THE SOCIETY OF CINEMATOLOGISTS

6th Annual Meeting
The Library of Congress
Woodrow Wilson Room
Friday, March 31 - Sunday, April 2

Friday, March 31

9:30 - 10:30 a.m.	Opening of Annual Meeting. Arrival of members. Presentation of New Members.
10:30	Coffee
11:00 - 12:30	Papers: "The Historical Perspective." Messrs. Stainton, Noxon. (Papers to be submitted to the Journal for publication.)
12:30 - 2:00 p.m.	Lunch (The Cafe Continental on Pennsylvania Ave. has agreed to serve a buffet at $1.50 plus beverage and/or dessert and 15% tip. The owner requests that we present one check. Please pay the treasurer in advance. Before lunch drinks may be purchased individually at the cash bar.)
2:00 - 5:30	Tour: The Library of Congress Motion Picture Section. (Note: Reassemble in the Wilson Room)
	Topic: "Archives, Technology, and Study Programs." Mrs. Macpherson, Messrs. Cotè, Forsdale, Kuiper.
5:30 - 8:00	Dinner: Cafe Continental
8:00	SCREENING: Premiere of Charles Guggenheim's MONUMENT TO THE DREAM Also the "Bobby Kennedy Political Film" from Charles Guggenheim and Associates (The Woodrow Wilson Room)

Saturday, April 1

9:30 - 12:30 a.m.	Topic: "Society Members and Cinema Projects." Messrs. Worth, Dworkin and others (Organized by Donald Staples and reported for the Journal by him.)
10:30	Coffee
12:00 - 1:30 p.m.	Lunch
1:30 - 5:30	Topic: "Frontiers in History and Criticism." Messrs Gessner, Amberg, Hammond, Steele. (Organized by Richard D. MacCann and reported for the Journal by Donald McCaffrey.)
	Preliminary Business Meeting. Agenda: Election of Officers and Council Member; Discussion of Old Business.

Photocopy is for reference use only. Further reproduction requires permission from the Department of Special Collections, Stanford University Libraries

8:00 — SCREENING: In the Coolidge Auditorium: "D.W. Griffith-Biograph Company Festival, 1908 - 1913." An invitational screening for Members of the Society, Members of Congress, and Members of local cinema organizations.

Sunday, April 2

10:00 a.m. or
12:30 p.m.

(Either Parlor A of the Burlington Hotel or The Wilson Room)

Business Meeting Agenda

Examples of CILECT Publications on Cinema

Topics for Discussion:
- Participation in CILECT
- Participation in NCAIE
- Publication of Journal
- Membership
- Bibliography and Filmography
- Constitutional Revision
- Newsletter
- Budget
- Next Annual Meeting

Business Meeting:

Old Business: Minutes; Treasurer's Report; Finances and the Search for Grants.

New Business: Membership; Proposals for action during the next year.

Photocopy is for reference use only. Further reproduction requires permission from the Department of Special Collections, Stanford University Libraries

THE SOCIETY OF CINEMATOLOGISTS
8th Annual Meeting
The Library of Congress
Woodrow Wilson Room
April 1, 1967

Society Members and Cinema Projects

Donald E. Staples

As an experimental departure from the traditional reading of formal papers this morning session of the annual meeting consisted of reports and discussion of the recently completed work or the work in progress of three members.

Solomon Dworkin led off by introducing the Society members to Animation by Means of Computer Programs--presenting two methods of computer animation in use at Bell Telephone Laboratories and illustrating some of their accomplishments by showing completed computer films.

"Computers, as they exist today, are really very stupid. Like all machines, they cannot reason for themselves but must depend entirely on directions provided by an intelligent human being." Their tremendous memory capacity and speed of working make them useful tools however. Mr. Dworkin, as Head of the Educational Programs Department at Bell Labs and at the same time a film-maker, got started in computer films by animating on motion picture film the paper prints of computer generated frames produced by the 4020 Stromberg-Carlson microfilm printer.

