

Propaganda and Documentary Filmmaking

by

Michael Roper

Bachelor of Arts
Pitzer College
Claremont, California
1977

SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEGREE
MASTER OF SCIENCE IN VISUAL STUDIES

SEPTEMBER 1984

© Michael Roper 1984

The author hereby grants to M.I.T. permission to reproduce
and distribute publicly copies of this thesis document
in whole or in part.

Signature of author

Michael Roper, Department of
Architecture August 17, 1984

Certified by

Richard Leacock, Professor of Cinema,
Thesis Supervisor

Accepted by

Nicholas Negroponete, Chairman
Departmental Committee for Graduate
Students

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE
OF TECHNOLOGY

OCT 05 1984

LIBRARIES

Propaganda and Documentary Filmmaking

by
Michael Roper

Submitted to the Department of Architecture on
August 17, 1984 in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the Degree of Master of Science
in Visual Studies

ABSTRACT

This thesis consists of a text and a videotape, entitled A
Call For Survival: Personal Responses to the Nuclear Threat.

The written thesis is an analysis of documentary filmmaking as a form of discourse. Drawing on the work of Michel Foucault, a French historian and philosopher, the two basic approaches to documentary filmmaking are explored: the observational documentary and the propagandistic documentary. The techniques of each approach are evaluated in terms of their effects as mechanisms of power and knowledge. The two approaches are then examined in terms of how each has been incorporated into mass media.

The videotape that accompanies this thesis is 3/4-inch U-Matic, 28 minutes long, color, sound, and in the English language.

Thesis Supervisor: Richard Leacock
Title: Professor of Cinema

Table of Contents

	Page
Title Page	1
Abstract	2
I. Introduction	4
II. Documentary as a Form of Discourse	6
III. Definitions	8
IV. Techniques of Power	9
V. Television as a Political Technology	16
VI. Observation, Propaganda and Their Relation to Truth	19
VII. Footnotes	23
VIII. Bibliography	25

I. Introduction

The subject of this thesis -- the role of propaganda in documentary filmmaking -- was sparked by my own efforts, over the past 10 years, to deal with a dichotomy in my work as a filmmaker: the desire on the one hand to make unscripted, observational documentaries; and on the other hand to make documentaries that deal with social-political issues. Despite my desire to make them, I've always had a great deal of trouble with my "political" films. It seemed to me that the propaganda film, however benevolent its aims, always amounts to a simplification and distortion of its subject matter, which is, in the broadest sense, the reality it purports to describe. So for a some time I've been thinking about new ways of dealing with political issues in visual media.

When I began work on A Call For Survival, a series of portraits of four anti-nuclear weapons activists, I felt I had an understanding of the issues underlying the observational and propagandistic approaches. I thought it might be possible to combine the two together somehow, by using some of the techniques of direct cinema. But during and especially after completing the project, I realized I had not succeeded in combining the two approaches. Instead, what had begun as an attempt at portraiture and observation, within the context of a political concern (nuclear weapons), had devolved into a fairly straightforward propaganda piece. This is true even though it lacked a narrator and provided little biographical information about its subjects.

While most people liked the film, many felt it wasn't doing its job correctly, that it wasn't saying enough about the issues, etc. Over time, the need to make the documentary

"work" as a film with a message, undercut the observational stance I had tried to adopt at the outset.

As I thought about how A Call For Survival had become a propaganda film, I realized that it hadn't been simply a question of what I wanted to do or what I thought about the relative merits of the observational and propaganda approaches. The film had changed, despite a great deal of resistance on my part, because of the pressures of its sponsors, because of the need to insure that the film would "convince" its audience. A Call For Survival had become part of an apparatus of sorts, a machine with a definite purpose. I had witnessed and been a part of the process by which our society judges and uses the documentary form, the cultural assumptions about what a film of this kind should be.

This experience caused me to consider a whole field of external conditions that have shaped the techniques of the documentary filmmaker. One signpost was Richard Leacock, who has analyzed the effects of equipment technology on the form and content of films.¹ Another was Michel Foucault, who, picking up from Nietzsche, has explored the "will to truth" in western societies: the history of the criteria used by scientific and quasi-scientific disciplines to produce "true" discourse.² The collection of procedures, techniques and apparatus that disciplines employ to produce "true" discourse also represents the place where knowledge and power meet: knowledge induces power and power induces knowledge. This relationship does not mean that these mechanisms alter the truth. Foucault demonstrates, at least in the case of the human sciences, that there is no such thing as a truth residing in some free space outside the realm of power.

