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Abstract

The thesis examines the way that different agents, organisations and institutions intervene in the cinema practice of South America. Using Argentina, Bolivia, Chile and Peru as case studies, the thesis outlines the way state and institutional organisations, commercial bodies, international interests and alternative practices have converged, even with individual discrepancies, to develop a national and regional cinematic culture at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Practices from funding and production through to distribution and exhibition are investigated in order to provide an overview of the most significant factors shaping the way cinematic culture currently operates in the region.

I argue that on the one hand, state-run initiatives (heritage drives, film councils, cinematecas, anti-piracy enforcement) attempt to reterritorialize cinema practice and create a national context for films. On the other hand, commercial bodies, international organisations and alternative practices frequently complicate or deterritorialize cinematic culture. Their various actions have an effect on the types of films that are circulated and disseminated amongst publics on the continent and in the global sphere. The complex relations between these intervening interests mean that cinematic culture is determined by various conflicting ownership claims. Furthermore, the way in which which some organisations and practices gain strength over others determines the type of access that local publics have to films and that which filmmakers have to audiences.

The findings in this thesis are drawn from extensive field-work in the region and are supported by theoretical frameworks and paradigms that are relevant to the study of cinematic culture. I have made use of published literature from text books, press articles, and official websites documenting various aspects of cinematic culture in South America to literature documenting a global film context that has relevance to my field of study. Participant-observation techniques and interviews with practitioners in the region have provided me with grounded, primary-research material, while trade reports citing statistical evidence such as production figures, box office data and investments in funding have strengthened my findings.
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Introduction

By the beginning of the twenty-first century, cheap DVDs had become ubiquitous, multiplexes had widened the scope and variety of material they were screening and film festivals were increasing their presence across the annual calendar. There had, apparently, never been a better time to engage with ‘world’ cinema. Why then, could I not encounter any South American films? A handful would appear amongst film festival catalogues or in special programs but these were few and far between. When living in South America between 2004 and 2005 I experienced the wide spectrum of cinematic works emerging from the continent’s diverse peoples and socio-cultural makeup. I also realised that film funding and production was increasing. Nonetheless, it was clear that problems of exhibition and distribution remained. Movie-theatres on the continent were saturated with foreign products and many promising directors were struggling to get their second, let alone third or fourth, film made. Governmental bodies were frequently celebrating national achievement in filmmaking but local audiences remained without access to the cinema of the region. At times films travelled abroad but this did not always lead to significant gains for the cinematic activity back home. I realised it was not simply a question of why this was the case but a deeper question of who were the main contributors and what were the main activities that were shaping this situation.

The features of contemporary South American cinematic culture mentioned above are not systematic processes that work in a vacuum but are instead the result of intervention from agents working in interlinking fields. From the initial stages of production through to exhibition and later stages of distribution and conservation, various interests are at work. These range from commercial investments in this high-cost area to cultural investments in creating, adding to and maintaining an artistic heritage. By understanding cinematic culture through this perspective, my focus is not simply on a body of cultural products or the practice of film-viewing, but is instead a look at the manner by which a collective notion of cinematic activity is given meaning by a wide variety of perspectives and interests. More precisely, cinematic culture is formed through the way in which cinematic activities operate in relation to particular locations and socio-cultural moments. Yet these are complex relations as cinematic
culture is both highly localised, with viewing often taking place amongst a relatively small number of spectators in a fixed site, and highly globalised as film products travel routes of transnational distribution. Contemporary activity is also the result of specific historical processes that have brought cinematic culture in South America to its present position. Although there is not one agent or organisation that controls the way in which these elements come together, a central question can be asked which is: who has ownership of South American cinematic culture? Is it the practitioners who produce the cinematic works; is it the distributors and exhibitors who determine the way the films may circulate; or is it the audiences who decide how and when to engage with the material they receive? These questions raise subsidiary questions such as how do organisations and persons intersect and compete when trying to gain a hold on cinematic culture; what kinds of access to local cinematic culture are South American publics allowed; and which discourses and conditions are applied when various agents and organisations have an input into South American cinema practice?

By choosing to examine South American cinematic culture in this way I am not seeking to deny the importance of the individual cinematic text, but I would like to argue that there is a need for an overview of the region to more fully appreciate the way in which films become part of a living culture. For this reason I plan to tie together the multiple and interlinking factors that constitute and continuously develop cinematic culture. As will be outlined in the first chapter, there are many excellent studies on various aspects of South American cinema but these have traditionally involved a focus on individual texts or historical moments and there has not yet been an investigation into the multiple interests that affect cinematic culture in the twenty-first century. Often these studies draw upon the wider region of Latin America but I have specifically chosen to narrow the focus to South America as this area is bordered industrially by the trade bloc Mercosur and has shared cultural traits that are not always available in Central America or the Caribbean. I will be drawing on the extensive research in the field of Latin American film studies (and will try to make it clear whenever possible whether it refers to South America or Latin America) but will be complementing it by using significant studies into national and transnational cinema, cultural policy, commercial interest, new technology and indigenous media, to bring to light the complex processes that are currently in operation. These areas of interest provide an initial framework from which I will develop an understanding of
the contemporary South American cinematic culture that I uncovered in the empirical findings of my field work. In Chapter Two I will be discussing the exact methodologies that I have used for this fieldwork but it is worth mentioning at this point that it is these findings which allow me to give concrete details in support of the claims that I will develop throughout the thesis.

Although the claims I will be making about the way in which cinematic culture functions in the region can be applied to South America as a whole, I have selected a small number of countries for analysis so that clear case studies can emerge. The countries of focus are Argentina, Bolivia, Chile and Peru as they form a group that spatially border each other, share similar languages (including the dominant language Spanish), and have a number of shared policies and agreements. It would be impossible to separate out their cinematic practices and analyse them country by country as there is such a wide amount of overlapping and shared tendencies. However, they do have some distinct attributes and for this reason the following paragraphs include a brief overview of the characteristics, practices and bodies at work in each country to allow for a quick comparison and reference guide.

**Argentina (population: 39.9 million)**

*Film Industry:* Of the four countries under study, Argentina has the most established film industry with a history of sustained production and strong national distribution. It had a successful ‘classical’ period throughout the 1930s and 1940s and although it suffered under a number of repressive military dictatorships there has always been a substantial annual output of films. It was a key player in the New Latin American Cinema movement of the 1960s and 70s and found success with what was called the New Argentine Cinema wave of the 1990s. It has two strong film festivals, the Buenos Aires Independent Film Festival and the Mar del Plata International Film Festival in which commercial, independent and experimental Argentine films are exhibited. There are various film schools, particularly in Buenos Aires, that offer training in film production and aspects of the industry. 74 national films were premiered in 2006 yet it has to be recognised that only a small number of these gained critical and public attention with 8 films gaining 86% of the box-office receipts for national films. Like many countries, US dominance exists at the box-office with an
83% share going to North American films in 2006.¹ There are increasing numbers of multiplexes, particularly in western-style shopping malls, and the majority of these exhibit a small number of national films. Many larger bookshops and record stores sell Argentine DVDs alongside US films and other world cinema works.

State Support: The state-funded National Institute of Cinema and Audiovisual Arts (INCAA) is long established and highly visible in Argentina. It offers support to producers and filmmakers as well as runs festivals and events to promote Argentine cinema. Although some films are made independently of INCAA the majority of commercial and international successes are produced with some aspect of support from this institution. INCAA helps to uphold and regulate the country’s cinema law and runs a number of cinemas aimed specifically at exhibiting national films and other Latin American or arthouse works.

Independent Production and Distribution: There are a number of politically-motivated grass roots organisations that show film screenings to local communities. They normally operate out of non-commercial or illegal spaces and have strong links to documentary and experimental filmmakers in Argentina and in other Latin American countries. Other non-commercial but established cultural centres, particularly in Buenos Aires, run programs of Latin American or Argentine film. Although piracy is illegal there are still a number of regular stalls and markets where it is easy to obtain pirate copies of both international and national films.

Bolivia (population: 8.9 million)

Film Industry: Bolivia is one of the least economically developed countries in South America and the film industry reflects this in the lack of resources and funds available for filmmaking. It played a substantial part in the New Latin American Cinema movement, mainly through the work of Jorge Sanjines in the 1960s and 1970s, but has never had a sustained commercial film industry. There has, however, been increased production in the last few years with four or five films produced annually and in 2006 Quien mato a la llamita blanca (2006) broke all previous box-office records to become the most successful national film on record. Large numbers of the population

claim indigenous/Andean heritage and this is reflected in the identity and non-Spanish language used in many films. A small number of film schools exist that provide training not just in La Paz but in Santa Cruz and Cochabamba as well. There is a relatively small number of movie-theatres in Bolivia meaning that there are few spaces for exhibiting national films. As opportunities to work on 35mm are rare, many filmmakers are making use of cheap digital technology for film production.

State Support: Conacine Bolivia is the state-funded national film institute and provides support in both the promotion of a national film industry and the regulation of the country’s cinema law. It has funds available to support film projects and the majority of films produced in Bolivia are made with some type of support from the institute though funds are very limited and dependent upon the repayment of funds following commercial success. There is also a national cinemateca that, although officially a private organisation relying on donations and philanthropic support, is the legal depository for all works filmed within Bolivia. It provides an important role in supporting contemporary national film through festivals and screenings as well as preserving the heritage of national film. The cinema law does support a screening quota system by which movie-theatres are obliged to exhibit a number of national films but there has not been any success in implementing or making use of the quota system.

Independent Production and Distribution: There are a number of independent video makers making use of cheap technology to film shorts and documentaries but there is little space for exhibition of their work although cultural centres such as the Alianza-Frances run festivals and programs that allow national and independent works to be screened. Piracy is prevalent to the extent that it is not commercially viable for stores to stock DVDs as cheap pirate copies can be bought for a fraction of the price on almost any street corner. Although the majority of pirate DVDs are copies of US films, it is common for national films to be available on the street during their cinema run.

Chile (population: 16.4 million)

Film Industry: Chile is the most economically stable of the countries under study yet has not had a sustained film industry. This is mainly due to the severe censorship and constrictions placed on the film industry during the Pinochet dictatorship (1973-1990).
Although Chile hosted the Viña del Mar festival in the 1960s that announced the political drive of the New Latin American Cinema Movement, the majority of Chilean filmmakers were forced into exile with the onset of the dictatorship and this led to the production of Chilean cinema outside of the national industry. In recent years there has been increased production, concurrent with the reopening of film departments in the major universities (that were closed by the dictatorship) and this led to around 12 national productions annually in 2005 and 2006. There are increasing numbers of multiplex cinemas in western-style shopping malls and Chilean films can gain limited distribution in these cinemas around the country. There are few older films released for sale on DVD but stores are beginning to stock contemporary Chilean films.

State Support: The National Council for Culture and Arts was divided into subsections in 2005 and this led to the creation of the Consejo del Arte y La Industria Audiovisual (CALA) that regulates and provides support for all audiovisual production in Chile. Cinema is seen as a key part of audiovisual production and is supported by laws to promote production and dissemination. The new audiovisual council brought together funds from various bodies such as the business orientated Corporación de Fomento de la Producción (CORFO) and Pro-Chile that had previously provided different levels of support. In 2007 the national cinematheca was opened with the main aims of preserving cinematic heritage and providing exhibition space. One of its most important tasks is to reclaim archive material as large amounts of film were destroyed by the dictatorship or stored in hiding or overseas.

Independent Production and Distribution: Almost all films produced in Chile gain the support of the National Council yet the proliferation of new film schools means that some independent and experimental films are made. There are also film groups working from indigenous communities, such as the Mapuche groups in the South, to make politically orientated documentaries. Culture centres and universities provide spaces for screening national films and other arthouse works. Piracy is far less prolific than in other South American countries yet it is still relatively easy to buy copies of contemporary national films through illegal street vendors.

Peru (population: 28.7 million)
**Film Industry:** Peru has had problematic political and economic development which is reflected in the lack of resources and funds available to filmmakers. There have, however, been a small number of films produced each year from the 1970s with many of these being made as coproductions. Each year, increasing numbers of shopping malls are built with movie-theatres attached yet there are still large rural areas with no access to the cinema and populations that do not speak Spanish as a native language. US films tend to dominate the cinema screens but some national productions manage to find exhibition in these spaces. At the same time, it is rare to find other Latin American films exhibited in this country.

**State Support:** Conacine Peru was created along with a new cinema law in 1994 to support and regulate the Peruvian film industry. Although there is a legal mandate for the state to support cinema production and to create a national cinemateca and library relating to national cinema, the government repeatedly fails to provide the funds that are promised within legislation. In 2008, the film council announced that it was going to consolidate Peruvian film archives in the Mueso Nacional but it acknowledged this was going to be a lengthy task.

**Independent Production and Distribution:** There are grassroots organisations, frequently with a political imperative, working to create independent productions, mainly documentaries. These groups often work in rural areas and with indigenous communities, with the aim of screening films as part of an education project. Filmmakers tend to rely on culture centres and universities in Lima to screen copies of national films and provide programs of Latin American work. Piracy is extremely prolific with established markets and stores selling pirate copies yet it is still possible to buy some legal DVDs in upmarket stores in urban areas such as Lima.

Although it is clear from this account that there are national specificities in the cinematic culture of each country, overlap between practices and activities does take place. It is within this context that these countries can be brought together. Analysis of their cinematic culture can then be separated into the four major competing and complementary interventions at work in the region. Each of these interventions plays a part in using one or more of the practices of production, distribution and exhibition.
to develop South American cinematic culture and will form the basis for each of the remaining chapters: Three to Six.

Chapter Three introduces the first of these interventions and examines *state and institutional involvement* in constructing cinematic culture. It takes into consideration the fact that transnational practices and global circulation do of course move cinematic texts beyond country borders yet there are very important state interventions at the level of production and exhibition that have an affect on the way in which cinematic culture is created and experienced. In Section One, an analysis of the construction or reaffirmation of cinema laws in recent years highlights increased levels of state intervention in contrast to other industries in which products are allowed de-regulated circulation through free-trade networks. It is an examination of the specific legal conditions in which cinema is produced as well as the way in which various types of cinema are prioritised and promoted through state legislation. While the first section deals with these factors in regards to contemporary production, the second section moves beyond this to study the way in which state institutions, and other organisations endorsed by the state, develop an historical trajectory through their emphasis on cinematic heritage and the nation’s cinematic past. Building on these points, Section Three uncovers the way in which the interventions of the state in cinematic culture happen simultaneously at a national level, with funds and support being given to projects that can be bordered or understood within national boundaries, and at a greater regional level as the countries form networks with other South American countries. This is an examination of the way in which regional identity is negotiated by nation states that have a degree of self interest in retaining and reterritorializing national heritage and cinematic production but can also benefit culturally and economically from reciprocal programs. Complementing this focus, the final section explores how the state can fully incorporate the diversity of its own nation, taking into account the varied identities and communities that come together in creating a shared cinematic culture. This section raises questions such as whether it is possible for peripheral subjects to be encompassed by types of cultural policy that are working as much to sustain a commercial industry as to promote cultural practices. This is particularly pertinent in the South American countries under study as there are many indigenous communities who are marginalised by mainstream cultural practice even though they have a history of contributing to national heritage. Each of the above
mentioned aspects is thus scrutinised to understand how contemporary state practices negotiate and develop aspects of cinematic culture, with priority given to certain national formations.

In the fourth chapter it is the role of the *commercial industry*, its impact and its interests that are investigated. With the understanding in mind that a cinematic text needs to be seen in order to enter into cinematic culture, this is an investigation of the various forces at work in allowing a cinematic text, or a body of cinematic texts, to gain circulation and thus form part of a living culture. For this reason in Section One, the workings of both distributors and sales agents are taken into consideration to see who has authority over distribution and exhibition in the region. It is also important to analyse different exhibition sites to see the way in which cinematic culture is not created uniformly within one cinematic space but takes place simultaneously between commercial venues, in which profit drives programming, and arthouse or cultural centres, in which other considerations can be prioritised. With this factor in mind, Section Two focuses on exhibition sites and the negotiation of cinematic culture that takes place within them. Examining these sites opens up ideas about new distribution technology and its potentially democratizing power: the subject of discussion in Section Three. Although there was hope that digital-screening technology would make direct distribution and accessibility easier, there is a need to explore how cinematic culture is negotiated through regulated paths of distribution and whether distribution in South America is still tied up with notions of commercial ownership. In Section Four, this issue is explored further by focusing on DVD reproduction. The fact that the processes involved in the commercial exploitation of cinematic works, in the various ways mentioned above, often make use of global circuits of capital means that films are frequently deterritorialized. This chapter, thus, throws into relief the attempts by state organisations to reterritorialize and develop cinema practice in the region.

The fifth chapter moves further away from persons and organisations working within a bordered South American nation-state to see the way in which outside *international interests*, insert themselves amongst the commercial and state drives to develop and negotiate cinematic culture. Section One observes intervention taking place at the level of production when other countries become involved with South American
cinematic practice through coproductions. Often these practices add to the cinematic culture of each of the countries that are involved, allowing processes of transculturation to take place. Through these practices it is possible to understand the way in which South American cinematic culture is bound to a place of origin, often the nation, but continuously reaches out beyond that boundary through interaction with foreign production. The second section looks at the way in which organisations such as UNESCO take a paternalistic approach to these processes of transculturation and how this has effect on the cinema practices that are encouraged. While this approach is often concerned with indigenous filmmaking in the region, there are other, international, bodies involved in funding a broader range of South American films and these form the focus of Section Three. The final section examines what happens when cinematic works are received and constituted within international film festivals and how that affects their placement within an ‘original’ localised cinematic culture. At the same time, although the various international organisations appear to take South American cinematic culture beyond national boundaries, the practices they promote often interact with the state organisations and commercial interests that have been outlined in the two previous chapters.

The importance of the final chapter is in contrasting the interpolations of organisations working within an official and endorsed capacity such as state institutions, commercial bodies and established international foundations, with the organisations and practices operating in the interstices. These are organisations and activities that take place at a grassroots level, are unendorsed, often illegal and thus providing alternative practices. In considering alternative practice, the work of piracy is treated within the first section because activities, from distributing illegal DVD copies to providing free movie collections online, are fundamental to the way in which film products are circulated in contemporary South America. This mode of distribution is often as important as legal forms in determining the types of cinematic works available to and perceived as meaningful to local communities. Following this, Section Two uncovers the grassroots organizations organisations that create sites for exhibition, often with politically orientated filmmaking in mind, that circumvent official or commercial networks. Their practices involve taking over space so that they can provide accessible cinema to local communities free from commercial intervention. The issue of access to cinema also draws into question the role of the
internet and the various technological tools that it provides for developing a continuous cinematic culture that is available to South American publics. For this reason, a focus on the internet’s association with South American cinematic culture is developed in Section Three. This section highlights the way in which the internet provides space for democratic discussion of cinematic texts and allows a public sphere to develop with regards to cinematic culture. These flows are not often made visible in ‘official’ discourse but provide important platforms for a community-level collective understanding of local cinema. The final section then examines the way in which alternative practices can allow space for indigenous identities and whether these practices can form a base for supporting greater cinematic production amongst indigenous communities. This chapter thus interacts with some of the primary concerns developed in the prior chapters but also allows space for the less-documented and less well known aspects of South American cinematic culture to emerge.

What is clear from an overview of each chapter is that there is a constant tension within contemporary South American cinematic culture between the national, the regional and the global, particularly when individuals or organisations attempt to influence or take charge of certain cinematic practices. For this reason, I will be paying attention to this tension throughout the thesis while also understanding it as a bridging point that frequently brings together the diverse organisations and activities that I will be documenting. Although I am unable to examine all the persons and organisations that invest in South American cinematic culture, each of the areas that I have examined plays an integral part in developing cinematic practice across the region and thus should not be ignored when understanding how cinematic culture is operating in South America at the beginning of the twenty-first century.
Chapter One: Research Context

South American cinematic culture does not exist in a vacuum and neither does scholarship in this field. Although the region was frequently left out of world-cinema guides and cannon forming text books in Anglo-European studies throughout the twentieth century, there have been a number of important texts that readdress this balance. As with much academic scholarship, they have often relied upon conceptual frameworks that have developed in other fields but provide useful tools for framing original analysis. It is a process that I have replicated in this thesis and, for this reason, a wide range of literature has provided me with the contextual base and theoretical paradigms for my research questions and findings. While I will be making use of the insights of a number of scholars and studies to support my findings in subsequent chapters, this chapter will review the most influential fields and commonly used conceptual frameworks for my research.

Latin American Cinema

An understanding of film culture in the region has largely developed through analysis of the New Latin American Cinema movement that had its inception in the 1960s, grew in strength throughout the 1970s and continued into the 1980s. Drawing on neorealism and avant-garde practices from Europe, the New Latin American Cinema movement made films dealing with the socio-political problems of the region amid the backdrop of harsh military regimes. The majority of publications in English that deal with Latin American film focus at some point on this political cinema and outline the importance it had in creating a regional ‘Third Cinema’ that wanted to oppose the imperialistic and hegemonic forces of Western culture. These publications have ranged from journals and textbooks translating and reprinting the manifestos and writings of the movement’s filmmakers1 to scholars focusing on specific filmmakers and their practices during this time.2 Frequently there has been a swing between an

overview of the movement’s key players and a return to close textual analysis of the films that were made. Importantly, the studies have contributed to two main strands of thought with regards to understanding the broader field of Latin American cinema. The first strand concerns its spatiality and the second concerns its historical trajectory.

With regard to the first strand, film practice within the New Latin American Cinema movement both highlighted and problematized the geographical location of film. Many filmmakers were forthright in their desire to create a pan-American movement that worked throughout the various countries in Latin America, yet scholarship has pointed out that a national context was often a strong factor in their cinematic production and transnational processes with partners outside the region were equally influential. For this reason Chon A. Noriega examines the conflicting metanarratives that have emerged (between the national, the regional and the global) and outlines his reasons for putting together an edited collection which attempts to advance scholarship beyond the particular transnational and antinarrative critical framework inspired by the New Latin American Cinema without at the same time losing sight of its political, formal and supranational concerns.

Although the collection brings together disparate academic articles and thus cannot account for a full picture of the region, each article successfully interrogates specific film practice so that cinematic culture is not lost amongst generalisations.

---


Furthermore, while some articles in Noriega’s collection situate themselves within a distinct national context, others highlight the very specific nature of films crossing borders in Latin America. The latter articles feed into the tendency of some scholars to document the specificity of transnational exchange such as Catherine Grant’s analysis of coproductions, particularly those employing several languages.7 In a similar manner, Zuzana M. Pick includes a chapter on the international film festivals that showcased some of the earlier manifestations of New Latin American Cinema movement and in this way places emphasis on the spatial distribution of the texts as well as their production.8 Following this focus on geographical sites, Paul Willemen questions the context for viewing ‘third cinema’ in first world exhibition spaces.9 The detailed moments of transnational exchange are further emphasised in Karen Schwartzman’s personal analysis of how she curated a Venezuelan film festival in New York.10

The pieces of literature that I have found most useful in contextualising the impact of the New Latin American Cinema movement on the cinematic culture that I have been studying are thus the texts, such as those mentioned above, that deal with this complex geographical interaction. They provide a useful link to cinematic culture in the twenty-first century as they suggest why regional definitions continue to have currency in film scholarship and that understanding their contradictions does not mean that regional or national terms become redundant. It is within this context that Deborah Shaw, writing about twenty-first century cinema, can state:

I have questioned the term Latin American cinema in that it renders certain countries invisible, yet the term is clearly used and useful to discuss films from Latin America.11

Although I have chosen to study South America rather than Latin America it is a relevant point as both these regions are invoked in a number of discussions from scholarship to official policy and marketing material.

---

7 Grant, ‘Camera Solidaria’.
8 Pick, The New Latin American Cinema.
With regard to the second strand of thought, studies on the New Latin American Cinema movement have also been useful in situating specific socio-historical moments for the films that were made. Much of the literature has looked beyond establishing meaning in the individual texts to see the way in which films emerged as a result of various external forces shaping and mediating their production. These studies frequently focus on the impact of historical moments such as regime change in governments, economic crises and popular revolutions. Their work is thus able to situate films in historical trajectories that provide a rich cultural context in which to understand cinematic practice. The approaches in these texts have been useful for this thesis as they demonstrate that it is possible to investigate socio-historical circumstance as a means to uncover the industry forces and cultural developments that have an effect on cinematic culture in the region.

Furthermore, although the majority of writing on Latin American film has focused on the New Latin American Cinema movement, some articles are beginning to appear that look at later filmmaking, particularly the cinematic texts that are working between the commercial drives of contemporary global capitalism and limited state funding and support. These articles are able to situate late twentieth and early twenty-first century contextual factors that condition cinematic practice. For this reason, in 2003 Marvin D’Lugo said, of filmmakers in the region,

Struggling to survive creatively, compelled by circumstances to serve as mediators between the business and art of Latin American film, they find themselves forced to negotiate their own political and artistic visions in accordance with the commercial demands of global film finance arrangements.

---


Chapter One

His statement follows on from Randal Johnson’s work in 1993 that addressed the fact that Latin American filmmakers have historically been put in difficult positions in which they rely on state support but find it hampers the artistic expression they wish to put forward.14 Tamara L. Falicov took these contextual concerns into the twenty-first century when she investigated the uneasy relationship that has arisen in recent years between television sponsorship and cinema in Argentina that is seen to be too commercial.15 Although much of this literature attempts to give an overview of the Latin American region there have been concentrated attempts that work within a national border such as the above mentioned study by Falicov.

Coming from within the region, there has been a relatively recent increase in literature on cinema and these texts analyse (in Spanish) the exact socio-historical circumstances under which film practice takes place. This work ranges from Jacqueline Mouesca’s historical overview of filmmaking practice in Chile16 to Octavio Getino’s close examination of industrial factors across the region.17 Other work takes into consideration political filmmaking in historical moments18 or industrial moments that are shaping the way cinema is understood.19 In each case, a clear social context is given which details the way in which cinema practice is not taking place within an historical vacuum. Furthermore, the majority of this work brings significant material to the study of South American cinema at the beginning of the twenty-first century either through a regional summary or a localised focus that can be used for comparative strategies.

---

National Cinemas

While the links between historical, national and regional paradigms in Latin American film criticism have been instrumental in allowing me to broach contemporary practice, I am equally indebted to the debates about other national cinemas. Many of these debates have been used by scholarship on Latin American cinemas and thus offer starting points with which to bring contemporary cinematic practice in South America under scrutiny.

There has long been an academic focus on ‘national cinemas’, particularly in a European context where works such as Susan Hayward’s *French National Cinema* and Thomas Elsaesser’s *New German Cinema* continue to define the field. What is significant is that, following theoretical paradigms such as Benedict Anderson’s ‘imagined communities’ and Louis Althusser’s work on ideology, these writers query the extent to which a fully formed and un-problematic ‘nation’ exists. They suggest that nation building is an on-going process, often alluded and referred to as a ‘myth’ making process, which intertwines with cinematic representation and formation. Rather than pointing out inherent national signifiers that lie beneath cultural representation, they reveal the way in which ideas of the nation and nationality are discursive formations that reflect the temporal and spatial context in which they are voiced. In particular, they reveal the nation’s fissured and fractured quality.

It is the very questioning of the ‘nation’ as an ideologically sound concept that allows writers such as Wimal Dissanayake to explore the ways in which under-represented national subjects enter the cinematic field and find a place within national imagining. He finds cinema particularly important as it has the ability to represent the spatial and temporal aspects of nationhood in a dynamic way that is not

---

necessarily possible in other mediums. It is within this context that Dissanayake sees the potential for ruptures to grand narratives:

The homogeneity of the nation-state and its legitimizing metanarratives begin to be fissured when filmmakers seek to give expression to the hopes and experiences and lifeworlds of the minorities whether they be ethnic, linguistic, or religious. Films dealing with the privations of minorities serve to open up a representational space from where the hegemonic discourse of the state can be purposefully challenged and the idea of cultural difference foregrounded.\(^{25}\)

In this way, cinema has the potential for exhibiting the contestatory voices that provide the real, lived situations within contemporary nations. The national cinema can thus be expanded to take into account multiple rather than singular identities.

However, the problem lies in the fact that a ‘national cinema’ may be named and claimed by different persons. If there is already a difficulty in determining what exactly constitutes a nation and its cultural signifiers, there is a far greater task in trying to define what a ‘national cinema’ is. Toby Miller suggests that national cinemas must be understood as part of cultural industries and are therefore usually under the auspice of government policy\(^{26}\) while, on the other hand, Tom O’Regan points out that ‘at some time or other most national cinemas are not coterminous with their nation states.’\(^{27}\) Trying to unpick this matter Valentina Vitali and Paul Willemen suggest that

It follows that, when considering the question of a national cinema, it is necessary to distinguish between two understandings of cinema: as an industry and as a cluster of cultural strategies.\(^{28}\)

This matter is complicated by the fact that in 1993 Stephen Crofts tried to outline six different types of national cinema from European-Model Art cinemas to totalitarian cinemas\(^ {29}\) yet his work was later refuted by Jerry White in 2004 when he suggested that adhering to formal and thematic concerns was reductive and not explanatory of what a national cinema is.\(^ {30}\)

---


What these studies have in common is that they struggle to set out straightforward parameters for the classification of national cinemas. It is for this reason that some critics find the use of ‘national cinema’ redundant. Andrew Higson states

my intention overall is to question the usefulness of the concept of national cinema. It is clearly a helpful taxonomic labelling device, a conventional means of reference in the complex debates about cinema, but the process of labelling is always to some degree tautologous, fetishising the national rather than merely describing it. It thus erects boundaries between films produced in different nation-states although they may still have much in common. It may therefore obscure the degree of cultural diversity, exchange and interpenetration that marks so much cinematic activity.31

While these various factors suggest the concept of a ‘national cinema’ may be better left aside, it does not make the study of the ‘national’ in cinema practice impossible. Instead, these somewhat contradictory, but always complex, approaches to national cinemas point to the fact that there are varied and competing interests who make use of aspects of the ‘national’ such as filmmakers themselves, commercial organisations and government bodies. Paying attention to the multifaceted issues that have arisen in the debates on national cinemas provides an ample base with which to take a nuanced approach to understanding how aspects of the national continue to operate in contemporary South American cinema.

Transnationalism

One of the best ways in which to understand the enduring appeal of a ‘national’ context is to acknowledge that it exists side by side with equally important transnational processes. Rather than erasing the importance of the national, studies of transnationalism in film have often been able to point towards the intricate movement between different national locations that characterises much cinematic activity. Through careful analysis of filmmaking and distribution trends, twenty-first century work on transnational cinema takes into account the way in which film interlinks national locations with a global situation at the turn of the century.

The focus on the transnational has been explicit in dedicated text books such as *Transnational Cinema: The Film Reader*\textsuperscript{32} covering a global context; more regional efforts such as *Transnational Cinema in a Global North: Nordic Cinema in Transition*;\textsuperscript{33} and various journal articles.\textsuperscript{34} As a concept, it has been given political weight when Elizabeth Ezra and Terry Rowden assert

because transnational cinema is most “at home” in the in-between spaces of culture, in other words, between the local and the global, it decisively problematizes the investment in cultural purity or separatism.\textsuperscript{35}

This is accentuated in the work of Hamid Naficy when he examines the interstitial modes of production in exilic filmmaking and posits a relationship between filmmakers and a nation (be it their homeland or current domicile) without confining the work to one concrete space.\textsuperscript{36}

What often links scholarly writing on a national, transnational, or even supranational context, is the aim of understanding the capacity of cinema for ‘fair representation’ of various subjects and communities. Close analysis attempts to determine whether diverse voices speak or are silenced in relation to their national domicile or homeland. This is a theme that runs throughout this thesis as I attempt to uncover the extent to which South American cinema is able to incorporate the varied communities in the region. However, the majority of academic writing on this matter privileges the examination of a small collection of films, individual filmmakers, or a group of linked filmmakers, that has textual analysis of films at its core. Criticism that I have found influential takes place in essays such as Crofts’ ‘Reconceptualizing National Cinema/s’\textsuperscript{37} or Tim Bergfelder’s ‘National, Transnational or Supranational Cinema? Rethinking European Film Studies’\textsuperscript{38} which move beyond this approach and outline the importance of reception and contextualisation of the cinematic texts. These studies


\textsuperscript{34} See for example Bergfelder, Tim (2005) ‘National, Transnational or Supranational Cinema? Rethinking European Film Studies’ in Media, Culture and Society 27:3, pp.315-32.

\textsuperscript{35} Ezra and Rowden, ‘General Introduction,’ p.4.
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are able to examine transnational processes within wider circuits of global film flow so that concerns with who and what is available on screen may be dealt with.

Although not widely used within film studies, the theoretical work on transculturation that developed in Latin American studies has been an equally important critical concept. The term transculturation was coined by Fernando Ortiz in his work on Cuba in the 1940s in an attempt to explain reciprocal processes of cross-cultural adaptation.39 Although work in this field has remained mainly within Latin American studies it has been taken up by scholars such as Mary Louise Pratt who have broadened its scope to include the way cultural meeting has taken place in various post-colonial sites.40 In particular, she has highlighted the importance of ‘contact zones’: the discursive sites in which different cultures come together and adapt to one another. The use this concept has for film studies lies in the way in which it allows sites of power to be interrogated and the exact processes that take place in transnational exchange to be uncovered. Rather than assuming that border-crossing processes will have a straight-forward effect on cultural practice, transculturation examines the complex ways in which producing and receiving culture are conditioned by the interactions that take place. For this reason, I have taken into account the theoretical work of transculturation when looking at transnational film practice taking place inside South America and with partners outside the region.

Film Festivals
An area of study that has been influential in giving concrete examples to transnational film processes is the emerging field of film festival research. Bill Nichols made important inroads into this area in 1994 when he situated the consumption of Iranian film in international festival sites.41 He focused on the way in which films are received when taken out of their original cultural context and the methods festival-goers use to negotiate cultural difference apparent in the films:

There is a reverie in the fascination with the strange, an abiding pleasure in the recognition of difference that persists beyond the moment. Even though the

festival-goer receives encouragement to make the strange familiar, to recover difference as similarity (most classically through the discovery of a common humanity, a family of man [sic] spanning time and space, culture and history), another form of pleasure resides in the experience of strangeness itself.\textsuperscript{42}

At the same time, he also saw the potential pitfalls in the power of film festivals to channel processes of spectatorship in certain ways when he asked to what extent does the humanist framework encouraged by film festivals and the popular press not only steer our readings in selected directions but also obscure alternative readings or discourage their active pursuit.\textsuperscript{43}

This concern points towards an emerging theme in film festival research, mainly the processes of mediation that is at work within the festival sites.

The way in which festivals can have a determining power over the reception of texts is a facet considered by Julian Stringer. He investigates the power dynamics of the international festival that he believes are important to any understanding of contemporary world cinema now that the theatrical markets for films have shrunk around the world and festivals constitute the sole formal exhibition site for many new titles.\textsuperscript{44} Although much of his analysis focuses on individual cities and their relationship to international festivals, rather than the relationship between spectators and text, he makes an important acknowledgement of the fact that the film festival circuit mirrors the uneven development of international film culture. He outlines a core centre of film festivals that determine the attention which is placed upon key films while festivals and films at the periphery go largely unacknowledged. This phenomenon has, in turn, led to Elsaesser’s suggestion that certain films are now being made to measure and made to order, i.e., their completion date, their opening venue, their financing is closely tied in with a particular festival’s (or festival circuit’s) schedules and many filmmakers internalize and target such a possibility for their work. Hence the somewhat cynical reference to the genre of the “festival film”, which names a genuine phenomenon but also obscures the advantages that the creation of such a relatively stable horizon of expectations brings.\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{42} Nichols, ‘Discovering Form,’ p.18.
\textsuperscript{43} Nichols, ‘Discovering Form,’ p.20.
While these studies are able to examine the way films entering film festivals are situated outside of their home context, many also use this as an opportunity to explore what this means for the ‘national’ within or attached to the film. For Janet Harbord film does not float freely above national borders, but attains part of its value and meaning from its perceived origin and the paths of its circulation. These paths are located within as well as cutting across national borders; to conceive of global flows as outside of the nation omits the tension between national and global economies, the force-field in which film circulates.46

To see the paths and flows of films, Harbord gives due attention to sites such as film festivals with an added focus on journalism – ‘the main mediating function of festivals to the general public’47 - so that films can be understood to exist in an international context that does not necessarily deny their residual national elements.

To date, there has been some analysis of the impact film festivals have on South American film, mainly through historical analysis of the Viña del Mar festival in Chile during the 1970s48 or the Pesaro film festival in Italy49 and the Havana film festival in the 1980s,50 but there is still work to be done on the way contemporary South American films interact in these global sites. Marijke de Valck notes that one of the most pressing complications concerns a discrepancy between the unproblematic presentations of the cream of various “national cinemas” at top festivals in the West, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the second-rate selections that are left for the newer festivals in Third World countries.51

This is an area that needs further study, particularly with regards to South American cinema, so that the structural aspects and power play at work in festivals can be determined with regards to how they situate films and how they have lasting affect on their production and circulation.

