

AUSTRALIAN FILM SEMINAR

INTERVIEW

INTERVIEWEES: **ARTHUR AND CORINNE CANTRILL**
Independent Film Makers.

INTERVIEWER: **PATRICIA CAMERON**

For David Jones
Media Centre.

From Pat Cameron
Margaret Avenue,
Montmorency.

Tel. 439 8136

Filmography

Robert Klippel, Drawings (25 mins. col. 1965) A film on Klippel's studies for sculpture, tracing the evolution of his style.

Robert Klippel, Junk Sculptures - (Five films, each 5 mins. B + W, 1964-65) Lighting and camera techniques to reveal new aspects of the works.

Above films sold to television and to film libraries in Australia and overseas.

The Incised Image (23 mins. B + W and colour, 1966) The work of Charles Lloyd, Australian etcher/printmaker. Prints bought by the Arts Council of Great Britain, the British Council and overseas.

Dream (4 mins. B + W 1966) Images from Lloyd dry points are animated to evoke the artist's concern with cycles of aggression and peace.

Henri Gaudier-Brzeska (30 mins. b + w and col. 1968) A documentary on the young Vorticist-sculptor killed in World War I. Shown by BBC and in other countries. Represented Britain at the Venice Festival of Films on Art, 1968.

Red Stone Dancer (5 mins. b + w 1968) Shots of a Gaudier-Brzeska sculpture arranged to evoke the Vorticist spirit. Acquired for the British Film Institute Experimental Film collection.

Moving Statics (28 mins. b + w 1969) The abstract Kinetic art of the Dutch Mime Artist, Will Spoor. Techniques of animation and multiple superimposition to extend the possibilities of mime. British entrant to Paris Biennale and to Cracow Film Festival. Shown at Melbourne and Oberhausen Film Festivals. Acquired by National Gallery of Canada. Shown on overseas T.V.

Other short films made with Will Spoor:-

Rehearsal at the Arts Lab (4 mins. b + w 1969) Filmed from a series of stills.

Imprints (4 mins. b + w 1969) An experiment with retinal retention of images.

New Movements - New Thoughts (11 mins. b + w 1969) An experiment in open-flow editing.

Fuß 69 (6mins b + w 1969) The memory traces of a participant in a drama festival.

Eikon (3½ mins. col. 1969) A secular film icon. Triptych images.

- Home Movie: A Day in the Bush** (6 mins. b + w 1969) Repeated movements of boys in the bush build up tension.
- Bouddi** (8mins. col. 1979) Camera calligraphy of the bush. Animated sequences evoke life energies in the landscape.
- 4000 Frames** (3mins. b + w 1970) 4000 separate 1/24th of a second images. An exercise in visual perception.
- Earth Message** (23 mins. col. 1970) Film poem of early winter landscape in Canberra hills and bush, using superimposed layers of landscape. Second Prize, Most Creative Entry, 1970 Australian Film Awards.
- Harry Hooten** (83 mins. col. 1970) A personal tribute to the Australian underground poet-philosopher. The film develops from a tightly edited, documentary approach in which Hooten's philosophy is outlined to a more free-flowing form, where the editing is minimal, the sequences planned and juxtaposed in camera. Exploits many techniques including computer programming and hand-printing.
- Expanded Cinema films** (1971) including
- Calligraphy Contest for the New Year:** Hand painted, incised film images cast on the screen which is cut during the projection. Screened at Dutch Student Film Festival.
- and **Films for Patterned and Constructed Screens**
- and **Three Screen Films.**
- Meditations** (5 films 3 mins. each 1971) Mandala images pulsate on fields of complementary colour.
- Milky Way Special** (3 mins. ed. 1971) An animated space trip fantasy.
- Video Self Portrait** (6mins. col. 1971) Video images are filmed. Filter-coloured and supered in the camera.
- Blast** (6 mins. b + w 1971) Animated images from the Vorticist manifesto, to the sounds of World War I.
- Island Fuse** (9 mins. col. 1971) B + W footage filmed on Stradbroke Island, reworked in colour by refilming, transcending documentary reality.
- Looking for the Desert** (10 mins. col. 1971) A search for a desert to film with some observations on filming landscapes.
- People Mix** (Duration to date, 50 mins. Col. 1971-2) An open-ended film. Based on Melbourne's alternative culture and its confrontation with conventional society.

P. Your films are identified as the work of Arthur and Corinne Cantrell. Are you each responsible for a different part of production or do you work together.

A. Well we work together pretty closely. It varies rather from film to film just who is responsible for what. One of us will have an idea for a film and we'll both work at it, but the film will develop with contributions from both of us altering the course of the film. If we have a different opinion about how a film should evolve we very often try both possibilities and sometimes even use both possibilities one way or another. We're sort of two-headed film makers I suppose.

P. Another thing that I wanted to clarify before we started is the terms used to describe your work. For example people speak of Underground film, Independent film, Personal film, Experimental film. Alternative cinema, Expanded cinema and after I made up that list I thought of Synaesthetic cinema. So what do you like to be called.

A. Well I think Independent Cinema is the thing.

C. Or new cinema and alternative cinema. We were the first people in Australia to devise that term. We used it to promote our screenings when we ran The Maze with the slogan "Support the Alternative Cinema.

A. Synaesthetic cinema is a description of a certain kind of film experience and I suppose parts of our films are synaesthetic in that Gene Youngblood sense but I don't think we can say that it's all synaesthetic as I understand it.

P. So independent film it is probably.

A. Yes.

P. I don't like the term experimental myself. Really it implies that you're playing around with something that might work and it might'nt.

C. I like the term new cinema in the sense that it's something separate and apart from the narrative.

P. Well alternative gives that sense too doesn't it.

A. There's a certain amount of experiment built into any creative expression in any case. It varies from work to work.

P. But you don't speak of painters as being experimental.

A. Again the notion of art that isn't experimental is meaningless, so I think that experimental is understood if you are referring to any kind of creative form.

