

---

---

## ETHNOLOGICAL FILMMAKING AT THE INSTITUT FÜR DEN WISSENSCHAFTLICHEN FILM (IWF) GÖTTINGEN

BEATE ENGELBRECHT\*

Up to the present the *Institut für den Wissenschaftlichen Film* (Institute for Scientific Film) at Göttingen has been the most important producer of ethnological films in West Germany. The history of its origin and development as well as the numerous discussions of the work of the institute reflect both the development of Ethnology in West Germany in general and the growing importance of ethnological films as a means of research and communication.

### THE RISE OF THE INSTITUTE FOR SCIENTIFIC FILM

The beginnings of the Institute for Scientific Film reach back to the time before World War II. It can be seen as a successor of the *Reichsanstalt für Film und Bild in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* (RWU), the work of which ended in 1945 with the occupation of Berlin.

Shortly after the war two *Institute für Film und Bild in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* (FWU) were founded with which a department for university and research was affiliated. The latter succeeded the university department of the former Reichsanstalt (RWU) and had its headquarters at Göttingen. The Institute for Scientific Film became finally an independent institution in 1956. Gotthard Wolf, former director of the Institute, pointed out that:

"The main object of the Institute is to further the use of Film in science in every possible way. This includes the production, publication and distribution of films. The Institute also has a responsibility for supporting research institutions in their execution of scientific work by providing research films and technical assistance. The development of technical and scientific cinematographic and analytical technique is a special concern. Suitable research films need to be published and made available to the scientific world at large and part of the Institute's work consists of building up and maintaining its archive, handling the distribution of films, and preparing and publishing related printed matter." (Wolf 1975:)

Nowadays the institute has more than 100 employees. Scientific films covering all areas of the sciences, such as Biology (including Botany and Zoology), Medicine (including Psychology and Veterinary Medicine), Technology and Cultural Sciences (such as Ethnology, Archaeology, History, and Geography) have been published.

\* BEATE ENGELBRECHT

Institut für den Wissenschaftlichen Film, Nonnenstieg 72, D-3400, Göttingen, FR Germany

## BEGINNINGS OF SCIENTIFIC FILMMAKING IN ETHNOLOGY

Ethnologists early recognized the advantages of film documentation for their work and put it down in a position paper at Paris in 1900. Later on this paper served as the fundament of the ethnological filmwork at the IWF.

The position of German ethnologists concerning film as a medium of documentation can be seen in their statement on ethnological film given in 1960.

"The topic of ethnological sciences, which is the culture of nonliterary people, has always been subject to changes in its contents as well as in its phenomena. At the present time, this change is occurring more rapidly due to the impact of western civilisation on the one hand to the free will of the peoples concerned on the other hand; this means that traditional forms and contents of primitive cultures are being blotted out. This is why ethnological science is losing its vibrant foundation . . .

Modern technology helps the ethnologist to document ongoing phenomena today not only in still photography but even as activities by the means of film.

The ethnological films which have been scientifically edited to date have shown the superiority of cinematography over older methods, . . . There are no other alternatives for working on activities except via film analysis. But above all the film allows to record such processes that are still present today among primitive people but will have disappeared forever in a few years time. Therefore, films representing a kind of secondary reality have an importance which today could not even be estimated in its significance for further ethnological research." (Rutz 1962: 7)

One recognized the rapid transformation of cultures, which brings about the obliteration of various topics of ethnological research, and therefore seized the opportunity of collecting as many documents as possible.<sup>1</sup> Filming represented a means of quickly documenting at the last minute what would soon be gone.

Ethnological analysis could be done later. Film was seen as a copy of reality; the rules how to make ethnographic films developed by Günther Spannaus gave the impression that it was possible to act objectively during filming.

Spannaus himself, who had already worked freelance at the RWU in Berlin and then was the first consultant for ethnology at the IWF, noticed a remarkable discrepancy "... between the deep respect for filmmaking in theory and its insignificance for ethnological expeditions in practice" (1961: 70), which could primarily be explained on technical grounds. This changed fundamentally in midcentury because of the introduction of 16mm security films and due to the construction ever lighter 16mm cameras.