This technique has been replaced now, since E. Zajac, also at Bell, developed a system whereby the film which comes from the camera that is connected with the computer display device can be projected directly without the print-making and animating steps.

Mr. Dworkin showed a film which illustrated the steps in production, showing how a computer tape which has come from a computer into which punched

Photocopy is for reference use only. Further reproduction requires permission from the Department of Special Collections, Stanford University Libraries

cards had been fed, is mounted on the 4020 microfilm printer and controls the information which is fed to a cathode ray tube and the mechanism of the microfilm camera which records the pictures on the face of the tube. The two systems currently in use at Bell are the "point-to-point" method and the BEFLIX method.

In the point-to-point system of Dr. Zajac the cathode ray tube is thought of as consisting of many invisible raster points on the face--1024 points up and 1024 points across. The pictures are drawn by a spot of light from an electron beam which is positioned at the raster points indicated by the tape and moves from point to point, and is recorded by the open camera. It is similar to the numbered dots in a dot-to-dot drawing which children do to reveal a picture by drawing straight lines between the points.

After the showing of a film which illustrated the above system the BEFLIX system was explained as a program or language developed by Bell Labs' K. C. Knowlton. It uses the 1024 by 1024 point grid; however letters or numbers are positioned at these raster points to create a picture. Therefore, if X's are used in an area, a darker picture results than if T's were used. By the choice of letter or number used and by controlled spacing, a picture containing apparent gray tones is achieved whereas the point-to-point system produced only black or white.

Since computer time is so precious, computer generated frames which must appear more than once in the final film are optically repeated by the motion picture laboratory when printing.

After showing more computer films, Sol Dworkin said that although an artist animator could have achieved some of the same pictures, it would have taken an extremely long time and certain kinds of data can not be visualized by the artist. It did, of course, take the programmers a great deal of time to write the programs for the computer to generate these films;

Photocopy is for reference use only. Further reproduction requires permission from the Department of Special Collections, Stanford University Libraries

however, by the use of loops, subroutines, and existing programs, the time for preparation will be substantially reduced. The computer language is so precise in its instructions and data that if any faults are discovered by the computer the program will either be totally rejected, or will indicate the error by printed diagnostic comments. Now the scientist and engineer can submit his ideas and data and receive a proof film from the computer as one might receive galley proofs from a publisher, make his corrections, and request the final product.

Color computer generated films have been successfully made and after being given the necessary parameters the computer has composed music in the style of Bach and produced a Mondrian-like drawing. Mr. Dworkin feels that computer animation "will never replace Donald Duck", however, besides its role in science and engineering, it makes available new techniques to the film artist.

This part of the session was concluded by the showing of TWO PARADOXES which combined the work of a computer mathmatician and an experimental film-maker--Ken Knowlton and Stan Van der Beek.

The second presentation was made by Arnold Eagle and was entitled THE Cinematic Characteristics of the Animated Still Photograph in Film. After pointing out that a great many recent award-winning feature and documentary films had used still photographs, the theoretical characteristics of the still and motion picture were compared with particular attention being paid to the psychological and physiological reactions of the viewer.

The advantages of the still photograph include the lower cost, ease and speed of set-up, easier lighting, variable exposures, and greater variety of angles and positions taking "a fraction of the time it would take a most efficient and very fast working movie crew."

Stating that the still photograph and a motion picture are "two totally different media", Mr. Eagle punctured the belief held by some that they could be interchanged. In order to demonstrate this misconception, the methods of

Photocopy is for reference use only. Further reproduction requires permission from the Department of Special Collections, Stanford University Libraries

working within these media and the kinesthetic response were explored.

