

Desalojos Cero. The Urban Dimension of Participatory Video (PV)

Stefano Collizzoli, University of Padua, Sociology Department, Via del Santo, 2, 35100, Padua (Italy)

1. What is PV?

1.1. Idiosyncratic practices, elusive theory

Communication that doesn't go both ways, doesn't go anywhere

Alan Alda

Participatory Video (PV) methods have been around for forty years by now, ever since they were originated by the *Fogo Process* in 1969. Nevertheless, PV still lacks a commonly agreed definition, and a theoretical framework which can coherently include experiences of various different types.

The literature on PV is made up of reports of single projects (Ferriera 2006; Gilbert s.d.; Gonzalo Olmos and Ramella 2005; Lunch 2004; Molony, Zonie, and Goodsmith 2007; Odutola 2003; Riaño 1994; Rose 1992; Snowden 1983; Lunch 2004, 2006a, 2006b; Nathaniels, 2006; etc.), and manuals (Braden and Than 1998; Chambers 2003; Clive Robertson and Shaw 1997; Lunch and Lunch 2006).

Even the best structured contribution to the field, the volume edited by Shirley White (2003), while being complete and valuable, suffers from the fact that "its theoretical contribution is limited. It's a book about practice rather than about theory, and doesn't provide a strong theoretical structure for its numerous case studies." (Pink 2004).

This limit is understandable, given that PV is a collection of practices that are essentially operative, and extremely situational and idiosyncratic; various experiences involving participation and video have been carried out at different times and in different places in the world, in a "*kaleidoscopic*" manner (White, 2003), and often without them knowing about the others (Huber, 1998).

Beginning from zero in this way each time makes this field even more elusive, and suggests the need for a brief introduction to an analysis of *case studies*.

By expanding a definition of Su Braden and Victor Young, we will call video participatory if it is "a collection of alternative applications of audiovisual technologies in development projects" or in projects involving social and political interventions, "whose scope is to produce social change" or individual transformation. (Braden, Young, 1998).

Some common characteristics of these applications put an emphasis on the participatory aspect of the audiovisual production process (Johansson, 1999b). Therefore, what determines the potential social impact of a video is not so much its "social" topic, as the social, collective and participatory way in which it is made. (Bery, 2003)

From a more applied viewpoint, what happens in a PV project can be described as a scriptless video process, directed by a group of grassroots people, moving forward in reiterative cycles of shooting-reviewing. This process aims at creating video narratives that communicate what those who participate in the process really want to communicate, in a way they think is appropriate. (Johansson *et al.* 1999, 35)[1]

In order to outline the possible social actions beginning from this definition, and their educational and transformative impact, I will describe some accounts and analyses of the *Fogo Process*; not only because of their pioneering character, but also because they have assumed over time a paradigmatic and canonic character.

Some other starting points could also be selected from the work on popular cinema by Cesare Zavattini

in Italy, from the construction of a network of "free filmnewspapers" (2002, :976-997), and on the experience of FAO over the years. (FAO 1987; FAO and UN 1996).

The elements of this work are particularly interesting, as allow us to understand how this field sees itself, and the *Fogo Process* itself has the analytical advantage of demonstrating some of the basic characteristics of this approach very clearly.

1.2. The Fogo process

By the *Fogo process* is meant participatory film-making in a community context, like that which took place on the island of Fogo, in the state of Newfoundland in Canada, mainly between 1967 and 1969[2]. This took place under the guidance of Don Snowden, the head of the Extension Department of the Memorial University of Newfoundland (MUN) (Extension 1972; Quarry 1984), field worker Fred Earle, who was working in the same department, and the film director Colin Low, from the Canadian National Film Board (NCFB). They made 28 brief film documentaries, seeking to create a shared vision of life on the island with the involvement of the inhabitants. (Williamson 1973; Williamson 1991).

The 28 films only lasted between 10 and 30 minutes each, but were developed enough to tell entire stories. Each film was a complete portrait of an individual person or situation, without using intercutting, and concentrated on the personality of its protagonists, rather than abstract themes. In other words, they are films based on very individual viewpoints of concrete, cross-cutting problems in a particular context.

