 1968), Ni ljuser (You're Dead — 1968), Lyckliga skitar (Blushing Charlie — 1970), Troll (1971), En handfull karlet (A Handful Of Love — 1974), Garaget (The Garage — 1972) and Taboo (Taboo). Arranged for Dole Doof (Who Saw Him Die? — 1980), Uvdarnaderna (The Operations — 1980), Dig Slektska (The Actress — 1980), Mazzagnara (The New Land — 1972), Zandy's Bride (1975, U.S.) and Bang. He is currently working on The Hurricane, which was originally assigned to Roman Polanski by producer Dino de Laurentis.
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DAYS I'LL REMEMBER — IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Director...... Michael Uhl
Screenplay...... Graham Green

SYNOPSIS: The film is a historical documentary that explores the early days of settlement in South Australia, focusing on the challenges and achievements of the pioneers. It highlights the importance of cooperation and resilience in shaping the future of the region.

HOUSING

Screenplay...... Kevin O'Donnell
Length...... 20 min

SYNOPSIS: This film examines the evolution of housing in South Australia, from early settlers' structures to modern developments. It discusses the impact of economic factors, social changes, and technological advancements on the housing sector.

HUMANITY AND HARMONY

Screenplay...... Malcolm Purcell
Length...... 16 min

SYNOPSIS: This film explores the concept of harmony in the context of interpersonal relationships and community cohesion. It uses visual and narrative elements to illustrate the importance of understanding and empathy in fostering a harmonious society.

LIFE BE IT

Produce Company...... Australian Centre for the Arts
Direction...... John Hock
Screenplay...... Richard Yeates

SYNOPSIS: A film about the resilience of the human spirit in the face of adversity. It tells the story of individuals who overcome personal challenges and demonstrate courage and determination.

PESTICIDE CONTROL

Screenplay...... Malcolm Purcell
Executive Producer...... Peter Lampard

SYNOPSIS: This film educates viewers about the importance of responsible pest management practices. It highlights the impact of pesticide use on human health and the environment.

TAX DURING WORKERS

Screenplay...... Christopher Bishop
Executive Producer...... Peter Lampard

SYNOPSIS: A film that explores the tax implications for workers and businesses. It provides insights into tax laws and their effects on economic decision-making.

SAFETY IN SMALL BOATS

Director...... John Hock
Executive Producer...... Peter Lampard

SYNOPSIS: This film emphasizes the importance of safety measures in boating. It offers tips and guidelines for preventing accidents and ensuring a safe boating experience.

TRAINING EXERCISE

Director...... John Hock
Executive Producer...... Peter Lampard

SYNOPSIS: A training exercise film that focuses on the importance of regular training for professionals in various fields. It demonstrates the benefits of ongoing education and skill development.

VICTORIAN FILM CORPORATION

ALLPORT LIBRARY

Produce Company...... Tasmanian Film Corporation

SYNOPSIS: This film provides a comprehensive overview of the historical and cultural significance of the Allport Library in Victoria. It explores its role in preserving and disseminating knowledge.

A Precious Inheritance

The V.F.C. have invested in the following projects:

**SCRIPT DEVELOPMENT**

Hexagon P/L, The Last of the Knucklemen $7500

Storey Seas, Woman in Love $5000

Watermark Furnaces, Rusty Bridges $4700 (additional pre-production money)

**FEATURE FILMS**

Prax Factory Productions, Dimboola $100000

**GENERAL**

Write a short film grant $2000

National Film Finance Corporation, The Money Movers $10000

Sue Miller, Tom Jeffrey, The Odd Angry Shot $16000

**AUSTRALIAN FILM COMMISSION**

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

Production approval from the 12 December 1977 AFC meeting:

SCRIPT DEVELOPMENT/PRE-PRODUCTION APPROVALS

Pelecia Lowel, The House Upstairs $2000

Michael Thornton, The Death in the Desert $750

Park P/L, The Hammer and the Spike $450

Lionel Hunt, In Search of the Marsupial World $5000

PRODUCTION APPROVALS

Mudly Pictures, Friday the Thirteenth $2200

Pam Oliver/Errol Sullivan, The Cathy Bachas Affair $17600

South Australian Film Corporation, Blue Fox $13000

Production approvals from the 7 February 1978 AFC meeting:

SCRIPT DEVELOPMENT/PRE-PRODUCTION APPROVALS

Peacees Productions P/L, Tim $4875

Edgelli Films P/L, Eden Rock $1800

Michael Ochek/Heidi Saltzman, Queen of Hearts $6600

Bill Wauckoch/John Beaton, Cataclyse Escape $2300

The Derrickson Family $5000

Bob Eats/Chris McDuck, Lindsay $6000

PRODUCTION APPROVALS

Greenbow Corporation, Sparks $6000

Arts Films P/L, The Last Tasmanian $5471

Spectra P/L, Telemovie Package $94000

Renu Productions P/L, The Odd Angry Shark $10000

Peter Loves/Paul $12375

Grapevine Productions, Learn Quick Die Young $18266

Candy Bar Productions, Allie's Birthday $100000

MARKETING APPROVALS

David Harmon, distribution for Solo $5000

Yoram Gross Film Studio, industry assistance $16000

William Foulsham House, industry assistance $16000

CREATIVE DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

Projects recommended for funding from the February 1978 AFC meeting:

EXPERIMENTAL FILM AND TELEVISION FUND

EXPLOITATION—FUND

Peter de Lorenzo (NSW), $10000

Antonette Starkiewicz (NSW) and Lottie Green (NSW), $500

Sue Millman and Tom Jeffrey (NSW), $1500

Michael Ochek (NSW), $2000

Roger Bayley (Qld), $2500

Roberta Hirst (NSW), $3000

Kim Rendall (NSW), $3000

Lauren Hills (NSW), $4000

Moldie Cole (NSW), $5000

Michael Wilkins (NSW), $6000

**FILM PRODUCTION FUND**

Chris Cordeau (Qld), Undertakers $32820

Peter Bulfin (Shepparton), A Precious Inheritance $4900

Ray Lawrence/Glen Thomas (NSW), Swee Dream $23000

Peter Williams (Qld), A Town in New Zealand $5245

Dee O'Connell (Qld), King Island $3000

Peter Dods (Qld), Percy Abdissa Granger $1200

**SCRIPT DEVELOPMENT FUND**

Geoff Golding (Qld), Man Down $750

Jeffrey Peak (Qld), Burke and Wills Are Dead $3000

Projects recommended for funding from the March AFC meeting:

EXPERIMENTAL FILM AND TELEVISION FUND

Michael Faircloth (Qld), Terra Lustralis $3000

Colin Jaeger (NSW), No Fear One Quake $9261

Nikki Raehl (NSW), Australia Abroad $3424

Lea Rue (NSW), Mariner's Story $400

Jan Thaysen (Qld), Maidens $2490

Robert Wyth (Qld), Suburban Windows $3874

**PRODUCTION APPROACHES**

Sonia Hohnam (NSW), $2000 for 35 mm blow-up of animated short, Letter to a Friend

Michael Gashnem (NSW), $2000 for 16 mm film, Kinescope of an experiment for the Arts Council

**FILM PRODUCTION FUND**

David Hay (NSW), Hard Yakka $35000

Sandra Alexander (NSW), script for a documentary film about the Aborigines in the desert $12900

Gill Eathly (NSW), script for a documentary about the Aborigines in the desert $12900

Jackie Rice (NSW), treatment for a film about the Japanese concept of inner peace $1000

Michael Peckin (NSW), treatment for a film about a teenage boy who gets involved in gangs $35000

Bruce Patty (NSW), screenplay for a comedy film about a young boy who joins a gang $35000

Renee Romeril (Vic), untitled $2000

Nancy Rothery (NSW), untitled $2000

Chris Oliver (Vic), untitled $2000

Kevin Anderson (Vic), untitled $2000

Roger Bayley (Qld), untitled $2000

**GENERAL**

Foundation of the Waterloo Workers’ Federation, $2000

Peter Kennedy (NSW), a script for a documentary about the Waterloo Workers’ Federation $5000

Jane Anderson (NSW), a script for a documentary about the Waterloo Workers’ Federation $5000

Richard Bradley (NSW), The Golden Section $12900

Brendan Shing (NSW), $600

Walter Edmondson, $650

Roger Bayley (NSW), The Thin Edge $2800

Kevin Anderson (NSW), The King of the Two Day Wonder $2732

Paul Janz (NSW), Things First $1251

John Laurie (NSW), Undertow $1445

Graham Williams (NSW), City of Gold $2872

Dorothy Hawke (NSW), Profile of a Clown $1280

Gary Fassett (NSW), Community Documentary Corporations $2000

Paul Reynolds (NSW), Saturday Play $1988

Renee Bremar (NSW), Untitled $2000

Frank Beniak (NSW), Big Life $2013

Stephen Bennett (NSW), Untitled $2064

Marco Polo (NSW), Untitled $2000

George Voca (NSW), The Brice $1168

Jillie Allison (NSW), Untitled $3284

**PRODUCTION SURVEY**
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for very very high quality.
NEW AUSTRALIAN FILM PRODUCTION
BUDGET FORM NOW AVAILABLE

This production budget has been specifically tailored to meet the needs of film production in Australia by The Australian Film Commission after consultation with industry experts. All applications to the Project Branch for production funding must be accompanied by this budget form.

