

https://dspace.org/

Visual images of South African communities

Tomaselli, Keyan G.

1984-08-13
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/9890

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND

A F R I C A N S T U D I E S I N S T I T U T E

African Studies Seminar Paper
to be presented in RW
4.00pm AUGUST 1984

Title: Visual Images of South African Communities.

by: Keyan G Tomaselli

No. 153

VISUAL IMAGES OF SOUTH AFRICAN COMMUNITIES

Keyan G Tomaselli

> *"Yes, well, 'They Came From the East' is secularising people, certainly, but we did make the series in South Africa. It was for the South African Broadcasting Corporation, and in the South African context there are separate communities. They are known as such and they are labelled as such ... How does one invent labels which go beyond the accepted labels?"*
>
> Lionel Friedberg, writer.director, April 1984

Language -- or labels -- is a prime site of ideological struggle in South Africa. The tussle for meanings, images and sounds occurs at every level within the media. Because the media are owned and controlled by the politically and economically ascendant classes within the social formation, it is inevitable that the media will accredit a dominant reality over subordinate ones. In South Africa, the state not only defines the hegemonic construct of reality, but it perpetuates and delineates the ethnic, racial, political, historical and geographical content of what it calls 'nation-states' and the racially segregated 'communities' which fall outside the homelands.

'Communities' in South Africa are officially defined in terms of race or ethnicity. Black individuals making up 'communities' are told that their roots are in their tribal homelands. Such 'communities' have few common interests other than a shared domination. Their only shared experiences are thus those of a negative nature. 'Communities' have no common basis of cohesion either in terms of class, geographical location, or political alignment. As defined by the state, such 'communities' comprise petty bourgeois elements, including professionals and merchants, as well as proletarians such as agricultural labourers and industrial workers. Thus, at the most basic level -- the level of class -- the interests of these amorphous groupings are unlikely to coincide. Geographically too, members of the state-designated 'communities' are widely dispersed. The Indian 'community' for example, is concentrated in Natal, but included under this rubric are Indian people in the Transvaal, both in the cities and

and the smaller towns. Similarly, coloureds live predominently in the Cape Peninsula, although large numbers are thinly spread in the Cape rural areas and smaller pockets throughout the country. The interests of these people are so different as to almost preclude any possibility of cohesion. Finally, political alignments and strategies also differ markedly, ranging from co-option into and cooperation with state sponsored organisations, to the total boycott of all state initiated political structures. Thus from the above, it can be seen that the state uses the term 'community' as a theoretical construct which beggars any notion of cohesion or common interest in any sphere of organisation.

This paper, on the other hand, takes the view that the term community should be reserved for discrete micro-structures based on the coincidence of class, geography and political organisation. Of these, location is perhaps paramount since it allows for immediate mobilisation to pursue common goals in times of crisis. At such times the common negative interests of the community, for example, imminent removal or dispossession, are sufficient to weld members of disparate races, classes and even political alignments with one another in a common struggle for specific ends. In such crises, differences are subsumed to form an apparent cohesion masking class and political incompatibility.

The obverse of the apartheid definition of 'community' is the idea of community-as-resistance. Cutting through the vectors of 'culture', 'national states', 'own freedoms' and ethnicity, are oppressed people within specific regions and neighbourhoods who have constituted themselves as communities, suffering a commonly perceived oppression. The source and cause of that oppression is recognised and these communities have established strategies to help them cope with their everyday circumstances.

COMMUNICATION AND RESISTANCE

Communication both within and across communities is a fundamental factor in developing cultures of resistance. Because access to the commercial and state media is largely denied to dissident communities, they have had to develop alternative channels to express their grievences and solidarity, and to debate strategies.

FUNDING

Film and video production is a relatively expensive undertaking, even in the smaller formats like Super-8 and cassette video, the costs of which have ranged from $50 to $2000. Where individuals are barely earning sufficient to survive, film making becomes an unwarrented luxury. Unlike in the United States, no state or public money is available to producers of short films. During the early 1970s, white students at English-language universities were funded either by the National Union of South African Students[3] (eg. *Wits Protest* 1970-74) or by welfare organisations within universities (see, eg., *Witsco*, a Super-8 recruiting film made in 1973 on social services provided by students to a coloured township).