"Perhaps too, we should abandon a whole tradition that allows us to imagine that knowledge can exist only where the power relations are suspended and that

knowledge can develop only outside its injunctions, its demands and its interests. Perhaps we should abandon the belief that power makes mad and that, by the same token, the renunciation of power is one of the conditions of knowledge. We should admit rather that power produces knowledge (and not simply by encouraging it because it serves power or by applying it because it is useful); that power and knowledge directly imply one another; that there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations."³

What I would like to demonstrate here is that the documentary form can also be analyzed as a form of discourse, with its own techniques and its own criteria of truth; that documentary techniques are the result and the basis of a network of power relations. I would then like to explore how the observational and propagandistic approaches to documentary filmmaking have been shaped by a "political economy" of truth that has incorporated each of them, to a greater or lesser degree, into mass media.

II. The Documentary as a Form of Discourse

Today there are essentially two documentary approaches that claim an important link with social reality. One is the political or preconceived documentary, the other is the unscripted observational film, sometimes referred to as "direct cinema." The former claims its right to interpret and explain reality to its audience, the latter focuses on filming reality as it unfolds, with as little intervention as possible. These two very different approaches are not simply the result of different approaches to filmmaking among

filmmakers. They are also evidence of the social and political forces that have shaped the practice of documentary filmmaking.

The documentary form exists at the intersection between film as "art" and film as political discourse. Both of these fields have their own criterion that enable them to identify "good" art and "legitimate" political discourse. Although this criteria has often changed, it represents the threshold beyond which art and political discourse is taken seriously.

Every form of knowledge, every discipline, has a set of theories, procedures, apparatus, and methods of observation that determine what the criterion of "truth" is in that discipline. This is the case whether the discipline happens to be physics, psychoanalysis, or documentary filmmaking. A "regime" of truth is constructed whereby knowledge is "linked in a circular relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extend it."⁴

The ultimate target of knowledge, as a mechanism of power, is the body, the human subject. "...The body is also directly involved in a political field; power relations have an immediate hold upon it; they invest it, mark it, train it, torture it, force it to carry out tasks, to perform ceremonies, to emit signs."⁵ The documentary, in its observational and propagandistic forms, also has a machinery for the production and distribution of knowledge. This machinery is not as rigorous or as systematized as that of a science, but its effects remain considerable.

But it is not sufficient merely to describe the documentary as a form of discourse; the techniques and procedures of this discourse must be examined in detail if we are to understand

how they function within the observational and propagandistic approaches, and how they manufacture different forms of truth.

III. Definitions

It is important that we first define the two fundamental approaches to documentary filmmaking: the observational documentary and propagandistic documentary.

By observational I mean unscripted, observational films often referred to as "direct cinema" or "cinema verite." This group of films has its origins in the approach of Robert Flaherty, who created a body of work, beginning with Nanook of the North, that demonstrated it was possible to make films about a people and their way of life, in this case that of the Eskimo, by living with them and using the camera as a tool of observation. Flaherty's approach was extended by Leacock and other filmmakers in the nineteen sixties, after the development of a portable, sync-sound camera rig made it possible to capture the sound as well as the visual element of an event without the use of heavy sound equipment.

By propaganda I mean any film that seeks to argue a position (e.g., "acid rain is a threat to the environment"). This is an approach where the issue precedes the film and is the reason for the film's existence. I would include the documentaries made by John Grierson's group in the thirties and forties in this category, as well as the "political" films of Joris Ivens. These films are generally made after a treatment or script had been written.

It is my belief that the propagandistic approach underwent a significant mutation with the invention of television. In the TV documentary, two opposing positions regarding an issue are developed in the same film. Although the causes of this

bifurcation are significant, it has not changed the basic characteristic of the propagandistic approach, which is to argue for and/or against an idea or position.

The basic difference between the two approaches is that in the case of the observational film, the filmmaker doesn't know what his film will be like or what it is going to say until after his footage is shot. In the case of the propaganda film, the filmmaker has a much better idea of what his film will be like: he knows at the outset what he wants to say; his task is to make the film express and conform to his position.