- P. It seems from these notes that your first film was a series on child art for television is that right?
- A. Yes.
- P. You had trained as an art teacher had you?
- A. No I hadn't trained but I was working with an organisation which was providing art to school and holiday creative art centres for children in Sydney, mainly in underprivileged areas. This was an organisation which was formed way back in the twenties, first to provide libraries and then, when municipal and school libraries came into being, to provide creative possibilities for children through the 'Education Through Art' philosophy of Herbert Reed. This was before there was any thought of having anything like this in schools. But we began to make films on child art for television. I was involved in these and then later, in Brisbane, we made several of these films ourselves. They were shown on ABC.
- P. After making the children's films in Brisbane you went on to make the puppet films.
- A. Yes. We were working closely with children and it was natural to move into an area of films for children as well as about children and their activities. I had had experience as a puppeteer. I myself had been a product of one of these child art centres. I'd gone to one since the age of 12 and I specialized in puppetry and directed a puppet theatre of theirs for a while. We made some puppet films including a 10 episode series of the Odyssey with shadow puppets based on Greek vase paintings.
- A. And also Kip and David which was a series of 13 episodes of the adventures of a little boy and his elf friend and both of these were used on ABC television as well as overseas television in several countries.
- P. And then you made the Robert Klippel film in Brisbane.
- A. We both knew him quite well and we made a half hour documentary on his drawings, tracing his development as an artist and also five short 5 or 6 minute films on five of his sculptures.
- P. Was Corinne working with you at this stage?
- A. Yes. I went to Brisbane to join Corinne. In fact to work at the Children's Centre. She set up the Brisbane division of this children's organization but at that point I stopped being employed by them. I had to get other employment. I joined the ABC as a film editor.
- P. What was the first equipment you had?

- A. I guess the camera. The one we're still using, the Bolex.
- P. So you moved to London with the intention of learning more about film there?
- A. Mainly we wanted to broaden our horizons and we were a bit ~~fat~~ fed up with Australia. The support from the ABC had suddenly been cut off by new administration. They'd been quite good about using our Klippel sculpture films and the children's films, also some experimental films we made using fireworks images and music. But we went to London just to find a new world.
- P. And you worked for Hallas and Batchelor Cartoon films. Did you find this helpful in any way?
- A. It was useful to work in a professional atmosphere, a much more professional atmosphere than in the film world in Australia. Certainly at that time anyway. And it was my first experience at 35 mm film. It was interesting practical experience, not so much in editing because there's not too much of that in cartoon films, but mainly in sound track work, track laying and also dubbing; sound mixing, inventing wierd and wonderful sounds for the cartoon characters like Dodo the Kid from Outer Space, which was on television in Australia.
- P. And while you were there you made the Gaudier-Bresca films. How did you become interested in him?
- A. Through Robert Klippel really. Gaudier-Bresca was a great hero for Klippel. He admired him very much. He said that if ever we were making another art documentary we should consider making one on Gaudier. The first documentary we made in London was the one on Charles Lloyd the etcher. He's Australian whom we vaguely knew and we made that film and then a short animated film on some of ~~his~~ his dry point etchings. Then the Gaudier film which was used on the BBC.
- P. He was a Vorticist.
- A. Yes. Vorticism was the British answer to Futurism, which was invading the tranquil art scene in London at that time and the work of the Vorticists is characterized by ^{ge}geometrical, mechanical feel.
- P. I was just wondering whether Vorticism influenced you at all in any way. For example you next made Will Spoor and there's this sort of mechanical thing in it.
- A. That's a coincidence really.
- P. There's nothing in Vorticism that's important to you.

- A. No. Verticism didn't really get underway much actually. Wyndham Lewis published a couple of reviews. We have a couple of them here, it was more or less a one-or-two-man show the others didn't get to be much good.
- P. You have said that/^aturning point for you was the Underground Film Festival in Belgium.
- A. Yes. That came up when we were half way through cutting the Gaudier film and it was a very important experience.
- P. Had you seen any underground films before that?
- C. We had seen some before we went to Belgium but not a great deal.
- P. What can you remember about Belgium? Is there a film that you remember particularly or was it a general impression?
- A. It was incredible, overwhelming experience. I think that probably the most exciting experience for me anyway was seeing the Markopoulos film, a master work. Some of the work was just too much for us in retrospect. We could accept that there was something really exciting going on there and important, but we were aware at the time of not being equipped to deal with a lot of the work. Even "The Great Blondino", which we subsequently advised the National Library to acquire in Australia, we didn't fully appreciate till we saw it again.
- P. You didn't reject it but you felt puzzled about it.
- A. Yes. It was also very interesting seeing the Australian contribution, which was the Bolero film by Albie Thomas in Sydney. It was an interesting conceptual film on Changing of Space and Time in a very pure way. It was interesting that the Grande Prix of the whole festival was a film of a similar idea called Wave Length.
- P. I've read about Wave Length. It had a very long tracking shot.
- A. It is in fact a zoom I think. It's not an uninterrupted pure zoom though. The zoom was shot over different times of the day and night, the lights always changing. The sound track was an amazing electronic glissendo from a low frequency tone to a high frequency tone so that in a way there was a visual glissendo of the zoom in the sound wave as well which matched. The other interesting thing was being there and meeting a lot of film makers and just being somewhere near where there was this important body of work which had nothing to do with one's accepted experience in experimental film. These were really important statements raising film to a level of fine art. Several of them were clearly on the way to something but I don't think they had necessarily reached the ultimate.

- P. There was a festival in Sydney last year wasn't there?
- A. Yes. It didn't come anywhere near. There was some overseas stuff but it didn't have the same effect.
- B. A lot of people are not prepared to send their work over to festivals. If you send them to a big international festival you get prestige; you send them to Australia you get nothing out of it.
- P. Then you returned to Australia?
- A. No, we went back to England and we were in the middle of editing the Gaudier film, feeling that this was such a past form of film expression that we were engaged in and I can remember trying to do some things in the editing to try to make it more interesting but the material wasn't there. However it turned out to be a fairly interesting and successful documentary as documentaries go. Then of course there was the experience with Will Spoor in the mime film. That was the last film we made in London.
- P. You made that after going to the Film Festival?
- A. Yes. We had in the past experimented with film parallel to making the more conventional documentaries and sometimes the shorter film experiments were related to or used material from the longer films. We made an experimental film out of the Gaudier film, one of his sculptures 'Redstone Dancer', based on random juxtaposition of images which does something towards evoking the Vorticist spirit. This was acquired by the British Film Institute for its experimental collection and also similar films were made related to the etching film on Charles Lloyd. But I began to be more interested in pursuing this new area of film expression.
- P. Well I think when you see the Will Spoor film after seeing the Gaudier Bresca it's obvious at the start that you use a lot more editing in the camera is that right?
- A. Not so much editing in camera, as a lot of superimposition and manipulation of images. It's a complex mixture of animation and live photography in a lot of those sequences, where the two merge together.
- C. The Gaudier film raises the question when you make an art documentary about an artist, of the extent to which you are going to play around with the work. When you're trying to make a comprehensive sort of documentary about an artist and his work the traps of trying to do something interesting in a film sense leave you with something so tricky and shallow it's not worth thinking about.
- A. I think that it's possible to do interesting things with the living artist and in fact what you are doing there is to evoke his philosophy in film terms rather than to illustrate his work.