By means of a complex process of film shows and discussions in all the villages on the island [3], a process of self-reflection and *empowerment* was developed at a local level, which had concrete results in helping their participants take their own destiny into their own hands. (Huber, 1998; Quarry 1994).

Besides this, the films were an effective means of communicating with the distant central political authorities, which were planning to transfer all the inhabitants of Fogo to more economically viable areas. For example, they were shown to the Ministry of Fisheries in Ottawa, which also used video in its reply. This originated a feedback circuit, including the local social impact of the filming, editing and projection processes, and reflection on them afterwards. As a result, the government redirected its efforts to help the islanders remain where they were. (Crocker 2003; Crocker 2008).

1.3. Feedback circuits

At the time they were made, Don Snowden commented on showing the films on the island: " Even though video will be unknown to the community, it is a technology that ordinary people can use and control, and by having the time to become familiar with it in a public setting, they may be encouraged to learn from it rather than to fear it or be mystified by it. *Its successful use involves both the screening of videotapes and discussion based on what the tapes have presented.* (my italics) [4]. (Snowden 1983)

Without the videos, local people would not have spoken in public at all, so the videos enabled them to see themselves as a community, represented by people they knew, talking the language of the island, both formally and substantially. This became a strong catalyst for discussions - not only regarding long term strategies, but also regarding small but important questions of community organisation-

The instant impact of the screenings was particularly evident at a community Council meeting in Lords' Cove (...) where playback of the meeting provided those present with an opportunity to become aware of their appalling lack of participation and apathy. As a result, the meeting was rescheduled, more people participated, and officers were re-elected [5]. (Extension 1972)

In this way a lively and empowering *Internal Feedback Circuit* was created, and the films began to circulate between the various villages. Such communication would have been difficult for the people themselves, personally, since although Fogo island was small, it had big internal religious divisions.

Through the mediation of video, the screen images of the inhabitants of one village were much more credible in other villages than their personal presence would have been.

We will use the term *Horizontal Feedback Circuit* to describe the feedback circuit developed between one community and another; that is, between human groups that were more or less equal, even if divided by obstacles of various kinds, and equally peripheral from centres of power.

We will also use the term *Horizontal Learning* to describe how community workers can show videotapes they have made with one group of people in a village to the same kind of group in another village, (...). This new form of learning is becoming increasingly acknowledged worldwide as an essential component of education, usually (but not only) among adults. People can use video to teach themselves within their own village, or between their village and others, as is increasingly happening.[6](Snowden 1983).

1.4. Feedback circuits and social action

We have therefore identified three dimensions in which this process operates:

The term *Internal Feedback Circuits* is used to describe the dialogue which film shows in Fogo began within the community, and the term *Horizontal Feedback Circuit* is used to describe the dialogue begun between different communities at the same level. Both these feedback circuits take place in contexts whose dynamics allow individuals to build up their own self confidence [7]. As a result, *therapeutic social action* may be possible to create collective self-confidence [8] as a basis for social action to *empower* the people.

Finally, we will use the term *Vertical Feedback Circuits* to describe new ways of communicating directly with centres of authority, from the periphery, that are created by this process, and which can assist in social action for *advocacy*.

This typology does not pretend to be systematic, but serves essentially as a framework for orientation. It aims to help generate new questions, and new ways of analysing phenomena based on practice, and to assess their significance within given contexts.

A problem emerges however in trying to model this process. Snowden notes that PV requires social contexts where the mass communication media have not yet penetrated in order to be effective [9]. In other words, it requires a context where the media of video is in itself unexpected, in order to be able to overcome the hydraulic closures between periphery and centre.

This is not because of any intrinsic aesthetic, communicative or emotional value, nor because of the emotional impact of any claims which may accompany it, but simply because it exists, and is unusual enough to help set up *internal* and *horizontal* feedback circuits.