The viewing of a shot produced on the animation stand is a very different experience than the dolly movement on film since "the basic phenomenon of optical perspective is the apparent increase or decrease in the size of an object as it approaches or recedes from a viewer's position" and this phenomenon, with the attendent increase of accelerated rate of growth for nearer objects, is only experienced in the latter--the dolly shot. This geometric rate of growth does not happen with the zoom on an animation stand.

A similar phenomenon occurs with the pan, trucking, or tilt shot on motion picture film, but not with the East-West or North-South movement on the animation stand. The gradient of motion defines the difference. When the motion picture is used the nearer foreground objects move faster past the camera than the middle, or background objects; whereas in the horizontal or vertical movement across a still photograph, all objects pass by at the same rate of travel.

Arnold Eagle noted Slavko Vorkapich's statement that "It is only the kinesthetic phenomenon which elevates the film medium to the stature of an original art form." He explained that Vorkapich contended that the other cinematic characteristics of film are derivative from more established art forms and that the kinesthetic phenomenon is unique to the motion picture. Because kinesthesia is invisible--felt not noticed--viewers and film-makers are not aware of it although they use it. Recent films such as A HARD DAY'S NIGHT and BLOW UP owe their success to kinesthesia, not fast cutting as the critics have implied. "The kinesthetic audience response probably accounts for the universal passion for Westerns and other violent action films all over the world. This very essential ingredient of the cinematic technique is <u>totally absent</u> in the animated still photo film technique." The difference results im the fact that one (film) is the recreation of real movement, while the other (animation) is synthetic.

Photocopy is for reference use only. Further reproduction requires permission from the Department of Special Collections, Stanford University Libraries

Even the editing is different. For the animated still photograph there is no matching of action; every shot is a cutaway. The most practical method of editing these films is "intellectual montage" according to Eagle--"the use of contrast to heighten the impact and to give the previous shot a conceptual meaning" (Eisenstein). Also the synthesis of repetition becomes a useful technique and Mr. Eagle cites Lewis Jacobs' technique of panning across Brady photographs of four dead soldiers and one dead mule to create the impression of a huge battlefield with hundreds of dead.

In the live action sound film the visual image has primacy; however, when the animated still photograph is used, a reversal takes place and "the sound track has the greater importance of the two." When new sound techniques are used with the documentary animated still photo film a believable cinema verite quality can be achieved. This is especially true with an "authentic spontaneous undirected sound track recorded on location at the same time that the stills were taken."

To illustrate his remarks, Arnold Eagle showed his recent film, NOW GOD SPEAKS TZALTAL in which the twenty-five years of work of two missionary women are recounted as they bid farewell to the Tzaltal Indian tribe of Mexico. Cornell Capa was responsible for the still photography which is "comparable to three or four movie cameras covering the action simultaneously."

"We just started to explore the cinematic opportunities of the animated still photograph, and we can look forward to its exciting possibilities."

Professor Sol Worth concluded the morning session with a report of work in progress which he is directing at the University of Pennsylvania's Annenberg School of Communications.

What do we mean by some of the expressions we use? Do we really understand words and phrases of interest such as "film literacy", "the language of the motion picture," or "the syntax of film?" Just how does the language of film

Photocopy is for reference use only. Further reproduction requires permission from the Department of Special Collections, Stanford University Libraries

work? This idea would be worth exploring.

In most languages we are expected to know how to talk it as well as just read it. Therefore doesn't it follow that to truly know the language of film, one must need to know how to make a film?

When we make a differentiation and compare communication and art we find that some artists aren't at all interested in communicating. Similarly, linguistics and literature must be compared in order to find ways in which to look at film. These older areas have guidelines and conventions; they have sets of rules. By applying these rules, it is possible to "decide if a native speaker is generating grammatical utterances or not."

What about film though? Who is the "native speaker" in film and are there different languages of film? If different languages do exist, what are the boundaries of film dialects or tongues? Are they geographic, cultural, or cognitive?