IV. Techniques of Power

The techniques of documentary filmmaking are at once tools for gaining knowledge about the subject and mechanisms of power. They operate in the process of extracting truth from human subjects and in the organization and presentation of this truth in the form of a film. We will first examine these techniques and how they are employed in the observational and propagandistic approaches; then we will explore how these approaches have been incorporated into our society's "political economy" of truth.

Camera

The motion picture camera is itself the single most potent "technique" in documentary filmmaking. Its origins are connected with the development of modern methods of scientific observation. It is an apparatus that can "see" things that the human observer cannot see: it can divide motion into infinitesimal moments; it can slow motion down or speed it up; it can record that part of the light spectrum which is invisible to the eye. At the outset it was developed to study the motion of planets, animals, and later people. By

creating a permanent record, it allows the scientist repeated opportunities for study. As a technique the camera fit in perfectly with the empirical strategies of scientific research. The camera objectifies what it records, transforming movement and behaviour into a form appropriate for study.

In 1898, a cinematographe operator for Lumiere, Boleslaw Matuszewski, wrote Une Nouvelle Source de l'Histoire, which proposed that film be used to document "...slices of public and national life,"⁶ that it be used in the arts, industry, medicine, military affairs, science, and education. The use of film spread quickly to these adjoining area because it was a singularly useful tool in helping the human sciences constitute man himself as an object of scientific investigation.⁷

In the observational documentary, a great deal of importance is given to capturing an "event"; that is, an authentic social interaction between human beings. The very first films celebrated the wonderous spectacle of everyday life, for example Louis Lumiere's Workers Leaving the Lumiere Factory and Arrival of a Train. But Lumiere's initial dedication to this kind of observation was quickly displaced by non-fiction films with more obvious commercial appeal. By the late nineteen twenties, the non-fiction film had become the film of the comings and going of kings and queens. It was not until Robert Flaherty's Nanook of the North that a workable approach to observational filmmaking was developed.

Flaherty believed that filmmaking should be an act of discovery, that the filmmaker should try to find out something about the world he is filming, rather than a vehicle for arguing a position. Francis Flaherty chose the word "non-preconception" to describe her husband's approach. While the films of John Grierson "have been preconceived for

political purposes", Hollywood "preconceives" films "for the box office."⁸

In contrast, Flaherty demonstrated that making reality conform to a preconceived idea was not the only organizing method for making documentary films. One could instead observe reality, admittedly in a very personal way, and make films "that celebrate...the thing in itself for its own sake."⁹

As Richard Leacock has noted, Robert Flaherty's films, even though they were silent, are "...very good at giving you the feeling of being someplace. Nanook was marvelous, it really gave you the feeling of being in the Arctic, and Moana gave you the feeling of being in the South Sea Islands."¹⁰ A key feature of observational filmmaking is that it gives the viewer this sense of being there, of participation.

The origin of the observational documentary film and the ethnographic film was Robert Flaherty's Nanook. However, the character of Flaherty's observation was highly influenced by the film technology of the era. Because of the lack of sync-sound, it was not really possible to capture a social event as such. Instead, Flaherty concentrated on evoking a broader understanding of the peoples he made films about; technology put the recording of an event, in all of its aural and visual complexity, beyond his grasp.

The early nineteen sixties was the next period of rapid development of the observational approach. During this period Richard Leacock and Robert Drew developed portable sync-sound equipment that made it possible to capture all aspects of a social event for the first time.

The new technology made possible a new approach to documentary filmmaking. Now the cameraperson could follow the event as it took place, rather than forcing the event to take place in

front of his camera. A rigorous observation of individuals interacting within a social space was now possible. The advent of sound was a key factor in this development, because before it had not made sense to film people speaking if what they said could not be preserved.

This development in filmmaking technology made it possible to exploit the camera as a power mechanism to the fullest. The camera, when trained on human beings, has the capacity to extract the truth of those it films. The act of filming them, the very knowledge they have of being filmed, can provoke them to speak and act their own truth. A ritual of confession is invoked, but this ritual does not work without the cooperation of those who are filmed. An example of this is the documentary Nehru, filmed by Richard Leacock and Gregory Shuker. Their plan was to film Nehru during a two week period before an important election. Although they explained the ground rules to Nehru -- that he would ignore them and they would stay out of the way -- both parties failed to live up to the bargain. Instead, Nehru referred to Leacock and Shuker on a number of occasions. They, in turn, were not totally successful in not attracting attention to themselves.¹¹

The camera ritual does not work automatically, and there is an infinite number of possible relationships between cameraperson and subject. But in general people do act like themselves when they are filmed.

