Indigenous Cinema in North America (with Karrmen Crey)

[opening music]

00:22 **Juan Llamas-Rodriguez**: Welcome to the Global Media Cultures Podcast. I am your host, Juan Llamas-Rodriguez. Today we are discussing Indigenous cinema productions within different national and institutional settings. Our guest is Dr. Karrmen Crey. She's Stó:lō from Cheam First Nation and is Assistant Professor of Aboriginal Communication and Media Studies at the School of Communication at Simon Fraser University. Her research examines the rise of Indigenous media in Canada since the early 1990s, and the institutions of media culture undergirding this phenomenon. Karrmen, welcome to the Global Media Cultures Podcast.

01:00 **Karrmen Crey**: Thank you for having me.

01:01 **JLR**: I wanna start by asking you, how did you get to focus on these research interests? Why are they interesting to you, and why are they an important area for us to study?

01:11 **KC**: A lot of it has to do with, obviously, my own Indigenous background, and what really sort of started me on the path to studying Indigenous media really had to do with the fact that the first time I ever encountered Indigenous media was in a class in university. So this was incredibly eye-opening, it was... We watched excerpts from Alanis Obomsawin's film, *Kanehsatake: 270 Years of Resistance*, which was from 1993 and documents the Oka crisis in Quebec. And from the perspective like in a sense, from the point of view of the Mohawk people, by which I mean Alanis and her cameras were inside the Mohawk encampment and worked closely with the protesters and warriors within the camp. So, number one, I had never heard about the Oka crisis, though it did happen when I would have been a teenager. I don't remember having any discussions about it and then second, here was this documentary about this history-altering event and conflict between Indigenous people in Canada and the Canadian state. And this documentary that was really involved in the events, and it took me until university to see this. So I was pretty astonished by that and really then very much ended up like following what else have Indigenous people been making that I've never seen?

03:10 **KC**: And so moving from... My coursework, in general, started to really focus on what is Indigenous media, like who are the filmmakers, what is the history, when did it start, what kinds of formats and genres? So, I had to look at a lot of different factors that really shaped this phenomenon, really, of Indigenous media development. And I realized that this was a very complex phenomenon, that there was a lot of different factors involved. Indigenous social movements, shifts in national law and cultural policy, developments in media technologies, and the ways in which the existence of, and ways in which institutions of media culture in Canada were responsive to these changes, and so when we start in 1990, that's a really key year, because that was the year the Oka crisis took place, and that really catalyzed a lot of activity, a lot of Indigenous resistance, responsiveness and created a rationale and motivation, for both the state and publicly funded cultural institutions to respond in kind. Like, how are we going to represent, create space for, set aside resources for Indigenous representation here? So that really brought me to realize, well, what... This didn't happen in a vacuum.

05:01 **KC**: There was a lot of factors, but this also... And a lot of resources that were needed, in order to make this possible. And institutions are really sites where all of these forces coalesce. And so that's what drew me to this question, okay, how do we conceptualize institutions as sites of Indigenous media production, and how did Indigenous producers actually work with, within, adjacent to these institutions to produce their work?

05:36 **JLR**: Great, yeah. So today, we're specifically discussing your article "Screen Text and Institutional Context: Indigenous Film Production and Academic Research Institutions," which was published in the journal *Native American and Indigenous Studies*, Volume 4, in 2017. So you've talked a little bit about the general project. Can you give us a brief history of how you got to this particular essay from this larger project, and how and whether the ideas changed in the process of researching it and writing it?

06:11 **KC**: So, yes. There was a couple of ways I came to this project. One, which was based on my awareness of these sites where Indigenous media was being produced, these institutional contexts. Really realizing, actually, that while something like the National Film Board of Canada has received a lot of attention, a lot of other institutions had not yet really been explored, as contributing to this history, so underpinning it. So, one thing I became aware of, as myself as a graduate student in a PhD program in a cinema studies program within an institution was that universities are the sites... Frequently, the sites of training programs for Indigenous filmmakers. So that was one...