In these conditions, historical factors may limit the development of feedback circuits, as well as geographical/socio-economic and cultural factors. Only very few communities by now are outside the human *semiosphere* (Lotman 1985), now globally saturated by the mass media. As a result, Bruce Lee is very popular among Palestinian children; and the *cinéma de la brousse* has shown video CDs of extremely violent US *action movies* to audiences in the African savana. This fact must be taken into account when planning a PV project in an urban context - where the dynamics noted above are even more accentuated.

It is possible however, to develop feedback circuits in contexts that are already saturated by the mass media, but it simply imposes more severe conditions because of what might happen - or in other words, it requires a real link between filmmaking and local social processes.

Two other elements also arise from these feedback circuits: the technical conquest of spatial-temporal distances, and the attribution of status. Thompson (1995, 37-39) has used the term *spaciol/temporal distancing* to describe the capacity of communication media to contract and redesign space and time, allowing the inhabitants of Fogo for example, to appeal to faraway Ottawa officials.

This is not purely technical: the islanders were using a means which was traditionally used, especially then, in the field of mediated quasi-interaction, in order to set up a mediated interaction (Thompson 1995) :122-151. This probably explains its success: it was much cheaper to send a video film, than to send the entire population of the island to Ottawa for a face-to-face audience; and the audience would probably not have been conceded.

This leads us to a second element: the use of video allows an *attribution of status* that allows the hydraulic closure between periphery and centre (Habermas 1996: 423-424) to be overcome. In the same way, horizontal feedback circuits enable media dialogues to take place between different, rival communities within the island.

What is basis of the power of audiovisual media to attribute status? In the first place, the great majority of audiovisual communication at present is *mono-directional* [10]. So, every time a mediated quasi-interaction becomes a mediated interaction, it begins from the sphere of silence that typical mono-directional communications themselves create.

In the second place, from the status of cognitive resource that audiovisual language, especially television, has obtained over the course of years (Stella 1999 :27-52.). Even after decades of denunciations, both by theorists and in common discourse, of the manipulatory and ideological ability of the mass communication media, audiovisual communication is still (and probably increasingly so) the place to validate cognitive knowledge, as well as knowledge of daily life.

Therefore, contrary to Snowden's opinion, the pervasive role of mass media at present may actually help set up feedback circuits, rather than block them, especially at a horizontal level [11].

Finally, since both the horizontal and vertical feedback circuits (and the internal feedback circuits in some cases) function as bottlenecks for the social structure (the reason why PV has been developed), PV may overcome barriers of status, geographical distance, diffidence or hostility. (zaLab, 2007).

To sum up, another new factor is that the key for the operation of this process is in the explicit link between the film-making process and social processes. This is something we have yet to understand about the Fogo process, in an era of new nomadic and superlight technologies, in which both the concepts of geographical distance and neighbourhood seem to obsolescent.

This success in Fogo was not just a result of making technology available to the islanders, but also in the way in which it was integrated into their lives. The experiments conducted at Fogo regarding the political and social use of the media, raise another question which has become still more important over time: what are the media for? Now almost anything can be represented by the media, why do we have to do it? The *Fogo Process* directs our attention towards the first and most basic problem of the politics of the media: what role can the media play in the formation of collective political structures? (Crocker, 2008)

2. Case study: an Urban Media Lab

The PV media lab which is the subject of a *case study* for this article took place in Santa Domingo, in the Dominican Republic, between 18 and 27 April 2007, within the context of the 2nd.meeting of the Popular Urban University of the International Alliance of Inhabitants (IAI).

There are two reasons for choosing this example: firstly, its extremely short duration (eight days' work) allowed me to see the method of working, including its advantages and drawbacks, very clearly, and to make a shorter report. Also, its urban dimension was very relevant, which therefore very effectively showed up its possibilities and risks.

I will introduce it analytically, and then gradually describe its development, not only to make my account easier to understand, but also to include points for further reflection and concrete operating indications.