Towards the end of the 1970s, the Inter Church Media Programme obtained external funding for a Super-8 production facility. A number of films of varying technical quality were made with the communities of Alexandra and the people who were being dispossessed of Pageview. Further funds were made available by the Human Awareness Programme of the South African Institute of Race Relations for the 16mm trade union film, *Fosatu: Building Worker Unity* (1980) and the partial financing of others. Personal investment led to *The Dispossessed* (1980), which deals with the interrelationship of resettlement and the economy, *Diagonal Street* (1971) on how the Group Areas Act has destroyed an Indian community on the fringes of the Johannesburg CBD, *Crossroads* (1980) on a huge squatter camp, and *Last Supper at Hortsley Street* (1981) which follows the fortunes of a Cape Malay family as District Six was demolished about them.

The introduction of broadcast television in 1976 opened up access to three-quarter inch, VHS and Beta video formats by the end of the decade. Another result of television was the establishment, for the first time, of film and video production courses at universities[4]. An increasing number of graduates are resisting co-optation by the industry and are forcing a space within which oppositional film can operate[5]. Not only are they helping to organise, finance and produce films and videos, but a number are aimed at teaching skills as well. The Inter Church Media

Programme runs seminars and workshops, and a French funded Centre for Direct Cinema was established in January 1984 at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. Apart from the provision of Super-8 equipment and film stock, three non-white South Africans underwent a three month training course in France. One of these was appointed to manage the Centre. Its students come from all walks of life: labourers, clerical workers, bus drivers, and so on. At any one time as many as ten projects are on the go either in Soweto or Johannesburg.

The CVRA at the University of Cape Town is involved with educational, investigative, documentary, and trade union videos. Where English-language universities have spearheaded the oppositional movement, Afrikaans speaking campuses have been less concerned with film and video, and even then, with a basically conventional application[6]. Television studios at the 'tribal' colleges remain beyond the access of student and staff wanting to make critical material.

Other sources of finance have been the South African Council of Churches (*This We Can Do For Justice and Peace* - 1980; and *If God be For Us* - 1984, both in 16mm), various internationally financed trusts (eg. *Awake From Mourning* - 1981) and the Second Carnegie Inquiry into Poverty and Development in South Africa. This Inquiry, which met in April 1984, partially financed about eight films and videos made around the country (eg. *Shixini December: Responses to Poverty in the Transkei, The Tot System* and *I am Clifford Abrahams, This is Grahamstown*, all released in 1984).

PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION

Distribution of oppositional media is a major problem. No national agency exists. Distribution is done on an *ad hoc* regional basis which is inefficient and disorganised. Each producing body disseminates its own material to film festivals, academic conferences, universities, churches, trade unions and private homes. No central catalogues exist and the titles available are known mainly to the small group of people connected with the production collective. There are two basic reasons

for this state of affairs. The first is that few of these films and videos have obtained censorship clearance. The costs of censorship, which is mandatory, must be borne by the producer. It is is doubtful that many of the films made would be granted exemption. The distribution of non-censored material has led to police surveillance of film makers and confiscation of copies. Second, the mainly working class viewers of such productions would not be able to afford the kind of hire charges necessary to bankroll a central distributing agency.

The lack of a distribution organisation puts the community media at a crucial disadvantage. The money, energy and time put into the production of motion pictures is rarely amortised in terms of audience size and composition. These films are mainly seen by the already converted and it is rare indeed that they will be shown to hostile or uncommitted audiences. However, it should be pointed out that films and videos are but one element of a highly organised progressive community and student press which form the gravitational centres for democratic growth within specific communities[7].

THEMES

Content ranges from highly structured documentaries such as *This We Can Do For Justice and Peace* which outlines the efforts of the South African Council of Churches (SACC) to combat structurally induced poverty and the appalling consequences of state enforced resettlement, through to Grierson-type documentaries of student demonstrations (*Wits Protest*) and on-camera harangues by resettled homeland dwellers (eg. *Place of Tears* - 1984). *Crossroads, Diagonal Street, Mayfair* and four or five other titles concentrate on community conditions, their imminent dispossession and the consequences thereof. In contrast to conventional documentary is a reflexive television of deconstruction where the traditional separation between subjects and crew is married,according to the principles of participatory cinema, as in *I am Clifford Abrahams, This is Grahamstown*).