In the propaganda documentary, creating the "feeling of being someplace" or capturing the dynamics of a social event is relatively unimportant. The cameraperson's responsibility is to film various shots for later assembly. They are brought together to form a montage that gives the audience "information" about the people in question: what they do, where they work, what environments they occupy. The cameraperson is engaged in taking process shots which act as a

support for narration. This kind of filming is not very different from the filming done for documentaries in the thirties and forties, before portable sync-sound equipment became available. The addition of sound to these shots simply gave the editor one more element to work with during the editing process.

The power over the human subject induced by this kind of shooting is much less intrusive than is the case with observational camerawork. The individuals filmed for the propaganda documentary are not observed in detail; they merely offer themselves as a tableaux for the camera. The unedited footage has no intrinsic meaning; the meaning is constructed later during the editing, using narration as a kind of grid. The one variation to this approach is the interview.

The Interview

The interview is a power mechanism with a long history in western culture. The interview has its origins in the practice of confession, which spread from the Catholic pastoral in the Middle Ages to jurisprudence, and finally to psychiatry and the other social sciences in the twentieth century.¹² Foucault has demonstrated that confessing the truth about oneself is one of the chief ways in which truth is manufactured in modern society.¹³ Its effects are intensified in filmmaking because it is combined with the already potent effects of the camera. Not only is one asked to speak the truth about oneself, but one's reactions and answers are recorded for all to see.

The interview is used very differently by observational and propaganda approaches. In the TV documentary, the use of the interview technique is dominant. The full power of this technique is used to extract information and titillate the audience. CBS's 60 Minutes is the pre-eminent example of the

use of this technique as a mechanism of power. Here, the interview mimics a cross-examination in a court of law, but now it is the audience who sits in judgment.¹⁴

In the observational documentary, the interview is used much less frequently and with more circumspection. When it is used, it is often employed as another form of observation: what the person actually says is less important than his reactions, what he reveals about himself as a person. Here, the interview is more like a confession or, perhaps more accurately, a therapy session.

What we find then is that the observational stance relies heavily on the camera as a technique to incite the "truth" by its presence, while the propaganda film employs the interview to provoke the subject to speak the truth about himself.

Editing

In the observational film, a concern for maintaining the integrity of the event continues to be important during the editing. This means that the editing should not destroy either the the context of an individual event (the sense of being there) or the chronology of a series of events that make up a film. However, a great deal of liberty is taken in including only some events and not others, and in the condensation of an event. This is partly the result of the open admission of the direct cinema filmmaker that what he is offering the audience is his personal account of the important interactions that took place. This is very different from the ethnographic film, where, in the interest of capturing as much as possible of a single event, editing is kept to an absolute minimum.¹⁵

In the political documentary, the integrity of an event or its accurate location in a chronology is relatively unimportant.

Instead, the emphasis is placed on developing a theme or position that can generally be expressed in words; it is this text that is predominant. Therefore visual material, except for interviews, is called upon to play a supporting role to this text. On the other hand factual accuracy, the truth of statements contained within the documentary, is considered highly important.

Only in the interview, an event wholly fabricated by the filmmaker, is some attention placed on the integrity of the event. But this is for the purpose of protecting the interplay of the questions and/or responses. The person interviewed allows himself to be put in a situation where he may be asked questions he does not want to answer. Because he is being filmed, however, he risks losing credibility if he fails to answer a question or does so evasively. The interview is a power mechanism where a disposition of roles is deployed. This architecture sets up opportunities and dangers for both sides.

Narration

The observational film eschews narration for the most part, preferring to let the audience interpret what they see for themselves. Narration is sometimes used to provide information that isn't available in the footage; but this is generally looked upon as a necessary evil, because it defeats the purpose of the observational stance: to let the event speak for itself.

Narration, whether it comes from a "correspondent" or from a narrator, plays a pivotal role in the propaganda film. The coherence of this kind of documentary is entirely verbal, it is based upon a "text". It is the essential organizing

principle of films with a message. All of the other elements are present to support the narration, the meaning and purpose of the film.

