

8-25-2011

Interview with Brooke Jacobson, 2nd Interview (audio)

Heather Oriana Petrocelli
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/cmi_oralhistories



Part of the [Film and Media Studies Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Petrocelli, Heather Oriana, "Interview with Brooke Jacobson, 2nd Interview" (2011). Center for the Moving Image Oral Histories. http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/cmi_oralhistories/2

This Interview is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Center for the Moving Image Oral Histories by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Narrator: Brooke Jacobson (**BJ**)

Interviewer: Heather O. Petrocelli (**HP**)

Date: August 25, 2011

Place: Brooke Jacobson's home in Portland, OR

Transcribed by Heather Petrocelli January/February 2012

Audited by Carolee Harrison, January 2014

Semi-Verbatim Transcript

Brooke Jacobson

August 25, 2011

HP: This is Heather Oriana Petrocelli, interviewing Brooke Jacobson on August 25, 2011 in Portland, Oregon, at her home. Brooke, do I have permission to record you for the Center for the Moving Image oral history collection?

BJ: Yes, you do have my permission.

HP: So, this is our second interview, and where I kind of wanted to go today, which I had said in the first interview, is to talk about your work as the foremost Deinum scholar (I think) in the world. I have (re)listened to our first interview and I kind of want to get a sense of... you graduated in '67, and [both talking] and Center for the Moving Image started in '69, and you had co-founded the Northwest Film Study Center by '71, and I'm trying to get an idea of the way you thought about Andries Deinum—how it shifted through the years to the point where you actually became a scholar of his body of work, or his life, a biographer, I don't know how you... [cut off]

BJ: [making "mmm-hmmm" sounds] Well, the aspect of review, of being able to review his papers and journals, and to actually produce some scholarly work, came *much, much* later in life. Here I'm going to be challenged for dates, because I can't remember exactly when he died; but it was not only after *he* died, but several years later, after his wife Ginna died, that Tom Taylor took responsibility for being the executor of the estate, and involved me in that work of cataloguing what was there in the apartment at that point. As he attempted to deal with all of that for the Deinum family, and so that was as far as it went at that point. I suppose that must have been close to the year 2000, thereabouts—I'm really guessing here. [Laughs] And then it was some years

after that... at some point after that... Tom and I felt that something should be written about Andries.

And Michael Munk was another individual, he was somebody who had retired from teaching at Rutgers and moved back to the family home, not exactly *in* the family home yet, but he had moved back to Portland with his new wife, Suzanne Hanchett, who was an anthropologist. I think because I was very heavily involved in teaching then, and Michael was retired and had time on his hands, we devised a plan of trying to work together on producing some kind of scholarly work on Andries. Michael took responsibility for reading the journals, and extracting bits of information from the journals, and then he drafted an initial introduction, because he was quite moved by some of Andries's remarks about his coming to Portland initially, and how much he loved the place and how it reminded him of the Netherlands. The climate here is very similar.

So I, at the same time, was going through the papers and trying to develop a kind of chronology. It was important to me to develop a kind of chronology of his life and his work. So I started work on that, and then we made an initial attempt to kind of merge the information. I remember, when I first gave that to Michael, my assessment, my writing incorporating his work, he said, "Oh, this sounds like radio, it sounds like a radio show!" And I suppose that did have something to do... I was, at the time, working with the old Mole Collective, and doing film reviews for KBOO and had become very conscious of addressing an audience in a more familiar kind of voice.

So, he thought that was fine, but very soon I realized that this wasn't really going to be a mutual project... that Michael had enjoyed reading—and it's very difficult reading these journals because the handwriting is very hard and it took me years—until just a few years ago, to be able to get into them myself. I don't think I'd even begun doing that at the time. I did present a paper for the Oregon Historical Society that I'd written that brought his activities up to his acceptance of a position at Portland State, because he had been working with the Extension Center prior to that. So I just concentrated on that early period, based on his papers, and records, and newspaper accounts of his work. So it was only after that that I actually had a summer off, and devoted myself to going through the journals and reading them myself, and making notes that I'm still working to develop.

Basically, I began taking it on as a project, realizing that it was going to be my project. And that Michael was not really that interested in collaboration.

HP: For Michael Munk, pardon if I'm forgetting... so he was a CMI student or...? [cut off]

BJ: Michael Munk was in the very first class that Andries offered. I think he had just graduated from Reed, actually, and was taking this class through the Extension Center, because he had heard about Deinum and was interested in what he was doing. So, he was in the first class that I took. That was my first meeting with Michael Munk and I was nobody—I was just this other person in the room. I had no college at all at that point, and here were these very erudite-sounding people in the class with me, who would ask interesting questions, and engage Andries in dialogue. So, that was very pleasant. It wasn't until many years later, actually when he came back to Portland, because he was a friend of a mutual friend of ours, Steve V- [?] who was in his class at Reed and who had married a close friend of mine, that we met up again. And of course our memory then, of Andries, was very important. Michael and another Reed student had done a film series that Andries helped them set up—so he had carried his interest in film in that way here in Portland. But I don't know a whole lot about what they did.