The vast majority of films concentrate on urban communities, trade unions and related issues. This geographical bias is in-

evitable given the urban location of universities, film and video facilities and technicians. It is, however, paradoxical, in that the cities have become the points of (limited) reform and co-option of the non-white working and middle classes. While there is a struggle in the cities themselves, one which is being negotiated through the mechanisms of trade unionism and political groupings such as the United Democratic Front, it is the rural dwellers and marginalised black population which is largely engaged in an unequal struggle for survival itself[8]. Videos like *The Tot System* (1984), *Future Roots* (1982), *Kat River - The End of Hope* and *Shixini December* are under-represented in their concern for a rural and homeland perspective. The videos commenting on urban issues can afford to make fun of their subjects (as in *Mayfair*), dwell interminably on the fishing village as a place in the context of a deteriorating informal fishing industry near Cape Town (*Loaded Dice*), or concentrate on the fortunes of a single family in absence of an explanation of causation (as in *Last Supper in Hortsley Street*). What is ommitted from these productions however, is the *relationship* between the events documented and *processes* operating within the political economy which have historically resulted in the prevailing social, economic and political organisation of South Africa. Even films dealing with the uprooting of entire neighbourhoods, like *Diagonal Street* and *Mayfair*, although rooting explicit causation in apartheid legislation, neglect to examine the economic determinants of that legislation. This point will be amplified later under our discussion of contextualisation and class.

It is not accidental that most of the videos produced by the Rhodes University Department of Journalism and Media Studies place unremitting emphasis on the rural connection[9] for it is the isolated homeland regions that apartheid policy is most brutally implemented. Not only is there a double repression of black inhabitants via the South African state and the Homeland governments themselves, but these areas are little more than labour reservoirs designed to service the fluctuating labour needs of urban industry, mining and unskilled labour[10]. These issues are the subject of *Future Roots* which exposes the structural constraints on bottom-up development schemes. By concentrating on a specific scheme in the Ciskei, the producers argue that they

are designed to reduce the social and labour costs of mining and industry in the white areas by creating the conditions for a viable subsistance economy in the homeland. *Shixini December* identifies the tightening grip of poverty as the subject community in the Transkei is caught between the evil necessity of migrant labour on the one hand and the enforced participation in 'betterment' schemes within the Transkei, on the other. Both are clear as to the relationship of the micro elements to the macro political economy[11]. These, and the *Kat River* video seem to be the only productions which have been made within an explicit epistemological framework which identifies *methodology* and historical and geographical context.

PROBLEMS OF OPPOSITIONAL DECODING

Because the media are a prime site of ideological conflict, the struggle is not only for meaning in a general sense, but specifically at the level of documentary conventions, and beyond that, the sign itself. It has happened that the state has allowed the production of oppositional films, only to co-opt them in its own interest. This happened with *This We Can Do For Justice and Peace*. The Directorate of Publications passed the film stating that "the one-sided presentation and lack of balance is unfortunate, but it is *likely to prove counter-productive*"[12] (emphasis added). The film was expected to fuel charges of subversion made by the state against the SACC, specifically while the SACC was under the scrutiny of a commission of inquiry.

At the level of production, the state propaganda apparatus has countered local and international criticism of apartheid through the subtle co-option of critical foreign films. *To Act a Lie*, for example, denounces the 'bias' of foreign films critical of South Africa by using the same techniques of persuasion that it discredits. Exerpts from *The Dumping Grounds, Last Grave at Dimbaza* and other anti-South African footage are 'proved' to be lies and fabrications. *To Act a Lie* and other propaganda films have fine-tuned the documentary form and its conventions into highly sophisticated communicative acts, punting the official discourse of 'communities' being 'autonomous', 'self-governing' and paradoxically, 'the same but different' -- hence the *solution*

of apartheid being necessary to create a stable social and political order which guarantees 'own freedoms' in the context of the beseiged 'constellation of states' that is South Africa.