Cultural Policy

47 Harbord, Film Cultures, p.68.
51 de Valck, Film Festivals, p.71.
In a similar manner, cultural policy in the region is a subject that is touched upon, particularly in the work of Johnson, but it is a topic that is given far less attention than, for example, cultural policy in Europe. Nonetheless, the various studies on cultural policy are able to provide a base for further research in this area. On the one hand, cultural policy scholarship attempts to examine the link between national and transnational flows of cultural goods. While critics such as Toby Miller and George Yudice have been able to provide historical overviews that confirm cultural policy is not a particularly new discourse, they have also been influential in outlining the way in which twenty-first century policy has particular relationships with global economies. Their approach has involved looking at how state organisations promote national works of culture inside and outside the nation from stages of production through to distribution. Often a national context is imposed upon work from a range of policy initiatives such as funding, tax-breaks, import and export laws, exhibition quotas and official awards. However, much work on cultural policy has been quick to point out that these initiatives often come across problems when attempting to formulate an ‘ideal’ version of national culture that does not include the variety and heterogeneity within its national borders. There is also a focus on the problem national policy faces when coming up against the seemingly deterritorialized global flow of goods and peoples.

On the other hand, cultural policy studies also provide a way of looking at the way institutional intervention frames larger structural processes. Much of this perspective developed from the concern that cultural studies were too dedicated to textual analysis and the struggle over meaning within the text, thus giving insufficient attention to institutional conditions that regulate culture. There was a desire to see the way in which cultural works such as films were formed and circulated by institutional frameworks and networks. Jim McGuigan states


that is what cultural policy is principally about, the conditions of culture, the material and, also, the discursive determinations in time and space of cultural production and consumption.\textsuperscript{55}

This manner of thinking is particularly useful for South American film studies as, following my previous arguments, there has been a tendency to focus on individual cinematic texts while there should also be an understanding of the conditions that form these works. The cultural policy approach is also useful because it outlines the way film circulation is institutional and formalised even when seemingly free in its flow through global channels. For this reason, it is possible to examine both the cultural practices and bodies that have been regulated on a visible level through government edict, and the private practices that appear to be de-regulated but may be at the whim of market regulation and thus still under the control of state policy.\textsuperscript{56} The extent to which policy plays a part in film production and circulation is unlikely to decrease in the coming years because, as David Hesmondhalgh points out, cultural industries are now as important economically as ‘durable’ goods industries.\textsuperscript{57} In South America, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, this is an aspect of cinema that has drawn the attention of government bodies and agencies and their response is thus in need of due attention.

Furthermore, studies on South American cinemas can be aided by texts on cultural policy that make the case for the way in which factors such as the state can still influence cultural forms, even in the light of global flows. Nonetheless it is worth noting that the scope and the origin of writing on cultural policy often means that cultural policy is given a wide overview in which tendencies in the West are presumed as the norm or the detailed studies only refer to European countries and the US. For South America to be duly considered the emerging cultural policy work in this region needs to be expanded.

\textbf{Commercial Exhibition and Distribution}

One of the most significant insights that work on cultural policy brings to the field of South American film studies in the twenty-first century is the examination of how

\textsuperscript{55} McGuigan, ‘Cultural Policy Studies,’ p.34.
cultural policy negotiates the fields of art and industry with regard to promoting cinema. Miller and Yudice point out that clearly, audiovisual policy across sites shares a dilemma – the commerce-culture relationship. There is always a struggle between (i) the desire for a viable sector of the economy that provides employment, foreign exchange and multiplier effects; and (ii) the desire for a representative, local cinema that transcends moneymaking in search of the opportunity for society to reflect upon itself through drama.58

Although Miller and Yudice are making a global point, Johnson confirms that it is a factor that is important to Latin America. He states that the fundamental opposition between commercial and cultural interests is often at the root of tensions which have arisen within Latin American cinema over the last few decades and has often shaped state policies of support of local industries.59

This tension between industry and art is a concern for both those researching cinema and those practising it.

Although films are cultural works of art, they rely on highly commercialised transactions for their distribution and exhibition. While studies on the meaning found within texts can disregard their industrial constitution, an understanding of cinematic culture, and the way films become accessible to publics, needs to take into consideration the commercial flows that allow films to be seen. A number of scholars at the beginning of the twenty-first century have been paying attention to this aspect in global film cultures with careful consideration of the socio-economic factors that play a part.60 There have also been South American scholars, particularly those based in Argentina, who pay attention to commercial flows and circuits.61 These studies are noteworthy for the consideration they give to film distribution and exhibition and, in this way, provide an economic and industrial context that is particular to the locations

58 Miller and Yudice, Cultural Policy, p.105.
59 Johnson, ‘Film Policy in Latin America,’ p.135.
in which the films interact. They allow cinematic culture to become significant in itself rather than a subsidiary interest to the films which circulate within it.

Furthermore, the work of these scholars often intersects with that of writers interrogating contemporary global capitalism and the way in which uneven development allows power to reside in traditional dominating regions such as North America and Europe. Critics such as Saskia Sassen look at the way new communication technology allows the potential for global capital to be directed and used from almost any point in the world yet there is a continuous reiteration of cities (particularly established metropolises) as financial centres in which hierarchical and spatial inequalities are reaffirmed.62 This factor points to one of the main issues of film distribution: the fact that Hollywood continues to dominate the global sphere with the majority of DVD sales in foreign countries pertaining to US films. This in turn leads to a review of the ‘media imperialism’ argument originally put forward by Herbert Schiller in 1976 in which US culture was seen to be dominating and eroding indigenous cultural forms in other countries.63 The majority of recent writing such as that of Janet Staiger64 and John B. Thompson65 works against some of the main tenets of the ‘media imperialism’ argument such as; the idea the US has complete dominance; the assumption there is an essential, pure indigenous culture being eroded by Hollywood; and that there is a causal effect by which spectators will accept the ideologies put forward in the media they watch. However, these writers do acknowledge that there is unequal development in the processes of production and distribution which makes it harder for non-US films to gain distribution and leaves many films and filmmakers working in smaller film industries at the periphery. This type of analysis explores the extent to which certain cinematic texts are allowed to dominate distribution channels, by examining the locations and positions from which they speak rather than the innate qualities within the text. It is an issue that is particularly important for South American films as they rely on global routes of commerce, even within their own nations, for their cinema to take root. Of equal

64 Staiger, ‘A Neo-Marxist Approach’.
importance is the fact this issue applies to the internal working of South American cinematic culture because urban, city-based, directors often find it easier to gain distribution than rural or regional projects speaking from the margins.

**Technology and the Public Sphere**

As a means to understand many of these processes, it is useful to examine the new technology that makes the contemporary circulation of film unique to the current global situation. From changes in screening capabilities to new methods of replicating and circulating film products, technology has been able to transform the context of films in their exhibition and reception. Although scholars have picked up on the fact that new digital practices in filmmaking have had a profound effect on the cinematic text, a small number of academic studies have also begun to look at the way digital exhibition and distribution are changing the cinematic culture in which these texts circulate. Recent studies such as those by Stuart Hanson and John Caldwell investigate the effect the new exhibition and distribution techniques are having on global film industries while work on film piracy has proven how technology allows illegitimate and alternative networks to circulate and disseminate films as part of localised cinematic culture, albeit in an illegal form.

Complementing these studies is work that examines the technological developments affecting home viewing, in particular the move from widely available VCRs in the latter part of the twentieth century to DVD players and computer screens in the twenty-first. These advances, which give increasing control to audiences wishing to interact with cinematic works, have concurrently given VCR and DVD companies an increasingly influential part in the reception and contextualisation of films. This factor

---


is touched upon by Grant when she suggests the way that ‘extras’ added to DVD products (such as interviews with the director and ‘making of’ sections) can give extra-textual information to the spectator that help inform their interaction with the film.\(^{70}\) It is thus important to pay attention to the scholarship on film and DVD technology that moves beyond mere assessment of the new technological forms to see their affect in the production, circulation and reception of films.

At the same time, any look at home viewing technology has to take into consideration the same concerns voiced by the scholars who are working on issues of distribution or access to cinematic and media forms. Although much of this new technology is relatively cheap, and supposedly universal, large numbers of economically disadvantaged communities in South America do not have access to these forms. It has frequently been the case that the internet has fostered engagement with cinematic culture and discourse on the national and regional context of films. Nonetheless it sometimes takes scholars working within the region such as Erick Torrico, Antonio Gomez and Karina Herrera, who are based in Bolivia, to point out that not everyone has access to this new technology.\(^{71}\) This concern intersects with studies on the public sphere, particularly post-Habermasian studies, that examine whether or not technology such as the internet can bring about the democratic discursive meeting space that Jürgen Habermas envisioned.\(^{72}\) In looking back towards the public meeting sites of eighteenth century Europe, Habermas made claims for these sites to be seen as a space that allowed citizens to engage in critical debates dealing with topics of public importance. He was optimistic that this space could be achieved in contemporary society in a way that allows cultural and political participation. Using these ideas in the twenty-first century, many scholars\(^{73}\) concur with Todd Gitlin’s point that technology has in fact led to a plurality of public spheres and that the democratic

---
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potential is hampered by larger socio-economic conditions. Nonetheless, these factors do not diminish the importance of examining how citizens involve themselves in cultural discourse and there are thus twenty-first century conceptions of the public sphere that reflect upon the complexity of public engagement through technology.

A number of scholars have applied the concept of the public sphere to cinema such as Michael Chanan and Miriam Hansen and have thus widened the way in which cinema can be understood to engage audiences. Within South America there has been a history of public engagement with cinema that was intensified through the New Latin American Cinema movement and there is thus reason to see how the concept of the public sphere can be understood with relation to twenty-first century practices.

**Indigenous Media**

Of importance to the concept of the public sphere is the issue of how minority voices and peripheral identities can be represented. Although the public sphere is meant to be a democratic space of engagement, indigenous communities across the world are particularly susceptible to exclusion from political and cultural debate. It is for this reason that John Hartley and Alan McKee have called for the promotion of an ‘indigenous public sphere’ with relation to communities in Australia. Their work follows on from anthropologists such as Faye Ginsburg who see the importance of defining the fields of representation that are available to communities with indigenous or aboriginal concerns. Scholarship in this field, particularly the studies focusing on indigenous media, plays a two-part role. Firstly they outline the film and media that comes from within these communities and document works that are made by rather than about the people involved. In this way they suggest that it is not only

---

ethnographic work or documentaries made by onlookers that offer cultural representation. Secondly, they question why these works remain excluded from wider circuits of cultural discourse.

South America has large numbers of indigenous communities yet they are not often considered in official discourse surrounding cinematic culture or even in academic overviews of the cinema of the region. Scholars such as Jeff D. Himpele80 and Freya Schiwy81 have made important inroads into analysing indigenous media practice on the continent, particularly in the Andean region. Nonetheless, further work needs to be done as there is not often a consideration of how indigenous communities are represented (or not represented) within cinematic works and, specifically, within feature-length films. The focus is often on short films and documentaries as these form the wider body of audiovisual works made within indigenous media practice yet this factor often puts the works outside of wider discourse on a cinematic culture that concerns itself with longer, fiction films.

These issues can be tied into the debates surrounding ‘national cinemas’ as they highlight the importance in analysing the variety of experience that takes place within a national context. Furthermore, they are important for an understanding of contemporary South American cinematic culture as indigenous peoples do play a significant part in the cultural makeup of the region but have largely been overlooked in considerations of this field. The extent to which indigenous communities participate in cinematic culture also highlights the areas where cultural policy and commercial circuits need to be examined to see if they fully interact with the various communities in the region.

Conclusion
From the literature on Latin American cinema, a picture begins to emerge of the diverse cinematic practice that is available in the region. Nonetheless, this work is often fragmented across edited collections and journal articles. There is a need, particularly with regards to twenty-first century practice, to examine the overarching

structures that shape the channels and flows of the cinematic culture. To bring this about, the other research fields that I have identified as significant can be used to produce a more fully rounded, but also more complex, overview of cinematic practice in the region. Furthermore, by using these influences, I can pick out three major strands that run throughout these fields and have significance for my analysis of cinematic culture: deterritorialization and reterritorialization; transculturation; and the public sphere. Each of these strands provides a structural basis for understanding the findings that I have discovered with regards to how cinematic culture operates. Due to the diverse activity taking place within the region, it is not within the scope of my study to sum up and make use of every one of the varied pieces of relevant literature in the above mentioned fields but I have been able to focus on those that provide insight and support for the research material that I have uncovered.
Chapter Two: Methodology and Qualitative Research

Prior to surveying the research context outlined in Chapter One, I was able to spend time in South America and gain knowledge of various aspects of cinematic culture in the region. This experience allowed me to identify primary research questions and formulate ideas about areas in need of study. In doing so I began an inductive approach that was based firstly on observation and then introduced relevant theoretical paradigms before returning to observation once again before honing the theoretical work. Rather than taking place through a linear process, I often found a spiral technique was at work which involved going backwards and forwards between my findings and the theoretical material until satisfactory conclusions were met. It was a process that involved two separate field-trips to South America as well as visits to film festivals in Spain, London and Edinburgh.

During the above mentioned research, I found myself working between three common strands of inquiry: textual analysis, historical accounts and economic investigation. With my desire to scrutinise the production and circulation of South American cinematic culture, the film text became an example of what had been achieved, the historical revealed the foundations for contemporary practice and the economic gave statistical weight to the way in which the texts operate as products in a field that is often more industry than art. This data was gleaned from a mixture of sources such as the literature mentioned in the previous chapter, information in trade journals and websites relating to organisations within the region. While these strands of inquiry produced a wealth of data, I found I was often analysing secondary sources or a type of quantitative data that offered a surface account without revealing the depths and processes below. Through pockets of information, particularly those in film festival brochures or the DVD boxes that reach consumers world wide, there were glimpses of the untold stories of opportunities and restrictions, successes and failures, which shape the body of South American films made available for domestic and global consumption. Yet to come closer to understanding these stories, and to examine why they may be of importance, I found it was necessary to undertake a type of qualitative research that could augment the information brought forward by my initial inquiries. It was a type of qualitative research that is almost certainly frequently practiced by
film scholars yet often in informal and understated ways with little paper-trail to expose its recurrent use. Specifically, it involved interviewing and collecting in-depth data from persons working in the South American film industries as well as undertaking participant observation at the sites in which cinematic culture is produced and circulated.

In order to undertake this type of research, I found it useful to draw on the work of scholars who have developed suitable techniques for qualitative analysis in related fields. This is a type of research most commonly seen in the social sciences and anthropology with the former using it as a welcome change or supplement to the restrictive nature of quantitative investigation. Thus Pertti Alasuutari says by qualitative analysis I mean reasoning and argumentation that is not based simply on statistical relations between ‘variables’, by which certain objects or observation units are described.1

In a similar manner, anthropologists developed qualitative practices in ethnographic research as a means of uncovering cultural processes close at hand in a way that could not be achieved through other methods. There was an attempt to understand culture by working with subjects, mostly by listening in depth to individuals either through extended interviews or through participant observation. The importance of getting close to the subject is underlined by John Brewer:

Ethnography tends to rely on a number of particular data collection techniques, such as naturalistic observation, documentary analysis and in-depth interviews. While these methods are used on their own as well, what marks their ethnographic application is that they are used to study a people in a naturally occurring setting or ‘field’, in which the researcher participates directly, and in which there is an intent to explore the meanings of this setting and its behaviours and activities from the inside.2

This type of study has not been confined to anthropology and many of the central concerns and practices have application for a variety of fields. Martyn Hammersley makes the case for comparing ethnography with history:

In particular, they both display a primary concern with describing social events and processes in detail, and a distaste for theories which, as they see it, ride roughshod over the complexities of the social world. Frequently too, they share a commitment to documenting “in their own terms” the perspectives of the people involved in the events and settings they describe. Historians and

ethnographers are often reluctant to move to general classifications of these perspectives, in which their uniqueness – and it seems much of their interest – is lost.³

There is thus a concern with the complexity of agency at work in social experience, a factor that was useful for my consideration of the varying persons and organisations that have an interest in South American cinematic culture.

Although the way in which ethnography has been taken into film, television and media studies is most commonly seen through studies into audience research rather than the areas I am investigating, these studies do offer some insightful approaches. In contrast to prior quantitative studies that assessed television viewing patterns, there was a development in the 1980s that focused on working with rather than on audiences.⁴ This involved a close examination of the complexities of audience responses and the multifaceted backgrounds they bring to their viewing patterns that cannot be determined by statistical analysis. Although it is easier to find audience research in television studies, work such as Jackie Stacey’s Star Gazing focused on film audiences, with particular attention given to the way in which she used qualitative research methods to elicit responses from female spectators.⁵ These studies, when seen under the wider umbrella of the humanities, add weight to Ann Gray’s assertion that there should not be too much power invested in theoretical work and textual analysis to the detriment of other methods of study.⁶ Gray sees a split between the humanities and social sciences that has often been understood as the split between the text and the social. She calls for a use of cultural studies, exemplified in the research listed above, that attempts to go beyond the text so that texts can be understood within certain material conditions as a bridge between the traditional humanities and social science studies. Her analysis suggests certain processes cannot be understood through the text alone and, instead, the text, a group of texts or a form of media, gain greater significance when considered within a socially produced position.

Beyond the use of qualitative research in audience studies, ethnography has also at times been applied to media organisations as a way of studying the producers, rather than the receivers of the text. This analysis has often involved participant observation that allows a researcher to see the decisions and practices undertaken by individuals while also giving the researcher the chance to react to and enquire about situations as they happen. The study of individuals is not a return to the study of the auteur that reached a critical height in the 1960s but a manner of seeing the way in which processes of production have an effect, particularly those organisational practices that influence the output of news-media. Much of its roots and methodological framework lies in the ethnographic studies of organisations, such as hospitals and large businesses, with the aim of seeing how work-places and their cultures operate. At the same time there is a focus on the way the culture involved in media organisations has an effect on the cultural products consumed by large numbers of people. The necessity of these types of studies is highlighted by Simon Cottle:

> It is disconcerting how many studies of media output are conducted with a complete disregard for the moment of production and the forces enacted or condensed inside the production domain.

It would be true to say that the same frequently happens within film studies and much of this thesis is an intervention that attempts to rectify this situation.

The scope of my study did not allow me to research individual organisations to the same extent as some of these ethnographic studies but I was able to move beyond the cinematic text to see the structural processes behind it. By speaking to individuals in the South American film industries and collecting related materials, I was able to find information relating to production and distribution of South American films that is rarely documented. This is particularly important as I feel that it is primary sources, beyond the published texts, that are necessary for my research to be grounded in material conditions. For this reason, I conducted qualitative interviews to find information about practices foremost, and about the people operating the practices as secondary. I also recognised that the persons participating in my research brought a

---


range of relative and subjective viewpoints that had to be analysed and taken into consideration in the use of the information obtained.

Thus, although my research did not closely follow previous models of ethnographic research there were some fundamental concerns that shaped my research methods, at the level of qualitative interviews, participant observation and at other stages of my research.

**Open Ended Research**

Amid a backlash in film studies against theory-driven research, David Bordwell made a call for the removal of top-down theory with the assertion that

> rather than formulating a question, posing a problem, or trying to come to grips with an intriguing film, the writer often takes as the central task the proving of a theoretical position by adducing films as example.10

Instead of looking for films to fit grand theories, Bordwell advocated that questions should be asked of the films and the practices that constitute them first. Taking this into consideration, I used participant observation and information arising from my interviews to formulate my questions and problems before imposing a theoretical model on them. This process had implications for the way in which I structured my interviews, particularly as I wanted them to be open to new ideas.

While it is understood that interviews can vary across a scale from very structured to non-structured, it is generally understood that qualitative interviews will be at the latter end of the scale.11 They are designed to be reflexive so that fresh and unexpected information can arise and be incorporated into the data collection techniques. This contrasts with strictly structured interviews, often used for gathering quantitative data, in which pre-determined ideas or constructs are likely to be either validated or refuted, without the opportunity for complex accounts to be acknowledged. In qualitative interviews there is, of course, the risk that a large amount of digression may take place yet to counteract this problem researchers attempt to keep to an overall structure, often with the use of an *interview guide*. An *interview guide* includes themes, topics and possible questions to be covered with the


idea that they can be modified throughout the interview process as opposed to an interview schedule that has a strict and unchanging list of questions.\textsuperscript{12} I will go into further detail below about the type of interview guide I used during interviews but it is sufficient to say that I used this technique so as to elicit information that was imbued with as much depth as possible. It allowed my research to reflect upon complex accounts and also allowed my research to be a work in progress in which the available material rather than pre-determined theory informed my outcomes.

**Interviewer-interviewee Relations**

In terms of undertaking qualitative interviews, one of the most important aspects is the relationship between the researcher and the persons being researched. Georgina Born, for example, discusses the importance of obtaining trust from the BBC (the organisation that she was studying) to gain access to meetings and one-on-one contact with staff members.\textsuperscript{13} Even when it is not particularly difficult to gain access to or find subjects to interview, a certain level of rapport must be achieved so that interviewees feel comfortable answering questions in sufficient detail for the data to be used.\textsuperscript{14} There are also ethical considerations that must be fully understood as the researcher is frequently in a position of power throughout the interview, as they direct and control the flow of the questions, and in the writing up stage when they have the power to edit, place and situate the words of the interviewee.\textsuperscript{15} For this reason, most guides to qualitative research, and many academic institutions, insist upon strict methods of gaining consent from participants. This is not simply a matter of gaining written or verbal consent as much as allowing the interviewee an understanding of how they will be used within the research project. An example of my own ethical consent form is given in Appendix D.

Thinking reflexively about the researcher’s position in relation to the interviewee is also more than just an ethical consideration as it takes into account the fact the researcher cannot help but influence the data that emerges in the interview. This is

\textsuperscript{12} See Deacon et al, *Researching Communications*; King, ‘Using Interviews’.

\textsuperscript{13} Born, *Uncertain Vision*.

\textsuperscript{14} Deacon et al, *Researching Communications*.

something that is particularly important when it is understood that the researcher becomes a part of the interview process. As Nigel King says

the qualitative researcher believes that there can be no such thing as a ‘relationship-free’ interview. Indeed the relationship is part of the research process, not a distraction from it. The interviewee is seen as a ‘participant’ in the research, actively shaping the course of the interview rather than passively responding to the interviewer’s pre-set questions.\textsuperscript{16}

Furthermore, factors such as the gender, ethnicity and class background of the researcher and interviewee can all play a part in forming the way in which the interviewee reacts to the interview questions and the types of knowledge that they are willing to reveal. I was thus very aware that I was researching across cultural differences and that my approach to South American subjects and institutions came from a position of inquiry that was based in Eurocentric academia. I was also aware of another possibility: that hierarchies of information may be established when researchers give preference to information that is established through a dialogue of rapport and good feeling.\textsuperscript{17} Caution is also needed as interviewees may not necessarily tell what they believe to be the truth but may instead say what they feel the researcher should or would like to hear.\textsuperscript{18}

Each of these considerations was taken into account during my interview process but I avoided becoming reflexive to the point that the research was lost amongst too much analysis of my researcher position within the interview. I will outline below a more detailed explication of the way in which the qualitative interviews were conducted with regards to South American film industries.

**Interviewing Those Involved in Cultural Policy**

During my field trips I was able to interview representatives of each of the film councils in the countries under study. Rather than simply asking interviewees to discuss South American film industries, I directed questions towards significant areas such as the funding opportunities available to South American filmmakers, the processes undertaken to gain distribution and the role of film festivals in promotional


\textsuperscript{17} Geraghty, ‘Audiences and ‘Ethnography’.

activities. I was interested in the stories and data about film production and
distribution processes that may not be documented in available resources. Because the
majority of films produced in South America have a relationship to cultural institutes
in their home country, whether through funding projects or distribution and
promotional activities, staff involved in these institutes were able to provide important
insights. At the same time, I was intrigued by the intentions policy makers and
institutes had with regards to the promotion of South American films, particularly the
way in which they wished the international community to understand the work
available. For this reason I made it clear that I was presenting myself as a research
student from the United Kingdom with an interest in the practices undertaken by the
cultural institutes. By asking questions about practices and listening to the answers, I
was able to analyse both the data about the practices and the way in which the
interviewee wished to express and outline these practices to a foreign observer. While
I placed certain value upon the information I received, with the assumption that the
interviewees were well informed, I also attempted to situate the information in
relation to other sources to account for its reliability, as will be discussed further
below.

To make sure that significant questions were as coherent as possible I made up a list
of questions in advance but left time for free discussion after the questions so that a
type of open ended research could take place. This meant that I had a somewhat
structured interview guide yet, unlike an interview schedule, there was plenty of space
for other information to be incorporated. During the interviews there were times when
the questions were answered in a fairly systematic order with freer discussion taking
place at the end of the interview. At other times, the interviewee extended their
answers to the first questions and incorporated the major points of information that I
was seeking in a form or dialogue that meant I had to ask few other questions. I found
that a reflexive approach to incorporate these different situations was successful and
in each interview I was content that my questions had been answered and further
points of information had emerged.

Interviewing Those Involved in Filmmaking and Exhibition

I was able to interview a number of persons involved in the filmmaking processes
such as directors, producers, heads of film schools and those working within grass-
roots film exhibition. The format and considerations involved in these interviews were similar to those in the cultural policy interviews although my questions were directed to different areas such as the opportunities they felt were available for filmmakers and their interaction with the commercial sphere. One of the main differences was that the producers and directors were not responsible for representing official institutions and were thus able to speak outside of official policy. At times this meant they were able to offer insights into the way funding and other activities worked at the level of reception. As with the other interviews, I asked specific questions to begin with and then opened up discussion more widely so that the interviewees had the opportunity to discuss a range of points that they felt to be important.

The one problem that was encountered within this area of my research was the reluctance of mainstream exhibitors and distributors to agree to interviews. While the above mentioned persons divulged a wide picture of cinematic culture in the region, I felt that I was missing the input of the commercial sector. As will be mentioned in the below section on triangulation, I made up for this lack wherever possible by using other sources such as participant observation and trade magazines.

**Participant Observation**

While the interviews that I undertook allowed me to direct specific questions and obtain detailed answers, I also benefited greatly from the experience of being in the region. During my field-trips to South America I was able to attend seminars, public meetings and other events relating to cinematic activity. By observing the discussions that took place, an understanding of wide-ranging issues and concerns emerged. Particularly important was the fact these debates were emerging from within the cinematic culture of the region without the intervention of an interviewer or researcher such as myself. At times the debates in these events confirmed hypotheses that I was working on or enriched my understanding of certain processes. At other times they introduced new pieces of information that I had not previously considered but became vital in my findings.

I also attended a number of practices in action such as the piracy markets in various countries, outdoor screening events and a number of film festivals. My observations of these events were complemented by time spent at relatively static sites such as
commercial movie-theatres, cinematecas and museums. When attending these events and spaces I was able to examine the dynamic, functioning aspects of cinematic culture and also the way it was rooted in specific locations. From these experiences, and with the information collected in the interviews, I gained a substantial amount of primary source material that was empirical in nature but not bound to hard facts or statistical data.

**Triangulating Research**

At each stage of my research I was concerned with relating my findings to the other material that I had uncovered so that a full picture of cinematic culture in the region could be uncovered. I took on board a warning given by Cottle of taking material at face value and not verifying it against other sources.\(^{19}\) In order to avoid this type of problem I attempted to triangulate my research whenever possible by looking for other sources that suggested my information was relevant. This was often a complex process as there are no easily available databases which cover the type of statistical data that I was often seeking to support my findings. Box-office sites such as boxofficemojo.com and wider institutional sites such as Recam.org hold various data but not often in a coherent manner or in a way which covers the whole of South America. Torrico, Gomez and Herrera make the point with regards to Bolivia:

> No se tiene en el país, hasta el momento, información sistematizada sobre los procesos empresariales que organizan la producción o importación, la distribución, comercialización y difusión de productos culturales de consumo masivo.\(^{20}\)

*In this country we don’t have, as yet, systematised information on the business processes that organise the production and importation, or the distribution, commercialisation and dissemination of mass cultural products.*

In a similar point, Pablo Perelman and Paulina Seivach state that in Argentina

> A pesar de la importancia de las actividades de la industria cinematográfica en el país y en la ciudad de Buenos Aires e incluso, de la contemplación de sus especificidades en la legislación, hay muy poca información económica sistematizada, actualizada y confiable.\(^{21}\)

*In spite of the importance of the cinema industry’s activities in the country and in Buenos Aires, including the specifications demanded in the legislation, there is very little economic information that is systematised, up to date and trustworthy.*

---


\(^{21}\) Perelman and Seivach, ‘La Industria Cinematografica,’ p.9.
This means that I have been relying on statistical data from a variety of sources, often taken and compiled from the above mentioned sites, but sometimes compiled from first-hand observation, conference papers and personal interviews. At times inconsistencies have arisen but these have not necessarily meant that data is invalid. Instead, they point to the complexities of the cinematic activity in the region and the need to take a balanced overview of the processes that are in place.

The concerns and considerations of ethnographic and qualitative research thus found a place in helping to shape my methodology even though they are approaches more commonly used in different fields of research. They helped me to define processes for collecting data beyond the textual, historical or economic investigation methods usually available in film studies and provided a way for me to undertake a rigorous analysis of my research methods. The following chapters will reveal the findings that were the outcome of this research along with the conclusions that have been supported by the theoretical frameworks that I have deployed.
Chapter Three: State and Institutional Involvement

Introduction

As discussed in Chapter One, there is a tension between the grouping together of South American cinemas as a regional entity and the national specificity which comes from each country’s cinematic output.\(^1\) Although various film movements in the twentieth century, most notably the New Latin American cinema movement, appeared to stimulate a continent wide identity in film practice, the nation frequently resurfaces as an important signifier.\(^2\) Underpinning this tension is the fact that a consideration of any film industry outside of Hollywood traditionally works within rhetoric of the ‘national’ cinema. However, this concept is in continually contested terrain. The scholarly work displays a sense of unease with attempts to distinguish what exactly the national is and how it can be represented on screen when modern day states commonly incorporate diverse identities and disparate communities. It is also true that as geographical distances appear to shrink through the links produced by contemporary capital and telecommunication flows, films often circulate through global circuits and diasporic communities unconnected to national concerns. Nevertheless, the attempts to grapple with the concept of a national cinema are useful, particularly as it is a term that resurfaces not only in academic research but in film journalism, marketing materials, state legislation and film festival discourse. One of the more constructive definitions for an understanding of cinematic culture lies in White’s claim:

I propose a definition of national cinema, then, that pays as little attention as possible to the degree with which films themselves engage with national identity. When trying to assess whether a group of films actually constitute a national cinema, two sets of questions must be answered. The first is: does the group of films come from a community reasonably considered to be a nation? The second is: does the group of films constitute a diverse output, and can one find their feature, documentary, and non-commercial sectors?\(^3\)

His outline has concrete practical application that avoids some of the trickier debates concerning the problem of deciding how to constitute a national identity, particularly

---


\(^3\) White, ‘National Belonging.’ p.224.
as he looks at groups of films rather than individual works. What I believe needs to be added to this claim is the matter of distribution and exhibition. For films to exist as part of a national context there must be a place for them to be seen and recognised by groups of people that are greater than a select number of film festival visitors, journalists or academic scholars. In the majority of cases at the beginning of the twenty-first century this means cinematic exhibition or DVD distribution.

Importantly, the issue of recognising and promoting national cinematic works, including the exhibition and distribution of films, is a concern taken up by state organisations that have an investment in producing some kind of national label. Although different countries around the world have varied levels of government involvement, each of the four countries under study here has state organisations that are paying increasing attention to cinematic culture. Particularly important is the fact that government involvement and support has been increasing in the twenty-first century against predictions that increased global capital would weaken the function of the state. It is a process that can be considered in light of Arjun Appadurai’s claim that ‘it needs to be pointed out that “deterritorialization” generates various forms of “reterritorialization.”’ Understanding the flux between deterritorialization and new processes of reterritorialization is important so that state input into cinematic culture is not understood merely as a continuation of early twentieth century modernity projects but as a specific intervention into modes of audiovisual production and circulation at the end of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first.

Gabriela Martinez points out that

although culture and national identity remain significant in the elaboration of new audiovisual laws, ideals of modernization and development no longer provide the central component for the creation of these cultural policies. […] To a large degree, nation building has moved backstage as ideas of globalization shape both state discourse and individual filmmakers’ aspirations of gaining access to global markets.  

---

Adding to Martinez’s comments, I would argue that it is not so much that nation building has disappeared in favour of globalisation, but that state intervention is now dealing with a more complex process of adapting and retaining its hold on cultural production as a response to globalisation and global markets.

Writing in 2004, just as Chile introduced its first cinema law, the director Silvio Caiozzi stated

at the end of more than 5 decades filmmakers, actors, audiovisual technicians, and even journalists have proposed the necessity for legislation promoting cinema and audiovisual media as an imperative necessity so that a country as distanced as ours can know and learn to know itself. It is important to see ourselves reflected in the great mirror that is cinema to correct our defects and feel proud of our virtues and to project our image to the entire world, exchanging artistic-cultural values. And in this way we can consolidate an image of the country that permits us to relate ourselves with presence and force, including the commercial exchange of our products.

Caiozzi’s statement suggests support for state intervention in cinema yet there is also the sense that what is at stake for a national cinema, and in this way a national cinematic culture, is not just the interest of filmmakers or policy makers but the interaction of the cinematic works with a wider public. This sentiment was echoed in the words of Jorge Alvarez, the Vice President of INCAA in Buenos Aires 2003. He noted that

we know that audiovisual expression is memory and a mirror, a link which unites our countrymen and all those with whom we share historical, cultural and blood ties.

---

Caiozzi and Alvarez’s thoughts intertwine with a desire that is noticeable in state-sponsored film councils across the world, namely to increase access to cinema within national boundaries. However, there are also initiatives, such as funds for sending delegates to international film festivals, which attempt to place the national cinema outside the country and onto the world stage.

When discussing government funded marketing enterprises at film markets such as Cannes, Graeme Turner suggests

the ‘nationalization’ of film promotion through such national marketing offices reveals how closely indigenous film production is connected to the representation and dissemination of images of the nation at home and overseas.9

In line with this, Antonella Estévez notes that

en el contexto de una economía abierta como la que se plantea a principios de los 90, el cine puede ser una herramienta para presentar en el resto del mundo a Chile y sus riquezas culturales. Son estas razones las que impulsan al Estado a involucrarse en el financiamiento del cine nacional a principios de los 90.10

in the context of an open economy, such as the one which was introduced at the beginning of the 90s, cinema can be a tool to present Chile, and its cultural treasures to the rest of the world. It is for this reason that the state began to involve itself in financing the national cinema at the beginning of the 90s.

There is thus a complex desire to hold onto and promote a bordered ‘national cinema’ yet also project this cinema into a space where it can interact with external international elements.

In this chapter I will be paying close attention to the involvement of the state in cinematic culture to examine the way in which cultural policy in Argentina, Bolivia, Chile and Peru negotiates this desire and the outcomes that take place. In particular, I would like to look at the way this is an on-going process of reterritorialization that is in constant practice. McGuigan warns of only treating cultural policy in relation to the narrowly defined nation state as this attitude ignores the effects of capital, particularly its international flows, on artistic production.11 Taking this into consideration, the issues I am discussing in this chapter will always have wider concerns of commercial

---

10 Estévez, Luz, Cámara, Transición, Radio, p.74.
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flow and interaction underlying them but the commercial interest in cinematic culture will be more deeply discussed in Chapter Four. The focus here is on four specific areas that lead into each other, highlighting the most important interventions that national institutions make with regards to cinematic culture in their own nation and in relation to the global sphere. Firstly, I will be analysing legal frameworks and policies as they provide the base and the reference point for all cinematic practice sanctioned under state edict. This is then augmented by an explanation of the way in which policy not only aids contemporary production practices, but also facilitates a larger historical context in which cinematic culture can take place. The remaining two sections focus on the way state processes position the context of their cinematic culture externally in relation to a wider continental and global interaction and also internally with regard to the diverse communities which have relations with cinema inside the nation.

Section 1: Cinema Laws and Legal Intervention

It is common for individual states to have cultural policies ranging from regulation on media and communication ownership to support for small folk art traditions. Following Foucauldian notions of ‘policing’, McGuigan, Miller and Yudice discuss the way in which cultural policy came together with increased governmentality from the seventeenth century onwards to produce attempts in the nineteenth century to educate citizens.\(^\text{12}\) Although this was not a straightforward procedure replicated worldwide, Miller and Yudice chart the way in which it took place in Latin America when advocates of state intervention, such as Domingo F. Sarmiento in Argentina and Andrés Bello in Chile, implemented methods for creating citizens in the nineteenth century. While the policies were aimed at nationalising the country’s culture, they often followed European models and ignored or formed prejudice against indigenous cultural practices. Within this process certain types of high art were privileged through a belief in their ability to produce a better and also governable citizen. Javier Stanziola outlines the way this persisted in Latin America during the early twentieth century when cultural policies continued to support elite artistic practices.\(^\text{13}\) Following David Morley and Kevin Robins this can be understood as typical of the nation-building project:

\(^{12}\) McGuigan, ‘Cultural Policy Studies’; Miller and Yudice, Cultural Policy.