HP: Was the film series done in the 60's?

BJ: Late 50's, it would have been, '58, '59, I think.

HP: Have you and Michael continued any dialogue about Deinum?

BJ: I don't see very much of him, because I've been tied up with other affairs, and he's been also tied up and spending more time at home, I think. I don't know how old he is at this point. He's older than I am, and I know I stay home, and don't see people as often as I would like to, but I get emails from him every day, that are sent to a wide group of people about political issues that he's engaged with.

HP: It seems a very large core of this extended CMI family continues to be engaged in political...
[cut off]

BJ: Oh, very much so. Of course Michael's father set up the World Affairs council here.

HP: Oh, what was his name?

BJ: Um... my mind goes blank at certain moments... I think his father taught at Reed or at least at Lewis and Clark. He comes from Czechoslovakia.

HP: You had said a few minutes back that you had presented a paper at OHS that covered Deinum's early... [cut off]

BJ: Early... yeah, first ten years he was here in Portland.

HP: In Portland? Can you expand a little bit on... did you reach out to OHS or did OHS reach out to you? What was the presentation like? Just some memories around that paper?

BJ: Well, I think this was one of David Milholland's projects and so it was sponsored by the Oregon Cultural Heritage Commission. There were two sessions that Tom and I participated in, talking about CMI, and about Andries. And Harry Dawson came to one of those, he came to both of them. Carol Thomas Koon came to... was she there... [trying to remember] It's terrible not being able to remember in detail. But anyway, we constituted a panel, essentially each of us talking about different aspects of our relationship with Andries. My part concerned a presentation of that first ten years, with some focus on his involvement with the idea of city planning, urban planning, and his work with television; his show *Speaking for Myself* that he did on public television, and later, *Urban Mosaic*, that he actually had brought Tom to Portland to work with him on, being the cameraman for this show that was looking at public affairs generally, but then quite specifically got into all of the discussion around Metro, and how Metro was to be established, and the rationale for bringing this tri-county area together.

HP: Do you remember the name of the precursor to Metro? I know that there was an organization that became Metro... I just can't remember.

BJ: I can't remember either.

HP: So you covered that urban planning component of it...

BJ: Yes, that side of his interests.

HP: Do you have memories of what Harry Dawson, Carol Thomas Koon, and... [cut off]

BJ: Well, they had both been students of Tom, and had taken Andries's classes, but I think they focused more on what CMI did, in the way of generating interest in *filmmaking*, and giving a lot of students very practical experience in filmmaking—and filmmaking linked to public issues, engaging in documentary that would be informative about our history and our culture and those kinds of interests.

HP: So, I'm just curious, of the things I *do* know about Deinum... [in a] very, very broad paint stroke... he's teaching... well, he's working in Hollywood first and he gets blacklisted because of his involvement with the Hollywood Ten, and then he's teaching at USC and he gets blacklisted yet again, in education, because of the HUAC hearings. He comes to Portland, and from the things I've read that you've written and the things I've read in the records, he does have this very civic engagement—film as an agent for social change and this civic engagement of the responsible citizen. In your research, do you see connections of that mentality back in L.A. of a man who had always thought in a very civically engaged manner?

BJ: No, I don't think he was... well, let me qualify that. Even as a student, as an international student at Stanford, when he first came, he majored in journalism, which right there indicates an interest in public affairs and politics, and he was involved with a group of international students. Actually, he wrote letters for the campus newspaper, dealing with political and social issues. [Laughs] Don't ask me exactly what they were, but he stirred up controversy even as student at

Stanford, because he did come with a strong Left awareness of international affairs, a political sophistication, from his family, and his experience in school in the Netherlands, and he brought that with him. And he was very excited about the whole concept of democracy and what democracy could really mean. He saw the U.S. is supposed to be this great “beacon” for the rest of the world, of democracy, and so he felt quite compelled to speak out about issues that he would run up against, like the whole situation in the South, the discrimination against African Americans in this country. He would call attention to those things and point out the kinds of hypocrisies that we accustom ourselves to in our daily lives, because he did have that outsider’s perspective, as well as a sense of engagement.