- C. And also if you make a film nowadays with the living artist, his work is bound to be related to the new cinema movement in any case. Some of the best arts documentaries ~~are~~ ^{are the} one on Richard Hamilton, and 'Jam on His Face', the one about Brett Whitely?
- A. Of course the Will Spoor film wasn't like that. It was simply a case of Will Spoor doing on film what he would like to do on the stage, but couldn't, because of the human and technical restrictions.
- P. But then your filming was sympathetic to what he was doing too, so the two met together very happily.
- A. There was a certain amount of our interpretation of his work into film and also partly his extension of his own work into film that had always been ~~inspired~~ inspired by film techniques of editing and animation in his work in any case, so it was fairly natural for him to work in film. He had used elements of film in some presentations.
- P. I remember thinking when I was watching it last time that I couldn't be sure where Will Spoor ended and you began.
- A. It was a very rare kind of three-way collaboration which happens very occasionally and it was very rewarding for the three of us.
- P. It was good sort of thing to do after going to a Belgium Festival wasn't it?
- A. It bridged the gap between experimental work and documentary work.
- P. Then you took up the Fellowship in Creative Arts at the University of Canberra; a position as lecturer was it?
- A. No. Actually it's a very free situation where you are virtually an artist in residence. Basically the idea seems to be to try to have some cross-fertilization between the vastly different classical disciplines of the university and the more free creative work in art. An idea which is an excellent one except that it turns out to be not so easy for one single, or in our case two, people to have any enormous effect on such a vast body of very conventional people.
- P. It gave you the opportunity to do some work of your own in fact.
- A. Yes. I think that, basically, that is the idea; to give people a chance to work for a while.
- P. And that's when you ^{made} ~~made~~ the film about Harry Hooten. You describe him as an 'anarchist, technocrat philosopher', or perhaps he described himself as that. You said that his philosophy had a great influence on your film making and I would be interested to hear more about this.

- A. He had an enormous influence on us. Basically I suppose it all revolves around his definition of art which was he said, "The communication of emotion to matter, rather than the communication of emotion from man to man." This seems to be the great difficulty that people have in film, accepting film which is a personal form of expression. While they'll accept that painting and music and sculpture is a result of personal self discovery, the idea of using film in this way often annoys people. But I think basically this was it. He maintained that the human situation is exhausted as subject matter for the arts. Music was the first to leave the human situation behind, insofar as A meets B and A rejects B or loves B or kills B or that sort of thing, and that painting followed suit as film is a more recent art form one would expect it to be concerned with the human situation while the other more traditional forms have long ago rejected it. Much of it relates to what Buckminster Fuller has been saying about our relationship to technology, the necessity to perfect technology and to use it to our own ends rather than to abuse it in the way it has been. All these things were a great influence and so it was quite an important thing for us to work round this film of Harry Hooten. In a way we were coming to grips with his philosophy for the first time in our life although we had known him and read him and been vaguely aware that this was important stuff. The film is really a record of our research into his ideas.
- P. Not only trying to explain his ideas but trying to use his ideas in the making of the film. So it's a two-way expression.
- A. The film in fact is a very hybrid affair of part-documentary, part-personal expression of his ideas. This possibility that a film can fit more than one category is another thing that disturbs film critics. I remember Geoffrey Gardner saying that he couldn't make up his mind about Moving Statics because he couldn't understand whether it was a documentary or an experimental film. Because he couldn't pigeonhole it he had this great blockage about it.
- A. So the Harry Hooten film was made over this period of 18 months at the university. It's really a record of our changing, evolving attitude to film. Concurrently we were making a series of short films which were pure expression in film image.
- P. On your broad sheet you quote Colin Bennett as saying it was a mammoth job of McLuhan age semi-subliminal editing and superimposition I was wondering how you felt about the word 'subliminal'?
- C. The most subliminal thing in Harry Hooten is the use of pure colour fragments which very few people would be aware of. Film makers might pick it up. Right through is the most incredible use of tiny fragments of pure colour which colour the images that follow. Most lay people wouldn't be aware of it.

- A. Sylvia Lawson, on the other ~~had~~ hand, said that there were no memorable images in the film at all. After the film finished she couldn't remember anything in it. I suppose it depends on one's attitude and one's ability to perceive images whether you remember anything or not. Certainly there are sequences in it which are incredible editing tour de forces. There are little tiny two or three frame things most painfully put together. I suppose it was in this film that I finally worked through the desire to structure at the editing table in such a detailed way. More recently we've been trying to structure more in the camera.
- C. The most remarkable part of the film from the editing point of view was the last thing we did, which was the opening sequence, where there's a sort of intuitive editing, based on the colour cycle. Little tiny images are put together for their colour rather than for any relationship in content. You might have a whole red sequence or blue sequence. At the end of the Hooten thing we had two big directions opening up! One direction was free play editing; the other thing was hand printing of a film, where editing doesn't come into it. It was on these two high points that the film work concluded.
- C. In the middle of the film there's a lot of ordinary sort of documentary style editing where we've gone out and filmed material to be edited. I find this completely uninteresting now.
- A. Finally the critical reaction varied. Sylvia Lawson and Michael Thornhill both thought that it was a pity that it wasn't a documentary film. Somebody else said that we misinterpreted Harry Hooten's philosophy but as far as we were concerned that was irrelevant because the film is a record of our personal reaction and interpretation of his philosophy and we weren't trying to interpret it for other people in any case. In fact we had access to tapes that other people had never heard. Finally the question of whether we are in the mass communications business or not is the whole crux of the thing. Clearly there is an area of film-making which is to do with mass communications but we're not particularly concerned with mass communications.
- C. What we're trying to do is to bring work like ours to a much wider audience. Then it's up to them to decide whether they want to see more of it. Most people don't know that work like ours exists or if they do they can't comprehend it. So we're trying to show it as very widely and reach a lot of people with it.
- P. Are you thinking here of the visits you've made to schools.