V. Television as a Political Technology

We have examined some of the techniques of power in documentary filmmaking that produce power and knowledge. How can we analyze the relationships between these techniques, the approaches that they dominate, and the overall role played by documentary film in the power relations of western society?

"In societies like ours, the 'political economy' of truth is characterised by five important traits. 'Truth' is centered on the form of scientific discourse and the institutions which produce it; it is subject to constant economic and political incitement (the demand for truth, as much for economic production as for political power); it is the object, under diverse forms, of immense diffusion and consumption (circulating through apparatuses of education whose extent is relatively broad in the social body, notwithstanding certain strict limitations); it is produced and transmitted under the control, dominant if not exclusive, of a few political and economic apparatuses (university, army, writing, media); lastly, it is the issue of a whole political debate and social confrontation ('ideological' struggles)."¹⁶

Here is a schematic description of the roles played by the sciences, universities and media in the circulation of power and knowledge in modern society. Knowledge is distributed through "apparatuses of education" and

"produced and transmitted under the control...of a few political and economic apparatuses (university, army, writing, media)..." Within this "political economy", the media has come to play a pivotal role in the production and transmission of knowledge. The importance of this component should not be underestimated. To a large extent our experience in the the United States of ourselves as a country (not to mention of our selves as human beings), is shaped and fomented by television. We are offered an incessant picture that is not exactly a reflection. This picture has become the primary target, the pressure point for competing interests in our society.

If one looked solely to the number of documentaries aired on television and the size of their audiences, it might appear that the role of documentary in media is a limited one. But if one looks at such entitites as the nightly news, talk shows, the news magazine, and the like, it becomes clear that many of the elements of the propaganda documentary have been incorporated into other forms of television programming.

It is important to understand why the propaganda documentary could no longer exist in the way it did before advent of television. The propaganda film of the thirties and forties has been transformed into the TV documentary of the eighties. The independent documentary of an earlier age has lost influence as the institutional or TV documentary has gained influence, and it has been displaced, to some degree, by the news magazine, talk shows, and the news itself.

The economic and political responsibilities of television have lead to a documentary form reminiscent of Grierson, but with several important modifications. John Grierson was one of the first filmmakers to formulate a number of

ideas about media in modern society.¹⁷ He felt that the scale and complexity of industrial society was making it increasingly difficult for the citizen to understand and evaluate his world. He believed that the documentary form, in aggregate, could gradually change public attitudes for the better.

Basil Wright, a member of the group of filmmakers Grierson assembled under the auspices of the Empire Marketing Board and later with the General Post Office, describes how he understood their responsibilities:

"As I remember, at the beginning we were supposed to educate the British public about the marvels of the Empire, because we still had an Empire in those days. We were selling New Zealand butter and Ceylon tea and so on to the British public, in a rather imaginative way. And we were also selling the British to themselves: we were selling the British industrial worker and the British agricultural worker to the British nation as a whole, as people who could be treated with respect. You must remember that in those days they weren't treated with respect. They were regarded as the working classes."¹⁸

Here we have the first model of media as a tool for social motivation and integration. Grierson's goals may seem overly direct and naive now, but this was the beginning of television media as it exists today.

In addition to Grierson's "corporate" approach to propaganda filmmaking, many filmmakers in the United States and other countries made documentaries during the thirties and forties that were openly defiant of the policies of government. The power of the documentary form was harnessed by individual

filmmakers who commented on modern society. It was just this kind of independent propaganda documentary that could not survive the coming of television.

As television developed as a political technology, it shaped the propaganda documentary to reinforce and expand its power. The independent propaganda documentary became the institutional propaganda documentary: the TV documentary where every opinion is balanced, at least at first glance, by its opposite.

The ability of television to influence public opinion was so great that this power could not be invested in the independent documentary filmmaker. Edward R. Murrow's attack on Senator McCarthy, at the height of McCarthyism, is the single example of television using its political power to its fullest.¹⁹ Afterwards, measures were taken to contain and regulate this power.

The TV documentary is the modern equivalent of Grierson's approach to documentary filmmaking. Its stance is essentially pro-government, in that no opposing individual "thesis" is ever fully developed. Every viewpoint, every critique, is balanced by its opposite. Television's need for corporate sponsors and government support, together with its spectacular hold on public opinion, has made its informational, "objective" stance a necessity.

