



A • M • E • R • I • C • A • N  
A N T H R O P O L O G I C A L  
A S S O C I A T I O N

F Yj JYk . 0 bh]h`YXQ  
5i h\cf fjt`GU`m`9b[ `Y`A`Yf`f`m  
F Yj JYk YX`k`cf`\_`fjt`  
Dc`Yhck b`@j`Yg`Vm;`Ycf`[`Y`7cf`gYhh` /`>`YUb]Y`K`m]Y`/`F`JW`Uf`X`K`]Yg`\_`Y  
Gci`f`W.`5`a`Yf`]Wb`5`bh`f`cdc`c`[`]ghz`B`Yk`G`Yf`]Yg`z`J`c`",`\*`z`B`c`"(`f`B`V`W`z`%`,`(L`z`dd`"`)`%`\$`)(!`%`\$`)\*  
Di`V`]g`Y`X`Vm`6`U`V`k`Y`Di`V`]g`Y`b`[`cb`V`Y`U`Z`c`Z`h`Y`5`a`Yf`]Wb`5`bh`f`cdc`c`[`]W`5`ggc`V`U`h`]cb  
GhU`Y`I`F`@`<http://www.jstor.org/stable/679251>  
5`W`V`gg`Y`X.`\$`)%`#`&`\$\$`,`%`&`.`)

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=black>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



Blackwell Publishing and American Anthropological Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to American Anthropologist.

<http://www.jstor.org>

The final segment of the film is reviewed separately because the pregnancy and birth episode seems a gratuitous extra. No doubt the Jury brothers believed this completes a kind of death-to-birth sequence, but in contrast to the first two segments, the last section appears contrived. This is especially obvious in the case of Mark's two young children whose participation in the dyings of Gramp and his wife has a voluntary and unrehearsed flavor that is both refreshing and convincing. However, their "participation" in the pregnancy and birthing amounts to no more than observation. They need persuasion and justification from their parents during the whole experience. Moreover, a pervasive underlying notion that the "closer to nature" birthing can be, the "better it is" should not be accepted at face value. One might additionally ask how many cultures have there been that encourage children to observe birthing and the husband to serve as midwife? In summary, this final part is at best unnecessary and at worst distracting and diluting.

**Hospice.** 1979. Produced by *Frank Moynihan* for the National Hospice Organization. 26 minutes, color. Purchase \$350 (16mm), \$250 (video), rental \$35 from Billy Budd Films, Inc., 235 East 57th St., New York, N.Y. 10022 (212/755-3968).

Christine Lemieux  
Kutztown University

This film is a demonstration of hospice in action. Hospice, as the film states, is not a building, but an idea, the idea that a group of trained personnel work together to make the life of a dying person as full and as painless as possible. Sometimes hospice work is performed in a special building, as with the Riverside Hospice in Boonton, New Jersey. Patients reside there, and life is made as "normal" for them as it can be under the circumstances. Children visit, surroundings are bright and cheerful—the ambience is that of a communal dwelling rather than that of a nursing home. But, in the United States, hospice workers normally go into the dying patients' homes and work with the patients and their families there.

*Hospice* opens with a brief monologue by a hospice patient's wife. She comments on her impressions of hospice workers: they are "wonderful, wonderful people." The main body of the film consists of these brief commentaries by various hospice personnel and live situations il-

lustrating "hospice in action." The role of each type of hospice member is demonstrated—that of the medical director, the nurse, the social worker, the volunteer, etc. The role of the volunteer hospice worker is characterized as "the backbone of the hospice program" and receives special emphasis in the film. Volunteers become like friends and help shop for groceries, babysit, and simply visit.

In general, this is a sensitive and dramatic portrayal of how concerned human beings intervene in situations of dying in a manner most acceptable and helpful to the dying person and his or her family. Family members are the very people who tend to be ignored or whose input is diminished in many hospital, nursing home, and home care situations; *Hospice* illustrates how this can be avoided. Episodes filmed in patients' homes and at hospice beds are especially expressive, both of the views of patients and their kin, and of hospice workers themselves. The overall keynote is compassion. As stated in the film, hospice is not for everyone, but it can be a valuable option for those who seek more autonomy in their own situation of dying and in that of their loved ones.

