

Matt Cheung

Professor Mary Hays

RHET 105

30 September 2015

### Traditions Behind Chief Illiniwek

Many controversies become muddled with emotion and opinions. Jay Rosenstein captured the essence of the conflict between the University of Illinois and Charlene Teters through his documentary, *In Whose Honor*. Through strong editing and directing choices, Rosenstein demonstrated the strong beliefs that both perspectives held. In addition to editing and director's choices, the acting, music score, and cinematography helped ease the audience into understanding the difficult subject matter.

The editing done by Rosenstein greatly assisted the audience in understanding the relevance of the topics discussed. To help the audience understand the Teter's contrasting opinions toward Chief Illiniwek, Rosenstein chose to overlay Teter's comments with Chief Illiniwek performance. In one of her interviews, Teter mentioned her admiration towards Chief Illiniwek headress was met with conflicting opinions towards Chief Illiniwek's dance (*In Whose Honor*). Following that statement, a brief video of Chief Illiniwek dancing was shown (*In Whose Honor*). This overlay helped the audience understand the degree of accuracy behind Chief Illiniwek's costume and the offensive nature of the imitational dance.

Rosenstein's directing choices created a documentary that focuses directly on the inception and progression of the Chief Illiniwek controversy. A large part of the film is dedicated towards informing the audience on the offense that Teter took from Chief Illiniwek and the

progression of Teter's protest (In Whose Honor). By doing so, a deeper understanding of the roots of issue is shown to the viewers. Rosenstein also chose to provide a rebuttal to both sides of the argument. Rosenstein often used a "back and forth" style which left an impression of debate (In Whose Honor). Such style greatly enhanced the understanding of both opinions through parallels. Audience members understood the paralleling respect for tradition valued by both sides through this back and forth style. The only issue I found with the editing is the cliché nature of the use of newspapers to symbolize progression and the abuse of fading screens to transition between frames (In Whose Honor).

Many other film tools assisted in the creation of such a stellar documentary. The acting found in the documentary was very natural and believable. Real raw emotions are displayed throughout the whole film. Teter's tears towards the abuse of her culture appealed strongly to the pathos of the audience (In Whose Honor). The music score help mold the environment perfectly. The slow tempo and crescendos used by Rosentein during description of the history of Native American culture created a sense of respect and empathy. While a much more uplifting and faster paced guitar sound track was often used to symbolize progression in the protesting movement (In Whose Line). The cinematography of this documentary primarily focused on the Ken Burns effect. The documentary panned across multiple historical pictures in attempt to animate them (In Whose Line). The video would pan across the faces of all the supporters as the narrator mention the admiration for Chief Illiniwek (In Whose Honor). This effect help audience members understand the focal point of each picture.

Ultimately, Rosenstein was able to create a masterpiece documentary that provided insightful information on the different perspectives behind the controversy of Chief Illiniwek.

Though not completely perfect, the documentary was able to satisfy my curiosity behind the controversy in an accessible manner.

Works Cited

*In Whose Honor?* Dir. Jay Rosenstein. New Day Films, 1997. DVD.