The state strategy of co-option -- at the levels of censorship and production -- has serious implications for oppositional film making, and community films in particular. We may recall Friedberg's question which introduced this paper: "How does one invent labels which go beyond the accepted labels?" To extrapolate his point, we should rather ask, 'how does one invent a cinematic form which is able to resist co-optation in the service of the accepted labels, as occurred in *To Act a Lie*?'. To an extent, Friedberg's response of detailed economic and historical causation seen in the first episode of *And Then Came The English*, provides the starting point.

Conventional documentary is usually ahistorical. Where history is recalled, it is displaced in terms of the dominant interpretation. In *A Place Called Soweto*, for example, the traumas of enforced urbanisation, overcrowded, insanitary conditions and minimal social services are acknowledged briefly and then displaced through the use of nostalgically elicited signs created through the colourful brush strokes of a black artist recreating a romanticised past.

This paper takes the view that historical assumptions of common sense should never be taken for granted by oppositional film makers, irrespective of whether the intended viewers are supportive of the film's ideological position. The *contextualisation of historical process* is a crucial semiotic defence mechanism against co-option. This requires extensive research and the accumulation of visual data which closely matches the explanation provided by the linking narration. This was done in the *Kat River* video, thus providing a context within which the remarks, grievences and hopes of the present community make historical sense, and are thereby credible to whichever audience. In other words, not only is there an internal consistency of logic in the argument presented, but that logic is both understood by and interpreted in terms of the experiences of the community itself. The comments made by the interviewees in *Kat River* con-

sistently recall their history, and the subjects are often both critical and in awe of it. Interpretation is thus not an idealised imposition of the film maker and thus open to charges of 'bias', though audiences may disagree with the argument presented.

Because the majority of community and oppositional films/videos lack contextualisation, the arguments and statements of their subjects can be easily co-opted and misinterpreted in any way that the state might require, as was done in *To Act a Lie*, and as is done on the television programme, *Perspektief*. Those films that do attempt theoretical placement, such as *Fosatu: Building Worker Unity*, *The Dispossessed* and *Reserve 4* generally have problems with cinematic coding. Long, dense and abstract chunks of conceptual information are read out at great speed at the start of the film on the sound track, usually accompanied by irrelevant and distracting imagery. Maps explaining South Africa's peculiar geography are never used and endless statistics are relayed verbally without the help of graphics and charts.

The basic problem concerns the inefficient use of documentary conventions and mismatched codes. Other than *Future Roots*, *I am Clifford Abrahams* and *Shixini December*, few other films have a clear awareness of the epistemological principles which inform their treatments and form. Some, like *This We Can Do For Justice and Peace* take the form for granted, while others like *Kat River* offer a dialectical redefinition. Most, however, work within the documentary form in a lazy, inefficient and disorganised manner. While opposing the dominant ideology which, amongst other things, has co-opted the documentary form in terms of political rather than social purposes[13], the makers of these videos have not seen the need to take dialectical advantage of either the way that documentary codes and conventions are employed by the state or the form itself. They are thus inevitably outmaneuvered by the state-produced films within the form -- which becomes the site of semiotic struggle.

If oppositional and community-oriented film makers are to successfully engage the state within the form of documentary, then they are subject to the same rules of structuring -- though not paradigmatic selection -- as are the makers of the state films. The

struggle, therefore, is over the use of conventions and how these can be deployed semiotically. At the moment, the struggle is being being won by the state, not only in terms of sheer output and access to unlimited capital, but more importantly, in the way that its film makers are able to manipulate the plane of content: what is present in relation to what is absent. This is mainly done through the efficient matching of codes -- image, narration, music and effects -- in concert with the internal consistency of apartheid discourse. Nothing more. They are tight, dynamic, let the pictures speak, often supported by very subtle narration which although relaying the repetitive 'lies' of subversive critics, are able to convincingly counter-argue through the calculated use of camera codes (colour, monochrome, dynamic, static etc) in direct relation to editing combinations. In *A Place Called Soweto*, for example, the 'negative' narration is matched with positive images, while *To Act a Lie* inverts two negatives (dated monochromatic footage taken from anti-South African films, and the verbal accusations relayed in the narration) into positive signs through the use of ironical news-type narration and montage within sequences. This near mathematical precision in the use of conventions is very difficult to counteract within the conventional form of the documentary as is presently used by the majority of oppositional film makers.