- A. Well that's a different form of communication. That is communicating a body of work and a philosophy of film making. But the films themselves haven't been made in a spirit of keeping in mind the lowest common denominator of an audience and adjusting the work to that. My experience ~~with~~ with the BBC in documentaries and so on was that one was breathlessly trying to gauge the reaction of the lowest common denominator in the audience and pitching the work just a little above that. We'd try to include something a little bit unusual now and then, hoping that it wouldn't be misunderstood. It's much more dishonest to prostitute your own abilities to bring it down to another level.
- P. You also said something similar in an issue of your "Film Notes" For evolution to occur the energy fed to the mass must be higher in content than the mass, not lower as it is now. I noticed too in the last Film Notes comment by a former T.V. executive which was also relevant. He said how bored people were, which is hardly surprising considering what they have to look at.
- A. We were making the point that the escapist fantasy material being purveyed to them now only makes their everyday lives more drab by comparison. They should be fed material, ideally, which is encouraging a different attitude, a different philosophy, in general to life.
- P. You moved down to Melbourne when the Fellowship ended. I think the first thing you did here was the Expanded Cinema Exhibition.
- A. We had been exploring some of these things in Canberra a bit but we welcomed the possibility to do those shows, sponsored by the National Gallery, so that we could extend and develop some of the ideas we had been thinking of in Canberra.
- P. There seemed to be two things involved. One was the idea of involving the viewer actively in the viewing process I suppose. This seemed to be evident in the idea of walking through the staggered layers of gauze, walking into the film picture itself. The other was using the multiple screens and the constructed screens and so on to vary the format of the image.
- A. We're interested in the possibility of bringing a more live aspect into the film presentation, instead of just playing a recording of some description which is unchanging from one projection to another. It is the possibility of varying the experience during projection which interests us by projecting and moving the film around to different screens or modifying the screen during projection, by painting on it or cutting it or even burning it.
- P. During the exhibition you were constantly at work in fact. Not just standing ~~beside~~ beside the projector.

- C. This was also the thing about the exhibition that all the people there were aware of all this activity going on, of projecting and running the tapes, moving from projector to projector. They were aware of the mechanics of the thing.
- A. The projector is usually hidden away in a bio-box out of sight. But we wanted to exploit the possibility of the projector as part of the environment. We had eight projectors there, all in the gallery, and they were all buzzing away at different times.
- P. Were the people who came in actively involved?
- A. No. They didn't have things to do other than to walk around and observe and be part of the experience. There are possibilities of course in the idea of involving them in action of one kind or another, it was never a fixed kind of performance though and I'd like to return to the idea and explore some other possibilities.
- P. I think that these exhibitions are held quite often in galleries in the USA. Do you know anything about this?
- A. This is fairly common now. The Museum of Modern Art in New York and the Whitney Museum both show films by new film makers and they are showing work that is more related to the philosophy and ideas in modern painting. It is quite a common thing. And of course they have film collections of their own. The Museum of Modern Art has an enormous film library.
- P. Do you see any interest here by ~~Galleries~~ Galleries?
- C. Yes, its starting. We've done several things in ~~galleries~~ galleries. Private galleries are beginning to be interested.
- P. The Expanded Cinema expression is somewhere between the Art Exhibition and the theatrical production isn't it?
- A. We're interested in breaking down some of the ~~the~~ barriers that exist between various manifestations.
- A. Like all art it's a ~~way~~ way of showing us hidden truths about the universe. It's an extension of our own limited everyday vision. We know we're very much limited by our optical structure. We can only take in certain wave lengths of light or only perceive a certain distance. I think it's the business of art in every field to open up some of these hidden experiences and get us thinking. Basically why the creative person is doing this is because he himself is interested in creating for himself this vision or experience. If you like it's a totally selfish activity. Then after that he knows because he is not a unique person, that other people are going to be interested in this research of his as well.

- P. This brings up the problem of the artist who's working for himself but would like to share his ideas with others. Invariably he's working ahead of his ~~time~~ time and so it's very hard to share his ideas because nobody else has caught up with him.
- A. There is that problem. Right through art history we see cases of people whose work is rejected only to be accepted after they are dead. As Ezra Pound ~~it~~ said, the artist is the antenna of society. He's picking up vibrations from the future. On the other hand you can argue that he's not picking up vibrations from the future he's picking up present vibrations but the bulk of society's very retrospective, very backward looking, just simply to preserve their continuity and their everyday sanity. If we lived in a more environmental society which gave more emphasis to creative thinking and people weren't tied down to banal daily ~~xxxxxxxx~~ routines it would be a different situation altogether.
- C. And of course there's a tremendous anti-intellectual tradition in Australia and it's nowhere more evident than in the newspapers and television. Television has deteriorated in Australia in recent years. The whole content of the television is so simple-minded it's unbelievable. If television were as exciting as in Europe, which does attempt some exciting programs, then we would have a much greater response from the public because they'd be used to seeing things in this mass communication medium.
- A. There is this question of the extent to which the work can communicate anything to people. Some people who are thinking in the same wavelength as the artist will immediately see what is going on. Other people will only be aware that here is somebody expressing something in a very exciting way but will not be aware of what they are expressing. I remember at the festival ~~xx~~ you mentioned in Sydney Gil Brearley's comment of a Paul Winkler film, Requiem, was "Here was a film where the film maker was only communicating to himself." The film wasn't explicit enough. It was a very personal film. The sort of comment you might expect in a poem.
- P. Is this where the difficulty lies? That people cannot accept film as a means of personal expression. And so what's accepted in a poem is not acceptable in film form.
- A. Susan Sontag says we've lived, have already passed through an age which was obsessed with interpretation. It started off with Freud and Marx, both of them obsessed with interpreting events. Related to art in most instances, interpretation amounts to the philistine refusal to leave the work of art alone. Real art has the capacity to make us nervous. By reducing the work of art to its content and then interpreting that one tames the work of art. Interpretation then makes the work of art manageable, comfortable. This of course is the problem as soon as one begins to study anything, to get anything under a microscope, to pin it out, peg it out. You're more or less bound to analyse the thing. The very point of much artistic experience isn't to analyse or to know exactly what is going on.

- P. I think this is related to what I was talking about earlier about hostility. This feeling of hostility when the viewer is presented with something that he can't intellectualize. He feels insecure.
- A. There is a slight technical problem with film compared to other forms of art and this is probably more important than we think. The audience is more or less a prisoner of the film maker. Is a captive audience. This is why I was more interested in the Expanded ~~Sinema~~ Cinema setup because we didn't have fixed seating. People had the freedom to choose what they were looking at. But to look at a personal piece of new cinema does require a certain dedication on the part of the viewer. If there is any kind of doubt or any feeling of annoyance this builds up to a really aggressive pitch. If the film maker is there and people become aware the work on the screen is an extension of the person standing in front of them it makes is much easier. The ~~exper~~ experience one has most control over there's no doubt is reading poems. You can take the book and read it and study it in your own time. I think eventually we will get round to a similar sort of situation with film. We will be able to have cassettes of film and be able to play them on the television set and we'll be able to look at a sequence again and again and to understand it. Youngblood says a film can be "a matrix for one's psychic activity." Certainly a poem can be that and a piece of music can give us this experience. We are living in a transitory period in film. Compared with other forms of communication it is still developing. It's very hard to take the old forms when you get used to the new ones. We hardly ever go to the cinema now. We certainly don't go to film festivals. The film festival before last I was just so amazed at what was going on on the screen that I just couldn't take it. Suddenly it seems so redundant. It's interesting to see old movies from an historical point of view but to see recently made films, made in an archaic format, is very uninteresting.
- C. We went recently to the Trak to see The Last Picture Show. To me it was like Bellbird, a classy Bellbird.
- P. ~~Y~~ Did you feel the same about it?
- A. It was a faithful reconstruction of the early 50's in film style and everything, but I didn't think that that was an enormous achievement.
- P. Are there any commercial film makers whose work you enjoy?
- C. I think Jacques Tati is a genius, But can you call him commercial? Would you call Fellini commercial? I think he is fantastic.
- A. These guys are interesting. Pasolini does some interesting things within the format. There are these people whose work one admires. Godard was great when he was doing really interesting things back in the 60's. We were in England at this time and we saw most of his new films just after they were made. These were all very interesting. ~~It~~ seemed to be forging a new vocabulary I find his revolutionary

period very uninteresting from a cinematic point of view. Cinematically he's going over the same ground.