\(^{13}\) Stanziola, ‘Neo-liberalism and Cultural Policies in Latin America’. 
Monolithic and inward-looking, the unitary nation state has seemed to be the realisation of a desire for coherence and integrity [...] And, in so far as it has sought to eliminate difference and complexity, the formation of a national community and culture has involved the extrusion or the marginalisation of elements that have seemed to compromise the clarity of national being.\textsuperscript{14}

Towards the end of the twentieth century, however, there was increased recognition of the need for diversity within culture. This followed identity-politics movements in the West from the 1970s that included feminism and calls for racial and sexual equality, as well as movements particular to South America that sought the recognition of indigenous subjects and cultural practices.\textsuperscript{15} South American countries now promote themselves as multicultural and nations such as Chile have reformed their cultural policy to reflect this.\textsuperscript{16} While the representation of communities within the nation may not be fully inclusive, as will be discussed later in this chapter, these claims of multiculturalism imply a different type of national formation from that which Morley and Robins critique.

At the same time, it is important to state that the move away from over-bearing policy aimed at creating homogenous citizens did not necessarily lead to the demise of cultural policy or its impact on cultural practice. Rather, South American film industries gained strength throughout the latter half of the twentieth century precisely because cinema was supported by government policy.\textsuperscript{17} For many audiovisual practices in South America at the beginning of the twenty-first century, policy in the form of government support and funding provides the only means for continued existence, distribution and exhibition.

While cultural policy can be understood as a vital support mechanism for South American cinema it is worth observing the way that strategies are provided by legal frameworks, instigated by governments, meaning that policy is as much a process of requirement and regulation as that of incentive and enticement. Each of the


\textsuperscript{16} Miller and Yudice, *Cultural Policy*.

\textsuperscript{17} Johnson, ‘Film Policy in Latin America’.
governments in Argentina, Bolivia, Chile and Peru has a specific audiovisual law that was created recently, such as Chile’s introduction of Ley 19.981 in 2004, or else updated in the prior decade. The key aims of each law are similar, mainly the creation of an audiovisual or cinema council that is expected to administer certain policies. INCAA (Instituto Nacional de Cine y Artes Audiovisuales) operates in Argentina, CALA (Consejo del Arte y La Industria Audiovisual) in Chile while Conacine Bolivia and Conacine Peru operate in their respective countries. Running throughout each law is the understanding that the state will play a part in cinema and yet cinema will also play a part in the state, providing in this way a sense that government interaction in this cultural form will have a pervasive quality, linking the cinema to a greater socio-political arena. In Argentina the law states that INCAA

\[ \text{tendrás a su cargo el fomento y regulación de la actividad cinematográfica en todo el territorio de la República, y en el exterior, en cuanto se refiere a la cinematográfica nacional de acuerdo a las disposiciones de la presente ley.}^{19} \]

will be in charge of the promotion and regulation of cinematic activity in all of the territory of the Republic and abroad, when it refers to national cinematography, in agreement with the orders of the present law.

Chile’s audiovisual law also emphasises the relationship between cinema and the nation:

\[ \text{El Estado de Chile apoya, promueve y fomenta la creación y producción audiovisual, así como la difusión y la conservación de las obras audiovisuales como patrimonio de la Nación, para la preservación de la identidad nacional y el desarrollo de la cultura y la educación.}^{20} \]

The state of Chile supports, promotes and develops audiovisual creation and production, within this the diffusion and conservation of audiovisual works as heritage of the nation, for the preservation of national identity and the development of culture and education.

Bolivia’s cinema law states

\[ \text{las diversas actividades cinematográficas […] gozarán, a partir de la fecha, de toda la protección legal al haber reconocido el Estado su importancia para el desarrollo de la cultura nacional y su vinculación a las manifestaciones más importantes de la cultura contemporánea.}^{21} \]

the diverse cinematographic activities […] will possess, from this date on, total legal protection, having been recognised by the state for their importance in the development of national culture and their link to the most important manifestations of contemporary culture.

---

18 Ley no. 24377; Ley no. 1302, Reglamento 1993; Ley no. 26370, Reglamento.
19 Ley no. 24377.
20 Ley no. 19.981.
21 Ley no. 1302.
The Peruvian law continues these themes with the purpose of Law No. 26370 is the promotion of the creation and production of Peruvian cinematographic works, considering cinematography as a cultural phenomenon, an art and a language of major importance and effectiveness for the affirmation of the cultural identity of the country.

It is worth noting that the binding together of cinema, national culture and the state in these statements reflects a stance that has increased with the turn of the century. Earlier versions of audiovisual laws, such as the Argentine Ley No. 17741 (1968) only went so far as to outline definitions of cinematic terms and the way in which the state would participate in funding and regulation. The particular emphasis given to the role of cinema in culture, heritage and education in Argentina is found in the most recent legal updates of the law: Ley No. 24377 from 1994.

I would argue that the expansion of state legal intervention is less about taking charge of cinematic culture, or even national culture, but is instead an attempt to formulate the diverse free-play of cinematic practice into a national whole. Much of this can be understood as an act of reterritorialization in the face of increased global transactions and media flows across borders. These laws set out parameters that have, at their heart, attempts to be inclusive. However, with the setting of parameters comes the question of what is inside and what is outside the boundaries set up in this legislation. There is thus a sense that the states are attempting containment of culture. Importantly, it is when the laws move from these abstract concepts to practical application that their effects can be understood and their motivations more clearly analysed.

Following the introductory statements about cinema and national culture, each law goes on to introduce detailed technical and administrative duties to be carried out with regards to cinematic practice. Significantly, although the laws developed in isolation from one another and are concerned with each country’s specific national situation, there are similarities between them in terms of the regulation and practice that they outline. For each country, there is a specific fund set aside to allow grants and loans to
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be made to filmmakers and to help with aspects of production. In Chile this meant that the Fondo de Fomento Audiovisual 2007 was able to support 144 projects and provide funds for fourteen feature length films.\(^{24}\) On the Internet Movie Database, INCAA is listed as a production company for 143 Argentine films from 1987 to 2009.\(^{25}\) This is an indication of the number of INCAA supported films that have been commercially released yet the number of productions that have gained support is far greater. Conacine Bolivia and Conacine Peru also administer funds and the majority of national films commercially released in these countries gain some support from the councils.

While there is significant support offered for production (a policy of enticement), there is also regulation in place when it comes to exhibition (a policy of requirement). In Argentina each cinema must give accurate box-office figures to INCAA and no feature film of Argentine or foreign origin can be exhibited nor televised without an exhibition certificate awarded by the council. In a similar way, any film that is to be legally distributed in Bolivia must be registered with the film council. Further control over exhibition in Bolivian is implemented by the law’s prohibition of the commercial screening of any film that is not made in or subtitled in Spanish or another of the country’s languages. Returning to practices of enticement, there are frequent instructions for the way in which the film councils must interact with cinematic spaces such as film festivals. In the Argentine law this includes setting aside some of the Cinema Fund to help national films participate in international film festivals and in the Argentine, Chilean and Peruvian laws this also means allowing money to help set up and maintain film festivals within the country. Each of the examples listed above indicates the extent to which government laws and funding interact to provide specific day to day frameworks for cinematic activity in the nation in a process of alternating encouragement and instruction.

Particularly striking is the emphasis on the direct link that cinema is expected to have with education policies, including the agreement that education will have a role in


creating a public that can appreciate cinema and its language. In Peru, one of the main objectives of the law is to promote the teaching of cinematographic language and its appreciation in secondary education; similarly the Bolivian law calls for the Ministry of Education to introduce a course in audiovisual language to the secondary school curriculum; and in Chile the law also calls for the Ministry of Education to introduce an audiovisual subject into formal teaching. The process of linking cinema with education moves a relatively new art form, one that is frequently regarded and derided as entertainment, into the more traditional preserves of state regulation. Formalising the connection between state practice and cinema in this way has the beneficial effect of providing prestige to cinema yet also continues the pervasive procedure of linking cinema into various aspects of national life.

Significantly, the implementation of state control over cinema in legal doctrine is a different approach from cultural policies in other countries, such as the UK, in which there is limited regulation and funds are outsourced to non-partisan bodies that have the ability to administer them. The latter type of approach allows an arm’s length procedure by which independent organisations can distribute funds and support without the need to defer to legal stipulations. Filmmakers and practitioners in South America, on the other hand, whether consciously or unconsciously, are bound to a set of systems that always reflect on and adhere to the power of the law. This has the effect of closing down certain notions of autonomy and independence that are often associated with cinematic practice. As mentioned earlier, this does not necessarily need to be read as a process that takes charge of cinematic practice but should be read as a practice of containment.

The line between the two is very fine and none of the nations under study has had a cinematic history free from the tensions, strains and restrictions placed upon cultural activities by the various dictatorships and military regimes that took charge of cultural activities during the twentieth century. In Chile there was a particularly difficult period when military troops, at the beginning of Pinochet’s dictatorship in 1973, destroyed large numbers of films including the only negatives available for various important works of cinematic history.26 During the military regime many filmmakers
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26 See Mouesca, *Plano Secuencia de la Memoria de Chile*. 
were forced into exile or executed for participation in left-leaning film work and as Estévez points out, censorship was not eliminated until 2001.\textsuperscript{27} In Argentina, Bolivia and Peru there have been similar histories of filmmakers facing persecution and censorship under military regimes and well known figures such as Jorge Sanjines from Bolivia and Fernando Solanas from Argentina were forced into exile.

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, however, all four countries operate as democratic governments and the audiovisual laws reflect a liberal stance towards cultural practice that offers a departure from the problems of censorship that previously complicated state relations with cinematic production. Argentina’s film law formerly had an article that stated INCAA would subsidise films

\begin{quote}
con exclusión, en especial, de aquellas que, apoyándose en temas o situaciones aberrantes o relacionadas con el sexo o las drogas, no atiendan a un objetivo de gravitación positiva para la comunidad.\textsuperscript{29}
\end{quote}

with the exclusion, in particular, of those that, by supporting deviant situations or relating to sex or drugs, do not support a positive disposition in the community.

The article was later removed and in its 1994 version the law was similar to the other audiovisual laws that set more general terms such as ‘quality’ when deciding when to administer funds.\textsuperscript{30} Furthermore, representatives of the film councils, Carola Antezana (Conacine Bolivia), Carola Leiva (CALA) and Julieta Vellano (INCAA) made it clear that the councils do not discriminate against filmmakers or projects on the basis of certain themes and that there is no type of censorship operating within the countries apart from the age classifications on film certificates.\textsuperscript{31}

Nevertheless, the rhetoric in the legislation that displays attempts to contain cinematic culture inversely suggests a lack of autonomy and independence given to cinematic practice. This is particularly true if the laws are understood to imply that cinematic works are considered as public ‘nationalised’ property through their relationship with the state. Complications regarding whether or not cinema is public property arise from

\textsuperscript{27} Estévez, \textit{Luz, Camera, Transición}.
\textsuperscript{29} Ley no. 17741.
\textsuperscript{30} Ley no. 24377.
\textsuperscript{31} Julieta Vellano, personal communication: interview, Buenos Aires, Argentina, March 2 2007; Carola Antezana, personal communication: interview, La Paz, Bolivia, April 10, 2007; Carola Leiva personal communication: interview, Santiago, Chile April 2, 2007.
the fact that cinema policy, theory and practical application often fall between definitions of art and industry. Using the latter definition, Hesmondhalgh sees film practice as part of the core cultural industries and analysing it as such is of importance because ‘studying the cultural industries might help us to understand how texts take the form they do and how these texts have come to play such a central role in contemporary societies.’ This would potentially be in opposition to usages made of cinema in galleries, festivals, and textual analysis studies that understand films as individual or collective works of art rather than part of commercial flows. Nevertheless, the execution engaged from production to distribution, that involves employment of personnel on a (relatively) mass scale, use of industrial equipment such as cameras and rigging, and the import and export of finished copies, suggests that an industry perspective is valid. It is for this reason that Johnson claims the state needs to navigate between support for two different types of value perceived in film. The first is the artistic or cultural value and the second is the value external to the film such as the marketplace potential. He later claims that these are often opposing values and it is true that there is tension between the view that cultural policy should involve state support for cultural practices and the, not always compatible, view that cultural policy should be involved in the commercial exploitation of cinematic works.

Although traditional arts patronage often sought types of return, such as an increase in quality to the high arts that represented the nation, there was little expectation that funding artistic practices would bring about wider benefits beyond the aesthetic. Miller and Yudice detail the way in which this changed when governments began to seek further returns on investment in arts and cultural sectors such as the end product of an improved national subject. Clive Gray extends this concept by paying explicit attention to increased instrumentality as a feature of cultural policy towards the end of the twentieth century and beyond. Using examples gained from scholarship around the world, he finds that there has always been an element of instrumentality in cultural policies since they are designed to achieve something concrete. However, there has
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been a move away from seeing culture and arts operating within their own fields towards an examination of how their secondary effects can be beneficial with outcomes as diverse as urban regeneration, social inclusion and economic growth. To this end ‘there is a burden of expectations that cultural policies should provide a host of solutions to problems that are originally economic, social, political or ideological (or some combination of these).’

When cinema is understood as a cultural industry, particularly with its ability to provide employment and large profit margins if a film is successful, there is a tendency to focus on the way in which it can work as a national industry that brings about economic growth. The problem that Gray finds increasingly urgent is the move towards an ‘attachment argument’ whereby cultural policy works on the basis that funds can only be provided if the cultural works can prove their ability to fulfil needs in other sectors. However, the requirement that cultural policy can only continue to support the arts when a utility value is proven goes against certain global policy statements such as the United Nation’s Declaration on Cultural Diversity Report published in 2001. It expressly stated that cultural goods should not be treated as commodities nor valued for their economic status.

Through analysis of the audiovisual laws of Argentina, Bolivia, Chile and Peru it seems that each state places high value on notions of cinematic heritage and cinema as part of national culture that override any expected economic or social return. Peru’s cinema law is unequivocal in its assertion that it is the obligation of the state to stimulate, develop, diffuse and preserve national cinematography without neither looking for nor obtaining economic reward.

Sarah Barrow notes that when Peru’s new legislation was introduced in 1994 the key difference with regards to the new law was its objective that cinema should no longer be regarded principally as an industrial activity and overt
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signifier of the country’s progress towards modernization, but as an important cultural activity for producers and viewers.40

Nonetheless, because of the large amount of funds needed to bring a cinematic work from development and production stages through to completion and exhibition, there is often the necessity for films to, if not produce profits, at least gain basic commercial returns. In the case of the introduction of Conacine Bolivia’s cinema fund, Fondo de Fomento Cinematográfico (FCC) in 1992, misplaced spending led to an almost complete loss of resources. Under the 1991 cinema law, Conacine was put in charge of distributing money as credit that could be repaid with low interest rates following commercial success of the funded projects. The money given to projects led to an unprecedented accomplishment in Bolivian cinematic history with five new feature-length films screened in 2005, yet there was not enough commercial success to reimburse Conacine’s contribution and this left the FCC almost bankrupt and unable to provide as much support over the following years.41 Learning from this, Conacine recognised that it could only support feature films that are likely to have a level of commercial success. This is a severe example of the concerns across each cinema or audiovisual council where funds tend to be given out in the form of loans. There is thus a desire to support projects that expect to be economically successful and/or provide examples of financing from other private sources. When Chile’s Consejo Nacional de La Cultura y Las Artes (Culture and Arts Council) published a report in 2003, it was quick to point out that the various funds made available for a recent feature film Sub Terra (2003) would be recuperated from a tax on commercial screenings and video sales and hire. It went on to say that

es necesario avanzar no solo en incrementar el aporte público, sino en hacer concurrir a la televisión, además de generar incentivos tributarios para el aporte privado.42

*it is necessary to boost not only the increase of public support but to bring together television support and also generate tax incentives for private support.*

These types of concerns thrust the art work, an individual film, into a greater field of commercial concerns. State intervention thus meshes its own support with initiatives
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41 Roberto Lanza, personal communication: interview, Cochabamba, Bolivia, 17 April, 2007

from the private sector in a way that ties the cinema industry to both the state and commerce.

At the same time, there is a danger in leaving national cinema products to operate as commercial objects in a free market economy since they may be overwhelmed by other, competing, cinema products. This is a view held by many critics who have indicated that a free-market for cinema products allows Hollywood studios to stifle local competition due to the size and extent of the latter’s resources.43

An example of the complexity of this problem is outlined by Ricardo Bedoya in his analysis of the history of the Peruvian film industry. He details the way that articles in the cinema law, including the tax on film exhibition and the quota system supporting the screening of national films, were repealed in 1992.44 Critics favouring their removal claimed that the previous system violated the constitutional rights of free commerce. Others alleged the funds gained from the exhibition tax were going towards film producers and not the municipal regions that the taxes were meant to support. By repealing these articles there was an end to financial gain for producers exploiting the system which, as Bedoya suggests, had created an abundance of cheap feature films produced mainly as a profit gaining exercise. It also appeased cinema owners since

desde su constitución, el sistema de exhibición obligatoria de cintas nacionales fue visto por los dueños de las salas como una intolerable intromisión del Estado en la libertad de comercio.45

from its constitution, the system of obligatory exhibition of national films was seen by the owners of the screens as an intolerable interference by the state in the freedom of commerce.

Nevertheless, Bedoya finds that the result of this shift was that national production ceased to take place and short films, which had been countering the cheap feature films by introducing artistic and aesthetic innovation, disappeared. Neither state intervention nor its complete withdrawal brought about a solution to the Peruvian film industry’s problems.

44 Bedoya, 100 años de cine en el Perú.
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With the complications brought about by state intervention, a suggested solution is often less involvement or an arm’s length approach, allowing the input of more diverse organisations in the creation of cinematic culture and practices. Stanziola pays attention to this with regards to Latin America when he says we will argue that modest legislative and social reforms have transformed cultural policy-making into a more pluralistic process that de-emphasizes the role of the public sector and aims at empowering nonprofit organizations.46

He believes that from the 1990s onwards, nonprofit organisations have been able to increase activity in the arts due to the improved conditions and opportunities that led to initiatives such as cultural funds and tax incentive funds. These are sanctioned by governments but because they are run by nonprofit organisations, they work independently of state control. In Chile this would include initiatives such as the Ley de Donaciones con Fines Culturales, 18.985 (Donation Law for Cultural Projects) that allows people to donate money as a tax write-off with the funds gathered from this initiative going towards a number of cultural ventures including cinematic projects.47

Allowing the input of other organisations and funds provided directly by the public has the potential to maintain a democratic and diverse interest in cinematic practices, particularly the production of new films. In this way, a fear that governments may control cinematic practice or implement restrictions, as was the case during military dictatorships in each of the countries, can be somewhat abated.

At the same time, when advocating a “hands off” approach to government cultural policy, problems arise concerning the production of non-commercial cinematic works. In the case of South America this is particularly true of documentary formats. Each country has a strong tradition of documentary filmmaking with films such as the _La hora de los hornos_ (1968) that brought issues of neo-colonialism in Latin America to world wide attention, _La batalla de Chile_ (1975) that produced some of the most important cinematic images surrounding the Pinochet dictatorship, and recent works such as _Cocalero_ (2007) that showed Bolivian president Evo Morales coming to power. With government policy geared towards supporting cinema as an industry, or leaving it in the hands of nonprofit organisations, there is little room for the types of

47 Ley no. 18.985.
work that do not have an established place in the audiovisual market, either in commercial exhibition venues or DVD catalogues. This came to light at the round table discussion held as part of Bolivia’s Muestra Internacional de Cine y Video Documento festival in 2007.48 A number of documentary filmmakers from across South America came together to talk about the difficulty of finding places to screen films, the lack of bodies such as television channels commissioning work and, overall, the almost total impossibility of being able to recuperate economic investment in their films. Alfredo Ovando, a Bolivian documentary filmmaker, pointed out that Conacine Bolivia does not support documentaries because it is impossible to recuperate costs and repay the loans given out by the FCC. There are some moves across the different countries towards rectifying this situation: INCAA provides some funds specifically for documentary filmmaking and Conacine Peru found money to support two documentary projects in 2008. Carola Antezana from Conacine Bolivia also pointed out that they are seeking to change the law so that Conacine can offer financial support that does not need to be repaid.49 However, policies to reduce government intervention and place cinematic practices into an industrial arena or at the will of non-profit organisations would lead to the drying up of these limited funds. South America would thus risk losing the work of important documentary filmmakers and other experimental artists that cannot recuperate capital.

A further complication in the debate is that policy intervention is not always possible when the state does not support its own institutions and policies. Barrow notes that Conacine Peru has often been unable to complete its mandate due to a lack of specific funds from the government.50 In 2006, an outcry ranged across filmmakers, policy makers and supporters of cinema with regards to the Peruvian government’s failure to provide adequate financial resources to Conacine Peru even though it is legally obliged to support this council. They put together a campaign called Perú en Pantalla (Peru on Screen) demanding that the government completes its decree under Law 26370 which declares that the state must award Conacine Peru seven million Peruvian

50 Barrow, ‘Images of Peru,’ p.47.
soles each year (£1.13 million). The government increased its funding in 2007 but only to the total of 2.8 million soles (£452,000), making it hard for Conacine Peru to support production and other cinema initiatives. President Rosa Maria Oliart raised these points in her interview with the blog Lacinefilianoespatriota when discussing the Peruvian film industry. She stated

all cinematography in the world is subsidised by its state except for the Hollywood industry. Unfortunately the present government has not come to understand the importance of this. If the government gave us the budget that had been assigned by law a film could be made by funds given by Conacine. It is to say, not 100 thousand but 250 thousand. It would be great. We could give funding not only to two but to four projects. The panorama would change. But this does not happen. And furthermore, if there are not public funds, where will they make films? You are never going to recuperate your investment at the box-office. There is no way. First, because of the access the public have to cinema, the price of the ticket, the distributor and the exhibitor who have their business and take their cut. You are left with very little. Because of this you cannot understand cinema here as a business. Without doubt, it’s important that the government understands that cinema is very important to the country, that it is a window to the world of our culture.

With regards to policies other than funding initiatives, Argentina has been successful at implementing film quotas to support the exhibition of national films in movie-theatres but Bolivia has been far less so. Bolivia’s film law explicitly states that,
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‘Todo filme de producción nacional gozará del beneficio de cuota de pantalla de acuerdo al reglamento elaborado por Conacine.’54 (Every film that is a national production will benefit from the screen quota in accordance with the regulation prepared by Conacine). Furthermore, in the later version of the law, specific tables are set out demonstrating that by 1997 a cinema in a population of more than one hundred thousand people would be expected to screen national works for at least 36 hours every year.55 However, by 2008 there was still no support for the legislation and it is consistently ignored by cinema owners. In a similar manner, Bolivia’s law highlights the need to introduce education practice relating to cinema but as Marcelo Cordero of the Yaneramai distribution group in Bolivia pointed out

en ningún centro educativo del país existe alguna materia relacionada a la lectura crítica de la imagen o formación de públicos entre sus estudiantes.

none of the education centres in the country have any material related to teaching criticism of audiovisual images or the formation of audiences amongst their students.56

Understanding cultural policy in cinema must thus take into consideration the published and available legislation as well as the way in which policy actually functions at a ground level. Throughout the various policies there may be an attempt at containment of all cinematic culture within a national sphere, presided over by the state, yet tensions emerge concerning the extent to which the state can fulfil this aim. There is also the fact that the precarious economic situations of each of the countries, all of which are still talked about as developing nations, means a policy of leaving cinematic practice in the hands of market forces is not necessarily a desirable option. Yet due to the legitimate concerns about repressive state involvement and national regulation of cinema, the way in which cultural policy does have an effect must be closely monitored. To expand upon the effect of legislation and cultural policy, specific working practices will be examined in the remaining sections of this chapter to understand both the motivation involved in policies and the way in which they interact with a cinematic sphere and socio-political situation that does not always allow policy to be carried out as planned. I will also be taking into account the fact that the state’s attempt at reterritorializing national cinema has to come up against the
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state’s own interaction with external and interior forces such as other governments and local interests.

Section 2: Situating an Historical Continuum

One of the main threads running through each of the audiovisual laws is the desire to preserve and maintain cinematic works as national heritage (patrimonio). It is within this context that policy and government initiatives in Argentina, Bolivia, Chile and Peru engage cinematic culture in a wide framework that goes beyond individual films. One of the most significant ways in which this is done is through their use of national cinema heritage to create an historical paradigm.

At this point it is worth pointing out that the presentation of an historical paradigm is complicated by the fact that cinematic products have a certain kind of spatiality which is intensified by their transference through global locations from one cinema screen to the next site of exhibition, with a trail of reviews and discussions tracing their mark on different locales. The way in which the film is continually reproduced and remade in new exhibition-windows, with a release onto DVD, a new cut exhibited or an edited version screened on television, gives a temporary feel to the product which elides the possibility of a manifest original. With films that have received some kind of investment from the state, their transference through different locations and across borders also moves them further from the national setting which fostered their production. To counteract this dispersal, states create space for films in particular sites, often in archives and cinematecas. This is both a reterritorialization practice and a historicising process that, in the interest of ‘national’ cultural heritage, seeks to lay out and classify artistic works in an historical continuum. A similar process has taken place with traditional heritage and ‘high’ arts, particularly from the eighteenth century onwards, leading to the construction of imposing buildings such as museums and galleries that fix and stabilise works within taxonomic collections. However, with cinematic works there are certain difficulties when attempting to classify and secure films using methodologies of traditional heritage, not least because of the border-crossing potential mentioned above.

Throughout the history of cinema, critics and journalists have often overlooked or resisted the possibility of cataloguing and classifying cinema as cultural heritage in
the same way as other ‘high’ art forms. This is mainly due to the commercial nature of the cinema industry; its relatively recent emergence; and the belief that cinema is a popular art form. There have, however, been a number of people, such as Iris Barry who began collecting films for the Museum of Modern Art in the United States or Henri Langlois who created the Cinémathèques Française in Paris, who have understood the importance of safeguarding films and retaining a durable cinematic history. Their work frequently encouraged private institutions to work towards archiving films and preserving those produced on nitrate that were quickly degrading. This in turn led to government organisations and endorsed institutions stepping in when it was the ‘national’ cinematic heritage that was at stake. In Argentina, the government-supported Museo del Cine Pablo Ducrós Hicken has been holding national film archives since 1971 while Bolivia has had a national cinemateca since 1976 and reopened new facilities during 2007. In Chile, the Universidad de Chile, Chile Films and other private organisations held archives at various points throughout the twentieth century and in 2006 archives were brought under state control when the Cineteca Nacional was created as part of Chile’s new Centro Cultural. In line with the other cinematecas mentioned, Chile’s cinemateca has the dual function of providing screening space for films in a cultural capacity and services and resources for preserving national films. In Peru the Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú (PUCP) currently holds an archive of Peruvian films although Conacine Peru began efforts in 2008 to move the archives into the Museo Nacional and bring them under state protection. This followed on from activities in 2007 when Conacine Peru began screening national films in the Museo Nacional and organising film-poster exhibitions to increase public access to film artefacts. In each of the countries under study, governments have contributed to increased archival activities in recent years, either through legal demands for the creation of new cinemateca spaces and archive services or through financial support for existing institutions.

57 Houston, Penelope (1994) Keepers of the Frame, London: BFI.
What is important is the way in which the state and other officially endorsed organisations do more than simply support the preservation of films within storage spaces; they also play a role in the creation of a history for the nation’s cinematic culture. At times their efforts catalogue a national cinema by creating a documented body of work that can physically and tangibly represent this concept. This can involve providing funds to preserve and give the public access to films from the nation’s cinematic history. As an example of this, the Cinemateca Boliviana screened every Bolivian film produced between 2000 and 2007 as a special season during its first year in the new premises.

While this type of season focuses on a concrete catalogue of films there have also been more abstract claims about what the cinematecas can achieve. During the first-anniversary celebrations of the Cinemateca Boliviana’s new building, various present and ex-members of the cinemateca such as Pedro Susz, Carlos Mesa and Antonio Eugenio repeated the importance of the cinemateca as a site for ‘la memoria de la imagen’ (*the memory of the image*). Throughout the public meeting this was described as a ‘national’ image. Ignacio Aliaga Riquelmo, Director of the Cineteca Nacional de Chile, repeated a similar sentiment during a public meeting in his institution. He affirmed that the importance of protecting national films lies in the fact that they are the works that created images of the country and that they show ‘who we are’.

At the same time, state organisations play a role in forming an historical framework for the nation’s cinema by contextualising films in a certain way. Each of these processes can be understood as a continuous act of construction and there are certain structures of power that determine which films remain and how they are presented. In his work on the ‘archive’, Jacques Derrida returns to the etymology of the term, citing its origin in the Greek *arkheion*: the residence of the superior magistrate.
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The archons are first of all the document’s guardians. They do not only ensure the physical security of what is deposited and the substrate. They are also accorded the hermeneutic right and competence. They have the power to interpret the archives.  

More so than public libraries, where citizens have access to enter and engage with texts in their own manner, cinema archives rely on personnel to interpret material and then present it to the public. The unwieldy nature of celluloid and other cinematic artefacts means that careful decisions have to be made about the way individual works will be dealt with and which ones will secure a permanent place. Furthermore, the selection that takes place when entering a work into the national archive means that the films which are included take on a certain status similar to that which Derrida sees as happening with archives in general:

> With such a status, the documents, which are not always discursive writings, are only kept and classified under the title of the archive by virtue of a privileged topology. They inhabit this uncommon place, this place of election where law and singularity intersect in privilege.

Those in charge of the archives are in charge of determining this privilege and it is up to the guidelines and policy provided by the state to determine the way in which these modern-day archons carry out this task. In the face of the continuously reproducing film product that crosses borders and formats, state sponsored archives make choices about how individual films will be preserved, if they will be re-mastered, whether they will be given exhibition and what kinds of auxiliary materials and information will be produced around them.

Chile’s relatively new cinemateca offers a good example of how these processes take place as a way of reterritorializing Chilean national works following the disjuncture created by the military regime. This reterritorialization is a particularly recent endeavour as an historical continuum for film was unavailable during the Pinochet dictatorship that lasted until the 1990s. When military troops destroyed large archives of material in 1973; demanded the closure of cinema departments that had been storing their own archives; and forced filmmakers and their material into exile; the legacy of Chilean cinema and its history was removed. Due to the worldwide attention paid to the New Latin American Cinema movement in the 1970s, knowledge of
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Chilean cinema from this period retained currency yet a sense of history prior to this movement was unavailable. Writing in 1988, film historian Mouesca noted:

*a pesar de que, a juicio de muchos, sólo se puede hablar verdaderamente de *cine chileno* a partir de los años 60, lo cierto es que en Chile se lo hecho cine desde principios de siglo, cuestión que no puede dejar de ser tenida en consideración.*

*in spite of the fact that, in the judgement of many, one can only truly speak of a Chilean cinema from the 1960s onwards, it is certain that cinema was made in Chile from the beginning of the century, a question that cannot be left without consideration.*

To bring consideration to this greater history of Chilean films, the cinemateca has not only been restoring and preserving films that were made prior to the 1960s but has also been screening them in its cinemas to allow public access to these films. As an example of this, in March 2007 the cinemateca exhibited *La mano del muertito* (1948), a film that contains a mix of genre – between thriller and farce – and a national feel with its use of Chilean dialect and social codes.

Furthermore, the exhibition of film such as this are framed by the cinemateca space which has posters in the entrance depicting films from early Chilean cinema through to post-dictatorship and twenty-first century releases. In 2008, the public was given
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wider access to this auxiliary material with an exhibition in the public plaza near the cinemateca that displayed seventy Chilean film posters from El Húsar de la Muerto (1925) to Tony Manero (2008). Contextualisation of the ‘national cinema product’ is thus enhanced by the material conditions that the cinematecas introduce.

The focus on public access is also complemented by an attempt to engage national subjects in the cinemateca’s projects. On May 30th, 2006, there was a call made to citizens within Chile to participate in forming their history within the cinemateca. The ‘Chile Tiene Memoria’ (Chile Has a Memory) campaign was launched to preserve audiovisual Chilean heritage from the silent era to present day with the idea that private institutions and citizens could guard their films in the national cinemateca. They sought, and are still seeking, films on 35mm, 16mm, 8mm, Super 8 and videos on U-Matic, Betacam, Betamax, Hi-8, SVHS and VHS. The publicity surrounding this campaign suggests the willingness and, also, necessity of housing a history of Chilean cinema that is open to a variety of forms and experiences. Furthermore, it contrasts the way in which the military regime restricted the types of cinematic images that were allowed to circulate. The campaign also has resonance for other countries, particularly Bolivia and Peru, which have only a limited number of cinematic works in their archives.

At the same time, there is the problem that many important South American films were made in exile and copies were managed and maintained outside of the continent, particularly Chilean films made during the Pinochet dictatorship. These films are categorised as Chilean due to the state’s legal definition that national cinematic works are those made by Chilean producers or audiovisual teams, yet they were never circulated widely inside the nation. Two particularly obvious examples are La batalla de Chile (1975) and Acta general de Chile (1986) that were filmed on Chilean territory by teams of Chilean filmmakers yet had to be distributed abroad because of political themes that were critical of the military regime. Although they are widely discussed in academic discourse and form an integral part of Chilean cinematic

history, they have been largely unavailable to national citizens. When Patricio Guzmán returned to Chile with copies of his film *La batalla de Chile* to make the follow-up documentary *Memoria obstinada* (1997) it was the first time the former had been screened within the country. If films such as these are to be included in a national history, cinématékas thus have to work to bring them into a national location and this often means recuperating cinematic works through donations and kindness from other countries. It is a situation that could be comparable with many third world countries attempting to repatriate their heritage from museums that house important artefacts abroad.

The practice of recuperating films from abroad also intersects with a wider process of reterritorialization that works to counteract concerns that a cinematic vision of South America is created and maintained abroad. In countries such as Bolivia, that do not have a large cinematic output, it is frequently the case that images of the nation are more readily available through documentaries and films made by foreign production companies. These images tend to be ruled by the cultural codes and aesthetic styles of the producing culture rather than the nation on screen. This sentiment was expressed by one of the organisers of Bolivia’s *Muestra Internacional de Cine y Video Documento* (*International Exhibition of Documentary Film and Video*) festival, Juan Manuel Peña, at a round table discussion and later repeated by his fellow organiser, Maria Teresa Torres, in a private interview. They both talked about the way in which there are more foreign made documentaries about Bolivia than documentaries available from Bolivian filmmakers. Their stance does not outlaw the production of cinematic work from an outside perspective but suggests that there is a desire to see and have access to works that are produced from within the nation and are thus more likely to put forward subjective positions formed within codes and aesthetics that are rooted in the home cultural space. National archives and cinématékas allow this to happen, particularly when they take on work that may not achieve a commercial existence either on television or on DVD, but nonetheless provides a record of films produced within a specific cultural and historical space. Thus, documentaries and
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other works shot on low budget video or digital stock are allowed in the archives alongside works created on 35mm.

The archiving of actual footage, whenever possible, is also important in allowing films to be studied in their original form.\textsuperscript{70} A great deal of writing on Latin American Cinema, particularly the abundance of work on the New Latin American Cinema movement, makes detailed textual analysis of key films yet, as these were sometimes only screened at festivals or had limited exhibition, they are often impossible to obtain for re-analysis.\textsuperscript{71} This leaves contemporary critics relying on secondary information, such as newspaper reviews or scholarship on film festival screenings, for an understanding of the cinematic works, or else forces them to miss out the films altogether as copies cannot be found. Counteracting this problem, the placement of works within archives where they can be uncovered means that scholarship can start from the point of the film and thus retain a sense of empiricism. This is particularly important for the large number of South American films that have not been released on a home viewing format such as DVD or VHS. It ties into what Eileen Hooper-Greenhill understands as the importance of museums:

\begin{quote}
Meanings are not constant, and the construction of meaning can always be undertaken again, in new contexts and with new functions. The radical potential of museums lies in precisely this. As long as museums and galleries remain the repositories of artefacts and specimens, new relationships can always be built, new meanings can always be discovered, new interpretations with new relevances can be found, new codes and new rules can be written.\textsuperscript{72}
\end{quote}

The potential for working with films to find new meanings and interpretations is enhanced in the Chilean case by the fact that archives are extended into the virtual world. Chile’s online cinemateca\textsuperscript{73}, sponsored by the Chilean Council for Arts and Culture, presents national films for viewing and study by a wide number of people, a practice which is concurrent with the radical potential of museums outlined above. Cinematic works pertaining to Chile, from the silent feature film \textit{El husar de la muerte} (1925) to the 2004 documentary \textit{Üxüf xipay: El despojo} (2004) which centres

\textsuperscript{70} The very nature of new prints, re-edits and physical wear and tear means that it is often impossible to establish an ‘original’ work but archives can, nonetheless, provide a physical audiovisual text that is the intended work of the filmmaker and similar to what was and is made available to audiences.


on the tensions between the indigenous Mapuche people and the Chilean state, are available for free download, making the works accessible to both members of the public and scholars seeking original source material. As the virtual cinemateca is run by the Arts and Culture Council it is given a certain level of authority and has the ability to position the works in one place in contrast to the varied on-line resources that have a scattering of films in different locations. This placement coincides with the aims of state-run archives that are not only hoping to preserve films but want to place them together so that they can be allocated a space in a greater historical schemata.