At the beginning the main ambition of Spannaus was the elimination of the shortcomings of former ethnological films. He saw these shortcomings on the one hand in the "potpourri-like arrangements of only fragmentarily recorded actions" (1961: 71, 75), which indicated that ethnologists who filmed did not know anything about

the structural means of the film. On the other hand dissociation from documentary film seemed important to him though he conceded a certain relevance for the scientific ethnological film. Nevertheless he refused most of the structural means of documentary and even more of feature film as far as their value for scientific ethnological film was concerned. At the same time he postulated "the cooperation with ethnological specialists who have experiences in filmmaking and therefore are conscious of the possibilities and limitations as well as of the dangers of filming for ethnographical research" (1961: 72).

To remove the deficiencies of ethnographic film in West Germany, Spannaus developed his "Rules for Documentation in Ethnology and Folklore through the Film" (1959) and carried out introductory courses on primary techniques, structuring and the topics of scientific filmmaking, in which the rules were taught also (1961: 76). Some of the Spannaus' rules are still valid, for example: that the processes to be filmed should at first be documented

ethnographically, i. e. before starting to shoot, a plan should be worked out carefully;

that the presence of a film team alone leads to distortions that should be fixed in writing wherever possible;

that a film documentation should also include a careful report of all technical and ethnological data which are important for filmmaking;

that usually only representative extracts from a process can be documented by filming; nowadays, representative should be understood in terms of important rather than representing the ideal type;

that the duration of a shot and the camera angle are of importance; that all movements of the camera have their own significance; that one can recognize in the recorded scenes what should be recognized. Basically that means nothing else than that one has a clear idea of what is meant by film language and that one should use it to clarify the contents of the film.

However, many thoughts of Spannaus on which the rules were based must, according to our present understanding of science in Ethnology, be regarded as obsolete or even wrong:

It has to be refused to change the filming situation for technical reasons (light problems etc.) to such a degree that one can regard the filmed process only as posed. It should be taken care that the course of events is not repeated several times for technical reasons, since this would lead to a serious disruption of the whole setting. However, it must be taken into consideration in which way a partnership during film production between the persons being filmed and those filming can lead to a new quality e. g. in the demonstration of highly technical processes.

Every film topic as well as every group being filmed requires its own style, that is one can give neither a general rule for structure and contents of films, nor for guiding the camera, nor for cutting.

In spite of all efforts at objectivity the results of scientific fieldwork can finally only reflect the fieldworker's own subjective view.

The more obvious his subjectivity is, the easier one can evaluate the scientific range of his products. This is all the more true for ethnological filmmaking. The film can therefore never be regarded as an "objective permanent visual record of phenomena".

It is therefore possible today to film without keeping the presence of the camera hidden from the viewer. Reactions to the camera can serve moreover to make the filming situation more transparent.

Due to the subjectivity just mentioned, the comparison of films with the same topics is only rarely possible and today no longer a main concern of ethnological filmmaking.

In formulating his rules, Spannaus had obviously dealt with the structural means of the film of his times. He analyzed their influence on the viewer so as to be finally able to judge their potential use in scientific filmmaking. He did not reflect on ideas concerning the nature of science per se, as there did not seem to exist any necessity for this, at that time.

### ENCYCLOPAEDIA CINEMATOGRAPHICA

In addition ethnological filmmaking in West Germany was influenced with far-reaching consequences by the establishment of the Encyclopaedia Cinematographica (EC). Soon after World War II Gotthard Wolf, director of the institute and originally in engineer, tried to work out a plan how films of scientific documentary contents could be archived systematically so as to be more easily available for research purposes. At this time he saw the main problem in the fact that films documenting a wide ranging subject would be very complex. Therefore the different activities could not be presented in sufficient detail for scientific research. As a solution to this problem Wolf proposed to subdivide a documentation of an larger subject into its smallest thematic units. Such subunits would be easy to produce for the scientists and furthermore were most suitable for comparative analysis.

This idea of Gotthard Wolf was soon supported by numerous scientists in West Germany and abroad. Already in 1952 the Encyclopaedia Cinematographica (EC) could be officially founded as an international institution. The name indicates that one aim of scientific film production was the establishment of an encyclopaedia of films, which should be put at the disposal of scientists for research purposes. (Wolf 1967: 9—14)

"The task of a scientific encyclopaedia of films is the registration and recording of significant scientific activities and patterns of behavior in animals, plants and substances, and, last but not least, in humans, . . ." (Wolf 1967: 23)

Unquestionably Wolf's main interest was an exact analysis of the activities captured on film and their comparison. A precondition of this was that the films represent reality to a high degree. This was to be guaranteed by special methods of film recording as well as of film editing. Wolf was completely aware of the fact that the film medium has its own language and that one must know exactly the influence of this language on the viewer. Everything that could

lead to misrepresentation of the purpose of a film had to be avoided in the production of scientific films and inevitably led to restrictions in the means of structuring a film (Wolf 1967: 25—29; 171—195). It is to be noted that deficiencies in recording technique at that time (unmoveable camera, problems in the production of sound-films, the high costs of colour material) were not seen as such (per se), but were discussed scientifically and thus substantiated.