P. What about the independent film makers. Who would you admire most there?

A. I think Stan Brakhage and Greg Markopoulos from America. I feel I'm out of touch now. The interesting thing about some of these people though is that they don't necessarily keep making films unlike the commercial guys who feel that they have to keep making films.

P. A couple of questions about your two most recent films Island Fuse first. I think that began because you had a lot of material and you looked at it again and had fresh thoughts about it.

A. In fact we had the idea of making a film which was a retrospective look at our 10 years of film making.

C. A synthesis of some of the interesting things from the past. We were getting out all this old material to refilm it and rework it and it was obvious that even within a handful of shots there was so much potential.

A. We ~~were~~ more interested in exploring a limited area of reality and truth and seeing exactly what was going on in that area. This is how it emerged with these shots from Stradbroke Island. In a way I suppose it had something to do with the fact that all too often you see a film once through and it's gone forever. If you're lucky you may see it again but there's so much rich material for investigation. To a certain extent Island Fuse is a meditation on this aspect of film experience.

P. I noticed your use of the word 'meditation'. I was just thinking along the Zen line of contemplating a tiny blade of grass for a long time and finding things there.

A. There's no doubt that unconsciously the eastern influence has been pretty great in new work. Where the Zen guy says: If something is boring after 5 minutes look at it for 10 and if its still boring look at it for 20, eventually you'll find that it's a fascinating experience.

A. Without making a study of Zen philosophy we are much aware that this has permeated the whole of the new approach to life styles. People aren't so much interested in event-packages which is what more traditional films are, with a beginning, a development and a conclusion. It's too tidy. It's not a reflection of life. And the idea that we ourselves are open-ended events is interesting.

P. These ideas in fact you're exploring through Island Fuse.

- A. I'm now more or less thinking in retrospect because I don't think we had exactly this idea. But again the film was a means of discovering some of these ideas.
- P. Like the Harry Hooten film. An exploration into a new area of experience.
- C. One of the interesting things about looking at that material of Island Fuse before we began filming it, and of course we've had this experience repeatedly in the past as well, is the material you don't use in films. You think, "Why don't you use that," because it seems very interesting.
- A. You go back to these rolls of leftovers and see so much material there.
- C. We made these original tree films, these native trees on Stradbroke Island when we first got our camera and we hadn't done a lot of filming, we had a tremendous obsession at that time with close-up.
- A. It was a mistake that a lot of people make in using film and thinking of it as a moving still photograph. Close-up work is interesting and important in still photography. It's still fascinating in movie film but it has very little to do with the basic presence of film. You come to the realization eventually how very different film is from still photography. People still talk about the composition in movie films, even established critics talk, about beautiful composition. People like Sylvia Lawson would have remembered images if there'd been certain composition.
- P. That's a static thing.
- A. Instead of composing in time and movement as an event, it is composing a static image. It's just a mistake that's carried over from the forms of communication which have preceded ~~film~~ film. Every new medium sets out by imitating its predecessor and ~~film~~ film has imitated theatre and still photography: a combination of the two. And television started out imitating film.
- C. In these left-over images from these native trees at Stradbroke Island, random long shots we didn't use, there's more of the true atmosphere of the island.
- P. This is more true to nature isn't it? Random experience. Things aren't prepared theatrically for you. So far though we've been talking about image in the film and not talking much about sound.
- A. Sound of course ~~is~~^{is} very much associated with image in our daily life. When we see things we often hear sounds which are related or which are part of the environment. Painters haven't worried about putting sound tracks to their paintings so much. Although this has changed a bit in Kinetic art, mainly of course because the painting is a static instant in time, while sound is a continuing event. When film started even in the silent days of course, there was always sound of some kind.

However it is possible to think of ~~the~~ film which doesn't have sound with it.

- P. The Japanese film, "The Island". Did you see it? That was a tremendous experience which was completely silent except for one violent exclamation. It was about a man and a woman and their struggle for existence. I think you should take sound into account though because film gives you that opportunity to use both. Painting is limited to visual, music limited to sound. In film you have both.
- A. We have this opportunity to use them both and once you start doing this you become aware of how the two senses are related, that both the ear and the eye are being stimulated by energy travelling in waves and rhythms. Certain sounds relate to certain colours. There are low frequency sounds which are low deep sounds and low frequency colours which are at the red end of the spectrum and the same with opposite end of the spectrum. High frequency sounds and high frequency blues. All these things relate in interesting ways. There are the textures of sound and also the rhythms of sounds and colours. So its possible to find sound equivalent for almost any visual stimulation.
- P. So in fact you'd use sound to reinforce the visual impression. You wouldn't use it in its own right. To convey another message.
- A. Yes, it's possible to do that, to counterpoint, and sometimes it's possible to create an experience where sometimes the sound seems to be in the foreground. Just as in a symphony orchestra certain instruments will come in and go out you can think of the film image and the sound as being two components in a symphony.
- P. Did you use sound to counterpoint the image in Island Fuse?
- A. No. Basically that was an attempt to create the equivalent in sound of the picture. I'm very interested in the way this can reinforce and increase the impact. To be stimulated similarly from both senses ~~and~~ can be quite overwhelming. Some of the films of Paul Winklers are incredibly overwhelming because of the inspired way he has discovered sounds which back up and relate to the images. The other possibility is to think of sound as very much more environmental and surrounding than the picture which is usually, at this stage, of development, a rectangle in front of you. We're interested in controlling the environment in which we see films and arranging and organizing the sound is one way of controlling it. If you experiment with a film and run it first with sound then without it you're conscious of watching the image in an empty environment but if you fill it with sound it certainly does involve you. So there are all these ways of thinking about it. But for us the picture has always come first and it's been a matter of finding the sound second. And sometimes it's much more difficult to find sound than it has been to get the picture.