So then, in Hollywood, of course, he studied at the Art Institute in photography, and was still kind of on the journalism bent, and then for a time in Hollywood... Joris Ivens had come and taught a class or two at USC and Andries served as his teaching assistant. That was a great step forward and, of course, Joris Ivens is powerfully Left political in his filmmaking, and had ideas about what documentary could and should be doing—you know, documenting people’s struggles for human rights, and so that brought Andries more into an interest in film, and learning more about film, and then of course his opportunity to work with Fritz Lang continued that. He also did other studio work as a production assistant, and things like that, on a lot of [films]. So it was part of his education to learn about film, and so he became more and more committed to what he always described as “the *task* of film,” as opposed to entertainment.

HP: Correct me if I’m wrong, but is Joris Ivens Dutch?

BJ: Yes.

HP: Basically I’m trying to ask, do you know if Deinum knew Joris when still in the Netherlands? Was there any connection... [cut off]

BJ: No, he didn’t. He talks in one of his letters, where I think he’s applying for a job, I don’t know exactly, it’s a letter of application, where he talks about how as a young person, maybe ten or twelve, he remembered making this trip from Friesland into Amsterdam, and going through this

area where they were building a bridge, or building a way; anyway, he had the opportunity to see a person... there was this huge construction project going on. It was some major construction that was very important to uniting the various parts of the country, and in the midst of this huge construction project, with earthmovers, and cranes and things, was this little figure of a man with a movie camera out there filming all this. I think he later then had an opportunity to see that film; but he never had the chance to meet... he knew who Joris Ivens was but he didn't have the opportunity to meet him until Joris came to USC to teach and they immediately connected.

HP: Just to trace Deinum's educational trajectory, he came to the U.S. to go to Stanford as a teenager? Is that correct?

BJ: To Stanford, yes. When he was eighteen.

HP: When he was eighteen?

BJ: Uh huh.

HP: At Stanford he majored in journalism; did he complete that degree?

BJ: Yeah.

HP: And then you said he wound up at... [cut off]

BJ: Then he went to Los Angeles and he was going to the Art Institute in L. A., studying photography, and using every opportunity to meet people. He also got married.

HP: Didn't he also wind up... did he do his Master's at UCLA?

BJ: Yeah. I think that was after he had done a lot of work in the studio before he decided to get a Master's at UCLA. And there, he wrote his dissertation on Film and the Novel—not a dissertation, his Master's thesis, on Film and the Novel.

HP: And then from there, he still continued to do Hollywood work and then wound up teaching at USC?

BJ: I think he went from finishing to his Master's directly to beginning to teach at USC.

HP: With your time that you've spent... it doesn't matter which decade... the time you've spent with Tom Taylor, when he was still alive, do you have any recollection of Tom ever talking to *you* about what it was like taking classes from Deinum at USC?

BJ: No.

HP: Then, basically he gets blacklisted and... I'm forgetting the name of a gentleman who was at PSU, who *also* was at USC... [cut off]

BJ: Yeah, yeah.

HP: Essentially... [cut off]

BJ: This is my greatest problem... Well, there was also a dean... well, I'm trying to remember exactly who it was... there was somebody in the Extension Center who was willing to hire him. I think I've gone into a fair amount of that in my writing. I must say because I'd been involved in teaching, and under a lot of pressure in my other work, I have kind of lost touch with my own material. It's like I haven't been able to find the space here, since having to move into smaller quarters, and my time's been taken up as well, and so it's not as fresh and clear in my mind as I would like it to be. So these names—I remember the name Howard Burroughs, who was a dean in the university system, I think in the Extension Center, but he may have been at Portland State, who was instrumental and very helpful in getting Andries a job, because he'd spent about a year unemployed, and *unemployable*, essentially, because of blacklisting throughout the country, and the whole political climate at the time. It was very hard, and he was seeking help from the

American Association of University Professors for Academic Freedom. They found themselves helpless to do much of anything.

HP: In your research about Deinum's early time in Portland, is there anything significant that you've come across about how his... Once he's in Portland he becomes a very active in his engagement, and, like you were saying, in civic planning or urban development.

BJ: Yeah, but beginning with lecturing at the Art Museum, and lecturing to many public groups. He became a very popular speaker, and he was actually kind of surprised by that. He had not previously thought of himself as that much of a lecturer, but he was finding himself in demand. So he was very happy to be able to talk to people, and audiences seemed to be universally enchanted with what he had to say, except for certain people in the legislature [laughs] and the Mayor, and people of that sort. But I think it's because he came with a fresh perspective and a willingness to talk in a very genuine way about real issues that people had become afraid to talk about, because of the whole blacklist and the repression of any kind of opinion that might be considered Leftist.

HP: You had mentioned earlier that the climate was similar to his homeland.

BJ: Yeah, the physical... [cut off]

HP: Is there anything else from your research about what else you discovered that Deinum felt or thought about Portland?