Technically, the film is good, with a few of the minor flaws that are probably inevitable when filming largely live episodes (such as some uneven zoom work). These minor flaws are not really serious enough to distract the viewer.

Without previous knowledge of hospice, the viewer of the film does not emerge with a clear picture of the structure of a hospice program, but this is not a serious drawback. A class instructor could easily overcome this with a brief introduction.

*Hospice* could be used in undergraduate courses in cultural anthropology as an illustration of attitudes toward the dying in some Western cultures. It would have an obvious place in classes dealing with the anthropology of death and dying and would be a most valuable asset to graduate courses in medical anthropology.

**Poletown Lives!** 1983. A film by *George Corsetti*, *Jeanie Wylie*, and *Richard Wieske*. 56 minutes, color. Purchase \$800 (16mm), \$400 (video), rental \$95 (16mm), \$75 (video) from Information Factory, 3512 Courville, Detroit, Mich. 48224 (313/885-4685).

Sally Engle Merry  
Wellesley College

*Poletown Lives!* is a stunning and dramatic

vision of the clash between the rich and the poor in America. When one of the largest corporations in the world, General Motors, plans to build a new plant on the site of an integrated, working-class neighborhood in Detroit in 1980, the residents mount an intense and moving struggle to avert the destruction of their lifelong community. The result is a vivid and compelling documentary of class conflict. Huge, corporate power is pitted against a small group of working-class Whites, Blacks, and Indians; the elderly and children. The struggle is doomed, however. With the cooperation of the city government and the Archdiocese of Detroit and passive acceptance by the United Auto Workers, demolition is completed. Poletown becomes only a symbol of resistance.

The underlying theme is the unequal distribution of power in contemporary America. Visually, the film contrasts the small, neat rows of houses in Poletown with the massive edifices of GM's headquarters and UAW offices. The leaders of the resistance appear in counterpoint to the heads of GM. It is for a Cadillac plant that the neighborhood must go.

The film begins with the uncomfortable role of government. The mayor is over a barrel. In order to attract jobs to a declining city, he makes generous tax benefit and land clearance offers. Detroit is poor and needs industry, and as a member of the city council points out, every city in the country is desperate for industry and might make a similar offer. The new plant promises 6,000 jobs. Yet, when Ralph Nader gets involved in the resistance, he argues that the factory will be highly automated and probably produce little over half that many jobs. Other plants may be closed when this new one is built. Nader cogently attacks the collaboration of government and industry, branding this as corporate socialism rather than capitalism. In one of the most intriguing interviews in the film, someone asks the president of GM if the taking of Poletown is an example of corporate socialism. He replies that this is simply free enterprise, since GM is building the plant on its own. The city, on the other hand, is doing its job of clearing the land, and they would not want GM to do that. It was, after all, the city, not GM who selected the site. His answer is clearly evasive. For the residents, the taking of their neighborhood is simply a government sellout to corporate power.

The climax of the film is the destruction of the local parish church. The archdiocese sell the church and evict the parish priest, but the residents continue to occupy the church. As ar-

son and theft drive most of the residents out of the neighborhood, the diehards remain and begin camping in the church. After 28 days, 60 police surround the area, carry off the protesters, including four 70-year-old women, and demolish the church.

As the buildings fall, the political sophistication of the residents rises. They see that a poor people's neighborhood has been taken by the rich and that democracy works "as long as you don't challenge the power structure." One man complains, "Rich people should not be allowed to rip off poor people," and compares the Poletown case to the treatment of the Indians. Although the rhetoric is not new, its use by working-class Americans is. Aside from the assistance of Nader and his staff, the resistance seems to be a genuine grass-roots struggle by working people who are discovering how the "system" works and how to influence it. When the film crew interviews the police commander during the demolition of the church and he claims that his role is simply to "maintain the peace," the viewer asks, along with the residents, whose peace? For whose benefit?

Technically, the film is well done. It is coherent and well organized, presenting a complex situation clearly. The segments fit together well, and the total effect is emotionally involving. The film builds up a picture of powerful institutional actors cooperating at the expense of this neighborhood without heavy-handed rhetoric. But a few questions remain. According to the film, architects proposed six alternative designs for the plant that would have spared the neighborhood, but the company did not use them. Why not? There was never any further discussion of these proposals. Nor was it clear what kind of an area this was going to affect, and how much of it consisted of the single-family, owner-occupied homes whose residents seemed to constitute the bulk of the resistance. Maps would have helped. The film begins by stating that the plant would displace 3,500 people and demolish 1,500 homes within eight months, but does not tell how many of these simply moved out and how many joined the resistance. Were two other GM plants going to close, and would this new plant actually create new jobs or simply transfer workers from one plant to another?