- P. Perhaps you could describe a small sequence from Island Fuse and then say how you think it works on the viewer.
- A. Well I can say how people have said it works. I know how it works on me. For instance in Island Fuse we have the scenes of the camper cutting the limbs off the tree. For me in that sequence he is a very alien figure in this lyrical landscape he's an intruder and he's destroying it, which is partly why ~~the~~ we coloured him red and repeated his actions. But in the refilming I'm not sure that this was the main motivation. We were more absorbed in the way he was moving, the mystery of his movement. He seems to suggest an archetypal Australian character in a way but it's hard to pinpoint all of this. As for somebody else's reaction Peter Kingston who is a film maker was absorbed in the mystery of this man. His face is hidden by a funny floppy hat and he's got a strange, stooped, round-shouldered look. But Peter Kingston was totally absorbed in watching what he described as "the mystery of the presence of this man." I'd like to say how important it is that we don't always understand things - that there is mystery. I think that it's important for us as humans to have mystery in life. It activates the imagination. It keeps us excited and full of wonder and curiosity.
- C. The greatest experiences I have had in film have been films that I couldn't comprehend like Relativity and lots of things I can think of. They just seemed greater than life. This is what I worry about in our education. Our education is geared to destroy this and try to reduce everything to knowable information, facts and explanations.
- A. "The words of the wise conceal the mystery of things." That's what Harry Hooten says, "but the works of man reveal his mastery of things." I think this is why we invented religion for a start because we wanted this mystery. We urgently need this mystery, this unknown mystery.
- P. This is ~~is~~ contrary to the usual explanation that it was invented to explain away the mysteries.
- A. So we're looking for a new mythology, a new mystery. I've been thinking lately that it is very important that we don't know everything.
- P. Do you think that there might be some elements of mystery in People Mix your most recent film.
- A. Yes.
- P. Because you've presented people without trying to explain them?
- C. Also the image is very low in definition, which is mysterious.

- A. The people have become abstracted a little in the refilming technique which is what happens when you ~~film~~ re-film things. Man is the unknowable. Again as Harry Hooten says, "You can never know man, he is the knower not the known and there's a great mystery about man." Harry Hooten was very inspired by Krishnamurti in this approach to whether we can know ourselves or not. Krishnamurti said it's impossible to know yourself because in the very act of trying to know yourself you're changing yourself and therefore you obviously have a new being to get to know. Therefore you're always one step behind yourself in knowing yourself. ~~Ex~~ This was Harry Hooten's main platform.
- P. So every new experience changes you. But you mightn't quite appreciate the experience because you haven't quite caught up with it. This ties in with what we were talking about before doesn't it, about people's hostility because something is new?
- A. People have always had this difficulty about accepting anything that doesn't fit into the pattern. Most of our films I must say, have had very few people in them. Most conventional film making is teaming with people, 'the talking lip' as somebody referred to most traditional film. People Mix is a departure. For ~~now~~ once we have a film that is teaming with people but we're not trying to know them.
- C. One of the things that I see in People Mix, although we haven't gone into this, is that it's really about movement and gesture and, although there's a lot of movement and gesture of chosen people for the film, I would like to have a tremendous amount yet of movement and gesture of people in the street. I'm really interested in this. It's incredible when you travel in the street watching the way people move and stop.
- P. And you think that in these movements people are expressing ~~something~~ something of themselves.
- C. Well maybe about our society, I'm sure that movement and gesture in Melbourne would be very different to movement and gesture in Jakarta or New York.
- A. The first thing that hits you in India is the way people move. Everybody is just so poetic and balletic and there's no doubt about it, it evokes a more spiritual sense of feeling, not a material attitude. The way they move their head, as though their head is about to fly away off their neck altogether in the most delicate way. This is what also interested us in the man in Island Fuse finally, more than anything else, was repeating the elements and re-animating and re-choreographing the movement there.
- P. Talking about communicating ideas. As an example of a certain type of criticism I quote a comment made by Henry Schoenheimer after seeing a program at the Pram Factory. He felt that the films offered "stimulation without communication." There was no intention that mind should meet, that the artist should offer anything structured, meaningful or enlightening." Would you like to reply to that?

- A. Well. First of all I would like to reply specifically and then generally to this type of criticism. Specifically I'm amazed that he should write this because he was looking at a documentary on Robert Klippel's drawings, a straightforward documentary that has been shown on television, as an arts documentary, and on a second screen I was running film images of Klippel's sculpture which related to his drawings in certain ways. There was no precise direct relationship, frame to frame, and Mr. Schoenheimer was amazed that I stopped the projector due to a technical fault and restarted it again, presumably now out of synch. But of course there was a general relationship, a fairly random relationship, not a specific one frame to frame, on this material. So he's exhibiting a certain degree of distortion of the facts there which one expects to find in journalism but not from an educated observer of a film manifestation. The other problem is whether the film is purely communication or stimulation. Of course it is a problem that's simply in the mind of the beholder. Some people are going to find it communicating; some people are going to find it purely stimulating; some people are going to find it a combination of both; and as soon as you begin to be concerned about the reaction of specific members of the audience in situations like this you have an enormous problem on your hands because you know that people react in various ways. They're conditioned in various ways and there's a great plurality of opinion and attitude to what this film or music or painting experience should be, depending on the chemical and physical makeup of each individual. So we can't do very much else but present the work and know that it is going to communicate to people who are on a similar wavelength as ~~our~~ one's self. Experience justifies this. From the feedback from the audience, from the sympathetic interested audience, who are not elderly people conditioned by a lifetime of conventional linear type cinema, we know that we are in fact communicating and the exciting thing about this communication is that it does feed back new energy into the environment, and back to the film maker, to feed on and to create more work.
- P. Its a sort of circular process. From film maker to viewer and back to film maker.
- C. The film energy circuit.
- A. Of course the entertainment film doesn't feed anything new back into the environment. It's a closed system, which is just presenting redundant information over and over again to people, which is why they are finally so frustrated by their life and it becomes a drug. They have to keep returning to the entertainment film to be constantly distracted. The film which is providing a more solid material is the film that creates this return of energy into the environment. It's film that also can be described as a matrix for one's psychic activity.