One crucial part of it was my awareness like, "Have we really examined post-secondary institutions as sites of Indigenous production?"

07:22 **KC**: And the other part of it was... This is getting down to like the nuts and bolts of this particular article, was that as a grad student, I was in a documentary film class and we had to formulate our own projects. And in the back of my mind, I'd always... I think this is true for a lot of Indigenous media studies students, academics, audiences, filmmakers, is an awareness of Arlene Bowman's *Navajo Talking Picture*. It's very well-known, this scene, where Arlene and her film crew seemed to sort of just arrive at her grandmother's home with this camera and sort of pursues her grandmother through her own home while her grandmother's trying to avoid the camera. And it's very painful to watch. A lot of people describe it as very uncomfortable to see a young Indigenous woman who's not listening to her grandmother's clear, explicit request that they leave, that they not put her on camera. And that had always been a film that I did want to engage with, but a little bit more critically because of the way it's discussed. It's sort of been condemned and critiqued, and I think a lot of that is really valid, but I wanted to really delve into it further.

09:01 **KC**: At the same time, I had recently seen a documentary by Banchi Hanuse, who is Nuxalk. And her film, *Cry Rock*, had come out and it's quite a beautiful meditation on this question that Banchi herself asks in the film. She wants to ask her grandmother, who was a Nuxalk speaker, if she can record her stories. Or she's thinking of considering this question of asking her grandmother if she can record her stories and yet cannot bring herself to do it. And the film becomes this meditation on what it means to record Indigenous oral narratives. How does it change the story? Ask the question: Okay, what are oral narratives, then? And then what is the recording of an oral narrative, then? So it's investigating those questions. And it's very thoughtful and contemplative and meditative.

10:08 **KC**: And in a sense, putting those two films together, you could sort of see a lot of thematic similarities: two Indigenous women, neither of whom speak their traditional language, but are seeking connection with their grandmothers who have traditional knowledge and live many of their cultural traditions in order to make a kind of connection. So thematically, I was astonished by these films that had so much in common and yet, we know those outcomes of those films are very, very different. The parallel, I was drawn by the parallels, but I also realized, in bringing them together, that what I was doing is creating a problematic binary between both documentaries. One, which would be the bad object and like this is how you don't use film technology. This

is not how you treat or engage with your grandmother. And then the good object, which is the debate around the ethics and consequences of using film technology or other digital recording technologies. And I realized that was really unfair. I was going to be oversimplifying my analysis if I did it that way.

11:38 **KC**: So there's something wrong with this way I'm approaching these films. How else can I approach them to move past the thematic analysis and talk about why these films that do share these similarities have very, very different outcomes? How can I talk about those in ways that help us understand where the filmmakers are coming from? What are the factors shaping their representational strategies, and what's the context for that? And it was well, they're both coming out of university programs and are producing films in relation to debates and discourses around Indigenous representation, documentary practice, and documentary conventions that are specific to their separate context, and then went and investigated those institutions. So that's what's set up, then, this logic like, "Okay, if we look at the institutional context, we can understand more fully the debates and strategies and tensions that appear on screen." And those do very much have a material context that to that point, I hadn't seen really acknowledged or examined in a lot of depth.

13:07 **JLR**: Right. And it's very... It becomes a way more nuanced argument, right, once you start thinking about that infrastructure or the larger context for them. As you point out, the two... Thematically, the two could just seem like they're the same film, but done differently and therefore, one is the good way and one is the bad way. But once you start thinking about where they're coming from and what kind of traditions they were following, it makes more sense in terms of why they would make the kinds of creative decisions that they do, right?

13:41 **KC**: Yeah.