While not doubting the potential of those film/videos I have critiqued to cement community solidarity in the face of oppression, these film makers have an ethical responsibility to protect the integrity of their subjects. This cannot be done by working (inefficiently) within the conventional form of the documentary. The imposition of a dense radio-type process oriented and theoretically informed narration on event-oriented and visually specific irrelvant material is not a satisfactory answer. Neither is the attempt by the makers of *District Six* to marry a carefully constructed analytical *cinematic* commentary with a general wide view of the area that was once a vibrant coloured community, wholly satisfactory. Over-emphasis on the conceptual is alienating unless it is related to a human scale. In fact, *District Six* would work best as the introduction to *Last Supper at Hortsley Street* which lacks historical contextualisation. The latter would give the former a human dimension.

The next point relates to methodology. Documentary conventions create an illusion of reality. The signs and codes which constitute this reality circulate and gain currancy through their constant repetition in the commercial media. Hence Friedberg's query about how to go beyond the accepted labels. Again, one of his series, *They Came From the East*, provides a partial answer where he revealed himself to audiences as a white, petty bourgeois director-cameraman. The literature on reflexive cinema would identify this producer presence as a partial requirement in the equation Producer-Process-Product[14]. However, Friedberg as Producer needs to encode two other elements if he is to break down the illusion of reality, and of the series appearing to offer a definitive ethnography of the "Indian community". To imitate an "Alister Cook style -- very much a personal voyage"[15], is only one-third of the equation, for the form of documentary governs the parameters of production and treatment of subject matter. Conventional documentarists would argue that to reveal Process is self-indulgent or 'not good film making', that in any case, there is no need to expose methodology because viewer expectations are being fulfilled by the form. This assertion takes for granted a direct relationship between the pro-filmic and filmic representations and is based on the premise of an objective world-out-there where 'truth' can be found by simply aiming a camera at it in terms of documentary conventions. The presence of the camera and crew is thereby denied, the shaping process of the form ignored and the text presented as if it were reality itself.

By leaving out acknowledgement of Process film makers are unable to deconstruct the mysticism that informs their authority over the production process. Just as the progressive press informs its readers of the warping effects of the conventions and discourse used by the commercial media, and the reasons why it explores alternative concepts of layout, newsgathering and reporting style, so film makers need to remind viewers that what appears as reality is nothing more than shadows and reflections on a screen . This can be very difficult, given the short-circuited nature of the cinematic sign where the signifier and the signified are collapsed into each other. Even *To Act a Lie* got this far by analysing the techniques used by foreign

film makers in their films on South Africa. However, having established these, *To Act a Lie* contradicted itself by using the same techniques to construct its own argument.

While reflexivity might not be considered necessary by film makers intending their films to be seen only within the subject community or across communities where a common historical perspective can be assumed, it is impossible to ultimately control the composition of their final audiences. Any film which lacks historical/geographical context and the encoding of reflexivity is susceptible to co-option and wilful misinterpretation by the state. This can occur as in *To Act a Lie*, or by the Repressive State Apparatuses being able to accuse both the producers and those who are seen in the film of subversion, lies and bias. Where the state produced films take for granted that the struggle is for the meaning of the sign, and state agencies like the Directorate of Publications is administering the conditions of the conflict, most oppositional film makers do not appear to have realised that the class struggle is automatically mediated through the way documentary signs are employed. Film makers cannot divorce politics from semiotics. Because they continue to use the form that has already been won by the state, their films provide easy access to state interference.

One counter strategy itself unwittingly suggested by the state, over which film makers can engage the Directorate on its own terms, was given in the judgement against *This We Can Do For Justice and Peace*. The reasons given for passing the film without the twelve cuts originally ordered was that "if the whole is not undesirable, then the parts are also not undesirable". Hence, to extent the implications of the judgement, an attempt to produce an historically contextualised and reflexive film which encodes method and draws attention to the fact that it is not presenting reality but an interpretation of reality, then it will have less chance of being banned. This is, after all, the paradox of capitalist society. There is no point in tackling the ruling hegemony as if it has no influence on the mediation process. The very contradiction highlighted by the Directorate's decision in the context of the discourse of 'objectivity' and 'logic' offers a breach which should be exploited by oppositional

film makers. Producers are then able to offer a materialist interpretation to the community itself, but beyond that, a possibility of its *legitimate* screening to other audiences not part of the oppressed classes. This more intellectual approach will not alienate the subjects and they should still recognise themselves in the way that they are portrayed.