From the very beginning the postulated smallest thematic unit was a great problem with regard to Ethnology, Wolf himself stated:

“In most cases the difficulty results from the problem that one has to fear that by subdividing a film one would disturb a higher context, which in total represents more than only the sum of the different subjects.” (Wolf 1967: 29)

“Which way one would choose in every single case, that is, whether the single process or the higher context will be seen as the smallest thematic subunit, can only be determined by exactly weighing the scientific facts against the aims of the encyclopaedic collection. Sometimes this decision cannot be reached without arbitrariness” (Wolf 1967: 30)

Anyway it is a fact that ethnologists from West Germany and abroad obviously acted according to the scheme of the smallest thematic unit in their work and thus produced hundreds of films for the encyclopaedia, the famous 5-minute-films. Thematically, the main emphases of ethnological filmmaking was laid on material culture on the one hand on rituals on the other. Topics concerning social interaction or with emic content (in terms of comments of the people filmed) obviously did not come into consideration. Wolf's belief that it is easier to film the smallest thematic unit than a complex subject, seems to be verified. Thus in 1967 Wolf could conclude:

“From these results one can draw the conclusion that the guidelines for ethnological scientific work for the encyclopaedia have proved to be right.” (Wolf 1967: 122)

Today one can observe that the rigid schematizing of film topics on the one hand of techniques of filming and film editing on the other hand has led to a standardization of cultural phenomena filmed which reflects reality in no way. It is especially remarkable that the main topic of ethnological research, *Homo sapiens*, has got lost in the meantime.

These deficiencies could not even be removed by introducing an accompanying text providing information on the filmed group as well as on the topic of the film and the situation during film work. Nevertheless, these texts, also being part of the teaching films, are unquestionably an invaluable complement to ethnological films at the IWF.

In spite of the mentioned critics, the concept of the EC does not contradict ethnological film work in general. EC-films are scientific films of a special kind: ethnological as well as other topics are treated for documentary purposes. That means that an existing chronology is preserved, that a synchronous sound is guaranteed and that an intended influence on the viewer leading to a subjective opinion should be avoided. Film work should be preceded by a longer term of field research or at least be accompanied by it. The choice

of subjects and, in connection with this, the length of the film depends on the author. Already in the 1960s it was recognized at the IWF that new subjects of ethnology must be dealt with:

"The future development of the ethnological film will go far beyond a pure documentation of those techniques that are dying out and of traditional processes and will lean toward psychological and sociological aspects... It would furthermore be desirable to record the attitude towards new working situations, towards machines and fabrics. Perhaps one day we will be approaching that kind of documentations often mentioned as desirable: such as one day in the life of a worker, craftsman or farmer, which until now has not been possible to achieve." (Wolf 1967: 142)<sup>2</sup>

### *GERMAN ETHNOLOGY AND THE ETHNOLOGICAL FILM IN THE 1960s*

Today, after more than twenty years, it is fascinating to see that in the 1960s the rules developed by Spannaus as well as the concept of EC did not seem to have contradicted ethnological work in West Germany in any aspect.

In 1963, Gerd Koch, author of more than 120 films published in the EC, wrote on his work in 1963:

"In principle, films of this series are supposed to contain only observational material for research into activities and events, that is to say, facts not influenced by opinions formed at the time of taking the pictures nor by subsequent technical processing (cutting and editing, fading, sound commentary). Moreover, a film of this nature should contain only the facts directly related to the subject, without any embellishments, emotional effects or other means used by feature films. Although the activity in question should in principle be covered at a length sufficient for observation and evaluation, many of the ethnological films of the Encyclopaedia are quite short because of the nature of the subject itself. ... Since I carried out my field work in the Ellice Archipelago by myself and therefore had no assistance with filming, it was technically impossible to shoot sound films. Moreover, the films of this Encyclopaedia are in general silent, following the principle of deliberate avoidance of commentaries, unless the sound is an essential part of the whole ceremony as, for example, in the case of dancing." (Koch 1963: 156—157)