13:41 **JLR**: And I think one of the things that I find really interesting is we... So we have a tradition of, academic tradition of people looking at films coming out of particular industries, or being produced in particular nations, let's say. But you're looking even more minutely to where are they studying, right? So the academic institutions where they're coming from and therefore, who are they in conversation in terms of what does it mean to create a narrative about Indigenous communities. So could you detail a little bit about this contrast, specifically, who Bowman was in conversation with in the '80s to produce *Navajo Talking Picture*, and then who Hanuse was sort of in conversation

with or working with to produce *Cry Rock*, that allowed them to think of different strategies or influence to think of different strategies?

14:38 **KC**: Yes, in the article, I talk about the prevailing way that Indigenous studies as an area of scholarship and academic practice, how Indigenous studies was being conceptualized and practiced within two different academic contexts. So in a way, we are... There is a bit of an evolutionary kind of dynamic because of course, Indigenous studies, as it was practiced in at the time that Bowman is producing her film, that the field has moved on and continued to evolve by the time Hanuse produces *Cry Rock* in 2010. So there's a 20-year difference. So taking that in mind, though, and given that the material reality that both films were produced in relation to Indigenous studies, it became a question of how was Indigenous studies conceptualized and framed? At UCLA, there was a tradition of sort of revisionist anthropology that started in the '60s. And UCLA was certainly really a site for the debate around anthropology itself as a colonial discipline. And highly paternalistic, highly problematic for constructing knowledge about different or other cultures from the perspective of outsiders or who were typically white men, with some key white women, historically involved. But this has historically been a highly, highly problematic discipline for Indigenous people and a lot of groups worldwide.

16:52 **KC**: And so in the '60s, with a lot of the social shifts that were taking place, the civil rights movements, a lot of scrutiny came to anthropology and really what was it doing as a discipline? Like who was producing knowledge for whom? So the revisionist anthropologists were thinking about how do we reframe the power dynamic here? And a lot of their strategies in that era involved changing perspective, meaning how do we equip the people that we want to study with the means of representing themselves? That will be more accurate, right? There's still a problem there. There's an attempt to right the ship and put the film camera in the hands of Indigenous people to produce their knowledge about themselves, but we still know that was just to shore up anthropology, continue to make it relevant because it's still producing knowledge about Indigenous peoples, but it's Indigenous people doing it. So it must be more real and authentic to do that, more accurate than what we've been doing.

18:14 **KC**: So this, I found, was the context for the very recent history and context for *Navajo Talking Picture*. In many ways, the program, the Film Studies program inherited from the revisionist anthropologist movement through some of the key thinkers and academics and practitioners who were involved with the film program, the MFA program at UCLA. And similarly, Hanuse came out of the First Nations... What was

then the First Nations Studies program at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver. And 20 years on, I myself, went through that program, so I was very familiar with its curriculum. We were kind of past the question of authenticity and accuracy, and really thinking about what happens to knowledge, what happens when we record certain forms of knowledge or when we zoom in for a close-up like the idea of... That this is really well-articulated by Cree and Métis filmmaker, Loretta Todd, it's like when... So much of her film ethic was about resisting the conventions of filmmaking, like documentary filmmaking, where when a person's having an emotional moment, typically, the camera zooms in on that moment right where tears are coming down the person's face, to capture that moment.

20:05 **KC**: And she talks about when she was making a film about a residential school survivor and her camera person, who was non-Indigenous, went to zoom in on this person as they're crying, telling their story. And she stops the camera person and zooms back out to give her space and privacy. So the question of film ethics was much over... Rightly, over two decades had evolved a lot and was involving a lot of... The discussion had shifted to really think about what does it mean when we use certain techniques...

20:48 **JLR**: Right. And essentially, it's a... You see this movement towards... I would say, it sounds like it's not necessarily a negation of the sort of debates in the post-civil rights movement era in the '80s of giving cameras to Indigenous people to record. That in itself was a move forward from not having Indigenous people record, right?

21:15 **KC**: Right.

21:15 **JLR**: But then 20 years later, the question became even if Indigenous people are using these media technologies, are we replicating the sort of same structures that White documentarians have been doing, right?

21:28 **KC**: Yeah, exactly.