BJ: Oh, he described taking trips up the Gorge and picking berries—no not picking berries, no, no, he was not one to engage in things like that—but, *buying*, buying jam and how delicious it was. He would go to the downtown library, and it was a wonderful space... open, and children would come into the library and very soon he was running the film series at the library. But, he felt the community was very welcoming. It was just a very pleasant life that he saw here, and then the rain of course; that was like home, so it felt very good to him.

HP: You had mentioned your paper and your presentation at OHS; was that the first foray into actual scholarly work with Deinum's life?

BJ: I had earlier made a little address, a gathering that was in celebration of Tom Taylor's life, that was held at the Hollywood Theatre, that Tom Chamberlin's daughter put together; feeling that we would rather do a recognition of Tom while he was still alive, than wait for him to die [chuckles a bit] and then have a huge memorial service. So I'd been asked to talk about Tom coming to Portland, and I found it impossible to talk about Tom and CMI without talking about Andries. So, I made my little speech about how Andries had come to Portland, and what came from that. So that was some time earlier... I can't remember when.

HP: Do you remember when the OHS paper/presentation was? I mean, do you remember just in broad strokes?

BJ: There were leaflets and things...

HP: ... to track the date.

BJ: Yeah.

HP: Two other things that I know you've done... I want to say Amsterdam...

BJ: Edinburgh.

HP: Edinburgh. Can you talk about that experience?

BJ: Yeah, it was a summer when I once again had some free time, and had really gotten into working on this material, and I got an announcement of a first kind of international gathering on the Arts in Society. They were soliciting participants and papers for that, and I thought, "Hmmm, Arts in Society..." because I'd been working and working on this material, and kind of trying to figure out what sort of shape it might take, thinking in terms of the larger work. And then I

thought, well actually, I've got *these* parts that would be very appropriate to a conference like this, you know, "How does Andries's interest in film and the arts and his speaking and teaching about film connect with society and social issues?" So, I wrote up a prospectus and got it accepted, and went off to this conference, where it was very well received, and there were a lot of people there—several hundred people—and that conference has continued, and they published their proceedings, so the paper then was reviewed and published online by the International Arts in Society. So that was a wonderful experience, altogether, and I particularly enjoyed it because Andries... one of the things that he had done as a film scholar when he was at USC, was to appear at Edinburgh, which had this enormous Festival of the Arts. Part of their focus is always on film, and sometimes documentary film, and I knew because I'd read accounts of the Festival and I knew a lot of independent filmmakers had presented their work there, and that Andries had in fact... and here again I'm forgetting the year... but I would say it was sometime in the 50's... he had been invited to Edinburgh as one of the commentators or responders, discussing the quality of the films, and he was highly critical [laughs] of what they'd done. Again did not make himself a lot of friends, I got the feeling, but they did publish his commentary. [laughter interspersed in this sentence] There again, he takes issue with films that are frivolous, and was more concerned with what film is capable of and looking for integrity in the work.

HP: In your research, have you seen the development of that thread of that *dichotomy* between film and a movie?

BJ: Oh, I think that's something that he was constantly lecturing on around Portland was—"What's a movie? What's a film?"—[laughs] and making people profoundly aware of how he saw a difference there. I must say that attitude sort of creeps into your thinking, although film schools, certainly at USC, we *attempt* to encompass the full breadth of film studies; but still there's work that you value because of its originality, or what it contributes to the ability of film to reflect upon who we are, what our society... how we operate in the world... and film is really a way of looking at *ourselves*. While we can certainly use it for diversion, I think one of its real lasting values is—even if you look at the entertainment film—you can learn a great deal about us from looking at that. But then there are also films that very consciously look at people, and psychology,

and do that with a degree of awareness. So, altogether, it expands our understanding of who we are.

HP: You went and got your PhD at USC... it was a *coincidence* that you wound up going there based on the story you told last time about how you wound up in L.A. and then working in a lab. But you wound up getting your PhD at the institution that blacklisted Deinum, or fired him I should say. While you were there at USC, did you ever research any of Deinum's papers or work or anything... [cut off]

BJ: No. The library, which I spent *a lot* of time in... I later became aware... because I wasn't... I don't think I was really aware of it while I was there as a student. I knew that he had been blacklisted and that he had taught at USC, but I don't think I was really aware of his role in building that library, as a major resource for international film publications. I just thought they were there because it was a major film school.

HP: Oh, so Deinum *was* instrumental in building... [cut off]

BJ: He was—The Farmington Collection. Yeah. Apparently at some point there was national legislation passed to fund or to establish libraries in certain subject areas—concentrated subject areas at different universities around the country. And I would guess that there was some funding to build that collection and he was responsible for doing that.