VI. Observation, Propaganda and Their Relation to Truth

We have now explored how the propaganda documentary was modified by a political technology to become the institutional TV documentary. This is an illustration of how the kinds of truth produced by the observational and propagandistic approaches have determined the role each can play in a larger

power apparatus called the media. It should be clear by now that I am not referring to an ideal truth that remains aloof from power. Instead I am referring to a truth that corresponds with the techniques used in its production.

The observational approach is linked to the empirical methods of scientific observation. Its truth is largely non-verbal and its practitioners recognize the interactions that occur between the observer and the observed. That direct cinema films such as D. A. Pennebaker's Elizabeth and Mary and David Parry's Premature can double as films for medical study indicates their close association with the observational techniques of the human sciences.

In contrast, the propaganda documentary is an extension of journalistic practices that have become increasingly important since the nineteenth century. Despite refinements in its approach, its basic use of visual and aural elements has not changed. Images are divorced from a sense of place -- which is a key aspect of the observational approach, and used wherever they might effectively illustrate the propaganda documentary's text. The development of portable sync-sound equipment did not greatly change the use of images in the propaganda documentary, but it did make possible the addition of the interview to the lexicon of techniques available to the propaganda filmmaker. This addition was not in conflict with the propaganda film's predominant concern with expounding a position.

The dominant techniques of the two documentary approaches demonstrate how they function as mechanisms of different kinds of truth. One approach uses the camera to create a sense of witnessing a social event. It uses the camera as a catalyst to observe and provoke truth. The other approach relies on the interview, a ritual of confession that enjoins the one who confesses to speak the truth about himself. Various

modulations of these techniques, and their use at times in the same film, does not belie their basically different trajectories. One approach is primarily verbal (although it uses visual information to add impact to its text), the other approach is primarily non-verbal (although it is highly dependent on sound).

The objects of the observational and propagandistic approaches are not the same. The former is trying to discover something about a social space, about a person or group of persons. The scale of investigation is limited to the space of that group. The object of the latter is public opinion itself; that is, it seeks to persuade its audience of the existence or importance of a social problem. Its object is an idea, its strategy is by nature argumentative.

Richard Leacock has often referred to an idea of Jonas Meekas: that "anything that causes you to wonder, to think differently, to see things differently, is political."²⁰ This concept of the political in documentary film is far removed from the war of ideas approach found in propaganda films. It emphasizes the importance of observation, of "seeing" the world in a new way. This, of course, is the kind of thing that observational filmmaking does very well. There is no attempt to couch what is presented as "objective". The observational filmmaker invites the audience to see the world through his eyes, with all their uniqueness.

In documentaries that argue a position, the point of view of the filmmaker is established before any shooting takes place. Reality is required to conform to a text, and as a consequence the possibility of discovery is lost. The object of the propagandistic documentary is not an event, but an idea; and this idea is only a foil for the real object: public opinion. The propaganda filmmaker does not develop his idea for its own sake; his purpose is to convince his audience that his idea is

true. Because persuasion is the fundamental reason for the propaganda film, a second-guessing of those who will watch it is inevitable.

In what sense, then, is the propaganda filmmaker making a documentary? If his object is to persuade his audience, what does his film document apart from his own ideas and his calculated strategy for making his ideas acceptable? The propaganda film is an extension and an intensification of journalistic discourse; its use of visual media is always a means to an end; it has no intrinsic stake in observing reality.

The observational documentary is one that admits its singular viewpoint, but this viewpoint is actually based on observation. Although every documentary is an interpretation of reality, the observational documentary contains more than the viewpoint of the filmmaker. There is a richness in this archive that makes it possible for the audience to study it for themselves. It is also important to remember that if we want to understand reality, it is first necessary to observe it.

Only by giving up the argumentative stance can the documentary fulfill its promise to observe reality, and open up a kalidescope of individual perspectives. The awareness and sensibility that comes from observation can decouple the documentary from its present role in political discourse. Rather than a single, monolithic truth, the observational documentary gives us a multiplicity of truths from which a larger truth can be fashioned; it does not attempt to have the last word.