2.1. Context and background

The International Alliance of Inhabitants (IAI) (www.habitants.org) is a unitary space that was set up in 2003 for urban social associations and movements. Since then, more than 200 organisations from more than 30 countries have joined. Its aim is to allow the exchange of experiences, the elaboration of common strategies, and the organisation of global solidarity campaigns such as the Zero Evictions campaign.

This network is promoting the *Popular Urban University* (<http://up.opencontent.it/cdiai/>): a process of organising meetings for training and research, that is open, participatory and organised from the base upwards, and is aimed at community leaders and activists in the struggle for the right to a home, and in the social construction of habitats.

In parallel with the 2nd. Meeting of the UPU, [12] a PV Media Lab was organised for Dominican participants.

The Meeting in itself immediately gave a fairly clear direction to the collective work, based on the requests, needs and expectations of the participants, who wanted their militancy to have an immediate impact on the *Desalojos Cero* (*Zero Evictions*) campaign now taking place. This global campaign is particularly important in the Dominican Republic, and especially in the city of Santo Domingo, whose population is undergoing a phase of violent evictions of entire communities. These evictions, which are often illegal, have finished with the destruction of former homes.

2.2. Participants

18 people participated in the Media Lab, divided into two groups. This was more people than the trainers anticipated, because each organisation belonging to the network now being constructed in the Dominican Republic sent a representative. As a result, labour unionists, priests, young university researchers, representatives of citizens' committees such as *Uprobrisas* and the *Junta de Vecinos* from Los Angeles [13], and organised networks like *Codecoc* and *Conamuca* were present.

This extremely varied social composition did not impair the PV Media Lab's unity or motivation. It involved both men and women from the age of 20 to 65, with various skills and social capital – a capital which didn't exist as such before it began – who were held together by their common activism in the struggle for the right to a home. Also, all of them were representing wider groups, whether of a political or communitarian nature.

In this context, *Us* counted more than *I*, and the *Is* were automatically part of the *Us*, which was experienced as very near, and involving all of the person, and not just individual interests or political positions.

The training was carried out in the Spanish language.

2.3. The development of the Media Lab

2.3.1. Plenary section

18 April – plenary: beginning the taller

After a preliminary introduction to the programme, "*Under the Same Roof*" (zaLab, 2006): a video from a previous PV media lab in Palestine, was shown, and discussed in depth together.

Then the video equipment was presented by organising videos of interviews of some of those present by other participants (Lunch and Lunch 2006). Their were only two questions raised, relating to self-presentation, and the need to wait for the outcome of the collective work. Then we watched these videos and discussed them. Then the participants definitely decided on the programme, bearing in mind their own expectations.

The Media Lab was then divided into two groups, on the basis of the participants' logistic

requirements. One group worked in the morning, and the other in the afternoon. Each group began by discussing what subjects they wanted to film. In a final plenary session, the two groups discussed and commented on the subjects together.

The morning group worked on the topic of street children (a problem which they were very aware of, but not actually in contact with). In this context, PV was seen as an instrument to explore the surrounding social context. The afternoon group worked on evictions (a topic which directly involved many of the participants. In this context, PV was seen as an instrument for telling their stories and **developing a single viewpoint/ accedere ad una voce ?**).

The more technical aspect of training to film was confronted by " guiding" the participants while they experimented directly with the video equipment, and the essentials of this were dealt during the first day's work. After a little film making theory, which introduced the concepts of the **camera shot/campo? off-screen, and the /range of camera views/scala dei piani?** , we passed on to simple video exercises in composition and narration, which we then watched and discussed.

In a second session, there was a basic training in using the tripod, as well as exercises with a moving camera, and with moving subjects.

2.3.2. Film group tasks in the mornings (*Los niños del sol*)

19 April: film subjects

After the technical training as described above, film subjects and their treatment were discussed. This stage generally lasts several days, given that most people have little experience of thinking consensually in social terms about film making. We decided that the street children should have a central role, instead of other potentially interesting subjects such as other children or adults representing mothers and fathers; which we would then interview, and observe in their daily life.

The analytical framework was based on an interview with a Salesian priest who managed a children's centre in the Cristo Rey area. We then discussed at length what kind of questions to ask children, what kind of working relations we could develop with them, and how to set these up initially.