This brings us to the final point, that of class. Very few of the above mentioned productions evidence a class analysis. While a number show a theoretical understanding on the soundtrack (*The Dispossessed, Fosatu* and *District Six*) this information does not always cohere with the visual track. Some, like *Mayfair*, which deals with the responses of white Afrikaners, Indians and coloureds who live cheek by jowl in this multiracial suburb, to the government's announcement that it is to be declared an Indian Group Area, ignores class altogether. This video never explains causation, or context: how did the suburb become multiracial in the first place? How did extreme right-wing racist Afrikaners come to agree to living next door to the people they hate and typify as 'foreigners' and 'the enemy'? Why are significant numbers of this multiracial community standing together to resist the government directive? And above all, why are *whites* going to be moved - the first time this has ever happened to an originally white urban community? Instead of contextualisation we get opening shots of the Prime Minister in a typical pose waving his finger at a political meeting and ranting about 'our culture', 'their culture', 'own culture', 'own community' and so on. This introduction, which is extremely funny in the context of the film, is then further trivialised by the kind of Fellini-type characters interviewed, the inapposite *boeremusiek* (Boer-music) imposed on the soundtrack and the lack of black and coloured opinion. The end result, apart from providing mirth for dissident audiences by laughing at people, mainly Afrikaners, is a video which could easily be interpreted as an exploration of blind prejudice without cause.

The producers of *Mayfair* should have examined the context of the shifting class structure which created the conditions for unexpected government action on Mayfair. The analysis would have had to take account of a maturing economy which needs more

skilled labour and professional skills. This, as was alluded to earlier, has led to the co-option by the state of the Indian and coloured 'population groups' which, together with the alienation of right wing Afrikaners from the National Party, has resulted in a new political alliance. This *rapprochement* was formalised in the proposals for a racially tiered President's Council to replace the Westminster parliamentary system in 1984. Against this knowledge, the viewer would have sufficient knowledge from which to make intellectual judgements.

Films exploring the class basis of the South African conflict are largely lacking. Some, like *Loaded Dice*, do point a finger at capital, but they do not explain why capital is responsible for the decline of the Cape fishing community. Similarly, *Diagonal Street* does not clearly connect how finance capital, though perhaps critical of the Group Areas Act, nevertheless benefits from it. Of one thing of which *District Six* is clear, class is a prime factor. In *Kat River*, the class positions of the subjects is implicitlydefined in terms of context: peasant farmers talk about themselves in their homes or land, while the petty bourgeois school teacher and spokesman for the community speaks in his office. A second version of this video is aiming to make the class and community connections clearer through the use of charts and diagrammes.

CONCLUSION

This paper set out to discuss problems in the representation of communities on film and video. Having deconstructed the negative 'community' attributes foisted upon people who rarely have more than the colour of their skin in common, it provided a positive definition incorporating the idea of resistance and geography.

The last four years have seen a tremendous spurt of oppositional film and video production. This activity, however, continues for the most part without an awareness of theoretical direction. A comprehensive film and video culture will only mature when, like other Third World countries before us, film makers begin to confront the semiotic problems which are endemic to social conflict as it occurs in South Africa.

REFERENCES

1. See D. Pinnock and K.G. Tomaselli, "The Progressive Press in South Africa: A Preliminary Framework", *FUSE* (forthcoming)

2. The UDF is an oppositional multiracial front which has clearly articulated its desire to work for a democratic government

3. For a detailed analysis of independent film making in South Africa see K.G. Tomaselli, "Strategies for an Independent Radical Cinema in South Africa", *Marang*, 4 (1983): 51-88

4. See K.G. Tomaselli, "The Teaching of Film and Television Production in the Third World: The Case of South Africa", *Journal of the University Film and Video Association*, 34 no 2 (1982): 3-12

5. See K.G. Tomaselli, K.G., "Oppositional Film Making in South Africa", *FUSE*, 6 no 4 (1982): 190-194

6. See, eg., P. Fourie and G.M. du Plooy, : "Film and Television Training at the Department of Communications at UNISA", *The SAFTTA Journal*, 1 no 2 (1980): 20-23.