21:29 **JLR**: So one of the things that you pinpoint or you zero in on is this question about the relationship between oral narrative traditions and recording media and this tension on, is that possible? And it's a tension that Hanuse also has in her film, right? Could you talk to us a little bit about that tension as it's played out in Indigenous studies and then as it's played out in the film as well?

21:58 **KC**: I think what *Cry Rock* is making really clear is this idea that a recording is not the same as being told the story in-person by somebody with whom you have a relationship in a particular moment in time, in a particular geographical location to which the story refers. So this has been the nature and practice of oral traditions, it's certainly an area of study in anthropology where there have been people who've made really, really... Non-Indigenous people who've made very, very important interventions into this idea that... Into helping non-Indigenous audiences and academics really understand that oral traditions are a particular mode of learning and understanding, and that involve sets of relations that are temporally bound, that are shared in relation to particular events or ceremonies and in particular places, because they refer to particular geographies, particular figures in that geography, like mountains, like rocks, like bodies of water.

23:33 **KC**: And that mode of oral storytelling is not the same as filmmaking. The places I saw these debates most concretely or these claims being made have been in institutional documents like in reports, in public materials, in proposals that I've looked at from different media-producing institutions is that, frequently, when these programs are pitched, like programs for training Indigenous people in filmmaking and providing funding to Indigenous filmmakers, they often use the language of "Filmmaking can be used to preserve and sustain traditional cultural practices. So this is why it's so imperative to set up these programs and to properly fund them, and fund these filmmakers and produce this project." I approach those claims which are... These are Indigenous authors and applicants making these arguments. I see those, in many ways, as a necessary strategy in order to get ahold of resources and funding for their purposes in order to really support and sustain Indigenous filmmakers and their rights to produce images and sound and projects that are meaningful to those people and their communities.

25:10 **JLR**: And it's interesting that you point out that this sort of language gets replicated in things like applications or institutional documents, but is sometimes very much used strategically or tactically, you could say. So students might know that producing a film will not be the same as an oral narrative and scholars might know that, too. But in some ways it's a way to be legible to institutions that are not Indigenous institutions, but they're the ones that hold the resources. So it's doing that sort of doublespeak, if you will, or translation there. But then *Cry Rock* goes in and both does that, but also makes that the center point of the film. It's the whole... As you pointed out, Hanuse reflecting and debating whether or not she could actually ask her grandmother to be in the film and record her language. Could you mention some of the

strategies... So in the aftermath or the... In the end, she decides that she can't. It's not something that she can do or that will be fruitful in those ways because of the disparity between oral narratives and film. But you do point out that there are some interesting strategies, creative strategies that she uses to move through this thinking or this processing. Could you point us to some of these ideas that you think are productive in how Hanuse treats this tension between the oral narrative and filmmaking practices?

26:47 **KC**: Yeah, I think the one that really did strike me, and I talk about it in the article, was a parallel kind of storyline, for lack of a better word, in the film, where we're watching her grandmother basically butcher a fish, like a large fish. She's cutting it up, filleting it, wind drying it, laying it out to wind dry. It's a fascinating approach that the film takes. And as I watched it, I really realized so much of *Cry Rock* is pedagogical. It's really trying to teach us something, and it has to be explicit because if it's trying to clarify the difference between oral traditions and storytelling and trying to use Western technologies to document, it has to heighten those distinctions and really make them explicit. So it's very instructive.

28:02 **KC**: This is actually a really crucial part of us learning about what she means by oral tradition. And it really, to me, is the camera is in a sense mimicking the behavior, the sort of demeanor of a person who's learning from a grandmother, her grandmother by observing, paying attention and participating in the sense of being a presence there but without being an active one. And in terms of the larger pedagogical intent, I really saw that as a way of modeling, a way of being in which to learn from your elders, from your grandmother. It's a way of showing us, it's like you pay attention, you're learning something all the time, and it requires our focus and attentiveness and patience and often silence in order to understand something about the world, understand about how to do something.