20 April - First day's filming- the children

Training in camerawork and filming.

After a rapid revision of the theoretical and practical elements of the first day, a demonstration troupe was formed to practice organising and using the materials, organising the work, and the production administration.

The first interview, with a boy called Manuel, suffered from a lack of preparation time. We therefore overlooked the importance of social relations with the subject, who was answering the questions while he was cleaning the interviewer's shoes! Although Manuel earned his living cleaning shoes and wanted to describe his job, this hierarchical type of situation was confirmed by the tenor of the questions: "*What do you think of the children's problems?*" (answer: "*You tell me !*")

Little of this video interview could be used, and it was certainly ineffective as a means of transforming a situation we wanted to change. We learned from this experience, and after discussing it at length, a second interview went much better.

21 April - second day's filming: morning- interview al cura

This interview was of a different type to we had made with the children, and was simply informative rather than narrating life stories. We had begun to think differently about the impact that the video camera and our work would have, and so were able to draft a more convincing film schedule. This much simpler interview went much better.

22 April -first day's editing

After overcoming frequent power cuts and related problems with the informatics, the basic essentials of the editing software programme were introduced. During the course of various exercises, some strong differences within the group emerged regarding their level of understanding of informatics.

Some of the group had never used a computer, and learning the editing programme is really complicated. This polarised the group, and created some tension between the participants. We managed however to make a schedule of the camerawork for the interviews with the children.

23 April - morning

As most of the group were absent at a visit organised by UPU, the work could then be shared out much more effectively between only two participants. There was considerable creative tension as a result.

For practice, we worked on the interview with a priest, discussing in depth the opinions expressed. By cutting out material that seemed less useful, we managed with difficulty to reduce the video to only eleven minutes.

24 April - morning

As a video of the plenary session of the UPU was to be shown in the afternoon, this was edited as part of the morning's work, and the rest of the group was introduced to the work that had been done on the previous morning.

But there was no electrical light. Usually it comes back on again at about ten, but not today, so we transferred our work to the university. In less than two hours, the trainer finished the editing, with the group around him looking on and listening as he explained what he was doing. There wasn't always time to discuss all of the editing choices, but despite this vertical technical dynamic, there was a great amount of emotional participation and creative tension in the group.

2.3.3. Directions // the afternoon group: (Desalojos cero)

19 April - afternoon

After some technical training and exercises, our work was interrupted by a university student demonstration against an increase in public transport fares.

Only enough time remained to meet some of the people coming from the local areas affected by massive evictions, and to arrange for possible witnesses, including a very brief discussion on the tone of the interviews to be carried out.

20 April - afternoon, Valiente (Boca Chica)

We met for a visit to Barrio di Valiente (Boca Chica), organised by the UPU. We only discovered when we arrived however, that we had no witnesses or contacts from the local area concerned.

Not wanting to waste our time, we practised camera work instead (moving the camera, techniques for handheld cameras). The local inhabitants of Barrio reacted negatively, and the members of the group were obliged to introduce themselves and to explain what they were doing.

We discussed the impact of the video filming together, taking this opportunity to investigate problems in more depth, and to get to know each other socially. We also rediscussed both the subject and the organisation of the interviews.

21 April - afternoon, filming at Villa Esfuerzo and Brisa de l'Este

Our first interview was at Villa Esfuerzo, where one of the video group came from. Our welcome there was very dignified and emotional, and we really felt we were in the midst of a community whose members would narrate their own lives. Many local people participated, and really appreciated the videos we had made.

After this welcome for the film troupe by lots of local people, Jazmin was chosen to testify after a collective discussion in the community. Some stayed to listen to the interview, and others left. They not only trusted her as a witness, but also the equipment assembled around her, to help her tell her story,

Another two interviews took place at Brisa de l'Este, in a much less formal situation.

22 April – afternoon, filming and discussions

Technical problems compelled us to work without the computer, and so we watched the interviews again, and decided how to edit them while we were discussing them. We decided to base the editing on the account of a leading personality: Jazmin, from Villa Esfuerzo, instead of basing it on a chronological reconstruction with other techniques (subject matter, flash forward, in blocks).