Only in the early 1970s German ethnologists began to raise doubts concerning the conception of EC films. The criticism was especially directed toward the rigid adherence to the previously established rules.<sup>3</sup> The IWF seemed to get more and more inflexible in the face of a dynamically developing medium and a changing science. It is, however, remarkable that most of the German ethnologists attacked the IWF soon with constant and, up to now, unaltered criticism without developing new theories on filmmaking themselves and without observing, on the other hand, what in fact had happened at the IWF in the meantime (Böhl, 1985; Weise/Wendl 1988: 36).<sup>4</sup> Recent productions have been judged in such a harsh

and critical way that this in fact objectively led to misinterpretations. A more neutral approach to IWF publications seemed to be impossible in West Germany.

### *CHANGES IN THE WORK OF THE IWF*

At the IWF one knows perfectly well that there are many different ways of making ethnological films. There is no doubt that they all have their place and more so their necessity. But according to its statutes the IWF only has the task of producing scientific films for university teaching and scientific documentation. Within this framework ethnologists of different theoretical and thematic orientations have numerous opportunities of publishing ethnological films accompanying their research. At the same time, the IWF sees it as its task to save film material for scientific research purposes which has not been produced on the request of a scientist but was recognized later as important for science.

Thus the material published at the IWF derives from three different sources:

- so-called “in-house material”, which at the request of an ethnologist is produced together with the scientist by an IWF film team.<sup>5</sup> These projects are financed in co-operation with other institutions, e. g. the German Scientific Association, the Volkswagen Foundation and so on.
- so-called “external material”, which is filmed by ethnologists themselves during their field work.<sup>6</sup> These projects are financed also in co-operation with supporting institutions.
- so-called “purchased external material”, which is bought following the evaluation of an ethnologist because it is considered scientifically of great value.<sup>7</sup>

Great importance is attached to the fact that scientists decide themselves on the contents of films and its scientific truth. The strongest influence on choice and structure of the subjects ethnologists do have when they film themselves, that is when the camera is guided by themselves. But in these cases they are often confronted with the problem that the realization of complex film ideas proves to be quite difficult.

At the present ethnological film projects are consulted at the IWF by four ethnologists, two of them employed for a limited time. Sometimes they participate in major film expeditions as film directors and look after the editing of the respective material. More frequently they advise on the editing of external material, which has been filmed by other ethnologists or has been bought. Accordingly their influence on the structure of the films is very divers. The direction of the influence depends on the individual consultant as well as on the organization and the topics of the projects themselves.

From what has been said it becomes clear that at the IWF there does exist a diversity in various aspects: The IWF produces teaching films as well as documentation films; both in-house material and external material is edited in co-operation with numerous ethnologists; several ethnologists are employed at the IWF. This diversity renders impossible a rigid adherence to old rules, as for example those of Spannaus. On the contrary, ethnologists at the IWF unani-

mously share the opinion that there cannot be any definite rules. Every project, every film, requires its own style. It is also their opinion that ethnologists from the most varied scientific leanings should have the opportunity to publish their ethnological films at the IWF. There cannot be any formation of an school of German ethnological film concerning the IWF. It is, however, a fact that the IWF is bound to the scientific teaching film and to the scientific documentation film as possible publishing forms.

The scientific documentation film, which could also be named EC-film, has changed continuously during the past decades. First signs of this change can be seen in documentation on folklore subjects of the 1960s produced by the IWF itself.<sup>8</sup> This work has been continued in the films documenting Eipo culture (West Irian)<sup>9</sup> in the middle of the 1970s, in an ethnomusicological film project among the Batak of Sumatra at the beginning of the 1980s,<sup>10</sup> followed by films documenting the death ritual among the Dajak of Borneo in the middle of the 1980s<sup>11</sup> and in a still running project documenting the folk-culture of Lower Saxony (West Germany).<sup>12</sup>

It would be too far-reaching to discuss here in detail the changes in the production of films at the IWF. To my mind such an analysis is the task of ethnologists not being employed at the IWF. However, I would like to cite Franz Simon, an ethnologist at the IWF. In 1966 he advised on the shooting and the editing of the film "Supper at a farmer's family".<sup>13</sup> With regard to this film he wrote:

"If one wants to document a work process, a methodological separation into a) work as technique and b) work as behavioral situation often becomes necessary. That means in the case of "work as technique" a separation of a process of the whole setting. Thus, one dispenses with the context. (...) Such a monostructural presentation can only be a strictly limited compromise and by all means needs a clear and complete disclosure of this circumstance.