29:18 **KC**: Knowledge is a practice, it's something that involves a way of being in relation to another person in a particular place. And that is a real reframing of how we think about knowledge, especially for me as an academic, for a lot of students who have a kind of orientation to knowledge as, "I go to my lecture, I download, I process later. Can I have those slides? Professor, can I have the slides from the lecture today? What's gonna be on the exam?" That way of learning is this kind of a consuming way of being. It's like as though you can package something and hand it off. And that would be... That's kind of what underpins this idea of recording Indigenous knowledge. It's like, "Oh, we packaged it. It's a DVD now or it's on this drive or whatever, it's in the cloud." That is completely different, it's a completely different way of thinking about

and valuing knowledge and learning. And so this parallel narrative really is modeling a different way of how you come to learn. It's not packaged, it's not explicit, it's not... It requires something different of you than to just show up. It's attentiveness and presence, and that to me, it was a very profound intervention.

30:53 **JLR**: Yeah, and similarly to what you're pointing out, the distinction between thinking of learning as just downloading information versus learning as part of an ongoing process that requires constant reflection and can never be contained to just having something in the cloud or downloading slides or so on and so forth. The film does that too, because in the end of the day it is a film. It's a half hour short, but the value of it is not in itself the recording, but actually the process that the recording is getting us through. It's how it's teaching us. It's teaching us how to learn and it's teaching us how to look to be able to learn in a particular way, basically by saying I could never capture this in a way that you could just download and have and watch, but I can point to the ways that someone, if they wanted to, could process this or learn about this, right?

31:49 **KC**: Yeah, absolutely. And even that story of the Sninik that's told in the film in a way, and then we see Clyde and another community member, they go to the Cry Rock and point it out. You see this in the documentary, and they're like that's where it happened. So in a sense, the film allows us, gives us a window into oh, that's the Cry Rock. We can see it on camera, but I think I say in the article that the film is really showing us what it can't show us.

32:26 **JLR**: Yeah, and I think you also pointed this out that even the use of animation in what is ostensibly a documentary is part of this process of the film's showing you what it can't show you. Because by using animation in a very... So reflexively points to this is a representation that is not going to be the thing because I can't show you the thing, but I can show you something that will give you a sense of it at the same time pointing to the limits of that representation as well.

32:57 **KC**: Right and I really appreciate that the animation is really... It's more about, as you're saying, it's about showing you. It's not giving you the knowledge, it's showing you sort of the sets of relations required in order to produce meaningful knowledge. So the animation is really beautiful and also very instructive itself, because it's showing you, by the words floating off and kind of living in the surroundings as an elder tells a group of children the names for things floats off and it connects to what it refers to, like the animation, the word goes and connects to the thing. Those names for things, those

stories for things, refer to something within a particular environment. It's a particular kind of world, and the language is the connective tissue between the world and the person. You can't replicate that on camera but you can talk about how it works, but you can't really show people on camera those relations.

34:23 **JLR**: So what your article does is compare these two different academic settings in two different historical moments, and how these two Indigenous filmmakers approach a similar thematic. If we were to sort of zoom out, to use a film metaphor, and think about what this sort of comparative work does, how do you see... The question is how do you see this sort of competitive work in terms of thinking about what we could generally call the study of Indigenous media, across different institutional contexts and across different national contexts? How do we think about Indigenous media broadly, or is it that we can't think of Indigenous media broadly and we're actually thinking at a more local level of media being produced by Indigenous people in a particular place at a particular time?

35:23 **KC**: There's a lot of debate about that. And I think, within Indigenous... We can call it sort of Indigenous media worlds, different networks and communities of Indigenous artists and filmmakers, critics and academics, who all intersect and communicate and read each other's work and talk about it. This is a question of what do we mean by Indigenous? What does Indigenous refer to? And one thing I think is really helpful, especially for students to think about is maybe conceptualizing Indigenous not as a set of features like oh, this is what it looks like, this is how it acts, this is what it sounds like, the aesthetics of Indigenous. We need to problematize this idea that Indigenous anything can be codified to express particular features, because obviously, Indigenous communities, traditions, cultures can differ vastly from one another. But I like to think about... And I talk about this and it will come up in my book, I talk about the utility and value of this concept of "native nationalism." And I came across that concept in Michelle Stewart's 2001 dissertation on Indigenous documentary in Canada and the US. And she talks about native nationalism, it's not a specific cultural identity. She's talking about... It's a shared experience of a pre-colonial history.