23 April – afternoon: editing

With the entire group, we introduced the editing programme. During the first set of exercises it was obvious that there wouldn't be enough time. The question of computer literacy emerged again. The trainer halted the training session, and began the editing himself. The group acted as a collective director: giving instructions and discussing possible alternatives.

2.3.4. The films produced and presented:

Desalojos Cero, 8', miniDV, Italy-Domenican Republic, colour, 2007

Jazmin, from the Villa Esfuerzo area, together with Candida and Cristina from the Brisa dell'Este area of the city of S. Domingo, described how they had been evicted. We saw how their houses had been destroyed, and how they continued to live in huts that they had erected on their own plots of land.

Los niños del sol, 8', miniDV, Italy-Domenican Republic, colour, 2007

The video shows a day in the life of Miguel, a boy who earns his living cleaning shoes; along with the edited interview with the priest who runs the children's centre in the Cristo Rey area of S. Domingo.

The film was presented on two occasions. The first time, we showed the two films that concluded UPU's work. The discussion that followed was mostly about the videos' contents, including the group's emotional reactions. When we tried to guide the discussion on to the working method, the main feedback was about the problems and potentials of getting such a big and diverse group to agree.

In general, the participants were seen as new video troupe available according to the needs of the struggle. Two days later, there was a film show at Villa Esfuerzo, it was presented to the community.

In this discussion I have intentionally included the highs and lows of the work when presenting the case study, as an example of good didactic practice.

Before concluding, I should explain that I have omitted to analyse in detail the more obvious elements – such as, for instance, the drawbacks of having too many participants, and of the breaks in our work, on the group's overall understanding of the technical, narrative and social processes. Also, I would like to note in passing that I couldn't find out how the videos were distributed after I left the Dominican Republic, so I can't describe the important question of their impact on the local public domain.

I would like to concentrate instead on two elements that can be generalised: the composition of the group and the dichotomy between the metropolitan and community dimensions.

3. Conclusions. PV, Urban Context, Community Dimension

3.1. The composition of the group

Working with a group composed of community leaders from so many different backgrounds had more

drawbacks than advantages. To begin with, too much time and energy was dedicated to bringing the group together, and its widely differing opinions made discussions tiring and sometimes tense. At a deeper level, it was impossible to work on the group's identity and needs. These are a fundamental aspect of training and the only possible guarantee of continuity; which in this case was basically absent.

Finally, the large difference in skills within the group -especially with respect to computer literacy - led to a certain polarisation inside it, which exposed a large gap in power, even if this never actually became conflictual. Similar general problems regarding the members' unequal knowledge and power were encountered during the editing work.

These differences were fundamental as they made it impossible to develop any continuity following the training activities. They also meant we had to be careful, since the time available was too short. It was probably better to entrust the editing work to the trainer, in order to avoid worsening the imbalance in power relations and causing more personal frustrations.

In general, I can recommend that the group of participants in a PV course should be as homogenous as possible in order to optimise their opportunities for training and personal development. Also, that the group should possibly be formed before the training course begins. This can also guarantee better continuity, by allowing a collective to be formed that can assume ownership of the video equipment.

[14]

This is even truer in an urban context, where centrifugal forces subject any type of social group to pressures and dispersion. This leads me on to the second point.

3.2. The urban dimension // The community dimension

Urban environments are not the best for a PV media lab; usually for the "classic" reason that video has a much greater impact in rural environments. This factor however can be reversed, as was described in section 1.3 above.

What is probably a more important reason is that in cities, which people and social groups should tell their stories, and who they should tell them to, is more difficult to identify. In a vast sea of citizens, the PV approach probably only works when the social context resembles an island; for example those communities of various sizes that are parts of cities, but at the same time separate from them.

That's what happened at "Desalojos Cero", and in particular in the community of Villa Esfuerzo, where the narration became organic, and was really shared, without losing its complexity, or the multiple publics that can typically be reached in an urban context.