From this situation in which we had to accept severe restrictions the desire arose to try to make a film documenting the highly diverse interactions of this family. This meant to lay hold of a complete and comprehensible activity in which all or nearly all of the family members participated. Furthermore, this action should be predictable, that is, one should be able to calculate it in order to make possible a well directed realisation as far as film technique is concerned. From these considerations resulted the plan to film a common meal of the family.

It was also intended to try by this filmwork a methodological clarification of the documentary work as to such topics. In numerous discussions the edited film was judged positively, the path pursued was welcomed because the film started where other means of documentation have their limits. To record a situation, which can only be understood and documented as the playing together of numerous single elements of human behavior as the constant flow of the sequences of interactions and of the dynamic, is a task especially for filming. Thus, film is primarily focussed on the "How". (1984: 356—357)

These statements should neither stand for a new guideline of the Institute nor should they represent the final say. Both Ethnology as



a science and the film medium have their own dynamics, making the continuous discussion of ethnological filmmaking essential. Only this can lead us to being constantly aware of the difficulties and problems, as do the permanent discussions on ethnological fieldwork. The changes in ethnological filmmaking in German-speaking countries and thus, at the IWF, too, can equally be seen in the publication of so-called external material:

One might mention the films on double Ikat from Bali by the Swiss ethnologist Urs Ramseyer.<sup>14</sup> Being shot in 1972/73 they have a total length of 140 minutes and demonstrate this highly complicated technique in an easily understandable way. The films have led to a revival of double-Ikat productions on Bali on the one hand, and have met with common interest especially of such people interested in textile craftsmanship. Here, a mediation between cultures takes place in a rather direct way.

One might further mention the films from 1973/74 on male initiation at Japanaut, Iatmul, Papua New Guinea<sup>15</sup> by film producer Hermann Schlenker. They have been edited at the IWF in cooperation with the ethnologist Jürg Wassmann from Basle. The films have a total length of 165 minutes and show a male initiation ritual at Iatmul lasting for several weeks in a very impressive way. This ritual has an enormous importance for the identity of the Iatmul. That it was possible to shoot this material and to publish it as a scientific document might in future be of great importance for Iatmul culture.

From a present-day view it is hard to understand that ethnologists in former times only rarely used the second category of films produced by the IWF, the teaching films. Only recently one seems to remember them. In this category of teaching films very different kinds of scientific films can be published: The film "Fachi — Oasis of the Saharan Kanuri"<sup>16</sup> by Peter Fuchs gives an overview of the culture of the Saharan Kanuri in the Oasis Fachi. The film "The Longhouse in Tumbang Garu — Ngadju-Dayak, Indonesia, South Kalimantan"<sup>17</sup> by Franz Simon and Sonja Balbach portrays the life in a longhouse. The film "Saline Luisenhall, Arbeitsalltag in einer Siedepfannensaline"<sup>18</sup> by Edmund Ballhaus shows the normal working day in a salt work, still using techniques from the times of early industrialization. And finally the film "Mami Wata — The Spirit of the White Woman"<sup>19</sup> by Tobias Wendl and Daniela Weise demonstrates a possession cult in its various forms of expression.

It is primarily this category of the so-called teaching film which enables the ethnologist to show facts according to his own scientific knowledge. Within this category it is possible to point to interrelations of facts especially making use of commentaries (or even of subtitles) which might be difficult to express by means of the film only. Films of general subjects have their place at the IWF in this context since long — an opportunity which ethnologist should apply to more often.

It is the aim of ethnological film production at the IWF to produce a scientifically well-founded documentation, which later on should be put at the disposal of scientists as well as — and especially so — of the people filmed as a historical document. On the other hand scientifically well-founded general films (teaching films) should add

to the understanding of other cultures. It is clear and desirable that there will be further discussions in future on how these goals might be reached. Never can a scientific institute claim to have had the final say.

Discussions will be necessary, too, because the advancement of video-techniques will raise totally new aspects concerning ethnological film. More and more scientists will use video to record activities and phenomena for research purposes. Even today it can be seen that in future we will no longer be able to edit the coming amount of visual documentation material and present it to a broad public. There does already exist a special archive of film sources in which films and video-records are stored for scientific research and documentation purposes without being edited. This source archive will gain importance in the very near future.