The recommended industry selling price is $2.25 and copies can be purchased from the following outlets:

AFC Offices Sydney & Melbourne — John Barry Group — Samuelson Film Service Aust. Pty. Ltd. — Cinema Papers and most State Film Corporations.

Producers Guide
Continued from P. 334.

(vi) a normal release form for material shot within the studio should be signed;
(vii) what equipment, flats, lighting, etc. the studio is to supply should be scheduled.

E. Problems of Filming Overseas

A producer proposing to take Australian-owned film equipment outside Australia to film on location will need to approach the relevant Chamber of Commerce in his city to get an internationally accepted “carnet” — a document setting out and identifying by serial number the equipment to be exported. A separate sheet is provided for each country the production will pass through; the producer presents this to the relevant customs authority at the point of entry for stamping.

The carnet eliminates the problem of establishing non-liability for import duty. The producer will need to lodge a bond or bank guarantee, or otherwise satisfy the Chamber of Commerce of his ability to pay the maximum amount of duty payable on the equipment in question in the event it is not returned to Australia.

F. Laboratory Forms

The producer will need to establish with the laboratory that is processing and ultimately handling the release printing of his production who has the right to order release prints, and those with the right to remove negative or other pre-print materials. This will be important when the film is completed and foreign sales agents are handling print orders.

In the event that part of the film’s financing comes from the Australian Film Commission, or some state corporations, it may be necessary to provide that only certain named people can remove material from the lab. This is usually provided by way of what is termed an “access letter” which is lodged with the laboratory and remains in force until cancelled.

G. Other Forms

There are a number of other miscellaneous production and post-production forms which the producer will need to make use of from time to time and which are more fully discussed in the subscription service.

These include arrangements with labs engaged in dubbing or sub-titling, and the production and arrangements for the use in the producer’s film of pre-existing film material, or other “stock” footage.
Subscribe:
Four issues, teaching guides, media courses, free and concession cinema passes. $10.00 (schools), $8.00 (individuals) (both tax deductible), $4.00 (students and unemployed). Forward cheques and orders to:
ATFAV (Metro), 243 Queensbury St., Carlton, 3053.

FRAMEWORK
ISSUE ONE — Interviews with Alain Resnais, R. Wood. Articles on Shakespearean films, theory, Bertolucci, Truffaut, Poland, Peckinpah.
ISSUE TWO — Articles by Pasolini, Bertolucci, Ferreri. Articles on Bertolucci, Cavani, Wertmuller.
ISSUE THREE — Interview with Bertolucci, Bellocchio, Zanussi and Saless. Pasolini on Semiotics. Article on Godard.
ISSUE FIVE — HOLLYWOOD Part two. River of No Return, To Be or Not to Be, One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest. Sirk, Wilder, Ritchie.

Festival reports, book and periodical reviews in every issue.
Feature contributors include: Britton, Christie, Crofts, Heath, Neale, Ranvaud, Whittaker, Willemen.
Framework’s third Festival of Film will be held in June 1978. Ideology & Propaganda — screenings of films of the ’30s. Details and forms available April 1978.
Single back issues 60p + 35p postage.
Subscriptions for 3 issues (UK £2.00 - O/seas £2.50)
6 issues (UK £4.00 - O/seas £5.00)
9 issues (UK £5.50 - O/seas £7.00)
You're never too young to start subscribing...

...enjoy it in the comfort of your own home...

SPECIAL OFFER

20% OFF

SUBSCRIBE NOW!

Four Issues $8.00* POST FREE

Name.................................................................
Address............................................................
..............................................................................
Postcode...........................................................

To commence with Issue 16 ( ) April-June
Issue 17 ( ) July-Sept

Please allow up to four weeks for processing.

*Australia only. For overseas rates see overleaf.

Cinema Papers Pty. Ltd., 143 Therry Street, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia 3000
CINEMA PAPERS
...the gift that keeps coming...

We'll enclose the card. You enclose $8.00.

Please send

as a gift, four issues of Cinema Papers.
from

Message

* Australia only. For overseas rates see below.

Address as a gift, four issues of Cinema Papers.

CINEMA PAPERS

BACK ISSUES

□ Copy(ies) of Number 1 at $3.00*
□ Copy(ies) of Number 2 at $3.00*
□ Copy(ies) of Number 3 at $3.00*
□ Copy(ies) of Number 5 at $3.00*
□ Copy(ies) of Number 9 at $3.00*
□ Copy(ies) of Number 10 at $3.00*
□ Copy(ies) of Number 11 at $3.00*
□ Copy(ies) of Number 12 at $3.00*
□ Copy(ies) of Number 13 at $3.00*
□ Copy(ies) of Number 14 at $3.00*
□ Copy(ies) of Number 15 at $3.00*

UNAVAILABLE: numbers 4, 6, 7 and 8

* Australia only. For overseas rates see below.

NAME_________________________________________________________________
ADDRESS............................................................................................
............................................................ Postcode ...............