To return however to the little understood social category of street children, as in the case of the "Ninos del Sol" with their varied backgrounds, there was a clear danger of disaster with this type of subject. At best, one may learn, as we did, how not to confront the problem, and then to begin to think about how we could treat it. In the training of urban leaders, this is perhaps a significant result.

4. Bibliographies

Braden, Su and Thi Thien Huong Than. 1998. *Video for Development. A casebook for Vietnam*. Oxford - London: Oxfam Press.

Chambers, Robert. 2003. *Participatory Workshops - a sourcebook of 21 sets of ideas and activities*. London: Earthscan.

Clive Robertson and Jackie Shaw. 1997. *Participatory Video: A Practical Approach to Using Video Creatively in Group Developmental Work*. London: Routledge.

Crocker, Stephen. 2003. "The Fogo Process: Participatory Communication in a Globalizing World." in *Participatory video: Images that transform and Empower*, edited by S. White. London: Sage.

- . 2008. "Filmmaking and the Politics of Remoteness: The Genesis of the Fogo Process on Fogo Island, Newfoundland." *Shima: The International Journal of Research into Island Cultures* 2:59-75.
- Extension, Department of. 1972. "Fogo Process in Communication: A reflection on the use of film and video-tape in community development." Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's. Fairbairn.
- FAO. 1987. "A rural communication system for development in Mexico's tropical lowlands." *Development communication case study*.
- FAO and UN. 1996. "Communication for Rural Development in Mexico." in *Available online at the Communication Initiative Website*.
- Ferriera, George. 2006. "Pelican case study: Participatory video in the policy making process: the Keewaytinook-Okimakanak case study." University of Guelph, Canada.
- Gilbert, Bruce. s.d., "Speaking of Fish. Exploring the use of Popular Education in Rural Newfoundland." www.ryakuga.org/library/fish.html Retrieved 15.05, 2006.
- Gonzalo Olmos and Marcelo Ramella. 2005. "Participant Authored Audiovisual Stories (PAAS): Giving the Camera Away or giving the camera a way?" *Papers in Social Research methods, qualitative series* London School of Economics.
- Habermas, Jurgen. 1996. *Fatti e norme. Contributi ad una teoria discorsiva del diritto e della democrazia*. Milano: Guerini e Associati.
- Lotman, Juri. 1985. *La semiosfera. L'asimmetria e il dialogo nelle strutture pensanti*. Venezia: Marsilio.
- Lunch, Chris. 2004. "Participatory Video: Rural People Document their Knowledge and Innovations." *IK Notes, The World Bank Group*.
- Lunch, Nick and Chris,. 2006. *Insight into participatory video*. Oxford: Insight.
- Molony, Tegan, Zeze Zonie, and Lauren Goodsmith. 2007. "Through Our Eyes: Participatory Video in West Africa." *Forced Migration Review* 27:37-38.
- Odutola, Kole Ade. 2003. "Participatory use of Video: A case study of community involvement in story construction." *Global Media Journal* 2.
- Pink, Sarah. 2004. "S. White (ed.) Participatory video: Images that Transform and Empower (review)." *European Journal of Communication* 19:411-412.
- Quarry, Wendy. 1984. "The Fogo Process: An Interview with Don Snowden." *Interactions* 2:28-63.
- . 1994. "The Fogo Process: An Experiment in Participatory Communication." University of Guelph.
- Riaño, Pilar. 1994. "Women in grassroots communications: furthering the social change." Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rose, Kalima. 1992. *Where women are leaders: The SEWA movement in India*. New Dehli: Vistaar Publications.
- Snowden, Donald. 1983. "Eyes see; ears hear." Memorial University, St. John, Newfoundland, Canada.
- Stella, Renato. 1999. *Box Populi. Il sapere ed il fare della neotelevisione*. Roma: Donzelli.
- Thompson, John B. 1995. *The Media and Modernity. A Social Theory of the Media*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- White, Shirley A.. 2003. *Participatory Video: Images That Transform and Empower*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Dehli: Sage.
- Williamson, Anthony. 1973. "The Fogo process. User-oriented communication systems and social development. The Canadian experience." in *UNESCO meeting on the planning and management of new communication systems*. Paris.