HP: I like the idea that the collection he built, years later, you used extensively for your PhD. Pardon my ignorance, but why Farmington?

BJ: That was the name of a person who initiated the legislation, perhaps.

HP: It wasn't a filmic reference?

BJ: No.

HP: I was going to also ask you; do you remember the year of the Edinburgh conference that you went to?

BJ: I think it was 2008—fairly recent... maybe it was 7. I just remember that ‘08 year, [laughs] that I have coded in my brain... but it was fairly recently.

HP: You said your particular lecture was well attended. Do you have any... [cut off]

BJ: Well, the whole conference was very well attended.

HP: For your specific lecture, with the hundreds of people there, do you have any memory of people *knowing* anything about Deinum prior?

BJ: No. No. I remember there was one person in the audience, though, who just *loved* the idea of Deinum resisting HUAC. He was quite charmed by that. I guess I shared with them Deinum’s favorite description of himself [laughs] as “a refugee from occupied Hollywood.” Anyway, some people connected with that aspect very well. When the paper was reviewed there was one reviewer who felt that the paper itself, because it concentrated on an individual, was not appropriate to talking about the Arts in Society, but there are always those people [laughs] who don’t like what you’ve done, or can find fault with what you’ve done.

HP: Do you mind taking a quick break to change the tape?

BJ: Oh, yeah. Go ahead. We can refresh our brains.

BJ: I know why I’m thinking ‘08, because [it was] August 8th—I have that imprinted in my brain. [laughs] But it could have been 2006.

HP: 08.08.06. That will be an easy thing to figure out too, just based on the paper you did. You said it was online. I know you gave me a copy but I think there was one page missing from the copy I got.

BJ: Oh, really.

HP: Yeah. Actually, the page missing is the next thing I want to talk to you about. I wanted to get your memories on—I'm going to call it the Deinum book. I think it's *Fryslân Revisited*. So could you just kind of talk about that? It was one of those things that, I guess for the record, I had an impossible time trying to track down.

BJ: The book.

HP: The book.

BJ: Yeah, because it was published in the Netherlands. It's online. You can go online. The publisher has a website. [Coughing] And they offer it... and I have it. Did I show you the copy that was destroyed? [both talking at once] Destroyed, yeah. And finally I cleaned up the front porch the other day, and I had to put it in the recycling. [sound of sadness] I do have a *copy* upstairs, however.

HP: Good. Well, I mean, in short, I know I did find some stuff online about it, but it's actually been hard for me to purchase it. The publisher does not have it for me right now to purchase. And I've seen a few pictures and I've seen, I think, potentially, a poem. I think... [cut off]

BJ: There are poems interspersed with the photographs. Tsjêbbe Hettinga is the poet who wrote poems in response to the images that's contained in the book.

HP: The images are all Deinum's?

BJ: The images are all Deinum's, yeah.

HP: Was this when he was OSS?

BJ: No, these were made in 1946. It was after his service in the OSS. He was able to return to Friesland and he made these photographs. And his nephew, Henk Deinum, had the negatives, and he worked with the publisher and with Tsjêbbe Hettinga to put together the book.

HP: And you have a reflective essay contained... [cut off]

BJ: And I have an essay writing about Deinum in Portland—what he did in Portland; how he happened to come here; and there's another essay on Deinum from another person who knew him and knew the family, and talks about his life. So it's sort of those two perspectives on Deinum.

HP: For the other person that wrote an essay, do you remember kind of the crux... what was the aspect of Deinum they latched onto? Do you remember?

BJ: They talk about his education and his impressions from the Netherlands of what Andries was doing in the U.S., and the one thing that stood out for me, was that they tended to put more emphasis on his experience in Hollywood, and his connection with Hollywood, and even insisted on identifying a figure in a photograph as John Ford. Here is a picture of John Ford talking to Andries and I don't believe it was. But there it is. He is legend, he's—oh dear, I should not be saying this... this is very undiplomatic... you really should eliminate that from the tape.

HP: Well, you're just saying that you looked at the photograph and think that potentially it is *not* John Ford.

BJ: Well, that's what I think. But, I don't mean to be critical. The people who put that book together did a *tremendous* job.

HP: Yeah, even seeing your fire-damaged copy of it last time we meet, on the porch, I could see that it was a very beautifully designed and printed book. That's why I want one. Do you remember, is that also a very recent publication?

BJ: Yes, and that was more likely around 2008 actually. Because I know Henk came to Portland and met with me and with Tom, and brought copies of the book... not with Tom... well, he'd come earlier and met with Tom... well, anyway, I know that he came to visit very shortly before I moved from the house on 12th Street. He came and brought more copies of the book than I had requested, so maybe it came out in '07, or earlier in '08. But it's recent.