### *GERMAN ETHNOLOGISTS AND THE ETHNOLOGICAL FILMMAKING OF TODAY<sup>20</sup>*

At present a change of generations is taking place in German Ethnology, which also implies a change in the understanding of science itself. It would lead us too far to take up the recent history of German ethnology. But it must be mentioned that the younger generation has difficulties in understanding Ethnology as a merely observing science and in viewing the people with whom they work as pure research objects. Today they do their work thinking in terms of partnership. They are aware of the danger of exploitation of the people under research. This new approach leads German ethnologists to see so many difficulties in ethnological field research that they tend not to carry out any field research at all. Thus, they hope to escape the colonial relationship between the ethnologist and indigenous people. However, to my opinion field research alone can lead to a relationship in the sense of partnership between people from different cultures.

The discussion of ethnological filmmaking in West Germany suffers from this situation. But it also profits from it. Discussion suffers because there are far too few German ethnologists carrying on field research which means that there is missing a basis for ethnological filmmaking. Discussion profits as to the quality of films and the transparency of their genesis. Today Visual Anthropology is seen as an important and necessary part of Ethnology. Young ethnologists, being familiar with media like film and TV from their earliest childhood ponder intensively over how filmmaking could be used for ethnological purposes. In this respect it becomes obvious that the younger and the older generation of ethnologists does not necessarily agree on the definition purposes too. Being aware of the amount of problems young ethnologists have joined together in a study group on ethnological filmmaking within the German Ethnological Association. Together it is tried to work out how ethnological filmmaking in West Germany could be developed in future. It is to be expected that this intensive dealing with ethnological film will lead to new impulses in West Germany. Even in future the IWF will not be able to disregard its welldefined task which does not allow the production of every possible kind

of ethnological film. Nevertheless ethnologists at the IWF are following the discussions of ethnological film with the greatest interest, hoping to receive new stimuli. A scientific discussion of the ethnological film cannot be the task of the IWF which sees itself as a kind of service industry. Even in future it will be the film authors themselves who will confront the IWF with new scientific knowledge and thus will contribute to the fact that ethnological film in Germany will continue to gain in relevance.

<sup>1</sup> Wolf 1972: 17

<sup>2</sup> See Wolf 1962: 16

<sup>3</sup> Baer (1971) dealt with the different goal of the School of Paris and asked for consideration of mutual human relations within ethnographic scientific films.

Koch (1972) essentially supported the encyclopaedic idea, however, he postulated the adjustment of both the thematic units as well as the subject of a film to ethnological necessities.

Schlesier (1982) referred to a similarity between the problems of field research and those of ethnological filmmaking which is due to the inherent subjectivity in each statement of the scientist. This subjectivity could only be reduced by an exact knowledge of the processes to be filmed.

Koloß (1973) was concerned with the subjectivity typical for the film. He reflected also the original task of ethnological filmmaking, that is "collecting of data of ethnological relevance" (S. 45)

<sup>4</sup> The most recent stock-taking of the activities of the IWF has been done by Rolf Husmann. He concluded: "But in the IWF a positive change in the concept seems to have taken place. This is shown by its attempts always to document the activities in their social context (. . .). Such efforts indicate that in the future a culturally holistic film documentation will make its way." (1978: 500)

<sup>5</sup> e. g. Toba-Batak, Sumatra, Secondary Burial (E 2804)

<sup>6</sup> e. g. Bali, double-Ikat (E 2416, E 2417, E 2418, E 2419)

<sup>7</sup> e. g. Iatmul, Middle Sepik, New Guinea, Initiation (E 2812, E 2813, E 2814)

<sup>8</sup> e. g. Central Europe, Tyrol — Supper at a farmer's family (Franz Simon/camera: Horst Wittmann/sound-engineering: Werner Eberhardt: filmwork carried out in 1966) (E 1958); Sout-East Europe, Romania — Sunday-mourning (Mourning on Sundays) in Desa (Franz Simon/A. Amzulescu/camera: Horst Wittmann: filmwork carried out in 1968) (E 1986)

<sup>9</sup> This filmwork was connected with a great international research project, carried out by German scientists and funded by the German Scientific Association. The initiator of the project has been Gerd Koch, an ethnologist from Berlin. Only part of the Eipo material had been filmed by the IWF team (Franz Simon/Manfred Krüger). Large amounts were filmed by the scientists themselves and are therefore classified as external material.