At the same time there is the potential danger in conserving cinematic material like museum pieces. Scholarly work takes into account various problems with the structures, policies and ideologies that take place in museums. For example, there is the difficulty museums have in accommodating a plurality of histories or the struggle for representation that takes place within them. The power of museums as representational spaces can be understood when Hooper-Greenhill states

> museums not only exist within a particular time and space, they also help articulate particular temporal and spatial orders. It is in this respect that we can see them as not just existing within a context but also as themselves creating cultural contexts.

When cinematecas and archives display, hold and preserve cinematic works, they take on the functions of museums, which include the problems of authorising certain works and cultural types as valid over others. Although the wide inclusiveness of Chile’s ‘Chile Tiene Memoria’ plan suggests a policy of inclusion and a lack of hierarchy awarded to certain works, the use of exhibition spaces and screening programs, even within virtual cinematecas, will tend to privilege and fix certain works as more important in the cinematic history than in others. Furthermore, as Sharon Macdonald points out

> museums, which literally employ physical objects in their constitution of culture, are unusually capable among institutions of turning culture into an object: of materializing it.
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The placement of films within a museum-like context overrides to some extent the fluidity of these works that can circulate through time and space when copies are made, passed on and used in personal settings. Archiving is a method of containing films that suits a national interest hoping to consolidate national culture but may not suit other persons or filmmakers wishing to interact with films in a more flexible way.

A parallel can be made with what Philip Fisher sees as the instance in the eighteenth century when museums became a pedagogical tool rather than an aesthetically pleasing and curious collection. He sees an Enlightenment force, the idea of systematic ordering, at work which meant aesthetics gave way to the overall intellectual pattern that objects embody. Film archives and cinematecas often have an education drive at their core and frequently provide literature and other learning materials to accompany the film object. However, the national institutions have to work through the tensions that exist between their categorisation of how the cinematic work should be understood and the fact that the public potentially have their own, different, interpretation of these works. There is also the further effect that along with the “work of art” the museum displays and stabilizes the idea of a national culture, an identifiable Geist, or spirit, that can be illustrated by objects and set in contrast to other national cultures.

In a similar way, cinematecas situate film in a manner that places them in a specific national context. Frequently, the cinemateca buildings exhibit films from other countries, but the programming of films and the way that they are advertised usually highlights the different national origin of the foreign film. As with museum objects, films from other places act to strengthen the local nature of the domestic object, so long as there are educational and contextual markers alongside to provide this demarcation.

Nonetheless, the films that enter the archives and are guarded over by the archons may be determined less by the desires of those working in the archives than by the resources available. Penelope Houston has outlined the problem of preserving films before they disappear due to the large volumes of material in existence and the overwhelming costs involved in keeping them in adequate and presentable
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conditions. Although national archives may have older cinematic works available in storage, until adequate copies are made, these works cannot be screened nor lent out, meaning that they are effectively hidden and unable to participate in a greater cultural sphere. In 2008 the director of the Cinemateca Boliviana, Antonio Eugenio, pointed out that the cinemateca has over 10,000 works in its archives and that all of those still need to be transferred to digital copies. As the archivist, Monica Villarroel Márquez, in Chile stated, this undertaking is complicated by the fact that the cinemateca usually receives prints rather than negatives and so it has to undertake the expensive process or augmenting two or three prints together so that an adequate copy can be made and digitised. The expense of this process is amplified by the fact that there is no suitable photo-chemical laboratory available in Chile that is capable of making all the necessary copies. The cinemateca thus has the expensive task of using foreign laboratories to undertake much of its work.

Houston also points out the tension between the film industry and archives which has led to suspicion from distributors about how archives may take away the potential for the films to turn a profit. She says ‘for the distributors, it was a key principle that all films should always remain within the system and under their control.’ This attitude creates problems for national services as they often cannot get the rights to works that they wish to display as part of the historical cannon within their facilities. This can then be exacerbated by the fact that there is often no alternative place for the public to encounter the films as distributors are often unable to, or have no interest in reproducing older films on accessible formats such as DVD.

There is also a problem with private collections as Mariano Silva notes with regard to collections of early films in Chile:

Para mayor problema, coleccionistas privados guardaron celosamente este material, en algunas casos, y tan celosamente – y con tanta ignorancia – que
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olvidaron su valor para la cultura nacional y, de paso, que tales películas hechos en nitrado (antes de 1950) se autodestruían.\textsuperscript{83}

\textit{A great problem is that, in some cases, private collectors jealously guard this material and, with such jealousy – and with equal ignorance – that they forget the value the material has for national culture. Also, because these films were made in nitrate (before 1950) they disintegrate.}

To overcome this problem, the cinema law in Bolivia demands that a copy of any film distributed and awarded an exhibition certificate in the country must be deposited in the National Archives.\textsuperscript{84} However, there is the reoccurring problem of finances. Although the Cinemateca Boliviana has the legal right to these films, it has few resources to help it enforce the legislation and as Antonio Eugenio noted, few companies voluntarily submit their work.\textsuperscript{85} Furthermore, the cinemateca’s limited financial resources means that it must rely on donations of works, often from other countries, to recuperate older films as it cannot buy copies or spend money searching for them. It thus has no cinematic works produced prior to the 1950s. In Peru, the cinema law states that one of the functions of the film council, Conacine, is to promote the creation of a national cinemateca, videoteca and library specialising in cinematography, yet Conacine Peru was still struggling to implement all of these features in 2008.

State institutions thus have to work with the fact that they have the right to maintain and provide access to cultural heritage, as enshrined within the audiovisual laws, yet this right is often thwarted by the unwillingness of commercial distributors and private collectors to allow access to their films and a lack of funds to implement legislation. The state legislation claims a right to protect national heritage but unless it resorts to over-bearing and repressive control, it is a right which cannot always be upheld. It is significant that statements within the audiovisual laws concerning cultural heritage suggest that heritage is a given and unproblematic concept. There is no suggestion within the laws that there may be private or economic interests that complicate the nation’s claim in this instance.


\textsuperscript{84} Ley no. 1302.

\textsuperscript{85} Personal Observation: Public Meeting, \textit{Conversando Con, Sobre y en la Cinemateca} (Conversing with, about and in the Cinemateca) Cinemateca Boliviana, La Paz, Bolivia, 5, 6 & 7 Nov, 2008.
The various policies in place, either through physical categorisation in archives or through support for screening and providing access to a variety of films, signal positive steps of inclusiveness. They also suggest that states are attempting a liberal outlook in their involvement in cinematic history. In many ways, consolidation of a national cinematic heritage allows the nation easy containment of cinematic culture. It can deal with tangible objects that were produced in the past and set out taxonomic collections drawn from a physical history. By doing this, the state can elude the trickier elements of the nation’s cinematic culture, namely its cooperation with external sources and the divisions that exist within current practice. However, as outlined above, there are various inhibiting factors such as a lack of financial support for these enterprises and an unwillingness amongst commercial and private sectors to play their part, which reduces the number of films that can actually be allowed to participate.

Section 3: Working Between the National and Regional

While the last two sections have outlined the way in which states and endorsed institutions attempt to assert a degree of control over cinematic culture within national boundaries, the tension that exists between these internal practices and the relationship that states have to the South American region and larger global forces, need due consideration. Framing this tension is the wider discussion on the problems that small national audiovisual industries face with regards to the dominance of products from external industries, particularly Hollywood. The post-Schiller arguments ranging over the extent and effect of ‘media imperialism’ in both film and other cultural activities have been well documented and do not need further revision here but it is worth taking into consideration Dissanayake’s claim that ‘at a minimum then, we need to pluralize the concept of cultural imperialism and talk in terms of cultural imperialisms.’ It is also worth noting that, regardless of audience usage of
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cultural products, uneven development exists in which small national film industries in South America struggle to compete with an overabundance of foreign products. In South America the experience of foreign domination is a condition that is felt not only in audiovisual production but throughout the majority of the economic sector as products attempt to compete in a global market that repeatedly favours traditionally successful nations such as the US, Japan and large European countries. With trade agreements such as NAFTA and regulation imposed by bodies like the WTO enhancing, rather than decreasing, this problem, movement has been made towards regional trade policies to consolidate South American economic cooperation. This led to the creation of Mercosur, from the Treaty of Asunción in 1991, which was originally an agreement between Argentina and Brazil but grew to include Paraguay, Uruguay, Chile, Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela. By 2005 Mercosur had become the fourth largest trade bloc in the world and formed an intergovernmental organisation that was similar to but less powerful than the supranational organisation of the EU. Of particular importance is the fact that these organisations problematise and work between what is often perceived as a binary between globalisation and the state. Although they facilitate interstate trading and encourage the free flow of products and finance along global routes, it is the representatives of individual nations that determine the decision making process within the organisations. It is this factor which strengthens the position of member countries when engaging with powerful entities such as multinational corporations. This follows what Sassen sees as an important component of global relations, ‘What matters here is that global capital has made claims on national states, which have responded through the production of new forms of legality’. Rather than a situation in which global flows of finance and trade erase national importance, they interact with ever-increasing state regulation that reterritorializes business flow. This is no less true in South American audiovisual industries where legislation has been increasing.

It is, however, the case that the opening up of economies through regional integration, as defined and led by the market, is a process which frequently favours the power of multinational or transnational corporations.\textsuperscript{92}

At the same time, there is a case for remembering the strength that national representatives bring to trade organisations and agreements. This is particularly evident in Mercosur as different member states often defer primarily to national constitutions or domestic law before international law and agreements.\textsuperscript{93} It means that Mercosur meetings are often concerned with the arbitration between individual states first and larger global frameworks second. Negotiations frequently reach the point of stalemate as representatives refuse to consent to new agreements and treaties if they will override national law already in place. The power of individual countries within these organisations also accounts for the way in which strong nations and metropolitan centres continue to hold the balance of power in the face of the fact that global relations can supposedly undercut and circumvent their importance.\textsuperscript{94}

With regards to cinematic culture in South America this has been of importance as new trade bloc agreements, and the national legislation that interacts with them, have filtered down to have an effect on audiovisual production. In 2003, Recam: Reunión Especializada de Autoridades Cinematográficas y Audiovisuales del Mercosur \textit{(Reunion of Cinematographic and Audiovisual Authorities of Mercosur and Associated States)} was created within Mercosur to provide a platform for audiovisual production and distribution in the member countries. Its objectives are:

adoptar medidas concretas para la integración y complementación de las industrias cinematográficas y audiovisuales de la región. Reducir las asimetrías que afectan al sector, impulsando programas específicos a favor de los países de menor desarrollo relativo. Armonizar las políticas públicas y los aspectos legislativos del sector.\textsuperscript{95}

to adopt concrete methods for the integration of the cinematographic and audiovisual industries of the region. To reduce the asymmetries that affect the sector by instigating specific programs that favour the countries that are relatively less developed. To harmonise the public policies and the legislative aspects of the sector.

\textsuperscript{92} Martín-Barbero, ‘Transformation in the Map’.
\textsuperscript{93} Vervaele, ‘Mercosur and Regional Integration in South America’.
\textsuperscript{94} Sassen, ‘Introduction’.
Each country provides a representative from their respective national film council and in this way the organisation has the capacity to work with individuals who are directly accountable to national policies.

Recam complements the work already in place by the organisation CAACI (El propósito de la Conferencia de Autoridades Audiovisuales y Cinematográficas de Iberoamérica) which was set up in 1989 and has representatives from film councils in similar countries to Recam but also includes Spain and Portugal. Without the umbrella of a trade organisation such as Mercosur, the focus of CAACI is somewhat more cultural:

\textit{The aim behind its creation is to promote the development of the audiovisual sector of the region and drive cinematographic exchange through the strengthening of Iberoamerican cultural identity.}

However, it did put forward a proposal in 1989 for a Common Latin-American Cinematographic Market:

\textit{The objective of the Common Latin-American Cinematographic Market will be to implement a multilateral participation system in exhibition spaces for cinematographic works certified as national by the signature states in the present agreement, with the aim of amplifying the market possibilities for the stated countries and to protect the united cultural links between the people of Iberoamerica and the Carribean.}

Although the work to create a common market is ongoing, CAACI has a significant achievement: the creation of the Ibermedia program which has greatly increased the number of coproductions taking place between member countries. I will be discussing the work of Ibermedia more closely in the fifth chapter yet it is important to understand that the success of this initiative is one example of the way that CAACI and Recam strengthen regional audiovisual co-operation. The move towards regional


\footnotesize{97 CAACI, ‘La CAACI’}
collaboration rather than a focus on individual national industries means that each nation needs to contextualise its cinematic culture within an external sphere. At the same time, it means that both CAACI and Recam can use regional strength as a protectionist measure to safeguard film products in a situation of global circulation that favours larger industries such as Hollywood. There is thus an opening out of the national cinematic culture towards a regional concern with a simultaneous defence against the larger global elements of free circulation that are viewed as dangerous.

However, an historical articulation of the way in which cinema in the region has circulated beyond national boundaries is necessary, at this point, to define the kind of changes that work by Recam and CAACI represents. Getino notes that their have been attempts to implement a regional ‘protective’ marketplace for Iberoamerican film since 1931 but it was only towards the end of the twentieth century that organisations such as Recam and CAACI gained strength. I would like to argue that the intervention of states in regional film markets during this time is of interest because it interacts with and moves on from the attempts at transnational exchange in the New Latin American Cinema movement of the 1960s and 70s.

It is by now well documented that film practices have, from the inception of cinema, reached across national boundaries by using a variety of locations, actors, filmmakers and financing sources. This was no less true in countries such as Chile where filmmakers and actors were imported by the national film studio Chile-Film in the 1940s to try and increase production standards. However, it was the New Latin American Cinema movement that celebrated the radical potential available in the movement of films and filmmakers beyond national borders. Many filmmakers spent time fleeing restrictive military regimes in their own countries and had to use clandestine methods to bring material to production and exhibition in other countries. Famous examples abound such as Jorge Sanjines’ account of the way in which his team moved from Bolivia to Peru, Ecuador and Colombia to smuggle film footage, stock and equipment out of the state. Other filmmakers in exile used foreign
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resources and locations to produce works that formed a critical stance on their country of origin.\textsuperscript{101} The use of film festivals in Europe to show work either made in Latin America or made by filmmakers in exile was also significant in allowing a global interaction with a cinema movement that was specific to the socio-political particularities of the region. In this way, transnational flow was used for political gain that worked against, rather than with, government organisations.

With a democratic form of government in place across each of the countries at the beginning of the twenty-first century, there is less oppositional filmmaking in place and governments are able to increase their use of cinematic works to represent the nation. Filmmakers have, in turn, benefited from the increased involvement that the film councils provide through funding and other initiatives. Furthermore, it is the state institutions such as INCAA and CALA that provide money for film festivals that invite foreign productions into the country, creating small circuits of global flow. They also make funds available for national films to travel to overseas festivals, providing a type of cultural exchange that will be discussed more fully in Chapter Five. Nevertheless, the involvement of cinema councils in an organisation such as Recam, which stems from trade practices for economic products, needs to be examined to see if any of the radical movement across borders created by the New Latin American Cinema remains or if the measures to protect national and regional industry do in fact inhibit the production, circulation and exhibition of films.

Within the policy published by Mercosur there is a desire to allow the free flow of products in a manner that can develop economic expansion and stability. For this reason, the studies commissioned by Mercosur often concentrate more closely on the workings of these flows and the origin and destination of the product than on the value inherent in the object that is traded.\textsuperscript{102} This aspect brings out some of the greatest fears of cultural critics as cultural works are put into motion in a way that divorces them from the location and meaning of their origin. If cultural works are left in the hand of a profit-orientated private sector that is given assistance by organisations such as Mercosur the practices of the private sector have the potential to go without interrogation.

\textsuperscript{101} Skármeta, ‘Europe’.
\textsuperscript{102} Mercosur, ‘Portal Oficial’.
Many critics felt this reached a peak in the 1980s when the communications industry was one of the few industries to grow but it did so through a private sector in which growth followed the movement of the market without state intervention. Writing in 1997, Nestor Garcia Canclini felt that the audiovisual industry had been relegated to the private sector in Latin American countries: “the private sphere, where transnationalization and deterritorialization prevail, has almost exclusive control over the voices and images.” In the international terrain this led to the successful sale and transference of the telenovela but did little to help smaller localised film industries and filmmakers. Contrasting this in the twenty-first century, Recam has been supporting small, local industries by working towards a joint screen quota system across the region that should increase the visibility of South American and Latin American cinema. This includes attempts to facilitate the free circulation of films by providing certificates that would award each film from a member country the same status as national films in other member countries. The desired effect is increased circulation of films, the opportunity for filmmakers to gain economic returns on their work and an increase in audience desire for these works that would thus initiate further production. At the same time, although Recam’s documentation frequently reiterates the necessity for economic development of the audiovisual industries, it usually retains the need for cultural development in the same sentence or paragraph. Its main aims acknowledge a policy that, rather than favouring the drive of the market, seeks to equalize opportunities for smaller nations by encouraging specific programs in favour of less developed nations. In this way, Recam does not undermine national industries but instead produces incentives and agreements for increasing the economic stability and growth of all audiovisual industries in the region. It also suggests that audiovisual works are more than just products or goods and are also important parts of regional and national culture.

Unfortunately, though, achieving the written aims appears to be a long and slow process. At times this is because there is opposition from the commercial sector that

rejects intervention from either the state or regional bodies. At other times, the regional bodies have to negotiate around the interests of the individual states and the prior agreements they may have made. Although there is currently work towards the free circulation of films in the region, as reiterated in the May 2007 meeting,106 there are prior agreements in place that favour specific coproductions between individual countries rather than the wider region. These existing agreements are alternatives to the Latin American or South American label Recam wants placed upon films so that they can benefit from the rights of ‘domestic’ productions across the region.

The main inter-country legislation in force is the Acuerdo Iberamericano that was originally signed in 2000 and amended in 2004 with the agreement of various Iberoamerican countries including Argentina, Bolivia, Chile and Peru. It allows coproductions produced by two or more of the member countries to be treated as national productions for the sake of gaining quota, customs and tax benefits in each of the countries where it is produced and exhibited. It does not, however, allow benefits to take place, such as ease of distribution and exhibition in any of the other member countries, unless they are formally involved in the coproduction. Restrictions apply within national legislation as there are normally specific stipulations that outline the conditions for coproduction to be considered under the national framework such as a minimum and maximum economic investment (often above ten per cent and below eighty percent), the use of personnel from each country and the requirement to submit appropriate documentation. Countries such as Chile and Argentina also have their own specifically drawn up legislation to promote coproductions which takes place outside of Recam’s remit. The inter-country agreements thus defer to national legislation for coproduction to take place and a body such as Recam is unable to operate with as much effect as the state institutions. It is a process that can be perceived as using state legislation and policy to reterritorialize the national within cinematic production even as film production moves across borders. While great efforts are made to support coproductions through the regional agreements, the film councils of each country tend to represent a national interest primarily and a joint
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Latin American or South American cinematic culture comes behind this. This factor fits in with the cinema legislation outlined in the previous section that promotes a national context as the primary determinant. The outcome of this situation is that efforts to expand Iberoamerican film consumption across the region still meet with problems. In Peru, for example, from 2000 to 2007, only 1.2% of spectators saw an Iberoamerican film.\textsuperscript{108}

Furthermore, although regional agreements give filmmakers a certain amount of economic freedom and increased access to distribution channels, there is a price in that they must tie themselves to an association with official channels, particularly national film councils. It also means that filmmakers cannot assert a Latin American or South American identity and thus declare themselves unconcerned by national identity claims. Instead, they almost always have to identify as a specific national so that their films can be correctly documented and allowed to circulate in the regional channels as created by inter-country agreements. As an example of this, to apply for CAACI’s Ibermedia coproduction program, filmmakers have to gain the backing of their national film council first and cannot apply ‘nationless’ on the basis of their Iberoamerican identity. It is a situation that is markedly different from the ethos of the New Latin American Cinema movement when there was political motivation behind the declaration of a Latin American identity as a means of solidarity with radical movements in the region.

Within current practices, then, there is not a binary of national industry versus global systems but a more complicated web of agreements in which filmmakers and their work have access, at times, to national modes of existence and, at other times, to a regional mode of existence and also global modes. Frequently within the regional framework provided by organisations such as Recam and CAACI there are claims to a supra-national identity, particularly when the organisations talk of either a Latin America or Iberoamerican culture under which the audiovisual works fall. Nevertheless, they normally defer to a national framework when choosing the terms for coproductions. There is thus a slippery context in which cinematic culture is produced through subtly changing boundaries in which the national, regional and global must all be taken into account. It makes it hard to speak conclusively of either a
Latin American cinema or a national cinema as the filmmaking and distribution practices are frequently tied to both contexts

**Section 4: Centre and Periphery**

Further complicating an understanding of the national amongst global cinematic networks is the elusive and slippery problem of what exactly the national contains. As outlined in the introduction to this chapter, the parameters of what constitutes a national cinema are particularly difficult to agree upon. Entrenched within the problem of definition is the difficulty found in all work dealing with nationality and boundaries: namely that nations attempt to both contain and represent heterogeneous groups and disparate peoples. Adding to this difficulty is the increased mobility of films and filmmakers in the global era who undertake border-crossings on a frequent basis. For this reason a variety of scholarly work examines the different communities that exist within national boundaries yet also form diasporic links that bring their identities into transnational communications.  

Within South America the problem of constituting homogenous nations lies within two main areas. Primarily, there are a variety of different minority groups in each country such as the indigenous Mapuche people in Chile and various indigenous Andean groups across Peru, Bolivia and the north of Argentina. I have, in this instance, used the term *minority groups* because their languages are not used in official discourse, they rarely have representatives in positions of power and they are frequently placed at the bottom of social hierarchies in South American countries. However, in countries such as Bolivia, the large number of persons who claim indigenous identity means that it is not through numbers that their status is made minor. I will, therefore, use the term *periphery* from now on as these groups are often peripheral through geographical placement yet also peripheral through their lack of access to power in central government. Secondly, there are groups of immigrants, such as the strong Buenos Aires Jewish community, that often retain practices, customs and links with places of origin such as Europe and in this way cut through and complicate a single national identity.
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Progressive views understand that the differences in culture brought by periphery groups in South America adds to a rich cultural fabric but this is not a tendency that has always been shared amongst people in power across the continent. Writing on this, Jesus Martin-Barbero states until very recently, for both Left and Right, the idea of the national was incompatible with the idea of difference: the people was a single indivisible entity, society a subject without textures or internal articulations, and politico-cultural debate shuttled between national essences and class identity.\footnote{Martin-Barbero, ‘Identities: Traditions and New Communities,’ p. 635-36.}

Various studies into the way in which peripheral identities have been socially and politically excluded, as well as ignored in fields of representation in South America, rearticulate the extent to which the state cannot always cope with internal difference.\footnote{See Radcliffe, Sarah and Westwood, Sallie (1996) Remaking the Nation: Place, Identity and Politics in Latin America, London: Routledge; Mignolo, Walter D. (2005) The Idea of Latin America, Oxford: Blackwell; Brysk, From Tribal Village to Global Village.} The importance of relating cinematic culture to this problem lies in the fact that while the arts may be understood to reflect a pre-existing situation, they can also be complicit in reaffirming and continuing the erasure of peripheral identities. Caiozzi’s statement about the need for cinema legislation called for an opportunity to ‘consolidate an image of the country’\footnote{Caiozzi, ‘Luz, cámara, ¿ley...?’} and in this way suggested that a singular image can be displayed. However, there is no obvious space for difference to exist when the ‘nation’ must be reduced in such a manner.

It is thus imperative to give voice to the types of cinematic interactions that counteract this trend. Naficy has done important analysis on cinematic work around the globe that allows difference to come to light in a type of filmmaking that he sees as \textit{accented cinema}.\footnote{Naficy, ‘Situating Accented Cinema’} He states that the variations among the films are driven by many factors, while their similarities stem principally from what the filmmakers have in common: liminal subjectivity and interstitial location in society and the film industry. What constitutes the accented style is the combination and intersection of these variations and similarities.\footnote{Naficy, ‘Situating Accented Cinema,’ p.111.}

This analysis suggests that both peripheral identities exist and that there are cinematic representations dealing with them. However, in South America, there is not necessarily space for interstitial filmmakers and modes to be recognised in the state-

\footnote{Caiozzi, ‘Luz, cámara, ¿ley...?’}
sponsored ‘national’ cinematic culture. Often it is structures and institutions that play a part in determining the types of identities that are allowed into national cinematic culture at a broader level and so it is critical to examine the way that they treat disparate groups. While I will be focusing on the way in which alternative identities insert themselves into cinematic culture in the sixth chapter it is important within the context of this chapter to examine the way in which institutional policy has an effect on the representation of difference within the nation. This is particularly true when audiovisual laws and other official policy documents talk about the nation and national heritage as taken for granted concepts rather than potentially exclusive fields.

For various reasons in each of the countries under study there is a central point for cinematic activity, normally located geographically within the countries’ capital cities and institutionalised by the respective audiovisual and film councils and their supportive legislation that all operate from this central focal point. As will be discussed in Chapter Four, lack of private investment and box-office returns means that the majority of films made are reliant on support from their respective national institutions and are thus compelled to make use of the central organisations. Argentina is one of the few countries to have an independent film network yet most films that find theatrical distribution will be those that have the Buenos Aires-based INCAA logo stamped on the opening credits. As Perelman and Seivach note

> en la Argentina, no existe el cine estrictamente independiente desde el punto de vista economico. Practicamente todas las producciones dependen del INCAA para ser economicamente viables.115

in Argentina, from an economic point of view, a strictly independent cinema does not exist. Practically all productions depend on INCAA to be economically viable.

There is thus a situation in which films are unlikely to be produced without the support of this organisation.

A report published by the Chilean Arts Council in 2003 regarding audiovisual production in the country made it clear that it understood concerns that the capital, Santiago, often absorbed the majority of activity. It addresses this in one of the three major blocks of policy that relates to audiovisual activity in Chile: the decentralisation

115 Perelman and Seivach, ‘La Industria Cinematografica en La Argentina,’ p.128.
117 Gobierno de Chile Apuntas Cerca del Audiovisual en Chile, p. 19.
of the management of audiovisual production through a program of provincial audiovisual development. It states that considering the concentration of almost all audiovisual production and capacity for management in Santiago, which represents an obstacle for the development of audiovisual activity and in this way results in an inequality that causes problems for the expression of cultural diversity in the country, the Council maintains a program that looks to overcome this weakness and gradually incorporates agreements with other national public organisations (CORFO, CNTV) and regional organisations (Regional Governments, local universities).

When the audiovisual law was introduced in 2004, various clauses were included to make sure that provincial participation played a part. It affirmed that representatives of provincial areas, specifically persons residing outside the capital, would make up the new audiovisual council and that certain resources would be channelled specifically into provincial activities. Corfo, the governmental body responsible for economic development in the country also takes on audiovisual activities, organising support for pre-production and development. When it organised a concourse for Cinema and Television in 2007, it added provincial workshops to make sure that new developments were dispersed throughout the country. In a similar show of support for decentralised filmmaking, Conacine Peru allows filmmakers from outside Lima to apply for funding in a specific provincial category that is aimed to prevent provincial film projects from having to compete with projects from the capital. These are all processes moving away from the dominant central point that national capitals represent. However, discussing the reallocation of resources geographically does not necessarily lead to the participation of diverse communities.

After signing an agreement between the cinematecas of La Paz and Santiago in Bolivia in 2006, the Chilean Minister for Culture, Paulina Urrutia, met with the
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Bolivian President Evo Morales and there was a dialogue principally about “la importancia del rescate de las lenguas indígenas y el intercambio cultural.” (the importance of rescuing indigenous languages and cultural exchange.) This fed into Morales’ strong belief in upholding indigenous identity and language, something he based most of his 2006 presidential campaign on. It also fed into the history of Bolivian filmmaking as Jorge Sanjines made it a political imperative to represent the stories of the indigenous communities in the 1960s and 70s. In recent years, however, filmmaking in Bolivia has returned to the geographically central locale of La Paz. The majority of production companies, film schools and decisions about filmmaking are made in the Spanish-speaking, well-educated sphere of the country’s capital. The Bolivian cinema law does specify that national films are those that are in either Spanish, Quechua, Aymara or any other native languages yet Spanish dominates in cinematic production and it is almost impossible to find works in the commercial sector that use other languages.

Furthermore, due to a lack of funds, Conacine Bolivia does not have provincial activities or funds in place, a cause of concern for those filmmakers wishing to work outwith a central position. At the Encuentro de Cineastas Sub-40 (Under 40s Filmmakers meeting) conference in La Paz in 2007, the young filmmaker Alvaro Morales discussed the new film school he is attempting to set up with some friends in Oruro. It came from a drive to see filmmaking activity take place in different locations and fits in with the principles of another film school, La Fabrica, which has one base in Santa Cruz and one in Cochabamba. The first feature film to come out of La Fabrica, Quien mato a la llamita blanca (2007), not only dealt with the concerns of under-represented groups in Bolivia but also used a mix of Spanish and slang in indigenous languages that signified the diverse idioms specific to Bolivia. Although the style and aesthetic of the film is very different to the work of Sanjines, it can be seen as a return to his concerns with the representation and visibility of indigenous groups in Bolivia. However, neither La Fabrica or Morales’ project can gain support from Conacine Bolivia’s funding. Efforts were made in 2008 to increase cinema

---

121 Ley no. 1302.
activity outside the capital when the Cinemateca Boliviana began supporting mobile cinemas to bring films to more diverse regions. However, the cinemateca made it clear that it was not in a position to support provincial filmmaking.123

The government-sponsored Chilean Virtual Cinemateca has a great variety of cinematic works online including a number dealing with the indigenous Mapuche communities such as Úxüf Xipay: El Despojo, sucesos históricos sobre el conflicto mapuche (2004). The documentary deals with the problems that Mapuche groups have faced in dealing with the Chilean state over a number of years and thus can be understood as one of Dissayanake’s challenges to the homogenising narratives of the state.124 Its placement in the virtual cinemateca is an example of authorised space for peripheral identity in the cinematic sphere. However, it is important to acknowledge that images of indigenous subjects are produced independently, and almost always in the less costly form of documentary. With the exception of Play (2005) in which the main character Christina speaks occasionally with her mother in the Mapuche language, few other twenty-first century Chilean feature films make predominant use of indigenous languages or the participation of peripheral communities in the production process. In a similar manner, Ella Shohat and Robert Stam document the way in which the Cuzco school in Peru made documentaries in the Quechua language in the 1950s and 1960s125 yet, as with Chile, use of indigenous languages as primary speech has not yet transferred into feature films. Following this pattern, few feature films from Bolivia or Argentina at the beginning of the twenty-first century contain any of the countries’ indigenous languages.

In a bid to engage diversity in the nation, INCAA worked with the Secretary for Culture and the television channel Encuentro to commission thirteen documentaries dealing with the theme of Argentine borders in 2007.126 The chosen directors were asked not only to focus on external frontiers but also internal borders. This led to diverse projects in which some documentaries explored national borders with Brazil
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123 Personal Observation: Public Meeting, Conversando Con, Sobre y en la Cinemateca (Conversing with, about and in the Cinemateca) Cinemateca Boliviana, La Paz, Bolivia, 5, 6 & 7 Nov, 2008.
124 Dissanayake, "Introduction,"
and Paraguay while others investigated frontiers created by jails and airports. While projects such as these represent the opportunity to open up cinematic space to diverse experience, and are backed by state support, the structuring process needs to be taken into account. For many, the power of cinema lies in the liberating experience of allowing persons and communities to speak with their own voices and to express their own concerns. Yet a top down commissioning process, as was the case in this project, develops a situation in which the periphery is visualised and constituted by the state and its institutions rather than from the cultural expression developed by the people living at the periphery. It is a concern that led to the creation of independent filmmaking groups in Argentina's Patagonia region. Falicov documents the way groups based in Patagonia such as Realizadores Independientes de la Patagonia Agrupados (RIPA) and Asociación de Realizadores Audiovisuales de Neuquén (ARAN) emerged to counteract this tendency and produce images based in their lived experience of Patagonia.\footnote{Falicov, Tamara (2007) ‘Desde nuestro punto de vista. Jovenes videastas de la Patagonia re-crean el sur argentino’ in Maria Jose Moore (ed) Cines al margen: Nuevos modos de representación en el cine argentino contemporáneo, Buenos Aires: Libraria, pp.109-122.} However, it is worth noting that these groups rely on cheap video production and face a similar problem to films such as Üxüf Xipay: El Despojo, sucesos históricos sobre el conflicto Mapuche: that they do not easily enter into mainstream cinematic circulation.

Looking beyond production processes that attempt to engage diversity, it is possible to analyse the way in which distribution and exhibition play a part. When state institutions support provincial projects that incorporate cultural identity the value lies in the extent to which these projects can be observed throughout the nation, particularly as there is little benefit in cinematic works that are created yet remain nothing more than one copy housed in an archive. INCAA in Argentina appears to be leading the way through its use of the Espacio INCAA movie-theatres. Although each movie-theatre is independently programmed by its own staff, it receives state support, funding and help through the quota system to screen diverse Argentine and arthouse

productions. Importantly the initiative boasts breadth of inclusion with movie-theatres in geographically displaced locations that reach as far as Antarctica. In 2008, INCAA President, Liliana Mazure, supported plans to extend the 17 screens in operation to around 100. This was an attempt to create a cinema-going public beyond the metropolitan area and specifically a cinema going public that has access to national films. Nevertheless, as a sign of the distance between policy and practice, or perhaps between intention and outcome, Atilio Roque Gonzales noted that

\[
\text{si bien la iniciativa es loable, los resultados son poco halagüeños, puesto que no ayudaron a incrementar la afluencia de público hacia las películas argentinas, o iberoamericanos, ni en la Ciudad de Buenos Aires ni el interior del país.}
\]

*if the initiative is commendable, the results are not very encouraging and it is a situation that does not help to increase the flow of people to Argentine or Iberoamerican films either in Buenos Aires or the interior of the country.*

This is a claim supported by both Marina Moguillansky and Jorge la Ferla who notes that the INCAA movie-theatres are often graveyards for Argentine film and are characterised by poor facilities.

---


In Chile the *La Fiesta del Cine* (Cinema Party) takes place across the country during a specifically chosen day each year and allows national audiences to see a variety of Chilean films screened in diverse locations for free or for a set low price. “‘Cine chileno para todos, para todos los chilenos, Cine’, es la premisa con que La Fiesta del Cine llegará a todos los rincones del país.’ (‘Chilean cinema for all, for all the Chileans, cinema’ is the premise with which Cinema Party comes to all the corners of the country.)¹³⁵ In places that do not have movie-theatres, town halls and outdoor spaces are used to facilitate screenings. The idea is to encourage as many people as possible to enter in and engage with the nation’s cinematic culture.

However, to fully understand these projects it is necessary to examine the extent to which diversity is truly engaged or whether it is used merely for promotional purposes. Following criticism of multicultural policies in various parts of the world, there has long been an academic suspicion of policy that projects a multi-coloured kaleidoscope which does little to interact with the problems of under-representation and powerlessness felt by peripheral groups. Shohat and Stam discuss the difference between the multicultural fact and the multicultural project. The former is a mode of national existence where difference exists whether or not the state wishes to acknowledge it. The latter is the effort made to overturn homogenous ways of being.¹³⁶ With regards to cultural policy, and in this case policy for cinema, the concern lies in the extent to which cinematic culture actually incorporates different experiences as a multicultural project rather than merely includes token quotas of diversity.

Much of the difficulty in fully incorporating diverse identity concerns ownership of voice, as the possibility for difference lies in the types of production and exhibition practices that allow communities with different cultural experiences to create their own cinematic works and representational spaces. The provincial initiatives written into the Chilean law offer the best example of expanding the centre outwards to reach peripheral areas while continuing to use the money and expertise available from the
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¹³⁵ Boletín Secretaria Ejecutiva Consejo del Arte y la Industria Audiovisual (2007b) ‘Boletin Secretaria: 08.11.2007’ in *Chile Audiovisual*
metropolitan area to help cinematic practices work. However, the central position of the film and audiovisual councils in each country tends to leave power in the centre, not just financially but also in fields of representation which are affected when, as is often the case, peripheral subjects are only engaged if a director or project based in the centre decides to use them. Complicating these factors, the current concern amongst all councils appears to be the importance placed on presence in an international sphere and the reputation of ‘national’ works. The desire to posit the ‘national’ on screen in a national and international arena as a product imbued with quality and presence means that more traditional methods of filmmaking and distribution will continue to form the basis of national production. Films that do not comply with traditional filmmaking modes or national identity formation will not face censorship but may face another type of discrimination as they are rejected by funding committees and only find space for exhibition in limited initiatives.

Conclusion
The types of legislation, initiatives and practices outlined above make it clear that, even within changing global relations and film circulation, state intervention plays a key role in the development of cinematic culture in Argentina, Bolivia, Chile and Peru. An outcome of increased intervention is the number of films produced, many of which have been directly supported by state funds and initiatives. According to Getino, from 1997 to 2005 the number of films produced annually in Argentina increased from 28 to 41; in Bolivia from 1 to 6; and in Chile from 1 to 14. In 2007, the Mercosur audiovisual organisation, Recam, found that 90 national films from Argentina were screened, as were 4 from Bolivia and 12 from Chile.