37:18 **KC**: And within that there are different Indigenous nations with their own particular practices. So it has utility in the sense of defining people in an experience that pre-exists colonial history and therefore, whose claims, whose political traditions, cultural traditions, community formations, land use and stewardship, all pre-exist the existence of colonial nation states then, that is our reality right now. So those are

gonna have different claims, different legal relationships, policy relationships with the state, with municipal and local governance. Those are gonna be different than those of other minoritized groups. What Stewart is really offering is an understanding of nationhood not as a kind of essentialist claim but rather that in order for Indigenous sovereignty and autonomy to exist, it must engage with the prevailing and hegemonic power structures that exist, in order to make its claims at all. So nationhood is constructed and deployed within a system that only really recognizes other nations. So it allows... It makes visible this concept of a kind of political, cultural, historical sovereignty in the terms that are recognized by the majority. I think native nationalism is much more helpful, in the sense that it defines a difference and a shared historical experience, but it also accommodates specificity of different nations within it.

39:32 **JLR**: Could we talk about gender? Because both films that you analyzed are produced and directed by women, and you're focusing on the relationship with their grandmothers. To what extent is this focus indicative of other Indigenous film, or is it a deliberate choice on your part as well, to focus on that?

39:53 **KC**: This is an observation that has been made over and over, and so many people are interested in asking why are so many of Indigenous filmmakers women? It's more than 50%. And I think in the 2017 Indigenous Film and Media Arts Festival, imagineNATIVE; in 2017, 72% of the films that it programmed and screened were by women, and this is the biggest Indigenous film festival in the world. And I know this, not just because I go, but because my work is going to... My next piece is gonna look at the presence of Indigenous film festivals in constructing how we understand what Indigenous media is, but this is an extraordinary number.

40:50 **KC**: I've asked many Indigenous filmmakers like why do they think so many Indigenous filmmakers are women, and there isn't ever one answer. There is the historical convergence of a lot of marginalized communities and groups and their demands to be given resources and to be represented as a part of nation states. So those coming out of... A lot of the social movements of the '60s, '70s, '80s onward, we did see formulations of specific programs, studios for women and people of color, Indigenous people, LGBTQ.

41:44 **KC**: And so they were all sort of in proximity, both in terms of policy, in terms of social movements, in terms of practice. So we can see that there's ways that Indigenous women during these times, certainly were potentially being given more access and more resources to produce work. But a lot of people talk about the cultural

dimension of Indigenous roles and accountability and thinking that Indigenous women often are the organizers, often the drivers, often those who innovate earliest, who pick up, test, and implement technologies differently and see what are their applications, limitations? And that's just in terms of practice that's often been the case.

42:45 **KC**: So it is something that I'm thinking about really hard, and I'm working closely with a colleague, Joanna Hearne at the University of Missouri on a book collection that asks that question by focusing specifically on Indigenous women in North America and digital media, and looking at how Indigenous women have been innovators in this area, actually going back into the late '60s in the first days of a shift towards computerized and digital media.

43:27 **JLR**: So you mentioned this was work you that came up part of your dissertation, how have you built on it since or where is it going now?

43:39 **KC**: So the article is really the focus of one of the chapters of both my dissertation and what will be my book when I get back to that and manage to get it down the pipeline. The way the dissertation is set up is sort of looks at... I designed it so that... My main intention was there are these underexamined institutional contexts. We have a lot of scholarship about the National Film Board and its role in creating programs and studios for Indigenous people, filmmakers, artists, producers.