—. 1991. "The Fogo Process: Development Support Communications in Canada and the Developing World." in *Communication in Development*, edited by F. Casmir. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

zaLab, Aut. Coll. ;, (Stefano Collizzolli, Andrea Segre, and Alberto Bougleux). 2006. "Zavattini digitale: dai cinegiornali liberi al video partecipativo." *Quaderni del CSCI, IIC, Barcelona 2*.

zaLab, Aut. Coll.;, (Stefano Collizzolli, Andrea Segre, and Alberto Bougleux). 2007. "Gli occhi non accreditati." Pp. 123-135 in *Lavorare con la diversità culturale*, edited by A. Surian. Trento: Eriksson.

[1] A process of directly making videos without pre-arranged screenplays by grassroots organisations. The work is developed in a repetitive cyclic process of filming and viewing the images, in order to create audiovisual narratives that can express what participants in the process really want to communicate, in a way that seems adequate to them (Johansson *et al.*, 1999, 35)

[2] The process was actually set in motion previously with the appointment of Fred Earle by the MUN Extension Department, as a *field worker* on the island, a post he kept throughout the early 1970s.

[3] The videos attracted the attention of those present, and stimulated discussions that Earle had earlier found very difficult to organise. There were many during the course of the first year's video work: 35 different showings, with a total public estimated at around 3,000 people (out of 5,000 inhabitants).

[4] Although making videos was unknown to this community, it is however a technology that ordinary people are familiar with and can control. If they have the time to familiarise themselves with it in a public context, they can be encouraged to learn from this experience, and not to be afraid of it or to be mystified by it. To be successful, the video cassette must be shown, and its contents discussed.

[5] The instant impact that showing the videos can produce was demonstrated at a community meeting at Lords' Cove, where the playback of the meeting gave an opportunity to those present to become aware of their apathy and frightening lack of participation. As a result of this *realization*, another meeting was held at a later date, which many more people attended, and elected new officers.

[6] Something else that the *community worker* can do, is to show the video that has been made in one village to a similar group of people in another village. The videos (...) then become a new vehicle of learning - known as *Horizontal Learning* - which is more and more accepted throughout the world as an essential component of adult education at least. People living in rural villages can use video to communicate with each other in turn; either within the same village or between their own village and others; which is increasingly happening today in fact.

[7] In particular, in the internal feedback circuits.

[8] As much in *internal feedback circuits*, as in the *horizontal feedback circuits*.

[9] The techniques described here to orient the community worker's use of video with village people are primarily for audiences that are illiterate and uneducated. (Snowden, 1983)

[10] Despite the enormous growth in the diffusion of audiovisual technology today, since the days of the *Fogo process*, it seems to me that video is still above all a mono-directional means of communication, even if forms of spontaneous dialogue have been developed in mainstream video channels (e.g. the audiovisual *threads* for replying in sequence to many video clips downloaded on youtube),

[11] However, there's an obvious need to go beyond using the video as a mirror, and instead, after the initial stages, to develop an understanding the impact the audiovisual text can have on mainstream media channels.

[12] About forty leaders from working class areas, and assistants coming from Argentina, Bolivia, El Salvador, Haiti, Mexico, Peru, Puerto Rico, Italy, United Kingdom, Venezuela and the Dominican

Republic took part in the days of training. . This meeting was organised with the collaboration of the Department of Urban Studies at the *Independent University of S.Domingo* (UASD) and the main Dominican representative of the Network: *Coophabitat*: <http://it.habitants.org/article/view/1875/>. can be consulted for more details.

[13] Brisa del Este and Villa Esfuerzo are two suburbs of Santo Domingo; the inhabitants of the first area had suffered a violent eviction, and inhabitants of the second area were occupying their land.

[14] Which in this case became the property of COOPHABITAT: the association which coordinated the network,