Total amount enclosed __________

Cinema Papers Pty. Ltd. 143 Therry Street, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia 3000

Please allow up to four weeks for processing.

Volume 4 available now

BOUND VOLUMES
ORDER VOLUME 4 NOW!
(numbers 13-16) 1977-1978
VOLUME 3 STILL AVAILABLE
Hand-bound hardback with gold embossed lettering. Each Volume contains 400 lavishly illustrated pages of • Exclusive interviews with producers, directors, actors and technicians • Valuable historical material on Australian film production • Film and book reviews • Production surveys and reports from the sets of local and international productions • Box Office reports and guides to film producers and distributors

STRICTLY LIMITED EDITION ORDER NOW!
TO PLACE AN ORDER FILL IN THE FORM

Please send me □ copies of Volume 3 (numbers 9-12) at $27.00 per volume.
Please send me □ copies of Volume 4 (numbers 13-16) at $27.00 per volume.
Enclosed cheque/postal order for $ __________

EASY BINDER
Cinema Papers is pleased to announce that a loose binder is now available in black with gold embossed lettering. Individual numbers can be added to the binder independently — or detached if desired. This new binder will accommodate 12 copies (3 years).

TO PLACE AN ORDER FILL IN THE FORM

Please send me □ copies of Cinema Papers' easy binder at $12.50 per binder.
Enclosed cheque/postal order for $ ______

ORDER FORM

EASY BINDER

TO PLACE AN ORDER FILL IN THE FORM

NAME_________________________________________________________________
ADDRESS............................................................................................
............................................................ Postcode ...............

Total amount enclosed __________

NOTE: Remittances in Australian dollars only.

Cinema Papers Pty. Ltd. 143 Therry Street, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia 3000.

Please allow up to four weeks for processing.

OVERSEAS RATES (including postage)

(A) Subscriptions and gift subscriptions (per 6 issues).
Zone 1 (New Zealand, Australia, British, European, Africa, South American Surface — $41.90; air — $44.40; Zone 2 (Malaysia, Singapore, Philippines, Indonesia, Japan, Hong Kong, India, Pakistan, China) Surface — $41.90; air — $44.40; Zone 3 (South America, Europe, Australia, Middle East) Surface — $41.90; air — $44.40.

(B) Bound Volumes (per volume).
Surface — $40.20; air — $43.00; Zone 1 Surface — $42.00; air — $45.00; Zone 2 Surface — $45.00; air — $48.00; Zone 3 Surface — $48.00; air — $51.00; Zone 4 Surface — $51.00; air — $54.00; Zone 5 Surface — $54.00; air — $57.00.

(C) Back Issues. The price of each copy add the following:
Surface (all zones) — $0.80; air — $2.80.

ORDER FORM

EASY BINDER

TO PLACE AN ORDER FILL IN THE FORM

NAME_________________________________________________________________
ADDRESS............................................................................................
............................................................ Postcode ...............

Total amount enclosed __________

NOTE: Remittances in Australian dollars only.

Cinema Papers Pty. Ltd. 143 Therry Street, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia 3000.

Please allow up to four weeks for processing.

Surface (all zones) — $40.80; Zone 1 — $52.80; Zone 2 — $55.60; Zone 3 — $54.20; Zone 4 — $54.80; Zone 5 — $57.40.

NB: All remittances in Australian dollars only.

(1) Surface Air Lifted available to U.K., German Federal Republic, Greece, U.S. Air Subscribers, use 6 issue — $37.80. 80 per bound volume — $32.80; 96 Back issues — add $4.65 per copy.
The big shot

A dynamic "SHOTGUN" microphone with lobar directional pattern. Narrow angle pick-up even at great distance from the sound source and elimination of unwanted reverberation and handling noise. Built in two position bass-cut switch (–7 – 20 dB at 50 Hz). Recommended for use in TV and film studios or on location.

Revox adds something special to a reel of tape

Experience and reliability — THE well known reliability of the A77 tape deck is a result of a professional design concept which successfully combines the advantages of a solidly constructed tape transport mechanism with an advanced electronic circuit design.

- Stability under heavy use
- Mechanical precision
- Off-tape monitoring
- Track to track recording
- Echo and multiplay effects
- Vertical or horizontal operation
- Editing and remote control facilities

Revox fulfills your professional requirements.

For further information on the REVOX or AKG Systems Contact:
Amalgamated Wireless (Australasia) Limited
New South Wales Phone: 797 5757.
Victoria Phone: 560 4533.
Canberra A.C.T. Phone: 95 3431.
South Australia Phone: 272 2366
Queensland Phone: 44 1651.
Western Australia Phone: 71 0888.
Tasmania Phone: 34 5266, 34 5412.
Australia's favourite premium beer.

CARLTON

Crown Lager