44:24 **KC**: So if we look away from the NFB, if we look at these other institutions, who do we see and what do we see being produced? So I was more interested in thinking well, we have to expand the institutional focus away from the NFB, and look at these other sites of production. So, post-secondary programs and institutions are one, but there's also provincial television, which I hadn't even thought of but once I looked at that catalog I was creating of Indigenous film, I saw these provincial broadcasters popping up.

45:07 **KC**: I'm like I don't think we've ever talked about... Not substantially. It's fascinating to me because those films are really... Or documentary pieces are really unwieldy, because on the one hand, they come in with this really... It's maybe familiar to you, the synthesizer music kind of leading in, and then you have this heavy-handed voice-over very explicitly saying what is this program about, and what you're gonna learn about it and who it's gonna involve. And then we have these sequences where the filmmaker has been interviewing Indigenous students in high school and also their teachers and parents.

45:57 **KC**: And in those interviews the camera is simply allowing the person to speak and talk and talk, and there's this very long takes, with no voice-over, no music, nothing, it's just them talking and that jarred so much against this very heavy-handed, heavily produced kind of voice-over, and I was like what is going on? And really what I was seeing was happening was, okay, so within educational programming, here are the conventions, they have to be very explicit pedagogically, you have to guide the viewer, you have to tell them what's gonna happen and what they're gonna get out of it. And yet, in these interviews, really the filmmaker is allowing the person to speak for themselves. They're not trying to force perspective on the interviewee. He's trying to allow them the time and space to really unfold their story and perspective. And that's coming from a really critical ethic in Indigenous filmmaking, which is to allow the person to speak, like let them tell their story and you simply listen.

47:09 **KC**: So what seems like a very... Some people might describe it as awkward or uncomfortable or clumsy. What I actually see are two conflicting ways of framing learning, and framing how we should engage in learning, and this is sort of relating back to *Cry Rock* in the sense that there is a kind of contemplative attentiveness to the interviewees, and that collides with this institutional imperative of provincial broadcasting, which is to package it, shape it, tell you what you're gonna learn. And once we saw these conflicting points of view and value systems, that text made a lot more sense, and made clear what the filmmaker was trying to do, that otherwise you might never think about or even... Chances are you wouldn't see this piece.

48:15 **KC**: But the other chance is that you might dismiss it for being what seems like uncomfortable, and that to me was the point. It was like because this is a very complicated text, and that's how we can... If we look at the institutional context as a part of the production, we can see what exactly the filmmaker is trying to intervene in and transform.

48:39 **KC**: What I really wanted to do with the article as a lead out to my book, which is forthcoming, is that I'm modeling a form of institutional analysis. The article is really explicit about... Okay, in order to look at... What sources can we look at to undertake institutional analysis? And there's a lot. There's some stuff that you will never get access to when you're trying to understand institutional context, you may not get that interview you wanted, you may not get those financial records, you may not be able to sit in a boardroom when people are making decisions about which money goes where.

49:17 **KC**: But you can find out a lot through public materials like their websites. Often there are textual materials an institution will produce specifically, publicly funded institutions often have to provide reports, financial records to the public because that's who it serves. So those will often be available on their websites or through Freedom of Information Act requests and that kind of thing. So I really wanted to show this is... In the context of academic institutions, here's how I went about doing it, but this is a transposable model that people can use elsewhere, and that I hope they do.

[music]

50:17 **JLR**: Karrmen, thank you so much for joining us.

50:19 **KC**: Yeah, thank you for having me.

[closing credits music]

40:45 **JLRR**: This episode of the Global Media Cultures podcast was produced by me, and edited by Alan Yu. Opening music by Podington Bear. Closing credits music by cloud mouth. This project is supported in part by the School of Arts, Technology, and Emerging Communication at the University of Texas at Dallas.

The Global Media Cultures podcast introduces media scholarship about the world to the world. I'm Juan Llamas-Rodriguez. Thank you for listening.