7. S. Johnson, "Resistance in Print: A Case Study of *Grassroots*" in K.G. Tomaselli, RE. Tomaselli and J. Muller (eds): *Addressing the Nation: Studies in the South African Media*. (Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball, 1984).

8. See, eg., R.J. Haines, C.P.G Tapscott, P. Tyali and S. Solinjani, "The Silence of Poverty: Networks of Social Control in Rural Transkei", *Carnegie Conference Paper* no 46 (1984)

9. Rhodes University is located in a small town near the Transkei and the Ciskei, and is the centre of one of the most depressed areas of South Africa

10. See, eg., H. Wolpe, "Capitalism and Cheap Labour Power: From Segregation to Apartheid", *Economy and Society*, 1 no 4 (1970)

11. See P.A. McAllister and G.P. Hayman, "*Shixini December*: Responses to Poverty in the Transkei", Carnegie Conference Paper (unpublished) (1984)

12. Appeal Board Decision 155/81

13. J. Grierson quoted in P. Rotha, *Documentary Film*. (London: Faber and Faber, 1936): 12

14. J. Ruby, "The Image Mirrored: Reflexivity and the Documentary Film", *Journal of the University Film Association*, 29 no 4, (1977)

15. Appeal Board Case No 155/81

LIST OF FILMS DISCUSSED

And Then Came the English	SABC-TV/IFC	Lionel Friedberg
A Place Called Soweto	Dept of Foreign Affairs and Information	
Awake From Mourning (1981)	Maggie Magaba Trust	Chris Austin
Diagonal Street (1971)	L Stephenson	L Stephenson, N Gordimer
The Dispossessed (1980)	Documents	Gavin Younge
District Six (1983)	Super 8 Film Group	Jon Burts,S Burton
The Dumping Grounds	N Mahamo	Nana Mahomo
Fosatu: Building Worker Unity (1980)	Human Awareness Programme SAIRR	B Tilley, L Dworkin
Future Roots (1982)	Rhodes University	R Purdy, S Trautman
If God be For Us (1983)	SA Council of Churches	K Harris
I am Cliffie Abrahams, This is Grahamstown (1984)	Rhodes University and Carnegie	G Hayman, C Abrahams and KG Tomaselli
Kat River - The End of Hope (1984)	Rhodes University	J Peires, K Tomaselli and G Hayman
Last Grave at Dimbaza	N Mahomo	Nana Mahomo
Last Supper at Hortsley Street (1983)	L Wilson	Lindy Wilson
Loaded Dice (1984)	CVRA and Carnegie	Liz Fisch
Mayfair (1983)	Ad Hoc Video Group and Carnegie	Tony Bensusan et al
Place of Tears (1984)	Rhodes Univ. and Carnegie	D Pinnock, S Burton
Reserve 4 (1984)	Documents and Carnegie	Gavin Younge
Shixini December - Responses to Poverty in the Transkei	Rhodes University	G Hayman, P McAllister
They Came From the East	SABC-TV/ IFC	Lionel Friedberg
This we Can Do For Justice and Peace (1980)	SA Council of Churches	K Harris
To Act a Lie (1982)	Dept of Foreign Affairs and Information	
The Tot System	CVRA and Carnegie	W Scharf
Wits Protest (1970-74)	Aquarius: & T and M Films	K Tomaselli, A Mabin
Witsco (1973)	Witsco	G Walker, L Hayden, K Tomaselli, A Mabin

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to thank Graham Hayman, Larry Strelitz and Ruth Tomaselli for their constructive comments and discussion over the last two years which has led to the development in this paper. I am indebted to the Human Sciences Research Council and Rhodes University for a grant to attend the 38th Annual Conference of the University Film and Video Association, James Madison University, Virginia, July 29 - August 3, 1984 where the paper was first presented