HP: Does Henk Deinum live in the Netherlands or in the United States?

BJ: He lives in the Netherlands.

HP: So we have the OHS presentation; we have the Art in Society conference; we have the essay, and *Fryslân Revisited*. I feel like I'm forgetting one. I know you also wrote a Deinum... [cut off]

BJ: For the website The Oregon Encyclopedia.

HP: Was that something you had suggested to them, or did they come to you?

BJ: They came to me.

HP: Do you have any knowledge of... I'm basically trying to figure out how did Deinum enter their consciousness, and they are like, "We need an article about this gentleman."

BJ: Probably Michael Munk has a lot to do with that.

HP: Speaking of those pieces of scholarly output, are there other things that you've done? Other pieces of work you've done on Deinum?

BJ: No.

HP: But you continue to piece together a broader life history, a full biography?

BJ: Mmm-hmm. Mmm-hmm. Well, not a full biography, but at least to extend more about what he did in Portland in more detail.

HP: As a scholar, I know you have a very personal connection, having been his student; and clearly he was influential in your relationship to film, which has been a lifelong relationship. What is it about Deinum that is *worthy* of a biographical interpretation, as the scholar that will be doing it? I can rephrase it... [cut off]

BJ: No, that is the big question that inevitably comes up. I think what leads me into this, is simply the fact of how *important* his work was, has been, to people like myself and others who came in contact with him directly; and to the existence of a really vibrant film community in Portland, that I truly feel would not exist were it not for him coming here. A lot of his ideas about television, and the proper use of television as a medium, I think were very, very visionary, and are things I think a lot about. It's just that he had so much to say about media in society, and the role of media in society, that I think we need to listen to, to pay attention to, and to strive toward; and right now, we're living in a society in which, I think, people are being driven, frankly, a little bit crazy by the overabundance and aggressive nature of public media, of commercial and public media, that you're getting information from all sides, and no way of assimilating it, or putting it together or making meaning out of it; and I've seen the university move *away* from any kind of critical perspective on media.

I was constantly coming up against restrictions on my academic freedom at Portland State, because people in the administration, and among the faculty, felt that I was too... the way they think about it is, "She doesn't really *like* film; she doesn't really like..." because I have a critical perspective on film and media, and one of my classes on television—theoretical and critical courses on television—was canceled because my communications department did not, first of all, did not see film as an essential part of our media world, and that the idea of a *critical perspective* sounded... they didn't say it frankly... but it sounded "too Leftist" to them. "We don't want to engage in critical studies." They didn't want that *language* used in the department. [laughs] So, it was a constant struggle to be able to teach, and I was removed from other classes for similar reasons. "Well, she doesn't really *like* film." So, I'm not going into a lot of detail about this, I realize. But

it's really come home to me now that I'm able to sort of distance myself and I'm not totally *dependent* on eking out a living by teaching. I can see how compromised my position constantly was and how under attack.

And frankly, I think that's the same kind of climate that Deinum worked under. I realize now what he was up against, whereas at the time, when I was a student, I was just kind of in awe of him, and he seemed very powerful because he was one of those people on the faculty. I didn't realize, until I got into reading his journals, realizing what a *constant* struggle it was and how he was always under attack. They'd give different reasons, public television would say, "Well, he's a little too much of a prima donna. He wants more control over his show. He doesn't abide by a strict format. And he doesn't submit scripts in advance." That's what everybody's concerned with. All these public institutions are, and Deinum *talked* about this so often, that Americans are just *scared*, they're afraid of *talking*, of saying the wrong thing, of appearing to be on the wrong side, and that's the political climate here. So I guess that's why I feel that somehow telling his story and the struggle that he went through, and what it means for us, is why I want to write this expanded work.

HP: Based on what you just said, your somewhat current or, potentially, very current issues with your own teaching career at PSU, in your research, you had just kind of made a reference to Deinum's diaries, and I'd guess that would be his internal processing of how things are. Have you also come across other research that gives a clear idea of PSU at large—basically, PSU's attitude or opinion, or support or lack of support for CMI?

BJ: I don't think there's a whole lot of documentation of the lack of support. It definitely was always running into problems. It was under-funded to begin with, and Tom and Andries had to constantly be scurrying around trying to, and Tom particularly, trying to work out ways to get equipment, and to have funding for the program, and keeping it running, and to have a secretary. [laughs] And here again, it had to do somewhat with Andries's unwillingness to fit himself into, to fit his goals into, the traditional university structures of departments where you establish your fiefdom, and maintain control over it at whatever cost. He saw the center as not being a "department," but being funded as this kind of core entity that could connect with other departments, and offer classes that would fulfill what he saw as film's potential to deal with all

kinds of subject matter, to deal creatively, to expand people's thinking, to expand people's understanding of all kinds of subject matter, because of the special nature of film and the way we experience it as individuals and also as members of a larger audience. That film has a potential for connecting us with other people, as well as understanding ourselves in relation to them.