<sup>10</sup> This project had been initiated by the ethnomusicologist Arthur Simon from Berlin and had been carried out in collaboration with a team from the IWF (Franz Simon/Manfred Krüger)

<sup>11</sup> This project was directed by Sonja Balbach, ethnologist from Frankfurt in collaboration with the IWF team (Franz Simon/Manfred Krüger)

<sup>12</sup> This project was proposed by the Institute for Scientific Film and the Institute of Folklore of the University of Göttingen and has been funded by the state of Lower-Saxony. Film topics had been specified by the Commission for Folklore of Lower-Saxony and the work is carried out in collaboration with many colleagues of the IWF by Edmund Ballhaus, who has been employed especially for this purpose

<sup>13</sup> E 1958, filmwork carried out in 1966

<sup>14</sup> E 2416, E 2417, E 2418, E 2419, Camera: Peter Horner, edited by Dore Kleindienst-Andrée

<sup>15</sup> E 2812, E 2813, E 2814, Edited by Dore Kleindienst-Andrée

<sup>16</sup> D 1322, Camera: Peter Fuchs, edited by Dore Kleindienst-Andrée. Film work carried out in 1976; published in 1979

<sup>17</sup> C 1608, Camera: Manfred Krüger. Film work carried out in 1984; published in 1986

<sup>18</sup> C 1664, Camera: Manfred Krüger. Film work carried out in 1986; published in 1987

<sup>19</sup> D 1678, Camera: Tobias Wendl, edited by Beate Engelbrecht. Film work carried out in 1986; published 1988

<sup>20</sup> Concerning the ethnological film in Germany the following book will be published in the nearer future: Peter Fuchs (Ed.) 1988

## REFERENCES

Baer, Gerhard

1971, "ZUR GESTALTUNG ETHNOGRAPHISCHER FILME." In: Research Film Vol. 7. 4: 315-319

Böhl, Michael

1985, ENTWICKLUNG DES ETHNOGRAPHISCHEN FILMS. DIE FILMISCHE DOKUMENTATION AL ETHNOGRAPHISCHES FORSCHUNGS- UND UNIVERSITÄRES UNTERRICHTSMITTEL IN EUROPA. Acta Culturologica 1, Göttingen: Edition Herodot

Friedrich, M. et al. (eds.)

1984, DIE FREMDEN SEHEN. ETHNOLOGIE UND FILM. München: Trickster

Fuchs, Peter (ed.)

1988, ETHNOGRAPHIC FILM IN GERMANY. Visual Anthropology Vol.

Husmann, Rolf

1978, "ETHNOGRAPHIC FILMING: THE SCIENTIFIC APPROACH." In: Reviews in Anthropology Vol. 5. 4: 487-501