VII. Footnotes

1. Richard Leacock, "Technology and Reality at the Movies," Technology Review, February, 1973, Volume 75, Number 4, 2-7.
2. Michel Foucault, "Discourse on Language," from The Archaeology of Knowledge, New York: Harper Colophon, 1972.
3. Michel Foucault, Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison, New York: Pantheon Books, 1977, 27.
4. Michel Foucault, "Truth and Power," in C. Gordon, ed., Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings, 1972-1977, New York: Pantheon Books, 1980, 133.
5. Foucault, Discipline and Punish, 25.
6. Erik Barnouw, Documentary: A History of the Non-Fiction Film, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983, 27.
7. Michel Foucault, The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception, New York: Vintage/Random House, 1975.
8. Francis Flaherty, The Odyssey of a Film-Maker, Urbana, Illinois: Beta Phi Mu, 1960, 11.
9. Ibid.
10. Richard Leacock, lecture delivered at M.I.T. Film/Video Section, Spring, 1981.
11. Stephen Mamber, Cinema Verite in America: Studies in Uncontrolled Documentary, Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1974, 85-89.
12. Michel Foucault, The History of Sexuality. Volume I: An Introduction, New York: Vintage/Random House, 1980, 18-24.
13. Ibid.
14. Michael J. Arlen, "The Prosecutor," in The Camera Age: Essays on Television, New York: Farrar Straus Giroux, 1981, 158-179.
15. John Marshall, Emilie de Brigard, "Idea and Event in Urban Film," in P. Hockings Principles of Visual Anthropology, Chicago: Aldine, 1975, 132-145.
16. Foucault, "Truth and Power," 131-132.
17. John Grierson, in F. Hardy, ed., Grierson on Documentary, New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., Inc., 1947.

18. Basil Wright, interviewed in J. Berveridge, John Grierson/Film Master, New York: Macmillon Publishing Co., Inc., 1978, 68-69.

19. After reading a draft of this thesis, Richard Leacock offered this anecdote regarding the Army McCarthy Hearings: "In a conversation I had with Bertrand Russel in 1964, he held that TV was merely an extension of the power of the establishment. I cited the McCarthy case as an exception, but he pointed out that the conflict was between the Secretary of the Army and McCarthy, and that the former 'was definitely representing the establishment,' while the latter 'whatever you may think of his politics, was in a very real sense a revolutionary.'" Personal letter, August 11, 1984.

20. Richard Leacock, lecture delivered at M.I.T. Film/Video Section, 1981.

VIII. Bibliography

Arlen, Michael J. Living Room War. United States: The Viking Press. 1969.

_____. The Camera Age: Essays on Television. New York: Farrar Straus Giroux. 1981.

Barnouw, Erik. Documentary: A History of the Non-Fiction Film. Revised Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1983.

Beveridge, James. John Grierson/Film Master. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc. 1978.

Flaherty, Francis. The Odyssey of a Film-Maker. Urbana Illinois: Beta Phi Mu. 1960.

Foucault, Michel. The Archaeology of Knowledge. New York: Harper Colophon. 1972

_____. The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception. New York: Vintage/Random House. 1975.

_____. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. New York: Pantheon Books. 1977.

_____, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History," In D. F. Bouchard, ed., Michel Foucault: Language, Counter-memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews. New York: Cornell University Press. 1977.

_____. Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings, 1972-1977. New York: Pantheon Books. 1980

_____. The History of Sexuality. Volume I: An Introduction. New York: Vintage/ Random House, 1980.

Grierson, John. Grierson on Documentary. Edited by F. Hardy. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., Inc. 1947.

_____. Grierson on the Movies. Edited by F. Hardy. London: Faber and Faber Limited. 1981.

Ivens, Joris. The Camera and I. New York: International Publishers. 1969.

Leacock, Richard, "Technology and Reality at the Movies," in Technology Review, February, 1973, Volume 75: Number 4, 2-7.

Levin, G. Roy. Documentary Explorations: 15 Interviews with Film-Makers. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc. 1971.

Mamber, Stephen. Cinema Verite in America: Studies in Uncontrolled Documentary. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press. 1974.

Marshall, John and Brigard, Emilie de, "Idea and Event in Urban Film," in Paul Hockings, ed. Principles of Visual Anthropology. Chicago: Aldine. 1975.

Tuchman, Gaye. Making News. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc. 1978.