In an attempt to answer some of these questions, Professor Worth posed two major questions as guidelines for research: 1) Could you teach the Navajo Indians to speak (make and use) film? and 2) Could you teach young illiterates (Negro drop-outs) to make films? The research was started.

Sol Worth and an anthropologist went to the Southwest and conducted their experiments with young Navajos ages 17-24 who had seen between six and one hundred films. The subjects could talk some English and were briefly instructed in how to use the Bell and Howell Camera with a three lens turret. They were told that after taking the pictures they could piece the film together in any sequence of any length. The results were astounding and the most successful film according to Worth was the film that a young girl had made about her sixty-five year old mother weaving. It was what we would call an educational documentary or "process" film which showed all of the steps in the weaving of Navajo material. After showing the film, Professor Worth revealed that even the girl's mother learned how to make a film during the project.

Photocopy is for reference use only. Further reproduction requires permission from the Department of Special Collections, Stanford University Libraries

At the same time, in Philadelphia, a graduate student was attacking the other question by teaching a group of eleven to fourteen year old Negro boys to "speak" with film. Their efforts resulted in a interesting documentary film about their day, which to them was boring, with nothing to do. This example was also shown to the assembled Cinematologists and Professor Worth completed his presentation by pointing out that Pasolini says that film has no language, just style, and that it created its own form first. Film then is a fairly universal language and it is hoped that a formal report on this project will be available next year.

These remarks concluded the morning session of Society Members and Cinema Projects.

Photocopy is for reference use only. Further reproduction requires permission from the Department of Special Collections, Stanford University Libraries

News in the Library World

The Society of Cinematologists, an organization of college and university educators, film-makers, historians, and critics, concerned with the study of cinema as an art form, held its 8th Annual Meeting in the Wilson Room at the Library of Congress on March 31-April 1 and concluded their sessions with business meetings downtown on April 2.

On the first day, L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, welcomed the group and discussed the Library's interest in the preservation of films and in the Society's research aims. The members toured the research facilities of the Motion Picture Section and discussed the use of the collection in scholarly pursuits.

The program for the first meeting featured papers on the history of the cinema delivered by Gerald Noxon of Boston University and Walter Stainton of Cornell University. Guy L. Coté, Director of La Cinemathéque Canadienne in Montreal, delivered an illuminating paper on the practices, procedures, and policies of his organization. The first evening session concluded with the screening of two recent films produced by Charles Guggenheim and Associates of Washington.

At the session on Saturday morning--organized by Donald Staples of Ohio State University--Arnold Eagle, New York film producer and editor, spoke on the integration of still photographs and motion pictures into a film production; Sol Worth of the Annenberg School of Communication, Philadelphia, compared films taken by Navajo Indians and by high school dropouts to illustrate different styles of film-making developed by people of different cultural backgrounds; and Solomon Dworkin of the Bell Telephone Laboratories described the production of computer-made, animated films.

The afternoon was devoted to a panel discussion--organized by Richard D. MacCann of the University of Kansas--on new college and university programs in the instruction and study of the cinema as an art form. Participants were George Amberg, New York University; Robert M. Hammond, University of Arizona; Robert Steele, Boston University; and Robert Gessner, New York University.

The evening of April 1 was devoted to a preview of the Library's April 3 and 4 public screenings of rare D. W. Griffith films from the years 1908-1913, selected from the collection of positive "paper prints" deposited for copyright during the early part of this century and recently rephotographed by the Library to make research and study of them possible.

New officers elected for the coming year were John B. Kuiper, Head of the Motion Picture Section, Prints and Photographs Division, Library of Congress, President; Richard B. MacCann of the University of Kansas, Secretary; Donald Staples of the Ohio State University, Treasurer, and Sol Worth of the Annenberg School of Communication, Philadelphia, Council Member.

The proceedings of the meeting will be published this fall in the Journal of the Society of Cinematologists.

50¢

Photocopy is for reference use only. Further reproduction requires permission from the Department of Special Collections, Stanford University Libraries