HP: In—let's call them the Deinum papers—that you've read, do you see any understanding on his part that by creating a center that was very greater-community-based, because I know Tom Taylor did lots of work with production throughout the community, that it wasn't about that academic fiefdom, of like creating your territory and protecting it at all costs, but in fact constantly creating satellites to all other departments. Was he aware, from what you know, that he was *always* going to be fighting a battle with the higher institution, because it was always going to be a vulnerable place to go, when it was time for any kind of financial reconfiguring and cuts?

BJ: Yeah, I think he was counting on his friendship. I know he counted very strongly on his friendship with this one... I don't know to what extent he was really a personal friend, but I know Howard Burroughs figured very importantly in getting him integrated into the university—moved from Extended Studies into the university proper. He always felt a little bit disadvantaged because he only had a Masters' Degree and not a PhD. That move into the university, and I forget exactly how it was accomplished, although I know Howard Burroughs was important; it was done in a different way. It wasn't something that was put forth and approved by the faculty senate, but was finessed through the personal connections. I'm supposing that he hoped that those connections would work sufficiently for him, and his friendship with Joe Blumel, as President. He really counted on that, but he was constantly aware... Joe, in many, many meetings with him... that he still hadn't really come through and consolidated this arrangement; hasn't fully put this in stone. It's still kind of temporary, and it went on like that for all the years that CMI existed. And then, of course, came the final blow, when this person that he had been counting on to save the program, to see the value of the program, was willing to let it go. So, yes he was *aware* of it, but at the same time hopeful that he could just hang in there and that somehow it would work out.

HP: So before we get to that denial that you just mentioned, I also wanted to ask if in the papers, in the journals, most particularly, was there... in your research have you come across a sense of

pride, a sense of accomplishment, a sense of what Deinum felt CMI was actually doing *for* the community?

BJ: No, he was not somebody to take a lot of pride in what he was doing; he's a Calvinist, and while I don't fully understand what that *means*, I think it has something to do with his willingness to work on under these circumstances, and to suffer a great deal; and I think he did suffer. I'm not sure that he realized how much he was suffering, but he depended upon Ginna a great deal to be supportive of him, and it seems he didn't have a whole lot of other support that he needed. And everybody was drinking too much, you know, and I know that it's true of... Social drinking was a way of life for that generation, and so I think he didn't have a whole lot of awareness of what the level of stress he was working under. It did take a toll on him, and I don't think he was fully aware of that, as a toll, or... it's always hard to evaluate your own work, you struggle constantly to keep yourself together and keep going, and doing what you feel needs to be done. Certainly there were a lot of laudatory newspaper articles about him, and I'm sure he must have taken a good deal of satisfaction, although it's not in the Calvinist to take a whole lot of satisfaction, at least as I understand it from my outsider's, non-believer perspective.

HP: Kind of flipping it and going the other end of... once the program was indeed cut. My understanding from many conversations was that it was a professional *and* personal hurt. [cut off]

BJ: Mmm-hmm. Deep. Deep. He felt really betrayed by Joe, and that he just had not gotten the support that he felt he was owed. So, there's some awareness that he *did* feel that what he was doing was important. So that was gone, and he went very bitter. Very bitter. It seems to me it wasn't so long after that that he did had a stroke.

HP: After the closing of CMI?

BJ: Yeah.

HP: In your research and going through his papers, have you seen an idea of how he thought the work *could* potentially continue? I know that he kept teaching some film classes, and did he go back to Extended Learning at that point?

BJ: Extended Studies. Umm, no. That's something I'm not altogether sure about. I don't think I have really firm documentation on any teaching that he did after 1980 or '81.

HP: You were down in L.A. getting your Ph.D. at this time, right?

BJ: Right. I was not here.

HP: I want to go back to a comment you had made. You had made an argument, essentially, that had Deinum *not* come to Portland and done the things he did in Portland, like bringing Tom up, and creating the center that offered education and access, the film community *today* wouldn't be what it is.

BJ: Mm-hmm.

HP: Could you, just from *your* experiences, tell me a little bit about what you saw... I know you had a decade in L.A... but as a person who has been in Portland for a number of decades... how have you seen the film community change? Did you actually have any awareness of a community prior to your time at PSU? Would you say there was a community?