- P. I thought that I would also like to ask you about the comments, which you quoted in Film Notes, made by the judges of the 1972 Bensen and Hedges Award. They expressed their "unanimous disappointment at the unimaginative and unadventurous approach of the films, which had an overall lack of technical expertise." I think you saw some of or many of the films entered. So I thought you'd like to comment.
- A. We've since seen the film Paul Winkler submitted and which was rejected, which didn't even make the four finalists. This is a staggering piece of work and there, if you like, there is communication of a most intense level although it's a communication of personal feelings. A very intense communication on the horrors of war. Now there have been a million and one antiwar films made but never a war film which, by making such an impact on one's sensibility almost recreates the experience of war. In fact the film maker himself was to a certain extent, being a German, involved in the bombing of Hamburg as a child. He drew on direct experience in communicating the intense discomfort and pain and horror a child feels in war.
- C. They talk about technical expertise. We've been analysing some stills from it and you only realize the incredible technical achievement when you see these.
- A. This, if you like, is a bit of subliminal work. These grossly distorted war victims are felt rather than seen because they are alternating so rapidly. The fact remains that Paul Winkler's film is a work of the most incredible degree of technical expertise and the statement is just patently absurd. They're demonstrating the fact that they are not equipped to absorb this imagery.
- A. I suppose the most positive ~~strong~~^{critical} reaction we've had has been not from film critics but from art critics, especially when we did the Expanded Cinema show because art critics have learnt to cope with accepting new experiences. They accept that it's not always possible to analyse and interpret an experience and some of the comments made by the art critics were quite interesting and useful.
- P. Most creative artists have a struggle to make a living from their work. Or many do. Do you think that ~~the~~ economic difficulties ~~interfere~~ interfere with your work?
- A. There's no doubt about it. Any kind of worry is a very negative influence on creative work. We've had various worries over the years with the children and finances and during these periods the work almost stops. You can't work worries out of your system you have to have a clean slate.
- P. Also film is expensive and you have to have the money to buy the film for a start don't you. It is the most expensive of the media.

- A. This is precisely why it's been held up as a medium of self-expression on a very wide scale. *Cocoran* said that film won't become an art until the materials are as inexpensive as pencil and paper.
- P. There's a positive side perhaps that you might like to comment on. The economic difficulty that you face perhaps help to mould the style. For example the need to be economical leads to editing in the camera and to the use of a rapid succession of images to compress a lot onto a limited amount of film.
- C. I don't think that it's for reasons of economy that one does these things. I think that economic difficulty makes you resourceful but I don't know that that really determines your style.
- A. I think, on the other hand, that if you had unlimited material to work with you would progress much faster.
- C. We're terribly interrupted now with making *People Mix*. We have a grant from the government to make this. They pay for materials but we have no time because we have to try to make a living and this eats into our time so much that we just can't ever get to work on it properly.
- A. The film grants are splendid but they assume that you have some other means of livelihood.
- C. I feel that *People Mix* will suffer if we don't have a burst of being able to work on it uninterruptedly for some time, maybe a couple of months.
- A. Our greatest output ~~was~~ was in the period at Canberra when we had the university paying for everything. Although at the time there were all sorts of frustrations and holdups in retrospect it was much easier than having to battle away.
- P. The government subsidy, which you have for *People Mix*, how does that work. Do you receive it after submitting the project?
- A. In our case we made a good part of the film before we applied for assistance. In theory we're not terribly happy about these grants and we've ~~managed~~ avoided applying for one as long as we possibly could. Particularly in the beginning there were several unpleasant conditions and aspects which have since been solved.
- C. We did a lot of work last year out of our own pockets. We made *Island Fuse* and *Video Self-Portrait* and a lot of short films. We practically ruined ourselves by doing that I still think that I would rather have real support from the public, put on our programs have a lot of people come to see them and get our money that way. I hate this cultural dole that we're all struggling along on.
- A. I suppose you have to rationalize it. In the past there was always

some sort of sponsorship of the arts from wealthy patrons and so on. Government assistance is the modern equivalent of this but its not easy to feel obliged to any organization, however detached they are and however much freedom they give you. There's still finally this feeling of obligation.

- P. Instead of providing finance for film making do you think that there might be a better scheme whereby the Government provides some sort of distribution or promotion or some sort of outlet.
- C. I don't think it would help work like ours. It would help conventional Australian movies. We're trying to produce and introduce the work ourselves. That is what's needed. In fact we asked the government recently to put up the costs of our air fares to take the movie around to universities right up to Townsville to Perth, Hobart and so on but they turned that down. But that's what's needed for people like us to be able to present our work and talk about it. Of course the other problem is that we want to do a lot more research into the expanded cinema activity and this needs a lot of time and a lot of money and equipment. All this talk about distribution is only finally going to benefit the conventional film.
- C. One of the problems in Australia is the high cost of living, not just the cost of food but the high cost of overhead. Postage in particular is exceptionally high and telephone. Anything you want to do to promote your work is very expensive, much higher than it is in say, England, where postage, printing, all these things are much cheaper. It means that you have to have big resources to be able to put your work on.
- P. There was an article in Lumiere recently about underground cinema it stated that the alternative cinema in America is now big business. Andy Warhol for example. He's virtually a millionaire isn't he? I think he began by taking his films around the universities.
- A. I think he's mainly a millionaire through painting.
- P. Though the article did say that he'd made millions of dollars in major release cinemas.
- C. But I think Warhol's success has stemmed from his success as a painter. It carries tremendous prestige and authority. If he started as a film maker no one would know him or would be interested. Its only because of his great success in the art world before he started to move into films that he is a recognized film maker.
- P. Do you feel that there is any sort of tendency towards some such acceptance here.
- C. Well let's put it this way if Nolan were to take up film making I'm sure he would do very well with his films. But don't forget that Warhol's successful films have been very sexy and there's nothing like sexy films for getting people in. We've not seen any, apart from Chelsea Girls. We've not seen any of the notorious ones.

- A. As to getting independent film making on a viable basis in Australia one is certainly trying to do this. In fact we've lived off our own film making for the last two years but it hasn't been all that easy. We're the exception. I don't see it happening yet. We don't seem to have the society to want it in sufficient numbers.
- P. If there was a viable, virile Australian Film Industry, and there were more people involved in film making then perhaps their interests might develop and extend to a more creative use of film.
- A. Yes. I suppose it's just possible that if people were used to the idea of Australian film making they might support a wider ~~an~~ spectrum of work. I don't know. I'm inclined to think that it wouldn't have much effect. Especially when one looks at the kind of commercial Australian films which are being made which, almost without exception, are extremely ~~low~~ vulgar and easy to assimilate. This may just be a temporary transitory phase but I think that there seems to be this quest to find the authentic Australian character or image and they're going through a period of exploiting ~~vulgar~~ vulgarity which of course is a perfectly valid thing to do to try and find the Australian indigenous form.
- P. For a long time they looked for the great Australian Novel. But I think Patrick White provided an answer. So now it's the great Australian film we have to look for.
- C. But also we have here and now, people who work in television and in the film industry, making commercials. They're not interested in our sort of work unless ~~it's~~ it's to pinch ideas. A lot of advertising people are interested in new cinema so that they can get some ideas for their commercials. But the people who work in the industry, in television, they don't come. They're not interested.
- P. Talking about pinching ideas. The article I mentioned before spoke about how independent film makers had influenced commercial cinema. Space Odyssey is an obvious example.
- C. I certainly wouldn't have anything to do with our ideas being used to bolster up or pretty up, to trick out commercial films. In fact this is what Kubrick does in the Space Odyssey and also in Clockwork Orange, he uses little bits of what one might call underground tradition to jazz up his films. I'm totally opposed to this, especially as he always comes along, years after it was vital, and then shows it to the public. The great vitality in any art is when it's done, not when its watered down 10 years later by commercial people.
- P. I was going to ask, did you find this irritating or flattering; obviously you find it irritating. But I also wondered whether perhaps the recognition by the commercial cinema of the achievements of the independent film maker meant that perhaps they might move together.