On the one hand there is a simultaneous spatial interface between the larger regional spaces of Latin America, the international sphere and with the internal regions that hold diverse communities. On the other hand, there is an attempt to contain the temporality of cinematic culture through the historicising projects that take place in the archives and the cinematecas. Rather than displaying a decline in the role that the nation plays in cinema production and dissemination, these efforts reveal that cinema activity is increasingly taking place through reterritorializing practices provided by

137 Getino, Cine Iberamericano.
138 Recam, ‘Aproximación’
government supported institutions. The lack of censorship, and the relative freedom given to filmmakers when producing work, means that they are given a high degree of independence but government bodies do attempt to contain cinematic culture through the types of support given and the representation of the state at international levels. Furthermore, although filmmakers work within a transnational era, the focus that state organisations place on heritage and national identity reasserts the claim that the nation has on South American cinemas.

At the same time there are certain gaps and spaces between proposed funding and initiatives and the support which actually takes place. This can happen when ideals of incorporating provincial efforts or supporting a diverse cinematic heritage are curbed by a frequent return to traditional types of filmmaking and films that fit into perceived notions of quality. Perhaps more importantly, failing state intervention in South American cinema is often characterised by conditions of poverty. While the majority of small national cinema-industries across the world find themselves lacking funds and support, South American economies are in a constantly precarious situation which has a trickle down effect on the funds made available. Although initiatives and drives are in place, and usually supported by legal edict in South America, if funds are not available, this widens the division between intention and outcome. And while the economic problems lie deep within the socio-political make up of the region, particularly because the countries are developing nations, there are certain factors within state policy that reinscribe the economic problems. Mainly, the continued rearticulation of the nation as primary actor with regard to transnational cinema cooperation, in networks such as Recam and CAACI, limits the potential for building greater exhibition markets and radicalising funding across South America.

Other aspects, such as a focus on the success of national films abroad may limit the amount of time that can be spent on discovering new ways to increase the output of national films in the domestic market. All of this is particularly significant because filmmakers and policy makers understand that cinematic practice in each of these countries cannot take place without support from the state. What remains to be seen in the following chapters, however, is the extent to which this state activity can contain and promote cinematic culture in the face of intervention from other sectors and organisations that play a part in South American cinematic activity.
Chapter Four: Commercial Industry

Introduction
There are two main ways in which South American cinematic culture interacts with commercial film flow, highlighting a continuing situation of struggle and negotiation. In the first instance, local works compete with more economically powerful foreign imports for space in domestic markets. In Argentina, Chile, Bolivia and Peru these attempts take place in a cinematic network similar to other countries that includes movie-theatre sites, established home technology such as DVD, and opportunities to hear about cinema via film journalism and internet access. And, in a similar manner to other countries, North American films dominate a well established commercial market. National films trying to find space on local screens are often engulfed by the weight of studio distribution packages or the breadth of marketing and publicity that surrounds foreign films. Even with increasing interventions made by state organisations, access to this commercial cinema, either for the public wishing to view films or for filmmakers wishing to display films, is dependent upon a decision making network that concentrates power in the private sector. More often than not this includes a bias towards large distribution-exhibition conglomerates and the film packages they support. Furthermore, because conglomerates controlling film distribution in South America are commonly owned by foreign companies, global decisions affect the choice of products that arrive on domestic screens. Documenting the way this takes place in Argentina, Getino notes that in 2003 the five main foreign distributors (Buena Vista-Disney, Warner, UIP, Columbia and Tri-Star Fox) released only 45% of the films shown in Argentina but these amounted to 75% of the prints circulating in the country. These films also took in 81% of the box-office takings and used 85% of the overall screen time.\(^1\)

In the second instance, few South American films manage to recuperate costs in the domestic market and thus producers frequently look outwards to foreign markets as a way to generate further returns. Getino outlines the impossibility of relying on local box-office receipts through his basic breakdown of film costs and recuperation in the Argentine market. On the basis that an average film costs one million US dollars to
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\(^1\) Getino, *Cine Argetino*, p.340. See also Moguillansky, ‘El cine en la ciudad de Buenos Aires.’
make, if it receives a generous 30% share of the box-office (50% to the theatre, 20% to the distributor) it has to sell two million tickets at an average $2 each to break even. Analysing the Chilean market, Estévez calculates that if a national film costs 500 million pesos to make and gains 700 pesos for each box-office receipt, it needs 500,000 spectators to cover costs. Whether it is necessary to gain the 500,000 ticket sales that Estévez speaks of or the two million that Getino estimates, it is difficult for a South American film to obtain sufficient audience numbers in its domestic market. The average ticket sales for a national film in Argentina, one of the largest and most developed industries, is closer to 100-130,000 ticket sales per film. In 2006, seven Argentine films generated box-office receipts of more than 130,000 yet the highest grossing film Bañeros 3 obtained little more than one million spectators (bringing in 2.9 million US dollars.) The other 67 domestic films released that year fell far short of this box-office success. While it is possible to make films on a smaller budget or to distribute in other windows, such as domestic DVD markets or television screenings, in the majority of cases, overseas sales are needed to maintain financial solvency. Estévez reaffirms this:

Hasta aquí está comprobado que es muy difícil que una cinta chilena se financie solo con el mercado interno, de allí que sea absolutamente comprensible – y necesaria – la extensión del cine nacional hacia publicas extranjeras.

It is proven that it is very difficult for a Chilean film to finance itself with only the domestic market and that it is absolutely understandable – and necessary – that the national cinema extends itself towards foreign audiences.

Nevertheless, there is difficulty in entering foreign markets as various systems of distribution need to be negotiated, most often through third party intermediaries. It is thus necessary to examine the different markets mentioned above in order to understand where decision-making processes lie and who facilitates the inclusion of South American cinematic culture in commercial film flows.

The first section of this chapter will focus on the third party intermediaries, outlining the way in which they help South American films enter into and negotiate the networks of distribution and exhibition in domestic and foreign markets. In particular,
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3 Estévez, Luz, Camera, Transición, Radio, p.70.
5 Estévez, Luz, Camera, Transición, Radio, p.102.
I will be surveying the way in which they broker distribution agreements that allow films to reach the initial point of contact with audiences: movie-theatre exhibition. Complementing this focus, the second section will examine the commercial movie-theatre spaces that are available in the domestic markets and the way in which they create certain spaces for domestic films. While the second section concentrates on traditional movie-theatre spaces as they have been conceived throughout the twentieth century, and the way they have formed patterns for commercial exhibition in the twenty-first, the third section explores the new screen technology that is emerging and the opportunities it offers to South American cinema. The final section extends an analysis of the commercial sector to the major secondary window for cinematic consumption: the home viewing format of DVDs. As I will continue to argue in this chapter, an interaction between national, regional and global cinematic culture comes into play in each exhibition window. With this in mind, it is impossible to separate the domestic market from the international market as the circulation of films in each is based upon processes of exchange with the other which ultimately affects various levels of cinematic culture from production through to exhibition.

Section 1: Developing Circulation, Distributors and Sales Agents
While the efforts of national film councils have helped increase film production in each country, films still need to enter the commercial exhibition circuit in order to reach widespread public audiences. Furthermore, because filmmakers are rarely able to distribute directly to individual movie-theatres or chains, they rely on a succession of intermediaries that reach through national and international territories. In a similar manner, the South American movie-theatre owner rarely has direct access to national films and, instead, relies on these same national and international agents to bring forward films that can be exhibited. There is thus a decision-making chain at work that brings a variety of forces together to determine how South American filmmakers gain access to the public and how audiences gain access to local films. The Argentine critics, Perelman and Seivach confirm this mediation and note the way this system disadvantages national films amongst the wider body of global films in circulation:

Los filmes no llegan directamente a las pantallas para que el público determine si los consume, sino que deben atravesar una instancia anterior de filtro por parte de los distribuidores y exhibidores. Con estas características, las decisiones de los espectadores son maleables a estrategias agresivas de...
The films do not arrive directly at the screens so that the public can determine if they want to consume them. Instead, they must go through a prior filter system created by the distributors and exhibitors. With these characteristics, the decisions of the spectators are malleable to aggressive marketing strategies and there is a great possibility that the spectators will miss the national products.

Aggravating the situation is the fact that filmmakers and small production companies are often caught up in webs of agreements that complicate the process of getting their final product exhibited. To understand the implications of these different agreements and the effect they have on the types of films that reach national and international publics, it is worth examining the major parties involved.

Increasingly the first point of contact in the network of distribution and exhibition is the sales agent. As Mark Peranson notes, this role only appeared in the last few decades of the twentieth century yet has gained importance to the extent that sales agents have taken over the role of the government agency that previously sold films to distributors. Indeed, their pivotal role within the industry can be seen by an increased presence at film festivals: sites where a large number of commercial distribution contracts are brokered. When the Havana Film Festival invited a number of young South American filmmakers to take part in its Film Crossing Borders workshops in 2008, two of the major guests at the workshops, John Durie and Beatriz Setuain, were there to promote the role of the sales agent. It was emphasised that young filmmakers should expect to work with agents and should be aware of the importance of following correct procedure when selling their film through these intermediaries. Significant to an understanding of their impact on small national industries in a wider global market is the fact the sales agent negotiates inside the state, working with national legislation and cinema-going norms, and outside the territory, in dealing with external distributors and exhibitors.
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The global remit of sales agencies has meant that many of the major international sales agents, such as Wild Bunch and Celluloid Dreams, have represented South American films. This international scope leads to a situation such as that with the Argentine film *Derecho de familia* (2006) whereby the film was tied into world-wide sales through the French based agents Celluloid Dreams, had distribution agreements with various European and US companies such as Filmcopi Zürich (Switzerland) or IFC First Take (USA) and had national distribution through the Argentine distributors, Distribution Company. Due to the complexities of these arrangements, the necessity of finding a sales agent that can manage the negotiation between national and international territories becomes pressing. One of the first hurdles, however, is finding a sales agent that believes the film is sufficiently marketable to be worth taking on in the first place. When journalist Charles Lyons interviewed Chilean director Francisca Schweitzer he was told that

> you spend three years of your life on your movie […] and an executive looks at it and quickly says: 'It's not a comedy, it has no sex, there's no blood. I can't sell it.' They see Latin America as a place with beautiful women, spicy food and exotic drinks. It's tough to get past that.9

This attitude suggests a cultural stereotyping at work which allows no space in the commercial sphere, particularly overseas, for films that break away from preconceptions of what a sellable film is. Furthermore, it is not uncommon for all communication between the production-company and distributor, from contract details to final cut changes, to be relayed through the sales agent. This means that even when a filmmaker has managed to find a sales agent, they are reliant upon the agent to determine the way in which the film is conceptualised as it enters the commercial markets. Complicating this matter, few large sales agencies are based in South America and they are thus unconnected to the specificities of cinematic culture in the region. In this respect, they do not have the same roots and motives as the audiovisual and film councils which have displayed a desire to project an image of their national culture outwards into the world via films. Instead, I would argue that the sales agents and distributors engaging in world sales are more inclined to isolate the film’s marketable qualities and project those into various markets.

---

The continual negotiations and delays that take place when waiting for contracts to be drawn up and confirmed also work to slow down the mobility of the South American films. Because US studios often have vertical and horizontal integration in place\(^{10}\), they have a great deal of control over when a film they produce will be exhibited. They can either decide upon a simultaneous world wide release that can reduce perceived damages to sales brought about by piracy or opt for controlled releasing in different markets over a few months so that publicity is built upon. In South America, national films are likely to take the best slot that is given to them by domestic movie-theatres and when hoping for distribution overseas they have to wait on the decision of distributors that may have various other films as priorities. Although the Chilean film *Play* was completed in 2005 and released in Chile that year, it took over a year and a half for it to reach screens in the UK, Germany and France. A situation such as this which is common with overseas release dates for South American films slows down incoming revenue and makes it hard for filmmakers and production companies to pay back debts and fund future films. Exacerbating the limits placed on revenue flow is the fact that although South American films may be made with overseas money, as was the case with the Argentine film *Glue* (2006), that received financial support from a British company, they do not necessarily gain access to theatrical distribution in that overseas market as decisions are passed over to the distribution or sales company that may be based in a different territory.

One of the few ways around this problem has been to consider the marketing elements and the structures of distribution at the point of production. Laura Martinez Ruiz-Velasco explains the way that Mexican director Guillermo del Toro set up the production company Tequila Gang, with other Latin American directors and a Spanish promoter, to make Spanish language films that were specifically aimed at playing worldwide. She says

> the idea is to penetrate the Hispanic market in the U.S., and, in the long run, distribute the movies in Latin America. If successful, this project could put an end to the problems of Latin American directors, who could dedicate

\(^{10}\) With vertical integration studios will normally have the facilities to organise their own production, post-production, distribution and even exhibition. With horizontal integration, they can normally organise their own distribution across all exhibition windows from theatrical to DVD rental and sales.
themselves to making Latin American movies, with Latin American actors, in Hollywood - then export them to Latin America. Only in Hollywood.¹¹

With this notion is a sense of fatalism that the structures and networks of distribution will always place power within traditional centres of film capital, meaning that adapting to existing market strategies or making films abroad is a more viable solution than attempting to strengthen domestic industries or find alternative solutions.

This decision to play into hierarchies within global film industries is a factor at work when finding a film domestic exhibition, namely whether or not the film should enter into a contract with a national or an international distribution company. In each of the four countries under study, large international distribution companies such as Warner Brothers, Fox, Disney and United International Pictures operate alongside national companies such as Primer Plano in Argentina, Inca Cine in Peru, Bazuca Films in Chile and Manfer Films in Bolivia. The power of the international companies in domestic territories is such that when Himpele writes about Bolivian cinema exhibition, he notes that US companies have greater control over the films that enter Bolivia than the national distributors.¹² Because this situation also occurs in Argentina, Chile and Peru, it is hardly surprising that foreign distributors often provide better options than local companies. As Argentine critics Perelman and Seivach note, the advantage of a contract with an international company is that the films can encounter a much wider distribution circuit, greater press coverage and an overseas distribution deal if the film is successful.¹³ The disadvantage is that time and effort spent on individual films is often less as the companies deal with such a large number of feature films. When an international company has other ‘high-profile’ films to support, it is entirely possible that the distributor might be complicit in giving national films less than adequate space on the cinema screens or a time slot that pits them against blockbuster films. Thus, ‘en ese sentido, para la distribuidora, el filme es uno entre una large serie, pero para el director y el productor es la obra de todo un año.’¹⁴

¹² Himpele, Circuits of Culture.
¹³ Perelman and Seivach, ‘La Industria Cinematografica en La Argentina’.
¹⁴ Perelman and Seivach, ‘La Industria Cinematografica en La Argentina,’ p.77.
Even after obtaining distribution agreements South American films still have to negotiate exhibitors before the films can reach audiences. While a country such as Argentina has national film quotas in place that should guarantee exhibition of a number of national films, the exhibitor still has the right to determine how the films are circulated within their sites. This often means that if there is not sufficient desire to promote a national film, it can be largely overlooked. Variety journalist Charles Newbery points out that in 2006 this led to grumbling from local artists, distributors and producers that the foreign multinational-run movie-theatre chains such as Cinemark and Hoyts were slotting films at poor times, for shorter runs. Without the funds available for marketing on the same scale as US productions, Argentine films relied on picking up word-of-mouth or local media publicity and were thus in need of longer runs. Producer Daniel Burman’s criticises this situation further by suggesting that even if a national film is successful it will get pulled from theatrical exhibition after a short amount of time. In 2008 the Argentine film *Un novio para mi mujer* (2008) broke this trend by opening on 91 screens and staying at the number one slot in the box-office for seven weeks yet it is telling that this film was distributed by the major US chain Disney/Buena Vista. Contrasting the favourable situation in which *Un novio para mi mujer* gained exhibition, independent Bolivian producer, Gerardo Guerra, made the point that the film he was promoting, *Dia de boda* (2008), was not given good time slots for attracting audiences such as evening and night time screenings as foreign films were given preference. Guerra pointed out that even in the national cinemateca there is a problem when a foreign production, such as a James Bond film, arrives in the country as it is given both the main poster space and the screen availability in place of a national film.

Adding weight to these sentiments are exhibition figures that I observed in the capital cities of these countries during 2008. In Buenos Aires, during the week Oct 9th to 16th, there was an apparently healthy spread of national films in the movie-theatres with 7 films available to view on a total of 22 different screens (*Abrigate* (2007), *El frasco* (2008), *Impunidad* (2008), *La mujer sin cabeza* (2008), *La proxima estación* (2008),
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16 Newbery, ‘Argentina Measure Has Legs’.
17 Personal Observation: Public Meeting, *Conversando Con, Sobre y en la Cinemateca* (Conversing with, about and in the Cinemateca) Cinemateca Boliviana, La Paz, Bolivia, 6 Nov, 2008.
Motivos para no enamorarse (2008) and Un novia para mi mujer (2008)).

Nevertheless, this data has to be compared with the spread of other films across the city. Foreign films were available on 115 different screens and although the national films amounted to a total of 71 screenings each day, the US film Beverley Hills Chihuahua (2008) was screened 62 times and Nights in Rodanthe (2008) was screened 58 times daily. In a similar manner, in Santiago during the week Oct 23rd to Oct 30th, six national films were available to audiences in the capital city (Tony Manero (2008), La buena vida (2008), Secretos (2008), El cielo, la tierra y la lluvia, (2008) El regalo (2008) and 199 recetas para ser feliz (2008)). These were spread across 20 different screens and made up a total of 69 daily screenings. During that week, foreign films were available on 138 screens and Mamma Mia (2008) was screened 67 times a day while Blindness (2008) was screened 62 times a day. These figures suggest that there is the possibility for national films to find a place on domestic screens yet the breadth of exhibition space given to them falls short in comparison to that given to ‘high profile’ foreign products. It is also significant that this analysis reveals a detailed context for the way in which national and foreign films are exhibited. Audiovisual and film councils often publish reports about the number of national films that are exhibited each year but without necessarily detailing the number of screens on which they are shown or how many screenings take place.

Furthering the problem of exhibition for South American films is the fact that the films dominating the cinema screens tend to come from outwith the region. Although Recam, CAACI, and the state film councils, made it clear that they want to see an increase in the number of South American and Latin American films on domestic screens this did not seem to be taking place in the weeks mentioned above. In Buenos Aires there were no other Latin American films screened and in Santiago there was only one film, the Argentine XXY (2007), screened once daily. There is thus a situation whereby local films come into contact with foreign works in the context of the ‘national meets the global’ yet a regional context in which a body of Latin American films gains presence on movie-theatre screens has yet to be achieved.

It is important to note the extent to which this situation persists due to a continually strong private sector even when state control over the cinema sphere is increasing. While there are on-going state initiatives in place that attempt to improve the situation
of national film exhibition, from quota systems to box-office taxes, these are often counteracted by the interventions of commercial distributors and exhibitors. In Peru, during 1993, filmmakers attempted to re-establish the screening of national shorts in the movie-theatres after the cinema law that had previously supported platforms for short film was repealed. Although they found initial support amongst movie-theatre owners, they were obstructed by the representatives of importers and foreign distributors who disagreed with the idea of giving a part of the ticket price over to the shorts.\(^{18}\)

The ongoing aggressive business strategies implemented by foreign distributors and exhibitors has led to pessimism amongst national producers and distributors in South America where there is an expectation that foreign films will dominate and domestic films cannot compete. Mouesca offers an example of this when she explains that in 2005 three Chilean films competed on the same opening day in November, trying to get audiences before the arrival of the big US productions that typically exhibit in the last six weeks of the year.\(^ {19}\) Rather than hoping to gain audiences during the profitable pre-Christmas period, the domestic films turned against each other in what Mouesca described as a ‘pathetic’ competition. As the Chilean film industry grows, more films are produced each year but Mouesca’s analysis (concurrent with that undertaken by Corfo) suggests the Chilean film industry is only able to support ten or twelve domestic films a year as 80% of the box-office will inevitably be taken up by Hollywood. At the same time, this assumption that small film industries will necessarily be subsumed by Hollywood is not necessarily true. In South Korea, for example, national films managed to increase their success in the domestic market at the beginning of the twenty-first century and obtained around 60% of the box-office takings.\(^ {20}\) However, amongst South American critics, pessimism remains and attempts to counter Hollywood dominance in the commercial sphere, as opposed to efforts coming from state-sponsored organisations, are limited.

Part of this problem can be linked to the fact that there is an artisan type of filmmaking taking place across South America that does not easily fit in with the
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\(^ {18}\) Bedoya, *100 Años de cine en el Perú*.

\(^ {19}\) Mouesca, ‘Un Largo Camino de Ilusiones’.

chain of intermediaries set up to support a commercial, product-driven system. Much of this lies in the particularity of South American filmmaking that does not lend itself to the studio structures which involve formal demarcation between roles such as producer, director and scriptwriter. As with much auteur cinema in other countries around the world, the filmmaker often takes on a number of these roles. In Argentina, the critically acclaimed directors Daniel Burman and Fabián Bielinsky have written scripts for their films as have Ricardo Larrain and Silvio Caiozzi in Chile. At the same time, there are other directors such as Claudia Llosa in Peru and Alex Bowen and Andrés Wood in Chile who not only write the scripts but also produce their films as well. In Bolivia, Rodrigo Bellot worked as director, producer, writer and cinematographer for his film Dependencia sexual (2003).

Although this method of working grants certain artistic licence to filmmakers because they do not have to consider the stipulations and restrictions placed on them by either studio executives or other investors, it also brings with it problems in the larger cinematic sphere. Barrow notes that the Peruvian director, Alvaro Velarde, had to take on the role of producer himself for his film El destino no tiene favoritos (2003) following a dispute with the film’s original producer, ‘leading in turn to a series of situations that might have been foreseen by a more experienced producer.’21 Adding to this, the head of La Fabrica film school, Roberto Lanza, outlined what he believed was symptomatic of film production across South America whereby filmmakers learnt how to make films but did not learn processes of the industry such as how to distribute films. In particular, he spoke of the problem of film producers projecting themselves as realizadores (filmmakers) without realising that the producer is a specific job and the writer another.22

Furthermore, this type of arrangement is often supported through state funding which gives priority and support to new directors who work outside formal production companies. As Getino points out, however, state funding is often unwilling to support further projects on the basis that the first film should have established the director and

22 Roberto Lanza, personal communication: interview, Cochabamba, Bolivia, 17 April, 2007
his or her team. When filmmakers continue to work in small independent units, they face a lack of resources as they are caught between a commercial sector that is largely operated by powerful conglomerates, most often privileging foreign films, and a system of state support that believes its role is to support new talent. There is no middle ground between these two in which smaller production companies can gain consistent support while continuing to work without formal studio structures.

Through their workings, the structural arrangements of distribution and exhibition display the various forces at work in deciding which films enter the commercial flow, particularly the way the national interacts with the global. Distribution companies, sales agents and movie-theatre owners participate in the macro structures of film circulation with the outcome that a commercial South American cinematic culture is dependent on which films are permitted inclusion and which films are excluded. Reasons for exclusion can range from a lack of space on global screens to a perceived lack of interest with films when they contain elements that do not synthesise well with marketing concerns. An aggressive private sector also makes it difficult for small national companies or independent producers to enter into successful distribution and exhibition agreements. In South America, even with the increased work of the state to provide non-commercial spaces for films, the commercial sector still facilitates the majority of interaction between spectators and film.

**Section 2: Exhibition inside the Multiplexes and the Standard Movie Theatre**

In addition to outlining the macro-level at which filmmakers and films encounter global circuits of distribution, it is possible to observe the micro-level of cinema-going to uncover the way in which films actually become part of an experienced cinematic culture. To do this, it is worth examining the point of first contact with spectators and the way this is contextualised through structures of cinema-going in South America. Although technological developments have meant that spectators can watch films on a number of formats with a great range of choice (which can involve a computer screen, DVD player or television receiver) the cinema screen retains a certain amount of privilege as the window of first exhibition. As Moguillansky points out with regards to cinema in Buenos Aires:

23 Getino, *Cine Iberoamericano*. 
la exhibición en salas de cine es solo el primer paso, aunque resulta fundamental porque el éxito en salas es la llave que abre la circulación por los mercados auxiliares.24 

the exhibition in movie-theatres is only the first step but it is fundamental because success in the movie-theatres is the key to opening up circulation in the auxiliary markets.

This sentiment is supported in a global context by Harbord when she notes that the ‘premium’ moment of filmic consumption in terms of social and symbolic capital is, then, the initial release. Further windows of release and consumption are, in contrast, detached from the collective debate of film and the sense of public ‘happening’.25

Furthermore, the importance that trade magazines, such as Variety, give to opening weekend box-office tallies and initial ‘hype,’ supports and continues the impact of the cinema screening.

Complementing the significance given to movie-theatre exhibition is the fact that the initial box-office screening is when the greatest marketing resources are given to a film and the time at which reviews and discussion are most prevalent. These aspects point to the fact the commercial circuit is bound up with the meta-cultural processes that inform cinema reception: film reviews, advertising, media hype, promotional material, etc. Greg Urban defined the importance of metaculture thus:

Metaculture is significant in part, at least, because it imparts an accelerative force to culture. It aids culture in its motion through space and time. It gives a boost to the culture that it is about, helping to propel it on its journey. The interpretation of culture that is intrinsic to metaculture, immaterial as it is, focuses attention on the cultural thing, helps to make it an object of interest, and, hence, facilitates its circulation.26

The process of cinema-going alongside the interaction with metacultural elements is the experience which binds film to audience and sparks off the point at which it becomes a part of lived cultural experience. In South America, daily newspapers in each country have sections devoted to cinema such as La Nación (Argentina) El Mercurio (Chile) El Comercio (Peru) and El Diario (Bolivia) that not only review

25 Harbord, Film Cultures, p.87.
films but also provide spectators with information from production and publicity material to where spectators can access the films.27

While any number of spectators can individually watch a film, it is the point at which it is a shared experience, either through movie-theatre attendance, metacultural material or involvement in dialogue surrounding a film, that socio-cultural action takes place. For this reason James Kendrick notes that, ‘despite the fact that the home has become the dominant site for film consumption, the theatre is still the origin of legitimacy.’28

Although alternative exhibition sites will be discussed in Chapter Six, the standardised commercial movie-theatre, a recognisable institution and format, is the most common site for this public-film interaction to take place in South America. The movie-theatre is the initial bridge between cinematic culture and audience, the point at which the experience is most public and most publicised. Across most of South America, commercial movie-theatres consist of dark rooms of varying size in which an audience enters, a feature film is played and the audience leaves again. However, the quality of the space can vary from recently-designed, comfortable, multiplex accommodation in the upmarket district of Buenos Aires to rundown, spacious halls complete with balcony seating in central La Paz. These movie-theatres often share similarities with the cinemathecas and cultural centres that also screen cinema: each has a place for a projector and a screen with the audience sitting in the middle. However, there are usually indices that mark the fact it is a commercial theatre with the aim of creating profit. From the advertising reels played before the main feature begins to food products and beverages on sale somewhere in the building and other marketing materials that are extended throughout the space, cinema-going as a paid-for experience is maintained. Furthermore, the physical characteristics of these cinema spaces mark out a timeline of different generations of movie-theatres that were built and modified throughout the twentieth century and now contribute to a cinematic culture in the twenty-first.

In the first instance it is possible to see an older style of movie-theatre that consists of one central viewing space, often with high ceilings; additional balconies; and a foyer space that is designed to move spectators from the box-office to confectionary booths and into the main auditorium. The Cine 16 de Julio in La Paz, which has a large interior hall and substantial balcony, offers a good example of this type of cinema space, as does the Gaumont 0 in Buenos Aires where the upper section has been converted into another screen but still hints at the original structure of a one-screen building. These movie-theatres are restricted in the variety of films that they can offer at any one time but their large auditoriums mean that there is often a collective viewing experience in which the audience’s presence can be felt. Enhancing this aspect is the fact that many of these older movie-theatres retain a shorter style of seat that allows other spectators to be seen, unlike the more modern ‘stadium’ seats which enclose the spectator and remove other patrons from sight.

At times the older movie-theatres have been turned into arthouse cinemas such as the Cine Municipal 6 de Agosto in La Paz or the Complejo Tito Merello in Buenos Aires. They are not often regarded as commercial movie-theatres because it is presumed that a love of cinema rather than an attempt at profit is their central aim yet these arthouse cinemas still have marketing strategies and business plans in place to try and support themselves through box-office receipts. These spaces become significant for domestic cinema as they often make available a larger number of national films than other movie-theatres, and for a greater time period. In the week beginning Oct 8th 2008 in Buenos Aires, five out of the seven national films exhibited were screened only in arthouse cinemas whereas in the week beginning February 26th 2009, all seven of the national films exhibited were screened only in these spaces. At the same time, the tendency for national films to screen in arthouse cinemas, a circuit that can be considered parallel to and separate from the more commercial movie-theatre circuit, suggests there is not an easy place for domestic films in the commercial sphere. This aspect is particularly problematic when taking into consideration the comments from Argentine critics in Chapter Three who displayed discontent with the way the arthouse Espacio de INCAA movie-theatres are run.
At other times, older movie-theatres have been broken up into smaller units, forming a type of multiplex movie-theatre that often makes the best out of refurbished space. A good example of this is the Monumental movie-theatre in downtown Buenos Aires. The movie-theatre has displays of old photographs and other materials inside the foyer which document the cinematic heritage relating to the site yet the movie-theatre is now split over two separate premises, a few doors apart, and has eleven different screens in operation. On the same street, Atlas General Paz, also stretches across two different buildings. These spaces usually seek to maximise profits by favouring multiple choice over the experience of bringing large numbers of spectators together.

Figure 3. Showcase Cinemas multiplex movie-theatre in Santiago

The newest generation of movie-theatres, however, are the shopping mall based multiplexes. From the Cinemark Alto Las Condes in Santiago’s upmarket Las Condes shopping area to the UVK Multicines Larcomar in Lima’s coastal shopping centre, multiplex sites are, by and large, situated within a commercial retail establishment. These movie-theatres tend to be characterised by a large number of screens and spaces that have been designed first and foremost to enhance the multiplex experience. Within them, there are often various box-office and confectionary sales points; stadium seating; up-to-date technology and easy access to the commercial units around the movie-theatres. Many of the multiplexes are built entirely or partly through
foreign investment, leading to a type of standardisation which, along with the international fare offered by foreign films on the screens, enhances the global feel given to the cinema-going experience within these spaces.

While these various cinema sites often represent the spatial coming together of the international and the national via the films they offer and the auxiliary international marketing material on display, they are also the result of an historical trajectory. Included in their history is the fact that the use of movie-theatres and access to cinema spaces in the region has been shaped by courses of growth and decline. The changing shape and use of the older movie-theatres often makes this clear but the decisions of when and where to introduce a new multiplex also reveal the historical implications of the exhibition site. As with much of the developed world, the advent of VCR use from the 1970s onwards made home viewing popular and parallel to this was a drop in movie-theatre attendance. In Chile in 1970 there were 445 movie-theatres but by 1992 this had been reduced down to only 80.29 In a similar trend, Argentine movie-theatre numbers decreased from 2000 in the 1970s to 280 in 1992 but towards the beginning of the twenty-first century the number rose again to around 1000.30 This growth in cinema attendance was concurrent with figures reported across the region, leading to the construction of new movie-theatres and investment into exhibition sites.31

Global analysis of this trend has often attributed changes in cinema attendance to the introduction of new technologies such as television, VCR, DVD and the improved cinema technology such as surround sound and quality projectors. While these have had substantial impact, socio-political changes specific to the region and each country are equally important. During the Pinochet dictatorship in Chile, heavy censorship was in place that reduced all social activity and so it was only during times of social agitation, in which there was greater participation in cultural activities, that cinema attendance took place on a more frequent level. Following this, an increase in movie-theatres and cinema-going attendance occurred once the country returned to

29 Mouesca, Cine Chileno.
democracy.\textsuperscript{32} Perelman and Seivach point out that although there was a recession in Argentina in 1995, movie-theatre usage began to increase partly because the TV-cable market has been saturated.\textsuperscript{33} It is also notable that the countries with the weakest local economies, Peru and Bolivia, have fallen behind in exhibition site investment during the twenty-first century, leading to a lack of commercial movie-theatres outside of the relatively wealthy urban districts.

In addition to the socio-economic concerns that influence cinema-going, the experience of engaging with the national or regional cinematic culture is dependent upon the physical conditions of the site in which they are seen. The national film is often placed in smaller theatres, such as the arthouse cinema, yet even when it is exhibited in the larger multiplexes it is often overshadowed by the foreign productions which are given more space, more auxiliary material such as posters in the foyer, and thus more prestige. Augusto Tamayo and Natalie Hendrickx outline the Peruvian case in which

\begin{quote}
en la mayoría de los casos las películas peruanas sean exhibidas sin haber llevado a cabo una adecuada campaña de lanzamiento que garantice, entre otras cosas, que el público esté enterado de la existencia de la película ni de su fecha de estreno, y, realizado este, de la duración de la exhibición de la película en las salas, lo que perjudica notoriamente su recaudación.\textsuperscript{34}
\end{quote}

\textit{in the majority of cases, Peruvian films are exhibited without an adequate marketing campaign which would have guaranteed, amongst other things, that the public was notified of the existence of the film, its date of release, length of time within the cinemas. This means that the takings of the film are markedly damaged.}

I found echoes of their findings throughout Argentina, Bolivia, Chile and Peru in October and November of 2008 when entering various commercial movie-theatres. Although national films could often be seen on posters in the foyers or on the outside doors and walls of the cinema sites, they rarely had the same presence as the ‘high profile’ Hollywood films. Productions such as \textit{High School Musical 3} (2008), \textit{Madagascar 2} (2008) and \textit{Twilight} (2008) were supported by large cardboard cut-outs decorated with images from the film. In Buenos Aires, the movie-theatre Atlas General Paz had a giant poster of around 8 foot by 20 foot for \textit{Beverley Hills Chihuahua} (2008) above its entrance and Atlas La Valle has a similar sized poster for

\textsuperscript{32} Estévez, \textit{Luz, Camera, Transición, Radio}.
\textsuperscript{33} Perelman and Seivach, ‘La Industria Cinematografica en La Argentina’.
\textsuperscript{34} Tamayo and Hendrickx, \textit{Fianciamiento, Distribución y Marketing}, p.84.
High School Musical 3 covering the upper portion of the building. Whenever South American films did have noticeable publicity material, such as the oversized poster for the Peruvian film Dioses (2008) hanging over the Cineplanet San Miguel in Lima, or the merchandise for the Chilean film Mirageman (2007) in the Hoyts La Reina in Santiago, these seemed to be exceptions rather than the norm. Intermediaries involved in the circulation of films, such as sales agents and distributors, are normally responsible for marketing and publicity and thus have the power to determine the way in which national films will (or will not) be publicised within these spaces. Although South American critics, such as Mouesca, have suggested that the multiplex has increased opportunities for national films due to the large number of small screens in one building that allow domestic productions into exhibition sites at the same time as foreign films, these films are often subsumed by the marketing and promotional material given to foreign works.

![Figure 4. Poster for High School Musical 3 at Atlas La Valle](image)

These points signal the fact that, as with trends in movie-theatre attendance, the constitution of the movie-theatre, both the building and the arrangement of material within, is something that has effect on the access national films have to movie-theatre spaces and the access audiences have to these films. Cinema-going in South America...
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35 Mouesca, ‘Un Largo Camino de Ilusiones’.
37 Acland, Screen Traffic, p.119.
is thus grounded in specific temporal and geographical moments. Charles Acland notes that

> Cinema complexes are hubs of community and public life. They do not situate conditions of spectatorship alone; they also construct relations between public and cinema practices.\(^{37}\)

It is within this context that critical work on cinema spaces, from that undertaken by Hansen working on early cinema\(^{38}\) to Barbara Klinger working on more recent developments,\(^{39}\) enunciates the way in which the experience of cinema-going is a practice constituted by the social settings in which it takes place. Thus, while there are basic similarities in the movie-theatres across South America, such as their reliance on a film projected onto a screen in a dark room, it is crucial to understand the way in which their space is produced with distinct effect in different cases and this is often aligned with broad socio-economic conditions.

Particularly important to an analysis of the distinct qualities of cinema-going in South America is the fact that it is not an egalitarian experience. The newly built multiplexes are more often than not situated in upmarket shopping malls that are only visited by wealthier members of the public. While increasing attendance figures would seem vital for profit making and traditional business models suggest lower prices to increase sales, these movie-theatres often cost more to attend than local, existing cinemas. Moguillansky outlines the situation in Argentina whereby

> los complejos multipantalla de las cadenas transnacionales cobran un precio mas alto por las entradas en comparación a los precios fijados por los complejos nacionales y las salas independientes.\(^{40}\)

*the multiplex cinema complexes owned by foreign chains charge a higher ticket price in comparison with the prices established by the national complexes and the independent movie-theatres.*

Also critiquing the Argentine situation, Gonzales notes that while ticket prices, and thus box-office revenues, have increased, screenings have decreased leading to a scenario whereby cinema-going has ‘elitizado’.\(^{41}\) Moguillanksy extends this concept into an historical context by noting that


\(^{40}\) Moguillansky, ‘El cine en la ciudad de Buenos Aires,’ p.92.

en conjunto, el aumento de precio de las entradas y del costo global de la salida al cine es causa, y a la vez expresión, de la elitización de este consumo cultural. Este es un rasgo relativamente reciente, ya que el cine en un principio fue un consumo ligado mas bien a los sectores populares y luego paso a ser un consumo policlasista, de carácter democrático por sus precios y accesibilidad.  

on the whole, the increase in ticket prices and the global cost of going to the cinema is the reason for and the expression of, the elitization of this cultural product. This is a relatively recent characteristic. Cinema was originally a product that was better associated with mass sections of society but has stopped being a multi-class product of democratic character due to its prices and accessibility.