BJ: No, I wasn't aware of any community at all. Not at all. There were theaters... this isn't to say that there weren't some people around, but I have no idea how much. I think that there were some commercial film... there may have been a commercial... I really don't know. Frankly, I don't know anything about that [laughter] when it comes right down to it. That's something that I have never really looked into, but my hunch is... I mean, I know *now* that Lew Cook was around somewhere; that were individuals making film. But as far as their coming together in any kind of community, I don't think that that happened at all. It's not the kind of thing that happens in a

commercial atmosphere, and up until that point I don't believe there had been anything other than scattered... the major theaters and a few commercial efforts.

HP: Yeah, to reveal what I'm actually trying to piece together is... we're in August 25, 2011: take a snapshot of the Portland film community. And I'm trying to figure out, how I can make direct links back—for example, Rose Bond, a prominent animation filmmaker, teaches, a scholar of filmmaking and animation. She was not a CMI student, but one of her main mentors is Jim Blashfield, who was a CMI student. Northwest Film Study Center, a huge hub of filmmaking education in the city of Portland, very directly, the two founders, you and Bob Summers, former Deinum students [Brooke “mm-hmm-ing” along] So, do you know any connections in that sense, of people in your extended world, who are prominent filmmakers or educators, that you can trace back in any capacity to you?

BJ: What can I say? That's a big question. It's not something that I can just easily comment on. But I know that those connections and networks exist now, and I don't believe they existed in any way before CMI.

HP: I totally understand that it was a big question; we'll put it in the back for rumination for another dialogue somewhere along the way. Just to kind of wrap up, since you are the Deinum scholar, is there anything that you would like to add? Is there anything that you found in all your research that was a surprising tidbit that might not seem consequential in a lot of things, but is an interesting thing?

BJ: Well, for me, so much of it has been a revelation. You know when you start looking for historical references it's just fascinating the things that appear to you, and that help to understand better what you know of the past. I wouldn't say that there were great surprises, but it's like getting gaps in my understanding, my own memory of what we were doing, what I was doing in the 60's, what people around me were doing, and it's like filling in a lot of the blanks, and making connections, and so it's quite interesting in that way. I think I certainly was not aware of indeed what a struggle, what a personal struggle, it had been to maintain CMI—and all of the doubts about how to keep it going. The kind of idealist that I am, I guess I was a little shocked at the attitudes of

Oregon Public Television toward Andries. I'd thought that they valued his work and so, in some ways, it's kind of disillusioning about people that you look to to be doing the right thing, and finding out that we're all just people with all kinds of different motivations. [Laughter] So I just pray that I can get this story together as well as I can, and get something out there that I hope pays tribute, but is also critically and academically astute about Andries and CMI.

HP: Just a quick question. Just listening to you... do you identify a lot with Deinum at this point?

BJ: I would say I do to a great extent. I certainly identify with a lot of what I *perceive* to be his ideals and interests. At the same time, I have to kind of question my own identification with that.

HP: Also your institutional... I mean, very specifically, within the exact same institution... PSU [Brooke making sounds of frustrated agreement] troubles... I mean there is a level of identification there, I would think.

BJ: Yes. [laughter] Yeah, I really had so much respect for academia, almost all my life. We try transmit some of this to our students so that they respect their studies. And as we have seen the university become more and more a corporate entity, which it was not to the same extent in 1980 as it is today... it keeps going in that direction, and it is less and less what I, and I guess Andries too, kind of idealized as the role of the university in contemporary life.

HP: As a person who spent the last four decades entrenched in academia, as a student and then as a professor, is that shift from [within the] institution to a corporate entity... was it a very *gradual* shift?

BJ: It is very gradual, with the steady de-funding by the legislature, and the whole anti-tax, "do away with government" mentality that has taken hold of our society generally. What is public education? It's this huge industry that allows banks to make loans to students to pay outrageous amounts of tuition, and to sell them the idea that they need this education in order to get a job, when there are no jobs; and to come out of it with enormous debt to be paid back to the banks. There's something terribly wrong with that picture, and I just heard again yesterday that the

legislature's going to be looking more closely at the productivity of teachers. Whatever *that* means—"productivity." "We have to have some measure of productivity to justify the *pittance* that we give in support of the university. Show us what you're doing." There was still, when Andries came into it in 1960, an idea that education that was separate from business and other values and concerns, that education was essential to a civilized society—thinking about making public policy, expanding understanding of humanity. Those were the days when humanities were considered part of a good education. That has all been totally dissipated, but it was still there and Andries spoke very strongly for that within the university system and gained admirers and supporters on the basis of that, but ultimately he was unable to hold up against the onslaught of other interests—athletics and business.

HP: Well, essentially do you have any comments on anything that you feel you didn't get to say in the process of the two interviews?

BJ: No. Thank you. [laughs] I've probably spouted off quite enough. It's helpful to me to be able... there are not forums for saying the things that I'm saying! [laughter] [Both laughing]