- Kapfer, Reinhard u. Ralph Thoms  
1984, "ÜBER DEN 'WISSENSCHAFTLICHEN' FILM. EIN GESPRÄCH MIT PETER FUCHS." In: Friedrich, M. et al. Die Fremden sehen. . . pp. 91—100
- Koch, Gerd  
1963, "FILMS ON POLYNESIAN CULTURE AND THE PROGRAM OF THE SCIENTIFIC FILM INSTITUTE, GÖTTINGEN." In: Journal of the Polynesian Society Vol. 72. 2: 155—157
- Koch, Gerd  
1972, "MÖGLICHKEITEN UND BEGRENZUNGEN ETHNOGRAPHISCHER FILM-ARBEIT." In: Research Film Vol. 7. 6: 578—585
- Kolož, Hans-Joachim  
1973, "DER ETHNOGRAPHISCHE FILM ALS DOKUMENTATIONSMITTEL UND FORSCHUNGSMETHODE." In: Tribus Nr. 22: 23—48
- Michaelis, A. R.  
1955, RESEARCH FILMS IN BIOLOGY, ANTHROPOLOGY, PSYCHOLOGY AND MEDICINE. New York
- Rutz, W.  
1962, "ENTSCHLIEßUNG DEUTSCHER ETHNOLOGEN ZUM VÖLKERUNDLICHEN FILM." In: Mitteilungen des Instituts für den Wissenschaftlichen Film Heft 15: 7—8
- Schlesier, Erhard  
1972, ETHNOLOGISCHES FILMEN UND ETHNOLOGISCHE FELDFORSCHUNG. ÜBERLEGUNGEN ZUR THEORETISCHEN UND METHODISCHEN BEGRÜNDUNG ETHNOLOGISCHER FILM-ARBEIT. Göttingen: Institut für Völkerkunde
- Simon, Franz  
1966, "VOLKSKUNDLICHE FILMDOKUMENTATION." In: Research Film Vol. 5. 6: 604—611
- Simon, Franz  
1984, "GEMEINSAMES ESSEN ALS MITTEL ZUR STÄRKUNG DER GEMEINSCHAFT." In: Matreier Gespräche. Otto Koenig 70 Jahre. Wien: Ueberreuter pp. 356—362
- Simon, Franz  
1986, "MITTELEUROPA, TIROL. ABENDESSEN EINER BAUERNFAMILIE." In Publikationen zu wissenschaftlichen Filmen Serie 15. 1: Film E 1958, Göttingen: Institut für den Wissenschaftlichen Film
- Spannaus, G.  
1959, "RULES FOR DOCUMENTATION IN ETHNOLOGY AND FOLKLORE THROUGH THE FILM." In: Research Film Vol. 3. 4: 231—240
- Spannaus, G.  
1961, "DER WISSENSCHAFTLICHE FILM ALS FORSCHUNGSMITTEL IN DER VÖLKERKUNDE. ENTWICKLUNG — PROBLEME — ZUKUNFTSAUFGABEN." In: IWF (ed.) Der Film im Dienste der Wissenschaft. Göttingen
- Weise, Daniela u. Tobias Wendl  
1988, "DAS REDUZIERTER GEGENÜBER. ERFAHRUNGEN BEI DER BEARBEITUNG ETHNOGRAPHISCHER FILME IM IWF." In: Trickster Bd. 16: 36—45
- Wolf, Gotthard  
1967, DER WISSENSCHAFTLICHE DOKUMENTATIONSFILM UND DIE ENCYCLOPAEDIA CINEMATOGRAFICA. München: Johannes Ambrosius Barth
- Wolf, Gotthard  
1972, ENCYCLOPAEDIA CINEMATOGRAFICA 1952—1972. Göttingen: IWF
- Wolf, Gotthard  
1975, DER WISSENSCHAFTLICHE FILM IN DER BUNDESREPUBLIK DEUTSCHLAND. Bonn-Bad-Godesberg: Inter Nationes

Beate Engelbrecht

## ETNOLOŠKO FILMANJE V INŠTITUTU ZA ZNANSTVENI FILM V GÖTTINGENU (IWF)

Inštitut za znanstveni film v Göttingenu (IWF) je najpomembnejši producent etnoloških filmov v Zah. Nemčiji. Njegova zgodovina odseva tako razvoj etnologije, kot tudi rastoč pomen etnološkega filma pri znanstvenem preučevanju in komunikaciji.

Začetki inštituta segajo v čas pred II. svetovno vojno. Današnja organizacijsko obliko in samostojnost pa je IWF dobil leta 1956. Gotthard Wolf, nekdanji direktor IWF je o njegovi vlogi zapisal: »Glavna naloga IWF je pospeševati uporabo filma v znanosti na vse možne načine. K temu sodi proizvodnja filmov, pisanje o njih in distribucija filmov. Inštitut mora podpirati raziskovalne institucije pri njihovem znanstvenem delu z zagotavljanjem tehnične pomoči pri izdelavi filmov.«

Danes IWF zaposluje 100 uslužbencev. Znanstveni filmi pokrivajo vsa glavna področja znanosti, kot npr. biologijo, medicino, tehnologijo in humanistične znanosti (etnologijo, arheologijo, zgodovino in geografijo). V zadnjem času je IWF deležen številnih kritiki s strani etnologov. Glavni očitke je naperjen proti pretežno naravoslovno usmerjeni metodologiji snemanja znanstvenih filmov, ki je bila sprejeta v petdesetih letih. Na IWF se zavedajo, da obstaja več načinov izdelovanja etnoloških filmov. Toda v skladu s statutom je IWF predvsem producent znanstvenih filmov za univerzitetno poučevanje in za znanstveno dokumentacijo. Znotraj tega okvira imajo etnologi različnih teoretskih in tematskih opredelitev vso možnost, da filme prilagodijo svoji raziskavi.