Nevertheless, the message this film provides for students is clear: our notions of American democracy and free enterprise are often naive or misleading. Neighborhood destruction for economic "progress" is a common event in American cities, and this film does a particular-

ly good job of showing the power relations between the movers and the moved: the collaboration of business, government, and labor against neighborhood residents who are seen as "blocking progress." The film would be very good for courses on American society, on urban anthropology, urban sociology, social stratification, ethnicity, and complex social organization in general.

**Dudley Carter.** 1982. Produced and directed by *Abby Sher*. 59 minutes, color. Purchase \$750, rental \$75 from Sher Film Library, Transit Media Library, P.O. Box 315, 779 Susquehanna, Franklin Lakes, N.J. 07417 (201/891-8240).

Linda A. Bennett  
George Washington University Medical Center

This film effectively adopts three historical traditions: life history, ethno-history, and art history. The life and work of Dudley Carter, a 90-year-old ax sculptor, is the topical focus. Beginning with the present—in 1982 at a shopping center site in Portland, Oregon, where Carter is carving massive sculptures from cedar trees—the film quickly moves back in time to the turn of the century and Carter's childhood in British Columbia and Alert Bay. It then reviews periods of his highly diverse work and artistic history. Abby Sher, in her first film, does a remarkably good and thorough job of covering the subject through a quiet and even-paced unfolding of Carter's life. She uses an unobtrusive manner of filming: Carter tells his own story in his own words and through his own work. The result is an aesthetically pleasing and informative portrayal.

From the start, we can tell that Dudley Carter is no typical person or artist. With "the forest as his studio," he combs the woods for the cedar trees that he will transform into the three sculptures that serve as the centerpiece for the shopping center. Carter, the tree explorer, gives some background on himself, commenting that he was a "timber cruiser" in the Northwest as a young man, a specialist who maps out the forest for timber companies. This experience prepared him for knowing how and where to look for these large, fine-quality cedars from which he will create the sculptures. Though a challenge to locate in the 1980s, some such large cedars are found in the Mt. St. Helen's area of Washington state.

Once located, the three trees are carefully removed so that the bark is not damaged and then transported to the building area in Oregon, where the 40-foot, 15-ton trees are moved by cranes into a vertical position. A wooden platform was built on the site for Carter to work from. Living in a trailer on the shopping center site over the two years while he creates the massive sculptures, Carter works from an exact replica and large-scale drawings from which he transfers his designs. Although he makes occasional use of a chain saw, he generally uses a series of axes of different lengths and weights and an adze. He likes the marks that an ax leaves on the wood.

Interspersed throughout the footage of the Portland Project Sher presents what I find to be the most interesting material: accounts of Carter's early years growing up and working in the remote areas of northwestern America and accounts of his development as an artist. These narrative flashbacks, supplemented with good drawings from the period, vintage photographs, and some films, make written ethnographies of this region during the early 20th century come alive. Carter was born in 1891 in British Columbia, one of nine children. His parents were homesteaders, living in an isolated area where a small logging operation provided the local income. Not surprisingly, Dudley Carter began working at age six in the timber business.

When he was 15, the Carter family moved to Alert Bay to live among the Kwakiutl Indians, permitting young Carter to witness close up a period of culture change among the Kwakiutl. Noting that their houses were still built on the beach with their canoes drawn up to the water-edge, Carter observed that the Indians had already begun to adopt some new styles of house building, drawing upon non-Indian structures. During these years, he saw two potlatch ceremonies, one of which lasted 2-1/2 months. This was clearly an important period for Carter in terms of his eventual move into wood sculpture. He paid special attention to the carving style in totem poles, coffins used in tree burials, and houses. There is no mistaking the considerable influence this art genre has had on his own work, in terms of medium (wood), size (large to massive), and style (realistic, combined with highly stylized).

Before becoming an artist, however, Carter spent most of his young adult years doing virtually every job available in the lumbering business. In addition to being a tree cruiser, he was a "head faller," "draftsman," "powder