The divisions between cinema-going publics that are created by this trend are outlined by Perelman and Seivach when they state that

asimismo, existe un público cinéfilo que ve varias películas el mes, mientras que vastos sectores sociales han quedado excluidos de las salas, debido a que el precio de las entradas les resulta prohibitivo.  

in this way, a cinephile public exists that sees various films each month, meanwhile vast social sectors have remained excluded from the movie-theatres due to the fact the price of the tickets is prohibitive.

While these comments suggest an economics based exclusion of certain populations from the movie-theatre, there is also a disjuncture between the access that rural and urban communities have to commercial cinema exhibition. Because movie-theatres have by and large ceased to exist in rural locations, cinema-going has increasingly become a city-based experience. Marcelo Cordero of the Yaneramai distribution group pointed out that 37.6% of the Bolivian population lives in rural areas yet of the 50 screens available in the country, only one is situated in a rural space: the Centro Minero Siglo XX in Oruro. Gonzales also notes a similar process takes place in Argentina, with regards to geographic concentration, as most movie-theatres are in the capital or in two or three of the biggest cities. This means that there are large numbers of the population excluded from movie-theatres through lack of funds to enter the site or distance from the more wealthy areas in which the sites exist. The social experience and cultural practice that is constituted by cinema-going is thus produced through uneven processes of access, both financial and geographical.
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42 Moguillansky, ‘El cine en la ciudad de Buenos Aires,’ p.95.
43 Perelman and Seivach, ‘La Industria Cinematográfica en La Argentina,’ p.84.
44 Marcelo Q. Cordero, personal communication: email, 7 Nov, 2008
While a variety of commercial sites in which to access cinema is disappearing, there is also a simultaneous reduction in the variety of experience offered inside the movie-theatre space. As multiplexes are constructed and older movie-theatres converted into spaces that mimic the multiplex function, a standardisation of experience occurs which in turn constitutes a type of social practice that takes place when engaging with cinema. Analysis of the different ways in which cinema-going previously existed offers a manner of understanding this social practice. Hansen has been critical in uncovering the way in which early US cinema provided the formal conditions for an alternative public sphere, a structural possibility of articulating experience in a communicative, relatively autonomous form.

She looks at the way in which early cinema had theatrical elements which created the sense of a one-time individual event rather than a homogenous experience. The lack of certain rules, such as the imposition of silence, also meant that the various voices of community members could be heard. Furthermore, exhibitors were most likely to be local and thus share an affinity with their customers’ ethnic and social background. Ina Rae Hark also notes that early movie-theatres had large lobbies and other public spaces which provided links to the community and encouraged a communal setting.

In contrast to these descriptions, cinema spaces at the beginning of the twenty-first century are more likely to remove the community elements and the variations in cinema experience. Harbord states if, in the early part of the twentieth century, film appeared to offer a multiplicity of possibilities (of political transformation, of bodily pleasures, of an imbrication of art and life), a century later the institutional locations on offer represent a radical paring down of those possibilities.

Supporting Harbord’s claim, space has become increasingly ordered inside the South American exhibition area. Often a common set of rules are in place which are enforced by the movie-theatre chains that produce standard information pertaining to correct practice in the movie-theatre. Frequently the rules are often matched and replicated in other independent theatres. I found that when visiting movie-theatres in South America, each commercial cinema followed similar patterns of expected behaviour and even when rules were not publicised within the space, audiences had

46 Hansen, ‘Babel and Babylon,’ p.90.
48 Harbord, Film Cultures, p.39.
been socialised to comply with them. They are largely similar to those used in North America and Europe and fit in with what Acland understands as the aims of the movie-theatre:

The cinematic sphere […] it would appear, offers the opportunity to glimpse the orderly and servile nature of a population. The policing of ushers, the presence of security cameras, the regiment of scheduling and the overt appeals to decorum in film trailers (feet off the seat in front, no talking, cell phones and pagers off, etc.) are indices of the intense interest in encouraging civility and reducing the prospects for impromptu (and economically unproductive) interventions.49

The fact that audience members enter into a space which is quickly darkened and, in almost all new theatres, has seats positioned so that other spectators cannot be seen reduces the possibility of engaging with fellow viewers. In the multiplex, after the spectators sit through the film in darkness, and also in silence, they are then encouraged to exit through a side door that takes them out into the street. There is no need for further contact with other members of the public or cinema employees and the experience is isolated as a somewhat solitary pleasure. These sites also leave behind the programming structures of the theatre and earlier cinema bills in which intervals took place and a space was created for the public. The reduction of public space is a factor which increases the streamlined flow of consumer from one part of the building to the next while the homogenising aspect of this experience makes individual films somewhat indistinguishable in form. In this way, multiplexes attempt a cinematic culture that is maximum consumption and minimum interaction.

The implications these factors have for national films can be understood alongside the fact that while their content will be unique, the lack of extra-filmic material to accompany the film makes it hard for the national production to stand out as something different from the foreign films on show (it is rare that programmes or film synopses are provided). This means that inside the multiplex it is cinema culture per se that is promoted rather than specificities of national, regional or foreign cinematic culture. A cultural imperialism argument would suggest that this is because the multiplexes are run by foreign ownership and thus work to promote foreign cultural products over domestic works, but I would argue that this is a worldwide characteristic of multiplexes that is based more explicitly in a drive for profits: the

homogenously packaged experience provides the most attractive and easiest to arrange profit making exercise. In this case, the result rather than the intention is that cultural specificity is lost and will certainly continue to be the case so long as global capital is at stake.

In 2008, the Peruvian critic Ricardo Bedoya provoked debate on his blog by outlining a list of 21 reasons why Peruvian films continue to fail at the box-office. While the list was largely hypothetical it is interesting to note that many reasons for failure were attributed to the exhibition context and the metacultural elements that accompany the films. Although nine reasons were given over to qualities inherent in the Peruvian works, eleven outlined problems from the lack of marketing and support from the national press to the fact that exhibitors pull films too quickly and place films at bad times in the exhibition calendar. These points highlight the fact that more attention needs to be spent on the context in which the films that make up South American cinematic culture come into contact with the public. Morley writes that, ‘Rather than selling individual films, cinema is best understood as having sold a habit, a certain type of socialized experience.’ It is within the socialised experience that the synthesis of cinematic culture begins and without sufficient space for this aspect to take place, cinema is little more than a loosely strung together network of films. For this reason, an improvement in the space movie-theatre exhibitors offer to national films is vital for creating the context for a cinematic culture rather than individual works to thrive. The quality of a film and its relevance to audiences is likely to increase success at the box-office but the foundation for the film to enter into the greater cinematic sphere exists in the meta-cultural elements that are fostered by social interaction with the film. Furthermore, for this culture to be a national or regional cinematic culture it must also involve access that is achievable by the majority of the population. Multiplexes offer certain opportunities to local industries, particularly because their structure allows large numbers of films to be shown at the same time, but it is important to remember that in South America, even though these structures bring the national and the global together, they are often placed in spaces that are inaccessible to large groups of people.

Section 3: Digital Screen Networks and Direct Distribution

While traditional distribution and exhibition patterns appear to work against South American cinema there is optimism that this situation can be readdressed by new screen technologies. Critics and film councils across the world have been paying attention to the ways in which the traditional circuits of distribution can be subverted by technological change. One of the most talked about changes, particularly with regard to theatrical distribution, is the implementation of digital screening that is expected to take over from the 35mm projection standard that is used in the majority of movie-theatres worldwide. At times digital screening is conflated with digital cinema as a whole, yet digital screening is a specific process that can be separated from other digital cinema developments (i.e. filming on digital footage, adding special effects and using digital editing facilities.) Many South American cinema facilities from cinematecas to universities and arthouse screens have taken up digital technology and have been using projectors to display DVDs either alongside or in replacement of 35mm copies. At times this has greatly widened the material and variety of films that can be shown in these spaces although it is widely acknowledged that this falls short of the quality expected of traditional celluloid. The Chilean cinemateca, for example, will often exhibit DVD copies of its archive material on its smaller cinema screen but for special events uses the 35mm projector to screen original or restored copies in its larger cinema. What remains to be analysed, however, is the uptake of advanced digital screening technology (which allows exhibition of digital formats in a standard that equals the cinematic experience of watching 35mm) and the effect this will have on the circulation of cinematic products amongst the various distribution and exhibition networks mentioned above.


See for example Belton, ‘Digital Cinema: A False Revolution’; McKernan, Digital Cinema; Harbord, Film Cultures.
When cinema developed in the twentieth century there were experiments with a variety of formats and ratio sizes for cinema exhibition. In the 1920s, widescreen viewing was implemented while in the 1950s Cinerama, VistaVision and Cinescope all provided different viewing experiences through various modes of celluloid size and screening types. Yet while some alternative formats continue in use at the beginning of the twenty-first century, such as the IMAX experience and the surge in 3D screens, 35mm projection has become the standard specification worldwide. Significantly, it was this standardisation of screening technology that eased the global circulation of film with the result that a foreign film could be distributed simultaneously throughout South America by a range of distributors and, at the same time, a South American film could be distributed abroad to multiple movie-theatres. Nevertheless, there have always been a variety of problems with circulating film for exhibition in this format. Celluloid is a fragile medium that deteriorates quickly when not handled correctly, meaning that individual film reels can only be played a number of times before they have to be replaced. Furthermore, the reproduction of prints is itself an expensive endeavour and extra costs are built up through transportation of reels from one site to the next. This is particularly problematic for South American production companies as they often have to rely on overseas laboratories to produce copies in 35mm. Argentina is currently the only country of the four under study that has laboratories capable of processing and striking prints, meaning that filmmakers in Bolivia, Chile and Peru incur additional costs when sending material abroad during the postproduction stage.

Digital screening, on the other hand, counteracts this by removing the physical limitations of the film print. New technology has been developed so that the film projector may play films directly from digital files which can be sent as hard drives and DVDs, downloaded or streamed straight to movie-theatres via satellite. It means that it can takes minutes, rather than days or weeks for a film to reach the movie-theatre and time spent reloading and changing film reels is minimised. Although many

films are still shot on 35mm stock, the images are converted to digital during post-production and the projection in movie-theatres is expected to match the quality of 35mm projection with any loss in resolution or depth of field seeming imperceptible to the spectator. More importantly, the quality is retained throughout each subsequent screening so that movie-theatres can rightly claim that they offer all spectators the same viewing experience. This process is significant for the global circulation of film as it reduces the temporal and spatial changes that are inscribed into a film print when it begins to shows the marks of repetitive screenings in different locations. When those individual traces are removed, exact replication of image can take place on various screens simultaneously and, in a region such as South America where the majority of countries use the same primary language, sound, subtitles and auxiliary material can also be replicated in a similar manner.

While the above factors have the ability to interact with the standardisation of movie-theatre spaces in South America and increase a homogenous viewing experience across the region, the more important impact the new technology may have on South American cinematic culture will be on the film sales to international markets. Because extra content such as subtitles and dubbed audio tracks can be sent as separate file types and added at the time of projection, the film product is more flexible and can be adapted to the needs of the audience. This flexibility reduces costs and contrasts with 35mm reels where subtitles tend to be imprinted on the celluloid, so that the film print could only be used by movie-theatres in specific areas or countries and could not be exported to other regions. With South American producers and filmmakers frequently struggling with the cost of post-production, any developments towards making these processes cheaper and easier to manage is to be welcomed. As Tamayo and Hendrickx note with regards to Peruvian film, post-production takes up around about 40% of the final budget and is particularly expensive as many processes such as a Dolby sound mix or transfer to 35mm, have to take place abroad. Particularly problematic is the fact that many producers embark upon a project without having the necessary funds to begin post-production and there is thus a situation whereby films
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enter the stage of production but do not reach the greater sphere of cinematic culture created by completed and exhibited works. Tamayo and Hendrickx state that esta realidad, no solo peruana sino en gran medida latinoamericana, ha conducido a que se incluyan en muchos de los fondos de apoyo al cine un aporte específico para la posproducción. Es solo con esta ayuda que muchas veces se completa un proyecto cinematográfico hispanoamericano.60

this situation, not only in Peru but in the majority of Latin America, has been the driving force to include specific support for postproduction in the funds that support cinema. In many cases, it is only through this support that a Hispano-American cinematic project is completed.

There is also much to be said for the fact that the move towards digital screening is a change that represents the transformation from the physical to the transitory. The physical constitution of the film object leaves power in the hands of those who can afford control over its movements and its storage. Film-cans, with their bulky weight and ownership details stamped over the front, suggest a presence that is not easily malleable. If another copy is needed, the right office must be contacted, other persons must be informed and time is taken to strike and send out another set of reels. Unsurprisingly, larger and more experienced distributors and exhibitors have greater access to and control over these processes. Small, independent companies, such as the ones operating in South America, have to carefully plan how many prints to strike as each unused reel is an expensive portion taken from the budget that cannot be returned. However, if not enough prints are produced, success is hampered by the limited screenings made available to the public.

Digital screening appears to overcome these problems and is surrounded by a discourse of slick, quick hyper-technology. For the pioneers and promoters of the new apparatus terms such as speed, flexibility, encryption and high definition are essential.61 Films no longer represent physical objects but are instead gigabytes of data that can be transferred through cables and over airwaves around the world. While various systems are in place to document and encrypt film copies, the physical object can no longer be stored in a unique location or placed under lock and key. The new digital technology is thus the site where some element of control is relinquished in favour of the opening up of products to global flows. Although David Marshall claims

---
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that digital exhibition reduces the number of film prints circulating and thus exerts a form of cultural control, the circulation of digital data rather than physical objects suggests an affinity with the free flow of information that the internet and other digital technologies have encouraged. The film is once again open to retransmission in the same way as was made possible with the ease and speed of reproduction brought about by DVDs at the end of the twentieth century.

The ease of transmission, and thus the opportunity for piracy, is of concern for larger studios, and for this reason a large part of the dialogue about digital cinema is devoted to encryption and encoding practices. However, digital cinema does offer new opportunities for small industries such as those in South America. Because copies of films can easily be transmitted and duplicated, smaller companies can build on word of mouth publicity to persuade movie-theatres to pick up extra copies. The formalities involved in advance booking procedures no longer need to be rigidly adhered to. Perhaps the most radical idea is that small production companies will have the technology to produce their own cheap digital copies and thus sell films directly to individual movie-theatres rather than go through the chain of sales agents and distributors. The buzz words for this concept are ‘direct distribution.’

Digital opportunities and direct distribution have been celebrated as a way of providing access and opportunity for independent and low budget films through an infrastructure that can be used to circumvent traditional routes of commerce. The benefits this should bring to small South American film industries can be summed up by Harvey Feigenbaum’s suggestion that as distribution costs drop, so should the barriers to showing foreign or independent films. This should help film producers outside of Hollywood amortize their costs over a larger market and thus make non-American film industries more viable.

Peter Broderick has similar optimism about technological advances for the independent sector and notes that independent filmmakers now have unprecedented opportunities. Digital production is shifting the balance of power from financiers to filmmakers.

---

62 Marshall, New Media Cultures.
63 Wasko, ‘The Future of Film Distribution and Exhibition’.
Filmmakers who can make movies digitally at lower budgets are no longer wholly dependent on financiers for the resources and permission to make their films. Likewise, new distribution models are freeing them from dependence on a traditional distribution system that has been failing them. Powerful digital distribution tools — the DVD, digital projectors and the Internet — are empowering independents to increasingly take their fate in their own hands and have a more direct relationship with their audiences.  

However, I believe it is worth intervening at this point to suggest a move towards direct relationships with audiences in South America has yet to make significant gains. Sales agents and other intermediaries continue to operate in the region and the signing away of rights to distribution companies makes direct distribution, such as internet distribution or direct sales to movie-theatres, void. Taking into consideration Perelman and Seivach's claim that in Buenos Aires there are only a few people controlling screen programming, the chance to circumvent the intermediaries may be limited.

Although very low budget filmmakers or experimental artists, that are certain their work will not be picked up by a distribution deal, can benefit from streaming their films online, producing their own DVDs or organising single exhibition events, independent companies that seek some kind of national or international exposure, such as the majority of registered film companies working in South America, still benefit most from a secure distribution deal that offers the potential for global coverage. If independent companies distribute a film through the internet or other means, the film is effectively in the public domain. Once in the public domain the film is likely to have forfeited the possibility for any distribution deal as distributors normally work on the basis of some sort of exclusive rights. There is the further problem that direct distribution on the internet has become characterised as a channel for low quality films that are the leftovers from sales agents. A vicious circle begins in which independent companies do not wish their films to be consigned to the same holding ground as poor quality works and thus attempt to find distribution in the traditional networks which in turn places further power in the hands of the sales agents and distribution companies. Caldwell suggests individuals can make no-budget independent features, or interactive DVDs, but unless such a producer contracts or affiliates with one of the recognisably
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branded sites or players, the film will probably stream with little or no visibility.\(^{67}\)

Feigenbaum concurs with this when he suggests that cheap technology brings about an abundance of amateurish films that can overwhelm other independent films, while at the same time production and distribution is made easier for Hollywood, allowing it to retain its advantage.\(^{68}\) The question to be asked at the beginning of the twenty-first century, then, is how these issues are being played out between South American film industries and the traditional centres of global power that dominate distribution and exhibition networks.

In South America there are signals that digital screening is beginning to leave a mark on exhibition across the region and this technology is slowly gaining ground and support amongst the government bodies and institutions that are taking increasing interest in cinematic culture. In Bolivia, the national cinemateca has begun working with the French based digital project Universcine. Run by the French government and supported by the French embassy in La Paz, Universcine is a type of cinema by internet whereby films can be downloaded and then shown in the cinemateca.\(^{69}\) Due to the fact the French government pays for the rights for the films that are screened, it is generally Francophone cinema that is exhibited under this project yet the cinemateca is trying to expand the access to digital films that this system can provide. There are plans for a project that will exploit the flexibility provided by digital exhibition and allow audiences to use the cinemateca’s website to choose which films will be shown and when. With regards to a larger regional framework, Recam also commissioned a project at the end of 2007 to look at the feasibility of digital exhibition and whether international funds could be obtained to support digital initiatives.\(^{70}\)

Nonetheless, symptomatic of the situation across the region, the majority of films shown in the Cinemateca Boliviana are exhibited in 35mm. The Head of Archives, Elizabeth Carrasco, noted that although technology exists to show a large range of

\(^{67}\) Caldwell, ‘The Business of New Media,’ p.57.  
\(^{68}\) Feigenbaum, ‘Is Technology the Enemy of Culture’.  
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digital films, it has not yet arrived in La Paz.\textsuperscript{71} In addition to this statement, Tamayo and Hendrickx found that in Peru in 2007, ‘cabe señalar que existe una tecnología de exhibición digital de alta calidad de la cual no existen aun salas en el Perú.’\textsuperscript{72} (it is noted that a high quality digital exhibition technology exists but is still not found in any movie-theatre in Peru). Although some digital screens had entered movie-theatres by the end of 2008, as will be discussed further in the following paragraphs, there had not been widespread uptake of this technology. This factor concurs with Gonzalo’s findings in Argentina, also in 2007, that the conversion to digital screens is expensive and thus digital exhibition

es una posibilidad que se encuentra en un horizonte lejano, y más para nuestra región, ya que por el momento, los costos de la transición hacia el cine digital profesional (es decir, de 2k resolución mínima) son prohibitivos.\textsuperscript{73} is a possibility that can be seen on a far off horizon but for the moment, particularly in our region, the costs of the transition to professional digital cinema (that is to say, a minimum of 2k resolution) are prohibitive.

Even if the technology were to become available, there are still factors which mean that South American filmmakers cannot bypass the expensive process of striking 35mm prints. In Peru, one of the contractual agreements between filmmakers receiving state-funded support and Conacine is that they will deposit a 35mm copy of their film with the film council within one year of completing the project.\textsuperscript{74} Tamayo and Hendricks also note that

muchos fondos internacionales de ayuda a la producción exigen su exhibición en sala convencional para considerar que el producto ha cumplido con sus “obligaciones” formales de existencia, y por lo tanto demandan una certificación de dicha exhibición para completar la entrega de fondos al proyecto.\textsuperscript{75} many international funds that offer support for cinema production require exhibition in conventional movie-theatres before they consider that the project has completed its formal obligations and often demand a certificate of said exhibition before delivering the funds to the project.
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The crux of this matter is the emphasis on ‘conventional’ movie-theatres as these continue to operate mainly in 35mm and thus filmmakers are still obliged to work with this format.

At the same time, it is important to note that while there is a lack of large digital exhibition uptake in government-sponsored sites such as the cinematecas, or in arthouse cinemas that tend to support national films, there is a low roll out of digital screening taking place through the private sector. Across South America this has mainly been introduced in the larger multiplexes where one or two cinema screens have been converted to digital to capitalise on the ability to show the latest wave of 3D films. Movie-theatres such as Cineplanet San Miguel in Lima, Hoyts La Reina in Santiago and Hoyts Unicentre in Buenos Aires have begun using the new technology to screen 3D films which can be charged at a higher price and, in this way, recuperate the cost of converting to digital. There is thus a situation whereby digital screening technology is entering the region but is doing so through the larger, international conglomerates rather than national exhibitors and distributors.

For national exhibitors wishing to make use of this new technology one of the greatest challenges is the fact that the worldwide commercial cinema sector is increasingly tied into an expensive standardised system when working with digital screens. The Digital Cinema Initiative (DCI) was set up in 2002 by major studios to create a standard operating system for digital cinema worldwide. The initiative puts forward its aims to establish and document specifications for an open architecture for Digital Cinema components that ensures a uniform and high level of technical performance, reliability and quality control. But a significant reason behind strictly controlling specification is so that film files can be encoded and protected from potential piracy. The result is a highly complex set of specification for all producers of digital screening technology should they wish to be DCI compliant. Those projectors that are compliant thus tend to be more costly, around US$70,000 and since many are produced by North American companies,
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importing them into South American countries often incurs additional tax charges.\(^7\) Due to the fact many Hollywood studios favour working with DCI networks there is pressure around the globe to adopt their formats. This means that digital screening is entering the region through studio supported exhibitors and, due to the likelihood that these formats will become standard, it is difficult to see how local exhibitors will find a way to circumvent the costs associated with these specifications.

A South American company that is trying to create its own intervention into the global movements in digital screen technology is the Brazilian company Rain. Working specifically to support independent film, Rain has been providing software programs to manage, distribute, and screen digital media in a low cost manner. The company has installed a number of screens, with exhibitors normally meeting the costs, throughout Brazil and in other countries. It actively engages small distribution and production companies and almost all films shown on its network of participating movie-theatres are independent or national films. There are various initiatives in place such as the Theatre on Demand scheme that allows a virtual community of Rain viewers to vote on-line with recommendations regarding the films they would like screened and in which movie-theatres.\(^8\) This approach takes advantage of the various ways in which digital technology can be used to link up spectators and independent films whilst also signalling an interest in open partnerships rather than the closed systems that characterise the way the majority of film distribution was undertaken in the twentieth century. Nevertheless, exclusions and oppositions are put in place by major studios as they refuse to allow their films to be screened on Rain’s open Microsoft system, citing security concerns as the reason.\(^9\) While films managed and distributed digitally by Rain can be shown on DCI compliant systems, other distributors will not show their films on the Rain system. It means that a two tiered system is likely to come into play in which exhibitors decide which system to support.

---


with the possibility that initiatives for independent films such as Rain may not gain ground in other South American countries.

New media technology, including the spread of video on demand and other ways of accessing film, was meant to have brought about democratic involvement in film and opportunity for direct distribution. However, in line with Sassen’s analysis of the way that traditional economic centres retain power in the circulation of global capital, established sites of power in the distribution networks remain even with the onset of a digital revolution. Gill Branston comments that celebratory accounts of audiences also tend to centre on the advanced industrial world, or PC-owning sectors within it for the study of Internet fandom, and ignore those cut off from advanced, or even basic, consumerhood.

It is possible to say that the same can be said of celebratory industry reports in which advances in new technology are acclaimed for bringing about new opportunities for filmmakers. More often than not the opportunities are only for those that are operating within the sites of established production and distribution networks.

Writing in 2002, John Belton dismissed the new digital cinema revolution with the suggestion that exhibitors will not take to digital cinemas as the technology is too expensive and ‘one obvious problem with digital cinema is that it has no novelty value, at least not for film audiences.’ By the end of 2007, however, more than 5000 digital screens had appeared worldwide with various deals brokered to encourage exhibitors to undertake the new technology. And while the process of watching digital screens may not have novelty value for spectators, it does offer opportunity for access to independent and national films that have previously been limited by high print and distribution costs. In South America, it is likely that new digital cinema will arrive as it becomes the worldwide norm for the distribution of studio films. What remains to be seen, however, is whether it allows a strengthening of national industries through the prospects it offers to domestic films or whether it will consolidate the distribution networks in South America as subsidiary circuits for studio-dominated distribution.

---
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Section 4: DVDs and the Other Side of the Market

Whereas the importance placed on the movie-theatre exhibition site and the move towards digital screening represents a departure from the physical film object, the repackaging that takes place when the film is moved into the final window of DVD marks a return to the material object that can be held, owned and consumed at the whim of its beholder. It is also the point at which film is divorced from its original contextualisation within a national cinematic culture and redefined as cultural object that may or may not retain traces of that contextualisation. If it is argued that within the exhibition site, the attributes of cinematic culture are begun and circulated as culture in the sense that it is accessible to a mass of people, it is within other windows that they are made concrete and given longevity. However, an important difference is that when the film becomes fixed on DVD, and circulates on that medium, it leaves behind the meta-cultural discourses that are attached to theatrical exhibition, from the press coverage that follows it as it appears in the multiplex to the attributes that formal institutions bestow on it in cinematecas and other locations. When the meta-cultural aspects are no longer there, it is the cinematic work which suggests the national cinematic culture from which the film originates. The film thus becomes a representative, rather than a part, of South American cinematic culture and in this way can stabilise the idea of a national cinema. Although there have been various reproduction technologies used, and still in use, for secondary windows of film exhibition (16mm projection, VHS, laserdiscs and VCDS) DVD had surpassed all of these forms by the end of the twentieth century in terms of annual sales and technological possibility and is routinely considered the home viewing format.

Much of the continued impact of DVD as a home viewing medium relies on the way that certain films are made desirable as objects to be retained but also on the way that they are set up as items that may be collected together and thus give the consumer cultural currency. Klinger notes that

although media industries do not control the activity of collecting, they have played a significant role in inspiring its growth as a routine activity, a commonplace aspect of the viewer’s relation to film. In league with other social forces, these industries have had a dramatic impact on defining films as collectibles in the marketplace and on shaping their reception in the home.85

85 Klinger, ‘Beyond the Multiplex,’ pp.55-56
With regards to these ‘collectibles’ it is much easier to buy US DVD products in South America than those of the domestic industry. Getino estimates that in 2007, 90% of films available for home use in Latin America came from outside the region and 80% were North American.\footnote{Getino, \textit{Cine Iberoamericano}, p.59.} Concurrent with this statement, Chilean scholar, Valerio Fuenzalida, made the point in 2008 that only 3% of audiences choose a national film for home exhibition.\footnote{He made this point in his conference paper ‘Tendencias en la Ficcion Televisiva Chilena’ IV Congreso Panamericano de Communicacion: Industrias de la Creatividad, Santiago, Chile, Oct 24 2008} The inverse of this situation lies in the fact that various South American films gain DVD release in international territories but not in their home country. When discussing the fact that the Peruvian film \textit{El destino no tiene favoritos} (2003), found a North American DVD release but not one in Peru, Barrow notes that the irony seems to be that overseas viewers with access to the Internet and DVDs now have greater opportunities to explore the cinema of this region than those viewers located within the national boundaries of a country that sorely needs the support of its domestic audience.\footnote{Barrow, ‘Peruvian Cinema,’ p.185.}

There is thus a sense that, as with movie-theatre exhibition, local cinematic culture is a hard-to-find cultural object and its ‘collectibility’ is bounded by the access consumers have to these objects.

Much of the access to local film products is tied in with the way in which DVDs are made available to consumers and how this affects their status as cultural commodities. When domestic films are on sale they are often placed in separate sections from the Hollywood films that are considered to be the mainstream. Of the four countries under study, Argentina has the largest number of domestic works in circulation on DVD. A significant number of contemporary films that find theatrical exhibition gain some kind of commercial DVD distribution within the country while some companies such as EsmeraldaVideo are working to re-release older classics onto the new format. These DVDs are sold within record shops, book stores and other DVD outlets yet they are often housed within specific sections. In the shops in Buenos Aires there is normally either an ‘Argentine’ section where a mixture of old and new films is thrown together or there is the more general but still specified ‘arthouse’ section where domestic films are placed with other films that are considered non-Hollywood. In Santiago, the few
shops that sell DVDs also set the Chilean films apart from ‘mainstream’ films and the collection of domestic films is often small as it has only been since the beginning of the twenty-first century that the commercial distribution of domestic works has started to increase. DVD piracy will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Six but it is worth noting that it is frequently easiest to buy Chilean films from the pirate DVD sellers who burn five or six domestic works onto one disc and sell it as the ‘Chilean collection’ than it is to buy national films in commercial outlets. Across the border, Bolivia does not have any infrastructure for legal DVD sales as rampant piracy means it is rarely commercially viable for shops to stock DVDs. Instead, one of the outlets for domestic films is through national newspapers that distribute Bolivian DVDs along with daily papers. This method of distribution sets the domestic work apart from foreign films that are advertised in the black market and gives the domestic work a national specificity as it is sold alongside other national cultural indicators: the newspapers.

While internet sites offer alternative opportunities to procure domestic works, South America does not have established national versions of sites such as Amazon.com as do countries such as the US, the UK and Germany. There are, however, some internet sites that are available, such as the Chilean Feriadeldisco website, and these also separate out national works from other films. Frequently, this process of differentiation is beneficial to the domestic industry as it creates a niche in which national films can be advertised without being lost amongst the plethora of US films that overwhelm the market. National specificity, or even South American regional specificity, is retained and the DVDs can be linked to a greater ‘local’ culture. Differentiation also offers a stable place for the films in the commercial DVD circuit meaning that, within South America, the cinematic culture has a space for longevity outside the archives used by official institutions. At the same time, this separation can have certain implications as to how domestic films are placed contextually. Their visible segregation from the dominant US films suggests that the domestic industry will always be a subsidiary of the larger industries and that these films should be considered ‘arthouse’ or ‘specialised’ rather than mainstream.

When these films are then circulated on DVD through the global circuits of product sales, much of this categorisation follows them and is retained in international markets.
International DVD sales are particularly important as they are both a much needed source of financial recuperation, due to the difficulties of gaining returns in the domestic market, and also a way of promoting national industries abroad for both cultural and industrial reasons. Although other countries in South America share the same language and certain cultural traits, making them supposedly desirable markets to disseminate national films, the markets in these countries are tied up by the dominance of US films and offer fewer financial incentives than other international markets where currencies are stronger and more money can be recuperated. However, when films enter sales points outside of South America in, for example, a country such as the UK, they are immediately placed outside of the mainstream and into categories such as ‘arthouse’ or ‘world cinema’. This occurs in popular retail outlets such as the high-street chain HMV and on-line at sites such as Amazon.co.uk and Play.com. A similar process occurs in the US Amazon.com site and Walmart supermarket chain. One of the few exceptions is in Spain where sites such as FNAC.es situate South American films along with other Spanish language films, including those from Spain, as a predominant category rather than just a sub-section of the ‘world cinema’ sector. Leaving the Spanish market aside, there is thus a type of segregation at work which informs the way South American films are considered as a minority interest and outside the mainstream in the global sphere.

Due to their segregation into niche markets and because South American films normally have small marketing budgets, the DVD must have a selling-point that allows potential buyers to engage with the film. Sometimes this is based upon well known directors and the cult of the auteur, but for films from South America where few internationally known auteurs have emerged in recent years, the selling-point is more likely to be based upon recognisable genre formats and well known character traits. It is within this context that D’Lugo states that identifiable genres such as melodrama have been used to cut across foreign audiences’ ignorance of local culture or history. Describing the way this takes place in Argentina he suggests that such efforts serve a double pedagogical function. They orient international audiences through well-established rhetorical tropes that undermine the presumed exoticism and difference between Argentina and other Western societies. In addition, and of no less significance, the streamlining of often complex details of recent Argentine history creates an internal distance for
national audiences that enable spectators to see their own culture from a position of renewed critical distance.\textsuperscript{89}

A film such as the \textit{Diarios de motocicleta} (2004), which was shot by a Brazilian director, filmed in Argentina, Chile, Peru and Bolivia and coproduced by companies from a number of countries, offers a good example of the way this can function. In the first instance, the film is structured as a road movie through the continent. While set in a distinct location from the US road movie, it follows much of the format and recognisable traits of the road movie genre that has been made popular to global spectators by Hollywood films. Furthermore, the main character, the revolutionary fighter Ernesto ‘Che’ Guevara, has been idolised in popular culture around the world and has emerged as one of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries’ most well known archetypal figures. Whether or not spectators have detailed information of the historical circumstances that surrounded Guevara’s rise to power in Cuba and death in Bolivia, most are aware of the revolutionary myth type that his image suggests. In addition to the thematic content of the film, the film starred Gael García Bernal, a Mexican actor who had by this point starred in Latin American, US and European films and was thus well-known to international audiences. Lastly, as a coproduction that included input from the UK’s Film Four and the US’s South Fork Pictures, the film was in an advantageous position to benefit from their success at distributing films in the international market. These elements combine together to reduce the distance created between the cultural elements specific to the locations of the film and international spectators who are the target audience for this material. At the same time, it is possible to see elements specific to the DVD that help form an enduring bridge between the producing culture and the receiving culture.

Due to the extra digital space available on the disc, DVDs can have a number of \textit{extras} added to them that can be accessed easily and independently of the main feature. The most common extras to be found are that of the ‘Interview with the Director’, ‘Director’s Audio Commentary’, ‘Making of the Film’ and various trailers and marketing spots. As Grant notes, these extras are increasing the ubiquity of the director or the auteur’s presence:

\begin{quote}
The interactive, intersubjective formulations of contemporary US auteurism have recently been ‘commercially enhanced’ by the ‘infotainment extras’
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{89} D’Lugo, ‘Authorship,’ p.114.
supplied on feature-film DVDs and by the near ubiquity of promotional documentaries on the ‘Making of the Latest Hollywood Release’. 

However, when the director is not particularly well known, as is often the case for South American directors abroad, the extra features have the ability to allow their extended conversation to provide insight into aspects of the film that may not be easily graspable. As Klinger notes producing cultures such as media industries help to shape the non-theatrical identities of films. Director’s commentaries on DVD, for example, are clearly designed to sell films in the ancillary market, but they also play a powerful role in negotiating film meaning for home viewers.

It is this negotiation that has a powerful role to play in linking the culturally specific within South American film to external audiences that do not have full access to this culture.

The extras features on Diarios de motocicleta work at various levels to allow this to happen. On the one hand, there is the ‘Featurette’ which includes moments from individual scenes alongside voice-overs from the director, Walter Salles, producer, Robert Redford, and scriptwriter, Jose Rivera, amongst others. Their conversations give an overview of the key ideas and themes within the film. Much of the comments in the featurette suggest the universal qualities of the film such as Rivera’s explanation that ‘we tried to present, you know, a story that just about anybody could relate to.’ This extra and the Director’s Interview suggest an outsider’s perspective on aspects of the film and align themselves with the spectator that may be watching the film from an international perspective. In the case of the Director’s Interview, Salles offers a South American perspective but because he is Brazilian he points out that he too, is distanced from cultural moments specific to other countries depicted within the film. On the other hand, there is an interview with Alberto Granado, Ernesto Guevara’s real life travel partner, who speaks from the perspective of an insider who was involved with the cultural moments that take place and thus acts as a further link between international spectator and the cultural content. Taken together, these various extras bridge the cultural gap between the film and spectators in a way that the content of the film may not be able to.
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90 Grant, ‘www.autuer.com?’.
91 Klinger, Beyond the Multiplex, p.10.
Interestingly, there is evidence to suggest that the actual viewing of DVD extras is relatively small yet the industry continue to place faith in their ability to make the product more ‘sellable’. Part of the reason for this lies in the fact that there is a certain value placed upon the quantity of extra features placed on a DVD that extends its worth beyond the quality of a film. Klinger points out that extras have become such a feature of DVDs that it would now be unacceptable to consumers were the DVDs not to have them and the worth of a DVD release is often judged less by the quality of the text than by the extra features that are attached to the disc. As Deborah and Mark Parker point out, there are some DVD releases, such as the 20th Century Fox release for the film *Fight Club* (1999), which have so many extras that it would take longer to watch these than to watch the film itself.