- A. There's no doubt that independent film makers have pioneered a lot of stuff that is now accepted in commercial film making. The use of highly mobile hand-held cameras and recording on location and all that sort of stuff which was pioneered by the independent film-maker.
- C. I think the only thing that's going to save any of us at any level is the dynamic culture—the dynamic society. This throws into question all the existing forms of mass entertainment, we now have. Television could be such an incredible medium for people like us. To have our work on television, to be paid for it, to be economically independent of the cultural dole that we're all living on now from the government. But television of course isn't this, it's very static and unimaginative but it could be an extraordinary social force I think.
- A. I noticed in London, Hugh Greenhall the BBC manager, was ~~criticizing~~ ^{criticizing} the BBC recently for becoming very stereotyped, not leaving itself open to other influences, just becoming very narrow in its attitude, doing all its own work and being very incestuous about style. Television used to bring in outside work and there was a greater variety, perhaps an unevenness but it was a more vital thing. Television now tends to be a very closed system to any other influence or work.
- P. It just goes on repeating itself?
- A. It really hasn't evolved much. We've been recently watching television. We haven't watched Australian television since we were in Brisbane in 1965 and we're really fascinated by just how static it is. It just hasn't evolved since that time.
- A. It's all very backward looking. There's no feeling of contributing to the present or the future.
- P. Yes, I would like to go back to something you said earlier Corinne. You said that nothing is going to change until society changes. This brings us to education. You've had quite an extensive contact with students. Have you been aware of any increased interest in film as ~~an~~ personal expression rather than as entertainment?
- C. If one is honest you can say that in most schools the kids only think of films in terms of entertainment. But this depends so much on the school and so much on the teachers. In schools where there are interesting teachers and a good atmosphere in the school you often find the students are much more alert and interested. I've found from giving the screenings in the schools, that so much depends on the quality of the school, not even individual teachers just the overall atmosphere there. Authoritarian unhappy sort of schools are very insensitive. In other schools where there's a good atmosphere it's very good to give the screenings. I think teachers have an enormous influence on whether kids are going to make imitation Hollywood-type

films with their 8 mm cameras and no back-up or whether they're really going to explore things. We've seen so much interesting work from schools.

- A. Film in schools has got grafted onto other departments, usually English, which is a bit odd. Sometimes art, which is also odd, instead of being recognized as an area in its own right.
- P. Have you got any advice you would give to people initiating a film course? Maybe advice about aim or method? Maybe based on your workshop experience.
- A. Fluency in use of camera seems to be the important thing to start off with. Not to worry about telling a story, but setting up a situation where the students can experience the feel of the camera as an extension of themselves of their nervous system, feeling at one with the piece of equipment. But the error one sees happen more often than not in school film making is that complicated story films are attempted as a first effort and the script tends to take over.
- C. I think this applies also to Teacher's Colleges. We were speaking to someone who did the course at Monash Teacher's College, 4 years. He's extremely disappointed. He said that most of the students at the end of it could barely lace a projector and were unsure of themselves in handling the equipment. After a 4 year course it's disgraceful. Something's really wrong somewhere in the way that they're being taught.
- A. I think that rather than start off with story films it would be best to start off with some kind of near-documentary approach, using the camera to record reality. A very simple idea is to make film portraits of individuals, little slices of life like this. This kind of film making reproduces the history of film in any case, because some of the first films were recordings of daily events and they developed them to documentary films. This is exactly what we did with our workshop. We set up a situation where we had people filming one another and projecting images onto bodies. It was a very intense experience of sound and light and a very exciting experience.
- C. No matter what you teach, you should try to get across a very thorough knowledge of all the possibilities and potentials within the media, whether it's the use of language or film or paint or clay, so you thoroughly understand your medium. You try not to impose any style onto your students but at least they should thoroughly understand the nature of the medium. This is a great problem with film education or film criticism: people just don't understand the potential of the medium.
- P. Well they see it for its story telling ability because every time they have seen film they've been told a story.
- C. We're concerned that people should understand how to process a film, to understand the ~~physical~~ chemistry of film and to understand the potential that lies in the camera.

- A. Film is a very complicated thing. You don't just pick up the camera and do it all. I think it would be very interesting in a class situation to have a series of exercises filming tiny aspects of movement - just the way a limb cuts through the air or a door swings open. Filming it from all sorts of angles, being aware of the movement from different angles and points of view. In fact you could make it a very interesting experimental film. Just take a simple movement of an arm or a figure, just making one simple arc of movement and reproducing it in many different ways. I think this sort of intense kind of experience would make up for years of self-discovery in the normal way. I think a lot of experimental film-making is a means of self-education and self-discovery, of reality. As to the future. We feel of course, that film is a transition. It hasn't developed ~~much~~ much since the turn of the century when Edison and the Lumiere Bros. first started it going.
- P. The first film makers perhaps saw more of the possibilities inherent in the equipment than many later film makers.
- A. There's no doubt that the coming of sound and the development of film as a viable industry concretised a lot of the thought and development. As soon as any kind of situation becomes large and ponderous, there are great forces working against change and development. These things work against what is the very stuff of life to the independent person. Film is in a stage of transition towards finally, I suppose holographic images. Images suspended in space without the support of the screen. But the problem of how to support the audience in the ideal fashion is something which concerns a lot of people. The one exciting possibility would be to suspend them on compressed air so that they're virtually floating. There's a great inhibition in even having a floor for them to sit on. It would be very exciting for them to be totally surrounded by images. The next development that one expects would be when one just plugs into brain electrodes which would generate images of one kind or another directly, live, from the film maker. You wouldn't have to connect one another with wires. It would be transmitted through ether as radio waves are, so that possibly you could ~~xx~~ have these transmissions going through ether just as radio and television does. Instead of looking optically, with your eyes, at a screen, you'll clap something on your head which will send the impulses directly to the brain.