However, many South American DVD releases offer only basic packages for the films and do not make use of the full technological possibilities. Most films will now have English subtitles attached and some of the original trailers or a brief text biography of key members of the filmmaking process, but few have substantial features such as the director’s audio commentary or an audiovisual interview with the director or cast. The DVDs are also less likely to offer technological choices such as audio and aspect-ratio options. Kendrick points out the way that consumer pressure from home movie enthusiasts in the US encouraged the majority of US distributors to release films in both the Original Aspect Ratio and Modified Aspect Ratio. Films that are only released on one of the formats, particularly the Modified Aspect Ratio, appear less conscious of the artistic importance of the different formats and less technologically capable. When South American film industries attempt to sell films abroad it is significant that the films may look impoverished and more ‘Third World’ when the DVD does not have these technological features and other high-tech aspects available to the DVD format.

The above points highlight the fact that DVDs of South American films cannot simply enter the global flows of distribution as a way of disseminating an artistic vision.
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92 Parker and Parker, ‘Directors and DVD commentary’.
93 Klinger, *Beyond the Multiplex*, p.10
95 Kendrick, ‘Aspect Ratios and Joe Six-Packs’.
Instead, they carry the weight of how the culture is embedded in the product with the final product being formulated as a statement about the cinematic culture it comes from either through its packaging or marketing. Parker and Parker state that

the DVD edition is essentially a reorientation of the film, often carried out by a wide variety of agents, and subject to a wide variety of choices made by the eventual viewers. Consciously or not, the DVD constitutes a new edition, and it should be seen in these terms.96

As South American films increasingly enter the international DVD market, the extent to which the ‘new editions’ reflect and constitute the cinematic culture from which the films originate is as much dependent on the filmmakers as those concerned with packaging the DVDs. If the extras features are produced by the film company within the context of the home cinematic culture, then this new edition is likely to be an extension of that culture. If, however, they are produced by external distributors in foreign countries, then elements of a new formulation of cinematic culture are imposed.

At the same time, it is important to note that neither of these possibilities will ever take place within a static field. Home viewing formats are caught up in technological changes that move far more rapidly than changes to theatrical distribution technologies. Whereas 35mm projection remained a constant theatrical viewing format, with only slight divergences towards other projection formats, in the twentieth century, home viewing went through a succession of changes in only thirty years from VHS and laserdisc to VCD and DVD. In the beginning of the twenty-first century, High Definition Blu-Ray DVDs are beginning to emerge with trade magazines, industry figures and journalists predicting that they will overtake standard DVDs as the common format.97 For the consumers, the benefit offered by HD DVDs is extended space on the disc so that greater resolution and extended extras can be added with the possibility of linking to High Definition television sets for greater resolution in the screen image.

96 Parker and Parker, ‘Directors and DVD commentary’.
For small production and distribution companies, on the other hand, the new technology begs the question of whether or not DVDs should be produced on this format. Unlike big studios, smaller production and distribution companies are less likely to have funds available for reprinting and releasing films currently on VHS or standard DVD. There are a number of South American films that were released on VHS but have not yet been made available on DVD. One example in the international market is that Tartan Video released the Chilean film *La frontera* (1991) in the UK on VHS but did not release it on DVD. The company went into liquidation in 2008 and although other distribution companies have bought parts of its back catalogue, it is uncertain whether or not *La frontera* will gain a DVD release. Apart from the classics that are being re-released by Esmeralddvideo, and a few very well known films, the majority of South American films available on DVD are those made post 1997 when the format was introduced. This process is likely to be repeated with the new HD formats so that the only South American films available on an HD format will be those made post 2006. Unlike the VHS situation in which DVD players made VHS players and VHS tapes redundant, DVDs can be played in HD players and so the South American films currently circulating on DVD will not become obsolete. However, it does mean that the South American film, as commercial product, will seem ‘old technology’ and potentially less appealing. The overall result is that at the beginning of the twenty-first century, South American films in the DVD window of circulation are at the whims of technological changes and advancements as well as the marketing and packaging strategies of distribution companies and sales sites that put the films into circulation.

**Conclusion**

The point at which South American films are sold into distribution and exhibition agreements is the point when the interventions of the state most heavily collide with the commercial interests of private companies. While the state tries to reterritorialize cinematic culture within the nation, intermediaries such as distributors, sales agents and movie-theatre owners constantly deterritorialize cinematic culture by opening it up to global flows. There is thus a situation in South America whereby cinematic culture is frequently formulated through a private sector that exists within the national sphere yet is never outside of or apart from the global flows that condition world wide film circulation. Due to a wide range of historical and socio-political factors these
global flows tend to favour and advance foreign films within domestic markets. In 1962, Argentine filmmaker and critic Fernando Birri made the point that our films are not seen by the general public, or are seen only with extreme difficulty. We denounce the fact this happens, not because of the films or because of our audiences, but due to the systematic boycott from national and international exhibitors and distributors who are linked to the anti-national and colonial interests of foreign production which is fundamentally a North American Cinema monopoly.

At the beginning of the twenty-first century the problems of distribution and exhibition remain. While it is difficult to pinpoint a colonial attitude on behalf of foreign production, there is still very much the sense that exhibition and distribution circuits are monopolised by North American film.

At the same time, the global flows of film circulation are indispensable to South American cinematic culture as they carry South American films out into the wider international exhibition and distribution markets that are essential if films are to recuperate sufficient costs. This is particularly true when the dynamic and organic formation of cinematic culture in the commercial public sphere interacts with the consolidating of culture at work in the DVD. These processes produce a South American cinematic culture in the domestic market yet also provide a South American cinematic culture to be consumed by the international arena. Furthermore, new opportunities such as digital screening and DVD technology have the potential to offer alternative means of circulating film and ways of readdressing the balances of power that favour networks of secondary intermediaries, particularly when these networks are beyond the local specificity, of a national, or even regional, context. This aspect is particularly pertinent given that domestic exhibition space represents the formative area for a national cinematic culture yet South American cinema is in a constant struggle to occupy that space. Instead, traditional sites of power remain in charge of the circulation of film and influence is consolidated in a private sector

which often goes against the aims and endeavours of the state when influencing the way cinematic culture is formed.
Chapter Five: International Interests

Introduction
While the process of working between a domestic and international arena is a pertinent issue for both governmental organisations and the private sector, there are also complex arrangements that allow South American films to meet other foreign investors and become a product and process of international engagement. When scholars such as Mouesca, King and Burton-Carvajal highlight the transnational cooperation that has been at the heart of Latin American filmmaking since the advent of cinema, they bring into focus the multifaceted and intricate relationships that cinema practices grounded in one location can have with other production spaces.\(^1\) This type of research successfully complicates and adds subtle analyses to the theories of cultural imperialism that provide an overview of the encounter between dominant cultural works and receiving cultures.\(^2\) Although aspects of the cultural imperialism argument have proven useful for analysing the unequal fields of consumption of cultural products within South America,\(^3\) it is also constructive to look at the other ways in which South American cinema comes into contact with external cultures. My approach is in contrast to a restrictive view of globalisation that suggests transnational media unequivocally follows private enterprise’s historical pursuit of capitalist objectives. Within this view there is often little space to develop an understanding of the positive encounters which take place when cultures come into contact with one another. Without moving too closely to the opposite side of the debate, where it could be said that communities have unrestricted access to subvert, occupy and claim cultural products from external locations as their own, I would nevertheless like to take into consideration the fact that meaningful encounters take place on a frequent basis between South American film practice and foreign cultural elements. In particular, I will be moving on from the global/local convergence in commercial networks of distribution and exhibition discussed in Chapter Four so that I can now examine other arenas in which the national, regional and global interact.
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2 See for example Schiller, *Communication and Cultural Domination*.
To understand this interaction it is useful to take into account what Pratt has defined as contact zones: ‘social spaces where disparate cultures meet, clash and grapple with each other, often in highly asymmetrical relations of domination and subordination.’4 Significant to her understanding of these spaces is the fact that they are often characterised by uneven power play and it is this aspect which continues to be pertinent in twenty-first century South America where much contact with external cultural production is unequal. However, she goes on to outline the way that contact zones allow subjects to be constituted in on-going relationships with other cultures in a way that is more complex than a mere process of domination or being dominated. This is on a par with work on transculturation, which Pratt herself draws on, whereby

Transculturation refers to a multi-directional and endless interactive process between various cultural systems that is in opposition to unidirectional and hierarchical structures determined by the principle of origin that is always associated with claims for cultural authority.5

The key to understanding transculturation is in the ability to see fluid relationships of ‘give and take’ within cultural encounters that are often contextualised by institutions of power yet are not confined to them. It is also important to understand that one geographical space with a seemingly stable ‘home culture’ can have different relationships with cultural influences from separate geographical locations and these relationships can change depending on the different time periods in which contact operates.

In South America, there are various contact zones produced by the forces of global culture which provide the meeting point for domineering cultural forms (most often the US movie and television show) and domestic practice. Carried in by global flows, the relationship these cultural forms have with South American subjects is often determined by gatekeepers such as policy makers and media programmers with little chance for two way dialogue in which the external cultural form is conditioned by its encounter with local culture. On the other hand, there are what I would term ‘purpose’ driven contact zones where specific intervention takes place to bring cultural modes together in a way that allows both external and local culture to be conditioned by the
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4 Pratt, *Imperial Eyes*, p.4.
other. South American cinematic culture often encounters these purposeful contact zones when an ideal of cultural exchange is, at times consciously and at other times unconsciously, posited as the primary aim. More often than not, these purposeful contact zones come about through the intervention of international organisations and institutions that appear to have benevolent and altruistic causes at the heart of their endeavour. This can range from financial support for coproductions through to world heritage initiatives.

To understand some of these contact zones, I will be using the first section of this chapter to look at global coproduction in which South American film companies come into contact with international partners that facilitate a type of cinematic meeting point that is financially, artistically or culturally motivated. This examination will first provide an overview of the various coproduction tendencies at work before moving on to focus specifically on the largest coproduction program of the region: the Iberoamerican oriented Ibermedia. Included in this section will be a brief analysis of some key South American coproductions as a way of giving concrete examples to the processes that I am discussing. In the following section, I will be looking further at the notion of purposefully motivated contact zones through a focus on the way the world organisation, UNESCO, attempts to balance global concerns with a desire to support local culture and, in particular, the effect of UNESCO’s altruistic approach on cinema practice in South America. Section Three continues to examine altruistic practices by outlining global cinema funds which have an aid-oriented approach when supporting South American cinema. To provide a framework for how these different organisations, and their effect on South American cinematic culture, intersect on the world stage, the final section untangles the contextualising force that is apparent in the international film festival. In particular, I will be observing the way film festivals act as highly visible sites for hosting ‘purpose’ driven contact zones.

However, to understand the above processes as simply cultural exchange would miss the point made by Richard A. Rogers, amongst others, that a level playing-field of cultural exchange is an ideal which is almost never met. ⁶ This is particularly true as it is impossible to isolate circumstances under which cultural exchange takes place in a
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vacuum of power. What needs to be interrogated with regards to the encounters between South American cinematic culture and external cultures is where power lies and why certain bodies with power act in commercially aggressive ways and others act in seemingly beneficial ways. My analysis of the various international interventions therefore examines the extent to which an attempt at altruistic behaviour benefits the continuation of South American cinematic culture and the extent to which top-down processes are always in danger of reintroducing or reaffirming cultural hierarchies. These processes of transculturation are pertinent because they often play a role between that of the nation-state, which wishes to remove hierarchies working against local film culture and in this way re-establish the importance of the national, and a commercial sector which frequently allows traditional hierarchies to remain for profit-making purposes.

Section 1.1: International Interest, Global Coproductions

Coproductions have become so important to South American cinema that Getino claims that in Peru and Bolivia ‘la coproducción se ha convertido en la principal, sino la única, posibilidad de realización de imágenes propias,’7 (the coproduction has become the principal, if not only, possibility for creating one’s own images). To analyse their importance it is necessary to take into consideration the different modes in which coproductions operate, particularly because transnational working amongst film practitioners can be seen to have different routes, purposes and effects, from the political and economic to the social and cultural. As discussed in Chapter Three, economic gains, particularly market expansion, can be met by coproductions which allow a film to be classed as domestic in more than one country and gain tax, funding or quota benefits specific to each nation. At the same time, there can be cultural goals in linking together separate nations in one cinematic space.8 In South America, this can differ between coproductions that take place with other Latin American countries, and thus produce a pan-American identity, and coproductions that take place with nations on other continents, often throwing into relief cultural difference. As will be demonstrated, each of the above factors is visible in coproductions across the region.

although there are times when economic conditions appear more important while at other times it is cultural dynamics that come to the forefront.

At the same time, it is important to remember that the transnational contact zones in which coproduction comes to fruition are not a new phenomenon. Instead, ‘film production and consumption in Latin American countries have from their inception been characterised by their transnationality’. The coproductions currently taking place across South America are part of an almost century-long experience in which transculturation has played an important role. In theorising these practices there is at one end the disappearance of the national as films emerge that cross borders and bring various claims of identity together without any deference to a unified national identity. This practice often occurs in the interstitial filmmaking that Naficy describes:

exilic and diasporic filmmakers and videomakers and their distributors and exhibitors are working at the intersection and in the interstices of cultural industries; transnational, national, federal, state, local, private, ethnic, commercial, and non-commercial funding agencies; and myriad institutions of reception and consumption.

Dina Iordanova also identifies films, particularly those at at the turn of the twenty-first century, in which migration is common and places of origin are subverted. When outlining the way that more traditional conceptions of film struggle to process these films she suggests

the established comparative strategies cannot catch these dynamics, as they are rooted in regionalism and rely on comparing firmly defined entities. The dynamics of the expanding universe, however, do not exist as such within the national and the regional. Their significance is visible only beyond the strictly defined 'cultural spheres'.

Both Naficy and Iordanova celebrate meaning-making which takes place when the national is disposed of and subjects (both filmmakers and the symbolic peoples put on screen) bring fluid and complex identities to the forefront. It is these strategies that run counter to the attempts in South American nation-states to develop and re-establish the boundaries of national cinematic culture.
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At the other end of this theorising is a return to the importance of the national with Shohat and Stam’s belief that all films are in a sense national as they are the products of national industries, exist in national languages and recycle national intertexts. Their claim is given weight by a range of texts, both scholarly and journalistic, which use national borders to frame a discussion of cinematic practice. It is this type of critical conception that allows state-organisations to claim cinematic works as their own even when transnational practice takes place in their production. This is often a process which attempts to overcome a certain contradiction: there are various films which appear at first glance to be deeply rooted in one national location, and the cultural heritage that is associated with that site, yet their production processes involve engagement with an external culture through external financing, personnel or other help given to the production. It is these processes that create a hybrid production bridging more than one origin. Twenty-first century films from Argentina, Bolivia, Chile and Peru, and methods of understanding them are, for this reason, often caught between different claims about where their identity lies and it is because of this that their transnationality (or lack of it) cannot be taken for granted.

Important to understanding the claims placed on a film’s identity, particularly when its transnationality is celebrated, is García Canclini’s warning that there is a danger of using hybridity to suggest there were prior ‘unadulterated’ sources that came together. He uses Brian Stross’ ‘cycles of hybridization’ formula to suggest that we move historically from more heterogeneous forms to other more heterogeneous ones, and then to other relatively more heterogeneous forms, without any being “purely” or simply homogenous.

It is within this context that I believe South American coproductions become the result not just of multiple national cultures, but also of the influence of global film patterns and localised cultural traditions.

Even with this in mind, criticism has emerged to suggest that in Latin America, coproductions attempt to down play this hybridity and focus instead on producing an
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13 For a discussion of this practice see Stock, ‘Through Other Worlds and Other Times.’ For examples of this practice see texts such as Getino, Cine Iberoamericano; King, Magical Reels; Martin, New Latin American Cinema.
overt and symbolic culture. In the attempt to open up overseas markets, filmmakers are accused of cultivating a state of ‘otherness’ to match a perceived quality sought by overseas producers and spectators. It is with this in mind that Chanan states that given the nature of today’s international film market [...] coproductions are the order of the day, in which Latin American filmmakers have often turned, willingly or unwillingly, to trading on the exotic.15

This concern is carried forward by B. Ruby Rich in her analysis of the Latin American-Spain coproduction series *Amores Dificiles* that she felt removed any political specificity from the works that comprised it.16 The problem, as she saw it, was that the series removed heterogeneity in favour of promoting Latin America as a magic realism brand, a genre that is best known in literary works but associated internationally with a certain type of Latin Americanism. Adding to this debate, Julianne Burton-Carvajal describes a larger process whereby films erase both hybridity and locality so that works from Mexico, Brazil, Chile and Bolivia ‘circulate as part of an international art cinema that is relatively indifferent to national specificity and targets privileged rather than popular audiences.’17 There is an issue, then, of address when it is suggested that coproductions are not taking place as fruitful contact zones but are instead aimed at worldwide sales.

Estévez confirms this issue by explaining that when bringing Chilean cinema to the international world, ‘siempre existe la controversia entre que tipo de historias son más atractivas en el mercado mundial: las localistas o las universales.’18 (there is always the controversy about which type of stories are more attractive in the global market, the local stories or the universal ones). However, Mouesca believes that las buenas películas chilenas que tienen mejores posibilidades de acceder a los públicos extranjeros son aquellos que les hablan de Chile, que tienen el sello de una identidad intransferible.19 the good Chilean films, that have the best possibility of gaining access to foreign audiences, are those that speak to them about Chile, that have the seal of an non-transferable identity.

19 Mouesca, ‘Un Largo Camino de Ilusiones,’ p. 373.
What these various statements reveal is that it is difficult to define set rules for the way in which coproductions operate and/or are successful.

Nonetheless, a number of key patterns emerge in South American coproduction practice and these deserve further analysis. Because the majority of coproductions have a director and key members of the production from one nation, often with that nation acting as origin point for the project, there is from the beginning a delineation between ‘home culture’ and ‘other’ participating countries. Often the ‘home culture’ has to sell itself to the ‘participating culture’ and this negotiation within the contact zone of coproduction often brings into play relationships of responsibility. This is particularly true when one coproducing country acts as financial guarantor and gateway to potential foreign audiences. In his work on European coproductions and cultural borrowing, Dimitris Eleftheriotis likens the situation to the ‘dynamics involved in the production and consumption of tourist souvenirs.’ \(^{20}\) He suggests the seller will try to second guess what the buyer from another culture wants in the souvenir and seek to provide this while the buyer will seek to obtain a representation of the local culture. At work in this act is the fact that both buyer and seller are aware that they are participating in a manufactured process.

At the same time, there are other relevant factors which emerge when filmmakers decide how to participate in coproduction processes. Juan de Dios Larrain, the producer for the Chilean-Argentine *Fuga* (2006), outlined what he saw as the motivation for coproduction in three elements. \(^{21}\) Firstly, they help bring in funds and often enhance technical assistance. Secondly they help with artistic matters such as gaining international actors to participate in productions. He finally added that they also help to acquire distribution in other countries and in festivals. By putting the concern of the international market last, Larrain suggested that coproductions are not so much a pandering to global finance and international audiences but a complex negotiation that splices technical and artistic elements of another country with elements of the home culture. Although *Fuga* has a prominent Argentine actor in one of the lead roles and was given a great deal of financial, artistic and technical
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\(^{21}\) Juan de Dios Larrain, personal communication: interview, Santiago, Chile, 4 April, 2007.
assistance from the Argentine companies involved, it was a project initiated by a
Chilean director, Chilean screenwriters and Chilean producers. They were able to
exploit the benefits of working with a co-producing partner in a way that did not
involve revising the Chilean cultural identity that they wished to put forward. This
factor is evident in the fact that the film uses its depiction of a fictional Chilean
composer Eliseo Montalban to re-inscribe the heritage of classical music in Chile
through an audiovisual form. Furthermore, the specificity of different cultures is
articulated through the relationship the lead Argentine character, Ricardo, has with the
Chilean composer. The processes of coproduction allowed both meaningful
engagement between the two countries on screen, as well as access to increased
finances and distribution resources. These processes extend, then, Felipe Hernandez’s
understanding of transcultural practice wherein transculturation is a ‘multi-
directional’ process. Understanding a film such as Fuga in this way leads away
from potentially delegitimising statements in which the cultural agency of a South
American filmmaker is denied in light of their supposed adherence to culturally
neutral texts or international audience sensibilities.

However, it is still worth looking closely at the geographical positioning of
coproductions and the way in which this informs the projects that take place.
Although South American countries no longer exist in the overtly colonial situations
that critics such as Pratt were analysing in their accounts of transculturation, they are
still subject to uneven balances of power in their relationships with ‘developed’
countries. The significance of this in regards to cinematic coproductions becomes
clear in light of the fact that agreements outwith Latin America are almost always
formed with North American or European countries. The Argentine-South Korea
coproduction Leonera (2008) and the Chile-Japan coproduction Santos (2008) are two
of only a very small number of coproductions that have taken place with countries
outside the Americas and Europe in the twenty-first century. Analysis from critics
such as Octavio Getino, Teresa de Hofert Turégano and Libia Villazana make it clear
that the dependency on the Americas and Europe for coproduction has been an

ongoing situation. There is thus the circumstance in which South American production teams frequently enter into a relationship with a co-producing partner who is from a place of greater financial influence.

Getino suggests that, historically, coproductions with the US are a closed process, of limited cultural exchange rather than creative input, as Latin America is used as a location with cheap technical facilities and personnel. His statement is supported by Falicov when she describes the coproductions between US producer Roger Corman and the Argentine producer Hector Olivera in the 1980s. Argentina was used as a location for a number of Roger Corman’s B-movies with the majority made in English and only a couple ever released on Argentine screens. According to Falicov, they produced films that worked counter to the spirit of Argentine filmmaking due to either the absence of Argentina from the cinemascap or the distorted representations and/or stereotypes of Argentine culture in the few times it was depicted.

While many South American countries have agreements at a state level with other nations to facilitate coproductions in the twenty-first century, there is no such agreement between the US and any South American country. Instead, the most significant agreement is between the MPAA and the private Patagonik company in Argentina. That the MPAA supports ‘runaway productions’ (location shooting and contracting out other services overseas) as a means to exploit low wages and facilities in other countries is not a new phenomenon.

In comparison to the above mentioned practices, Getino makes a point about twentieth century coproductions between Latin America and European partners that involved directors such as Fernando Solanas, Jorge Sanjinnes and Miguel Littin:

Estos ejemplos no tratan de un cine realizado en América Latina, sino de un cine de América Latina, el que a pesar de obvias intermediaciones y algunos condicionamientos, contribuye a mejorar el intercambio cultural entre
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24 Getino and Octavio, Cine Iberoamericano, p.65.
26 Villazana, ‘Hegemony Conditions in the Coproduction Cinema of Latin America’.
naciones con grandes diferencias de desarrollo cinematográfico inaugurando experiencias que benefician por igual a cada participante.28 These examples do not display a cinema produced in Latin America but instead a cinema from Latin America, that in spite of obvious intermediaries and some conditions, contributes to improving the cultural exchange between nations with large differences in cinematic development, and opens up experiences that benefit each participant equally.

While it is difficult to uphold categorical claims that coproductions with European countries are more beneficial to South American film industries, there is a history between filmmakers and European partners that has both allowed production to take place and has brought South American films into an international market. Throughout the politically turbulent times of the twentieth century, Europe frequently provided refuge for South Americans artists. Exiled filmmakers such as Raul Ruiz, Fernando Solanas and Miguel Littin found opportunity in Europe to carry on with their filmmaking after leaving their home countries. Furthermore, part of the reason that cultural exchange with Europe has often allowed more agency on the part of the South American partner can be attributed to the fact that there are various organisations in Europe with politically motivated altruistic tendencies towards Latin American cinema. During the 1960s, 70s and 80s there were various solidarity groups in Europe that supported the left-wing ideals of South American filmmakers29 and at the beginning of the twenty-first century there still exists various supporting bodies. Teresa de Hofert Turégano notes that Spain’s Agency for Corporation for International Development (AECI) drives cultural cooperation through support specifically aimed at co-producing films with Latin American countries.30 Another company, Buena Onda, from the UK was set up with the aim of supporting talent from Latin America via coproductions with companies that share the same political values as its founder Donald K. Ranvaud.31 Each of these organisations supports transcultural exchange at the level of finance as well as at a cultural level, leading to film practice that is more than ‘runaway production’. It is within this context that it is worth examining the biggest coproduction program in the region, Ibermedia, to uncover the extent to which it contributes to South American cinematic culture.

28 Getino, Cine Iberoamericano, p.65.
29 King, Magical Reels.
30 Hoefert de Turégano, ‘The International Politics of Cinematic Coproduction’.
Section 1.2: Cross-Region Cultural Exchange in Ibermedia

Operating within the audiovisual policy of CAACI, Ibermedia shares the same member countries, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, Chile, Spain, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic, Uruguay and Venezuela. Created in 1997, Ibermedia is an initiative that uses finances from each of the member countries to pool money for audiovisual production into one specific fund. There are certain conditions attached to funding applications, mainly that each production must be a coproduction with two or more member countries and involve the participation of a certain number of personnel, yet there are very few restrictions on the types, or genres, of films that are given support. From 1997 to 2007, Ibermedia supported 250 films and around about 900 projects in total, making it the most significant fund for audiovisual production in South America.

The importance of Ibermedia funding in Argentina, Bolivia, Chile and Peru is evident in the way that it is discussed in film production circles throughout the countries. During interviews, Carola Antezana from Conacine Bolivia, Caroloa Leiva from CALA and Emilio Moscoso from Conacine Peru each listed Ibermedia as one of the most important sources for audio visual funding. It was a name that was repeated throughout a meeting of young filmmakers in La Paz in 2007 and is a subject that constantly occurs in debate amongst Peruvian filmmakers on the Cinemaperu listserv. In the countries with the smallest industries, Bolivia and Peru, Ibermedia is especially important as it often finances the greater part of cinematic production in any one year. When the Peruvian government withdrew its financial input and refused to pay the quota for two years running there was an outcry amongst Peruvian filmmakers and increased pressure was maintained in 2007 by Conacine to secure (belated) funding to participate. Important to this point is the fact that while different
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34 Carola Antezana, personal communication: interview, La Paz, Bolivia, April 10, 2007; Carola Leiva, personal communication: interview, Santiago, Chile April 2, 2007; Emilio Moscoso, personal communication: interview, Lima, Peru, May 18, 2007.
countries are expected to contribute different amounts dependent on their economic capability, each country must send the full monetary sum expected of it each year for its filmmakers to be eligible for the program. This fits in with Hoefert de Turégano’s understanding that the way Ibermedia ‘is conceived and administered reflects a cooperative approach as opposed to an aid orientated one.’

At the same time, although each contributing country is meant to be given an equal voice when deciding which projects are funded and how other parts of the program are run, Villazana notes that ‘Spain controls the fund.’ Whereas member countries contribute around $100,000 annually, Spain contributes $2 million and, at an administration level, the offices are in Spain and the majority of staff are Spanish. Furthermore, Villazana notes that due to various specifications in the funding application, coproduction with Spanish producers is more attractive than coproduction with other, less economically developed, Latin American countries. The compulsory co-operation elements have served to make extremely visible to Latin Americans their level of economic dependency, and to Spaniards their economic and technical advancement over the subcontinent. In addition, although Ibermedia gives loans to coproductions organized between Latin American countries without the involvement of Spain, the tendency is to coproduce with Spain. Spanish producers bring to the productions more financial and technical resources. Spain is also attractive to Latin American producers, since it is seen as the gateway to Europe.

There is thus a situation of unequal power relations in which different cultural contexts come into contact yet modes of dependency and dominance still operate.

Furthermore, Villazana notes that there is an emphasis on funding individual coproductions rather than developing distribution networks. This factor means that there is the potential that, once the films are completed, they will struggle to find sufficient distribution and exhibition circuits in a similar manner to the problem faced by most Latin American films. Although Ibermedia is successful in bringing projects to fruition, it sends them into markets dominated by the global flows and commercial networks outlined in Chapter Four.

39 Villazana, ‘Hegemony Conditions in the Coproduction Cinema of Latin America,’ p.66.
40 Villazana, ‘Hegemony Conditions in the Coproduction Cinema of Latin America,’ p.73.
With regards to the content of the films produced, there is the question of whether or not Ibermedia coproductions can influence the types of cultural exchange within the cinematic text in a way that is different from coproductions with other international sources. Films supported by Ibermedia such as *Los Andes no creen en Dios* (2007), *B-Happy* (2003), *La señal* (2007) and *Cachimba* (2004) each display a particularly national setting that can be attributed to the South American co-producing company even when, as is the case with *La señal*, Argentina is only represented allegorically as a fantastic and fairytale like world. Their content suggests that working within the Ibermedia program does not necessarily presuppose the erasure of locally rooted South American identity. In each of these films, there is the portrayal of a type of cultural specificity, such as the importance of mining culture to Bolivia in *Los Andes no creen en Dios* or tropes of Chilean cultural heritage in *Cachimba* that suggests that the coproduction processes in this program allow filmmakers the freedom to put forward aspects of national cultural identity that they see as important. At the same time, this begs the question of whether or not transculturation processes become visible on screen and thus accessible to audiences viewing this aspect of South American cinematic culture, an issue that will be discussed further in the following subsection.

Before discussing the visibility of transculturation on screen, there are still some remaining issues about the chosen films that are produced and circulated through the Ibermedia program. Roberto Lanza of La Fabrica film school denounced the fact that Ibermedia has become a closed faction of known directors41 and de Turégano explains that ‘one of the criticisms made of Ibermedia is that the chosen projects often go to the same select group of individuals.’42 At the meeting of young filmmakers in La Paz in 2007, filmmaker Juan Pablo Urioste made a distinction between the established filmmakers involved in Ibermedia that are overtly trying to promote a Latin identity and the younger generation which is less preoccupied with identity per se and more preoccupied with personal stories and the possibility of experimentation.43 These various claims suggest that Ibermedia is in danger of becoming a conservative model

41 Roberto Lanza, personal communication: interview, Cochabamba, Bolivia, 17 April, 2007.
for film-support that allows transculturation to take place but only within traditional modes of film practice.

Section 1.3: Coproduction on Screen, Visible Transculturation

With regards to evaluating transculturation processes, Villazana points out that these practices do often become visible on screen. She gives the example of Ibermedia productions that require Spanish actors to participate in works based in Latin America in order to fulfil personnel requirements for the coproduction fund. The way in which this takes place ranges from plot devices in the film which explain the presence of a Spanish citizen to a change in accent to suggest the actor is playing a Latin American character. In either case, these moments bring the transnationality of the film onto the surface of the screen, particularly when, as Villazana points out, the presence of the Spanish actor is awkward or clumsy and in this way reveals the mechanisms of coproduction at work.

These processes raise interesting questions about the way in which contact zones are produced in different ways by coproductions and the effect this has on a wider cinematic culture. Coproductions can be broadly split into two different strands: those in which the ‘contact zone’ is apparent on screen, as discussed above, and those in which they are not. It is the distinction between the two that I would like to briefly examine in this section. With regards to the first strand, I have listed some of the most successful coproductions (in terms of box-office achievement and retention within the cinematic sphere) in Appendix A. Each of the films in the first section Coproductions with Multiple National Content share in common their use of multiple national locations and financing from non-national sources, and there is a degree to which they are visibly influenced by the international input that goes into them.

Made in 2005 and set in 1978, Mi Mejor Enemigo articulates the weaknesses of national frontiers as it positions characters on both sides of the Patagonian border that separates Chile and Argentina. The film takes place at a tense political time during which the two countries were on the verge of war and thus creates a situation in which it is imperative that the opposing groups of soldiers maintain and reinforce their
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44 Villazana, ‘Hegemony Conditions in the Coproduction Cinema of Latin America,’ p.73. See also Alvaray, ‘National, Regional and Global’.
national borders. Chilean soldiers, the initial protagonists of the film, are on an assignment to find a barbed wire fence from the beginning of the century that marks the frontier yet this boundary never materialises. Instead, under vast Patagonian fields of pampa and wide open skies, the soldiers quickly lose sense of where the border is and find themselves astray without a marked position. Much of the rest of the film becomes an attempt to make sense of and redefine the border even though narrative events often contradict this attempt. In the first half of the film, the Argentineans are an abstract concept that is not yet visualised: the ‘other’ which is the enemy. However, when discussing the ‘homeland’ they are fighting for, the Chilean characters find themselves talking about the way in which people from the southern stretches of their country cross into Argentina to find work and in many cases have families in both territories. With this comes the realisation that they, northern Chileans, have been chosen to fight in this area as they do not have the same ambiguous experience with national definitions that some of their other country-men have.

This paradox continues when they meet a group of Argentine soldiers and realise that for any formal conflict to continue the border must be marked out. As they set fire to the land, in an attempt to singe the boundary into the earth, the Patagonian winds push the fire off course and the border becomes a meaningless swaying line. Moments such as this, and later points when the two groups of soldiers play football together or share food and drink, signify the fact that national borders will always be fluid and traversable. At the same time, this border crossing does not act to erase difference between the characters and the developing friendship between the group of Chilean and Argentine soldiers shows that they retain a sense of their specific cultural identity which sets them apart. A clear example occurs when the characters have been drinking together and the Argentineans begin a Tango and the Chileans a Queca, their respective national dances. Distinct cultural inflections can also be heard throughout the scenes as the characters use different accents and slang that characterise their common Spanish language. With regards to production processes, the film was financed by both Chilean and Argentine production companies and given support by Corfo and Fondart (Chile), INCAA (Argentina) and Ibermedia, yet it is within the content of the film that the interaction of different nations and culture becomes most apparent. There is thus a point at which the production processes have facilitated a type of transnational exchange that becomes available on screen so that a discernible,
narrative expression of the contact zone that can take place between Argentina and Chile is represented. South American cinematic culture thus becomes a product of and active agent in transcultural practice.

Further films from Appendix A continue the trend whereby international elements involved in the production processes influence and support the exchange of nationalities within the content of the film texts. At the same time, it is interesting to note the way in which these films are contextualised in the cinematic sphere. Dependencia sexual (2003), for example, makes clear use of Bolivian and US locations: a number of key scenes take place in the United States, performed by American actors and with English as the primary language while others take place in Bolivia and in Spanish. Yet this transnationality did not exclude it from being presented alongside other Bolivian films in February 2008, when the Cinemateca Boliviana ran a program of ‘todas las producciones de largometrajes nacionales a partir del 2000’ (all the Bolivian feature length productions from the 2000s), or from being listed amongst Bolivian films on Conacine Bolivia’s website. A similar situation takes place when various other South American coproductions are claimed by official organisations as part of a ‘national’ cinematic culture regardless of the transnational elements apparent in the work. While the presence of contact zones on screen means that transnationality in these works comes to the foreground, it is worth considering how transculturation is made available in the second strand of coproductions: those that appear to be grounded within signifiers of a singular nation.

I have identified a number of these films in the second section of Appendix A: Coproductions with Single National Content. Although the films are not easily divided into these two different strands, and there is a subjective element involved in deciding to categorise them in this way, the films listed here have more obvious reference to a single national context. In El bonaerense (2002), for example, the village home of the protagonist Zapa has the trappings of a claustrophobic rural Argentina where family and work spaces are crowded with old and re-repaired domestic objects that are further closed in by tight camera framing and limited empty spaces. As Zapa changes location to become a police trainee in Buenos Aires, the abundant light and noise of the city acts as a contrast to the rural space. However, the more closely it is examined the more clearly the city shows the same traces of clutter
and paucity. The acute examination of Argentine poverty, and the on-going corruption of the national police force which occurs in the film’s plot, suggest little of the other nations, Chile, France and the Netherlands, that participated in the production. Instead, the narrative draws upon intra-national movement and layers of social problems that are ingrained within the lives of the Argentine characters. In a similar manner, *Play* (2005) is tightly bound within the Chilean capital Santiago. The main character, Cristina’s connection to external locations is achieved through the telephone when she talks to her mother yet this is an intra-national exchange as her mother is located in the southern end of Chile. The influence of the co-producing country Argentina is not apparent in the narrative or formal elements of the film.

Nevertheless, it is important to note that these films do not register some kind of cultural purity through the absence of transnational signifiers. Nestor García Canclini makes it clear that culture results from the constant rearticulation of identity that draws on a number of, often international, cultural sources. Each of the films in the second section of Appendix A draws upon events and experiences, and a manner of displaying them, that is the result of interaction with national, regional and transnational culture. This takes place either through a use of film forms that have developed in other parts of the world or through a debt to cultural expression that was initiated by forceful colonisation processes or more recent globalisation. Both *Quien mato a la llamita blanca* (2006) and *Madeinusa* (2006) offer examples of this cultural heterogeneity. They each visualise a twenty-first century situation where an Andean culture, which relies on spiritual concepts of the mountain and natural resources, meets an overt colonial European influence.

In the former, the two protagonists Domitilia and Jacinto identify with native ‘indios’ and are seen wearing the embroidered clothing associated with indigenous Andean communities. They are also shown performing a ritual blessing to the mountain that overlooks La Paz. However, these cultural traits are met by Western forms when they undertake a bandit-style road trip through Bolivia to deliver drugs for a US supplier, and come into various remnants of Western culture from Miss Bolivia contestants to Spanish-style catholic churches. The convergence of different cultural elements

---

45 García Canclini, *Hybrid Cultures*. 
within the plot and the mise-en-scene makes apparent the hybrid influences that Canclini discusses. In Madeinusa (2006) there is also a strong mixing of cultural heritage in the events which take place in a remote Andean village in Peru. When the village enters into a festivities mode for the Easter weekend there is an obvious display of colonial Catholic tradition from the church that overshadows the village to the Virgin Mary robes in which the protagonist, Madeinusa, is dressed. At the same time, Quechuan language is mixed into the rituals that take place and the villagers wear their clothing and hair in a fashion that is unique to the Andean communities.

There is thus the sense that these films do not have a singular cultural origin and the fact that they are coproductions means that there are a variety of sources, even if only at the level of financing, that are influential in bringing the themes in these films in to a South American cinematic sphere. Further to this, the films within Appendix A are not an effortless amalgamation of the two, three or four ‘national’ cultures that participate in the production of the film. Instead processes of hybridity mean that there are various influential cultural practices at work even when it appears on screen as if just one or two national contexts are evoked.

To conclude the first section of this chapter, on the one hand coproductions contribute to South American cinematic culture by increasing the potential for films to reach a production stage and find markets and circuits of distribution. On the other hand there is another factor at work when the coproductions form spaces for contact zones that have the ability to display and also interrogate the transnationalism that is at work. Nevertheless, as with many global transactions, the patterns of South American coproductions are subject to particularities and trends of an international market place, meaning that companies and institutions do not necessarily have a sustained commitment to working with South America. Although the Ibermedia program is seen as a stable option, and is thus relied upon by many film councils, in his analysis of new Argentine films in 2008, Charles Newberry pointed out that ‘the attention of foreign co-producers […] is shifting to new "in" territories like Romania.’46 In this way, coproductions with European, or other international countries, cannot simply be understood as free or open processes of cultural exchange as they are in fact

46 Newberry, Charles (2008a) ‘Argentina Tries to Shed Arthouse Image’ in Variety, Feb 7
determined by the extent to which coproduction partners are available and the freedoms filmmakers are given to use these practices in a manner that allows cultural agency. Even when the South American country acts as the point of origin for a project and inserts cultural agency into the process, the ability to get a film into production stages and later into circuits of distribution is often determined by conditions that are inserted by external interests. It is these external interests which will be explored in the following sections.

Section 2: Cultural Identity as Global Heritage

The issue of transnationality or hybridity in South American films is complicated by the protectionist attitude of globally oriented organisations that assert a duty in maintaining local and established tradition in the face of potential erasure. Whereas many South American filmmakers and institutional organisations understand the benefits of coproduction and allow various international identities to be expressed in cinematic form, there is a network of globally operative organisations such as the Instituto Cervantes, Goethe-Institut and Alliance française, who stake a claim in promoting specific and particular cultural identity. These institutions frequently organise exhibitions, festivals and other events which display coherent, unified and pre-determined cultural signifiers, often closely linked to a ‘national’ or region-specific culture. While the primary aim of these institutions is to support and disseminate the culture of their home country, the branches located in South America frequently work to assist and create programs dealing with the ‘national’ culture in which their overseas institutes are based. They often operate with a paternalistic scope, aiding and supporting the continuation of pre-existing South American cultural forms rather than co-producing new formations. The slightly distinct but most wide-reaching of these organisations is UNESCO which is not tied to a ‘home’ culture, as are the other institutions, but has the promotion of indigenous cultural forms and cultural agency fully enshrined within its conventions. And although Argentina, Chile, Bolivia and Peru have support for cultural forms built into their cinematic laws and find support for cultural agency in the regional agreements produced through CAACI and Recam, UNESCO has influence due to its position as a global organising committee.

UNESCO, the United Nation’s Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, has a history of theorising cultural identity through a conceptual and abstract model that includes language, personal expression and social organisation. At the same time, it does outline the importance of specific cultural formations such as theatre, music, dance and film. Although UNESCO was weakened by the ‘neo-liberal tide sweeping international organizations from the 1980s’, its commitment to minority cultures and the constant rearticulation of the importance of cultural pluralism has been evident in the varied cultural programs that it supports. It currently has three conventions in place ‘that protect humanity’s cultural heritage’. This phrase suggests that while the focus on diversity signals a respect for non-cohesive units of cultural production, the rhetoric is very much that of one-worldism produced through the unifying concept of humanity. In UNESCO’s 2001 Universal Declaration, cultural diversity was specifically recognised as the ‘common heritage of humanity’.

While UNESCO’s engagement with world heritage is more broadly thought of in terms of monuments such as Peru’s Machu Picchu, it has made an effort from the beginning of the twenty-first century to engage with what it terms intangible cultural heritage, relating to language, belief systems and cultural practice. The 2001 declaration defines its understanding of culture as

the set of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features of society or a social group that encompasses, in addition to art and literature, lifestyles, ways of living together, value systems, traditions and beliefs.

Following this logic, film can be understood as important because it produces and articulates these features of a society as well as being a form of cultural expression that is particularly dynamic: it can simultaneously portray various levels of values and beliefs amongst socialised systems and communicate the processes of transformation.
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within them. Film acts as a heightened expression of what Carlos Tello Diaz sees as important to UNESCO’s investment in culture:

All cultures are dynamic; they evolve with time, through contact with other cultures – sometimes in the form of exchange, other times conflict. Diversity always involves a degree of tension. Cultures are not sedentary; they’re nomadic, they travel with humanity.⁵⁴

One of the most pertinent aspects of UNESCO’s work, and one that is particularly applicable to South America, is the opportunity it offers to minority culture groups that are on the fringes of national or global cultural expression.

UNESCO has a program of work with the Fundación del Nuevo Cine Latinoamericano to produce, enhance and promote audiovisual projects that involve these groups and demonstrate cultural diversity. The Fundación makes the point that in much of Latin America

...many communities that carry this type of diversity live in isolation in remote rural areas and in marginalised urban settlements without access to new forms of communication technology and usually without the necessary capability to revitalize their cultural resources as a factor of intercultural dialogue and human development.

The aim of the UNESCO-supported Las Cámaras de la Diversidad (the Cameras of Diversity) is to involve these marginal communities in projects which will enable them to become ‘sujetos creadores de su propia palabra e imagen’ (creative subjects of their own words and images), bringing awareness of the importance of creativity and cultural diversity to a local and international level.⁵⁶ Thus far various short films and documentaries have been produced such as the Bolivian Ecuana sha Yahua - Tierra Nuestra (2004) that lists UNESCO as the producer and made use of CEFREC, a Bolivian cinematographic organisation that supports filmmaking amongst indigenous communities. As Himpele notes, filmmakers working with CEFREC
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are staking their claim in the present and the future by engaging with the multiple cultural combinations and transnational networks that the state could not contain, hide, or homogenize.57

Other documentaries supported by UNESCO, such as the Peruvian *Arena Viva* (2005), collaborated with the Asociación Cultural Integración Ayllu-Wari that has similar aims to CEFREC. The films have been able to enter the global flows of dialogue that UNESCO supports through various film festivals as geographically diverse as the 5th Morelia International Film Festival in Mexico (2007) and the 17th First People’s Festival in Montreal, Canada (2007).

When the schemes are observed more closely it becomes clear, however, that certain types of audiovisual projects are favoured. Specifically there is an engagement with what Shohat and Stam would term ‘fourth world’ culture: what they describe as cultural works pertaining to First Nation communities or peoples indigenous to colonised territories.58 This has implications for cinematic forms as audiovisual works relating to the ‘fourth world’ have more traditionally been ethnographic films in which communities are analysed for their unique or distinct cultural traits rather than given the opportunity to express themselves.59 In line with more recent ethnographic film, the UNESCO projects firmly place cultural expression in the hands of local people working on the films. Yet the category of ethnographic or ‘fourth world’ films remains the primary signifier as these films are often distributed and exhibited in specific channels such as the Native American Film and Video Festival.60 I would argue that this creates a barrier to circulating these films more widely and creates a contact zone for transculturation that is segregated from mainstream cinematic practice. While UNESCO seeks to open up the films it collaborates with to other parts of the world as part of its aim to create dialogue between different cultures, cinema industries tend to overlook these cinematic works. What is missing is the bridge between these cultural expressions and their commercial counterparts because a working relationship with UNESCO often suggests that the film is part of a world heritage movement more suited to museums and community art centres than a global

57 Himpele, *Circuits of Culture*, p.37.
58 Shohat and Stam, *Unthinking Eurocentrism*, p.32.
circuit of distribution. Films that form a part of a UNESCO circuit of cultural circulation are in danger of being segregated into specific distribution and reception arenas whereas it is their commercial counterparts that give South American culture the ability to travel and thus the nomadic quality that UNESCO wishes to promote.

When Turro Diaz speaks about the importance of UNESCO promoting living culture rather than trying to preserve it, these issues are brought forward. However, UNESCO’s focus on heritage, and the paternalistic attitude it takes towards protecting indigenous cultural forms, could be read as precariously close to an attitude that fetishizes indigenous culture as being something ‘pure’ and ‘natural’. This is particularly true when UNESCO encourages individual projects specific to singular communities rather than bringing together various practitioners. This took place when the Peruvian *Arena Viva* was produced in conjunction with the Peruvian Asociación Cultural Integración Ayllu-Wari while the Bolivian *Ecuanasha Yahua - Tierra Nuestra* worked with the Bolivian CEFREC.

For various reasons ranging from the problem of accessing resources to discrimination on the part of official institutions, there is not often the same opportunity for people in these marginalised communities to coproduce with other cultures in a creative way that would bring about new forms through transculturation. Furthermore, these communities are often left outside the cinematic ‘heritage’ supported by government-supported organisations. However, the intervention of organisations such as UNESCO frequently enforce a continuation of isolation and singular identity through attempts to retain specific types of cultural expression in opposition to mass global culture.

**Section 3: Altruistic Funds**

There are other, globally-oriented institutions that to some extent avoid the issue of heritage and protectionism while still helping the production of South American film. Their main input into South American cinematic culture is in the form of funds that are unconnected to specific state or national institutions. For South America, the most significant funds, and those that repeatedly support South American film production, are the Hubert Bals Fund, the Global Film Initiative, the World Cinema Fund and
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Cine en Construcción. These funds are based in locations outside of South America and, apart from the Global Film Initiative, each fund is closely tied to an international film festival of significant prestige. Often these funds provide the only means of support to allow a film to finish production and because all of them are key in launching films onto a global stage, they provide a pertinent link between South American cinema and the international market.

The Hubert Bals Fund, based at the International Film Festival Rotterdam in the Netherlands, is the longest running of these funds. From 1998 to 2007 it supported almost 600 cinema projects ranging from script development (up to €10,000), low-budget digital production (up to €20,000), and post-production (up to €30,000), to distribution of finished films (up to €15,000). It states that ‘although the Fund looks closely at the financial aspects of a project, the decisive factors remain its content and artistic value’ and embedded within this policy is a concern for specific cultural content:

The Hubert Bals Fund is designed to bring remarkable or urgent feature films and feature-length creative documentaries by innovative and talented filmmakers from developing countries closer to completion.

To define the nations to be considered as developing countries the Fund makes use of the ‘DAC list’: the Development Assistance Committee’s List of Recipients of Official Development Assistance (ODA) published by the French-based Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Argentina, Bolivia, Chile and Peru are all on this list as countries in receipt of overseas aid and thus qualify for the scheme. In this way, the countries participate not as loci of regional culture but as sites in need of Western support.
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Films that have received support from this fund at times display the otherworldliness of the ‘developing country’. *Dias de Santiago* (2004), in which the protagonist Santiago and his friends have been let down by the Peruvian army that used to employ them, displays a number of tropes of the ‘developing’ world: poverty, inequality and violence. The mise-en-scène is filled with rickety houses and chaotic streets and the sound mix in the opening scenes is textured to allow every creak, squeak and shudder of Santiago’s flimsy environment to be heard. As the film develops it becomes clear that the ex-soldiers are left in a country where opportunities are rare. When attempting to enrol at a local university, Santiago cannot get beyond the barriers presented by a bank of unresponsive computers and the indifference of the secretaries. Later, when Santiago starts working as a taxi driver in an unlicensed cab, there is no meter and fares are based on a balance between what the customers are willing to pay and what Santiago is willing to accept: a condition that makes it hard to earn a living. In a similar way, another film supported by Hubert Bals, *Pizza, birra, faso* (1998), follows a group of young people in Buenos Aires who endure a parasitic lifestyle: gathering and stealing coins and spare cash for small luxuries (pizza, beer and cigarettes). These characters are shown as part of a greater multitude of the Buenos Aires underside where poverty and destitution is rife. Images and narratives such as these concur with the perception in much of the western world that ‘developing’ countries are characterised by poverty.

However, other South American films supported by the fund show a different side to their country that is not characterised by a type of ‘Third Worldism’. For example, *Una semana solos* (2007) is the story of a number of Argentine teenage children left alone for a week in the rich middle class compound where they live. Under the almost absent care of their nanny, they move through the living rooms of other houses; between large television screens, computer consoles and other luxuries; and in and out of the swimming pools that populate the lush green area. Although class relations are evident in the disparaging relationship the children have towards their working class nanny and her son, a Hubert Bals Funded film such as this does not display poverty and unequal social relations as the defining referential framework for people in Argentina. Instead the film provides the type of diversity that fits in with the founder of the fund, Hubert Bals’, desire for cinema when he said, ‘the future of
cinematography is not to be expected from Europe or the United States, but all the more from lesser known film cultures."\textsuperscript{66}

Nonetheless, the way in which the Hubert Bals Fund determines the eligibility of countries and their filmmakers suggests that there is some kind of quality or genre inherent in ‘developing country’ films (more commonly discussed as Third World films) that make for desirable cinema. When discussing transculturation more broadly, Mark Millington raises concern with these assumptions. He states that:

\begin{quote}
in the case of emphasising subaltern cultures, there may be a danger of assuming that those cultures embody some absolute difference or are the repository of some ‘untarnished truth.’ Beyond these issues, there are ethical concerns to do with presuming to represent subaltern points of view and to mobilise them for a broader emancipatory cause.\textsuperscript{67}
\end{quote}

Part of the danger in the approach that Millington outlines is the fact that it suggests the ‘subaltern’ subject is encouraged to remain subaltern. Complicating this issue is the fact that the Hubert Bals Fund’s main supporter is the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Aid.\textsuperscript{68} These points raise the question of whether or not the fund can claim to have significant cultural exchange at its heart or will remain a primarily aid-orientated approach that continuously reconstitutes the developing world.

This question also arises with regard to the US-based Global Film Initiative, founded in 2002, which shares many of the qualities of the Rotterdam fund and makes explicit that its production scheme, the Granting Program, ‘is based on the Hubert Bals fund’.\textsuperscript{69} With a board made up of global filmmakers from Lisa Stantic in Argentina to Apichatpong Weerasethakul of Thailand, it states that it has developed four complementary programs [granting, distribution, education, acquisition] to promote both the production of authentic and accessible stories.

created in the developing world and their distribution throughout the schools and leading cultural institutions of the United States.70

Unlike the Hubert Bals Fund, the Global Film Initiative dedicates a large proportion of resources to help improve access to ‘developing country films’ in its home country, the US. This drive is part of an attempt to educate the American public about global cultures and, through this process, enrich the citizens of that country. Thus

the Traveling Series ensures that the best of developing world cinema is available on screens throughout the United States, with a particular focus on films in languages other than English.71

and

the Education Program of The Global Film Initiative presents full-length feature films from around the world, in specially-designed programs that encourage students to gain a deeper understanding of different cultural points of view.72

This has allowed films such as *La sagrada familia* (2004) from Chile and *El custodio* (2006) from Argentina to gain distribution around the US while money from the Granting Program (up to $10,000 per project) has supported ten films from Argentina, Chile and Peru from 2005 to 2007. The process of two-way development, in which the US host will be enriched by South American culture on film while South American cinematic culture will be given support, implies contact zones in which transculturation is at work. As with much transculturation, however, balances of power are in play as it is the ‘developed’ US which offers financial aid whereas South American culture offers a service.

While the World Cinema Fund from Berlin does not specifically model itself on the Hubert Bals Fund, it has similar aims and scope to that fund and the Global Film Initiative. The fund began in 2004 and

in co-operation with the German Federal Cultural Foundation (Kulturstiftung des Bundes) the Berlin International Film Festival has set up the *World*

---

Cinema Fund to support filmmakers from transition countries [...] Latin America, Africa, the Middle East and Central Asia.73

Of the 735 projects from 61 nations that submitted proposals until 2007, 47 received support for production (up to €100,000) and distribution (up to €15,000). As with the Hubert Bals Fund and the Global Film Initiative this fund supports cinematic works on the premise they are from ‘developing’ countries and, thus, are in need of aid. This is true even when it is the term ‘transition’ country rather than ‘developing’ or Third World that is used.

In contrast to the aforementioned funds, Cine en Construcción is unique in that it only supports film projects based in Latin America. Initiated in 2002, Cine en Construcción is a joint initiative organised by the Donostia-San Sebastián International Film Festival and the Rencontres Cinémas d'Amérique Latine de Toulouse [film festival], the aim of which is to facilitate the completion of rigorously selected Latin-American fictional feature films which, while they have actually been filmed, are having difficulty with the post-production stage, by presenting them to a group of professionals who can contribute to their completion.74

The format for the way in which Cine en Construcción supports film production is slightly different from the other funds as it sets up a twice yearly meeting (one at each festival) between industry professionals and filmmakers from selected projects. At each of these sessions, six film projects are selected and screened to delegates attending the festivals. Financial awards are made to individual films, of which the Industry Award is the greatest, but other awards are also available. At the Donostia-San Sebastián festival in September 2007, Estudios Exa, Mediapro, Molinare Madrid, Technicolor Entertainment Services Spain, Kodak (División de Cine Profesional), Titra Film and No Problem Sonido assumed the post-production of the selected film chosen for the Industry award while the Casa de América Award put forward €10,000 and the Signis Award put forward $25,000 for post-production.

As with the other funds, competition for support is fierce. In 2007, the fund received 129 applications for the 12th Cine en Construcción session and only 6 films were invited to attend. Although the financial gain is useful to the filmmakers, perhaps as important is the possibility of screening the unfinished film to members of the film industry who are in attendance. At each session, the filmmakers are invited to take questions from the floor so that they can provide potential producers, distributors and investors with further information as well as receive advice about completing their project. During the 12th session in 2007, many of the questions from the floor were concerned with the remaining work to be done on the film and plans to convert films into 35mm copies. At the same time, there were also comments on the commercial viability of the projects and how the films would find an audience. Una semana solos (2007) was critiqued for its particularly long length with many delegates suggesting that while there was beautiful camerawork and a strong focus on individual characters, it would need to lose half an hour of footage before it could be commercially released.

By supporting films in this way, Cine en Construcción moves away from merely giving financial aid to filmmakers and instead brings Latin American filmmakers into contact with international industry members so that their work can be influenced from this interaction.

However, during a paper given on Cine en Construcción, Nuria Triana Toribio made the suggestion that the desire to support Latin American films comes from a postcolonial sense of responsibility on the part of the European organisers. The possibility for hierarchies relating to colonialism to play a role in the funds listed above is an issue that is supported by the Argentine filmmaker Aldo Paparella. In a 2004 interview he stated that

de formas sutiles los países desarrollados ejercen el colonialismo. Para acceder a la financiación, el cine nacional debe tener un costado social, y eso de alguna manera lo está condicionando. Puede verse en las invitaciones de festivales, los premios. […] Se ven muy buenas obras actualmente, pero como sistema es limitado, y también peligroso.

---

76 This issue was addressed by Nuria Triana Toribio during her paper ‘Cine en Construccion,’ University of St Andrews, UK, April 15, 2008
developed countries exert colonialism in subtle ways. To gain access to funding, Argentine cinema must have a social side, and this requirement is conditioned in a certain way. This can be seen in festival invitations and prizes [...] Currently, very good works can be seen, but, as a system, this is not just limited but also dangerous.

Following this line of thought, Peranson asks ‘Why the sudden interest in colonizing the Third World through world cinema funds, which, though certainly valuable, often end up influencing the kind of film that is made.’

In addition, the funds are in danger of facing the same criticism that Ibermedia receives, namely that they create a small group of favoured filmmakers. The four funds often provide funding to the same films as the other funds, either at the stage of production or at the stage of distribution and acquisition. From 2005 to 2007, six of the fifteen film-projects that the World Cinema Fund supported from Argentina, Chile and Peru were also given support by the Hubert Bals Fund during the same period: ‘Agua y sal’ (Argentina), ‘Dioses’ (Peru), ‘Liverpool’ (Argentina), ‘El custodio’ (Argentina), ‘El otro’ (Argentina) and ‘El cielo, la tierra, y la lluvia’ (Chile). ‘Una semana solos’ was given support by both the Hubert Bals Fund and Cine en Construcción while ‘El huacho’ was supported by the World Cinema Fund and the Global Film Initiative (see Appendix B). Considering the large number of projects that apply for funds, the crossover between these different bodies suggests that there are shared tastes between the juries awarding the grants for certain types of films. The favouring of certain projects also means that Peranson’s suggestion, that the funds influence the types of films made, may be a just claim. Furthermore, multiple-funding in this way means that although each fund makes clear its desire to support the local industries of the filmmakers, depth of support to certain films is often favoured at the expense of breadth of support to industries of the ‘developing countries’.

This aspect of breadth relates to the problem of supporting a region as diverse as South America in an equal manner, particularly as it is often the case that some nationalities appear to be more successful in gaining support than others. Because I have been focusing on Argentina, Chile, Bolivia and Peru for the scope of this thesis I


78 Peranson, ‘First You Get the Power’ p.42.
had these countries in mind when analysing the data provided by the funds. Nevertheless, even when using only these countries as a case study, it quickly becomes apparent that there is an imbalance at work. As the following table illustrates, projects from Argentina far surpass projects from the other countries in terms of achieving funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hubert Bals Fund</th>
<th>Global Film Initiative</th>
<th>World Cinema Fund</th>
<th>Cine en Construcción</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the funds tend to publish lists of the successful projects they do not provide detailed information about the submitted films that were unsuccessful except to give an idea of overall numbers. This makes it difficult to determine why the disparity between the location of successful projects takes place. However, it would seem likely that the imbalance in projects comes in part from the fact that funds receive more applications from Argentine companies. Furthermore, as the industry is stronger and training opportunities somewhat greater in Argentina, the quality of projects from that country are potentially higher. This correlates with the fact that the other Latin American nations that produce successful candidates are Mexico and Brazil, countries that have the strongest industries in the continent. Nevertheless, there seems to be a contradiction at play when the funds imply that they wish to help struggling industries yet consistently support the Latin American film industries that are already relatively strong.

There is also the question of what types of requirements are placed on the films and their filmmakers when they undertake to work with the funds. For instance, three of the four funds are connected to film festivals and expect the films to be shown at these sites. The Hubert Bals fund states that ‘the finished film will automatically be selected for the International Film Festival Rotterdam and (preferably) have its World
Premiere here. The Donostia-San Sebastián film festival has a Cine en Construcción section which screens the most recently completed films that took part in the sessions. Agreeing to screen a film at a film festival means giving up the much guarded and valuable ‘premier’ status for the film and can also delay it from reaching domestic spectators on national cinema screens as film festivals prefer to screen films that are not already available to audiences. Furthermore, the funds express the desire for films to be screened at other high profile film festivals. At the beginning of the 12th Cine en Construcción session, one of the directors, Jose Maria Riba, spoke with pride about the large number of completed projects that had gone on to Cannes. The Hubert Bals fund explains that

many international film festivals keep a close eye on completed HBF supported films and select them for their programmes. Each year, HBF supported films are screened at, among others, the Cannes, Venice, Locarno, Toronto and Pusan film festivals.

On the one hand, this suggests that an international address rather than an engagement with South American audiences takes precedence. On the other hand there is the notion that the film should be suitable for film festival consumption, and will be expected to enter the European film festival circuit.

Films that gain support from these funds are, thus, in some ways responsible to the future audiences that are determined by the funds. In the information made available by the funds there is little concern for distribution in South America and the ‘local’ audiences that could be engaged in this area. Instead, the World Cinema Fund explains that ‘another important goal is to strengthen the profile of these films in German cinemas’ and the Hubert Bals Fund states ‘in exchange for its financial contribution the Hubert Bals Fund wishes to obtain the exclusive distribution rights of the film in the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxemburg.’ Equally, the Global Film Initiative places substantial emphasis on the relationship that completed films will have with US audiences. In this way it is particularly difficult for filmmakers utilising these funds to move away from a process of creating cultural works for external benefactors.
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The issues involved when filmmakers are perceived as needing to create works for specific audiences can be conceptualised through what Branston, amongst others, understands as the ‘burden of representation’. She identifies an ongoing difficulty that takes place when filmmakers or artists feel they have to stand in for their community and represent it in a certain way. Shohat and Stam further this idea as they explain that representations of dominant groups are allowed to include difference and diversity whereas representations of minority groups become allegorical and thus come under pressure to include positive representation. Coming as they do from marginal spaces - both economically and in the context of global film circulation - Latin American films become representatives of minority film culture. Although the films that emerge from these funds are diverse and do not always display a ‘third world’ or ‘developing nation’ aesthetic and content, there are certain expectations placed on them to represent some kind of ‘home culture’. For the Hubert Bals Fund ‘the entry should be original, authentic and rooted in the culture of the applicant's country’ while the World Cinema Fund desires ‘feature films and creative feature-length documentaries with a strong cultural identity’ and the Global Film Initiative seeks ‘authentic and accessible stories’. These conditions raise questions of who it is that decides whether or not the films successfully represent an ‘authentic’ culture.

There is also a concern with fixed, rather than fluid, national identities. Of the 61 South American film-projects supported by the funds between 2005 and 2007 only four are listed as coproductions: ‘99% Murdered’ (Chile/Uruguay) ‘A festa da menina morta’ (Brazil, Argentina, Portugal) ‘Acné’ (Uruguay, Argentina, Spain, Mexico) and ‘La perrera’ (Uruguay, Argentina, Canada). The remaining films have one country firmly highlighted next to the film in the fund’s publicity material. Even when the films are coproductions with ‘non-developing’ nations, their status as part of a ‘Third World’ is emphatically reproduced by the publicity that attests to a primary origin.
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This emphasis on a national or ‘developing country’ identity is reconfirmed by the need for filmmakers to work within their national space. The Global Film Initiative only accepts films that are ‘produced exclusively in a developing world country and created by filmmakers from that country’ and the World Cinema Fund states that ‘a film will be considered to be from a particular region if it is shot there and if the director comes from that region.’ The Hubert Bals Fund explicitly states that the support should contribute to the local film industry in one of the developing countries. Therefore in case a film is set and shot outside one of those countries, the project unfortunately cannot be accepted by the fund.

While these criteria go in some way towards aiding local film industries in South America, they do not provide any opportunities for the types of exilic and interstitial filmmakers that writers such as Naficy and Iordanova see as important and filmmakers from South America are instead restricted to working within a limited geographical scope.

In some ways the transculturation facet of films that are produced through these funds is particularly strong as the South American films are not cultural products produced in a vacuum but are instead part of a constant negotiation with an external culture which carries certain expectations of the producing culture. However, the aid-oriented approach suggests certain hierarchies are in place in which the South American cinematic culture will be constituted as the beneficiary rather than as an equal partner. The extent to which these funds are beneficial to filmmakers within South America must thus be viewed in light of the kind of restrictions placed upon their working when transculturation is tempered in this way.

Section 4: Film Festivals and Validity

While, as has been discussed, film funds have great impact on South American cinema, their role in producing contact zones is often only evident when watching the beginning or end credits on the films they support. Film festivals, on the other hand,
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act as highly visible sites for hosting ‘purpose’ driven contact zones. Furthermore, the fact that most of the global cinema funds which support South American production are linked to a highly regarded international film festival is a point that cannot be overstated. Film festivals are consistently the site at which South American films and filmmakers are first exposed to an international arena and there is a cyclical tradition of production and exhibition that is facilitated by the meeting spaces and industry areas provided by these sites. Much of the coproduction that takes place between South American industries and external partners is initiated and consolidated at these sites, something Chilean producer Juan de Dios Larrain confirmed when he acknowledged that international festivals allow contact with other producers.93

More than this, festivals often act as the bridging point for independent South American films to reach the commercial circuits discussed in Chapter Four as, ‘festivals are in effect shop windows for arthouse distribution’.94 High profile festivals are particularly influential as Pablo Perelman and Paulina Seivach point out:

Los festivales se clasifican por categoría y eso influye mucho a la hora de la negociacion con la distribuidora, porque tiene correlación con la expectativa generada antes del estreno.95

*Festivals are classified by category and this has great influence at the hour of negotiation with distributors because they correlate with the expectation generated before the film’s release.*

Writing about the limited prospects non-English films normally have to gain distribution in large markets such as the United States, Robert Sklar makes the point that

Cannes remains the most important site in world cinema [...] Its annual festival is the most powerful motor propelling films from around the globe into the distribution and exhibition system, some to arrive at our festivals, a few even into our theaters.96

De Valck also places a historical perspective on the festival’s relationship to distribution practices by detailing the way that European film festivals transformed film markets when they opened up their programs to world cinema in the latter half of the twentieth century. Following this,
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directors from Argentina to Zimbabwe realized they had a better chance of building a career through the international “art” forums of festivals, than via commercial success at home.  

For a film such as the Argentine *XXY* (2007), winning the Critics’ Week Grand Prize at Cannes meant a flurry of press attention and invitations to other film festivals such as the Edinburgh International film festival in August 2007, the Toronto Film Festival in September 2007, the Santa Barbara Festival in January 2008 and the Glasgow Film Festival in February 2008. The film was also able to extend a fairly consistent theatrical circulation from its French premier at Cannes in May 2007 to movie-theatre distribution in Argentina in June 2007 and Europe in June and July 2008.

To understand the way this type of film festival success can be converted into a tool for visibility in larger global film networks, involves taking into consideration the concept of Peter Wollen’s ‘film festival genre’. Although genre has often been conceived as a set of relations between thematic and textual units, Christine Gledhill details the way later scholarship has sought to uncover industry and institutional usage of genre definition in a way that is distinct from textual analysis and more concerned with the way that films can be marketed. Gledhill rightly points out that there is a difficulty when industry usage of genre is taken to usurp alternative definitions and is posited as a better ‘origin’ for genre. However, a consideration of the way film industries use ‘film festival’ as a genre can be informative in understanding the way certain South American films are circulated and marketed. By invoking international festival success as a common marker between South American films, distribution companies and exhibitors do not have to restrict individual films to a ‘thematic’ genre with shared textual traits (comedy, horror, romance) which have the potential to sub-divide and alienate potential audiences. Instead, marketing material can put forward a certain genre of ‘quality’ that links films with diverse themes, character types and styles. This is consistent with de Valck’s claim that a ‘process of value addition’ is apparent in the workings of international film festivals.

---
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However, in addition to providing commercial distribution platforms for South American films, international film festivals have a history of interacting closely with wider aspects of South American cinematic culture. Harbord notes that there are different discourses at work in film festivals, from the independent artists to the business transactions, press and tourism. She states that these are ‘the discursive formation that constitutes the film festival’. Each aspect of the discursive formation interacts within the specific geographical site of the film festival but also resonates beyond it, taking aspects of South American cinema out on to the global stage and reflecting it back into the home cultures. It is with this in mind that

Festivals function as a space of mediation, a cultural matrix within which the aims and activities of specific interest groups are negotiated, as well as a place for the establishment and maintenance of cross-cultural looking relations. Moreover they play a key, if often underacknowledged, role in the writing of film history. Festival screenings determine which movies are distributed in distinct cultural arenas, and hence which movies critics and academics are likely to gain access to.

Long before international festivals began to operate as a platform that could bring South American films together with potential commercial investors, festivals were functioning as important sites that recognised some kind of film culture existed in the distant lands of the post-colonial world. In the 1962 Italian Festival of Latin American Cinema in Sestri Levante, various filmmakers were able to meet and discuss their practices and aims. A resolution “The Cinema as Expression of Latin American Reality” was drawn up where the filmmakers agreed to establish a base for collaboration amongst different Latin American cinemas. A few years later the Italian International Festival of New Cinema in Pesaro gave one of the key New Latin American Cinema Movement films, *La hora de los hornos* (1968) its world premier and contributed to international recognition of the Third Cinema movement. With many South American films banned and filmmakers forced in to exile it was often the case that film festivals in Europe during the 1960s and 70s were the only sites for exhibition of these films. The trend of bringing Latin American films that contained anti-colonial discourse to the world stage was continued in 1986 when the Edinburgh

---
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International Film Festival hosted a special conference on Third Cinema. It brought to light questions of cultural practice and the cinematic vision of many South American and other ‘Third World’ filmmakers. Importantly, these festivals and others acted as sites where a cinematic movement of regional and, then later, anti-neocolonial identity was given both recognition and a space to form.

Although many international film festivals in the twenty-first century offer retrospectives or groupings of films thematically, they no longer appear to bring together filmmakers in a way that nourishes rather than names a shared cinematic culture. Rather, it seems more apt to say that they often re-configure films and filmmakers within certain boundaries and definitions which have a lasting impact on the way they are then understood in the wider circulation of global discourse. Although transnationalism is a key facet to film festivals, their boundaries and definitions often reinstate the national as a prominent taxonomy.

Stringer claims that since the 1970s festivals have abandoned national classification yet discourses surrounding international film festivals from press coverage to programming choices and even official festival documentation suggest that national boundaries are in fact reiterated and films are frequently discussed with regards to a single country of origin. Programmes and catalogues regularly use the national setting as a starting point for explanation of a film’s themes, setting and style while press coverage of directors often highlights where they are from and the industry background that has contributed to their filmmaking process. An example of this was the Variety article on the 2008 Cannes festival programme that reported

Argentina boasts two features in the Competition. Lucrecia Martel, who previously competed with "The Holy Girl," is back with the politically tinged woman's drama "La Mujer sin cabeza," while Pablo Trapero will bring "Leonera."
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What the article does not mention is that both films are the result of coproductions with European countries and South Korea. In a similar way, although *XXY* was a coproduction between Argentina, France and Spain and the events of the film take place and were filmed in Uruguay, its award at Cannes in 2007 was hailed as a success for the Argentine film industry. The government supported ‘Official Promotional Portal for Argentina’ website picked up on the acclaim received by the film and ran an article on the film as an example of great Argentine cinema. This involvement of national organisations relates to the fact that it is not just filmmakers who accompany films to the film festival but also film council representatives and/or government funded marketing enterprises. Turner feels that the ‘nationalization’ of film promotion through such national marketing offices reveals how closely indigenous film production is connected to the representation and dissemination of images of the nation at home and overseas. The ways in which the texts produced by the national industries are patrolled for their images, for their suitability as the national ‘touring team’, offer another set of determinants of what is produced, what is distributed, and what is positively received by audiences and by critics

It would appear, then, that a national identity attached to films cannot be escaped from and that there is often state involvement in promoting this aspect, even when the film is circulated in an international meeting place that, with its global visitors, appears to represent the optimum point for border crossing and transcultural contact zones. This factor ties in with the reterritorialization practices discussed in Chapter Three.

Adding to this process, the focus on individual directors as meaning makers, frequently allows this national identity to return to the forefront. The majority of press conferences, and interviews made available from film festivals, concentrate on the director, their past history, and their vision for the film. More often than not there is a causal chain in which the filmmaker speaks for the film which speaks for the country and the separate elements are conflated together to mean that a representation of the ‘national cinema’ emerges. D’Lugo writes about the way this happened with Latin American filmmakers such as Fernando Solanas, Arturo Ripstein and Tomás Guitérrez Alea when

---


in each case, their well established reputations as oppositional, anti-status quo, resistance figures had become refigured as national auteurs, principally through international film festivals which privileged the authorial as an expression of the national.\textsuperscript{110}

This is concurrent with Noriega’s belief that the New Latin American Cinema Movement filmmakers were ‘quickly assimilated into the auteur-as-nation-as-genre sensibilities of the international art cinema’.\textsuperscript{111}

Although state representatives often play a role in the promotion of ‘national’ films at a festival, the autonomy with which festivals and their surrounding discourses operate, means that authority to name and configure what constitutes a South American cinematic culture on the global stage more often lies outwith the domestic sphere. This becomes a pertinent issue when an international film festival gives its own identity to a film and configures it within international discourse which is then exported back to the place of origin. One of the more renowned examples within world cinema is the case of the ‘fifth generation’ Chinese filmmakers of the 1980s. An array of films won prizes at international film festivals yet did poorly in the domestic market as local audiences were supposedly disappointed by the images of China they were presented with.\textsuperscript{112} While criticism for these practices has often been aimed at the filmmakers themselves, it is important to recognise the part international critics have played in naming and prioritising a Chinese cinema that is alien to the experience of most Chinese people: ‘Internationally, the phenomenon known as “Chinese cinema of the 1980s” is the result of various projections cast onto the screens of international film festivals.’\textsuperscript{113} Although scholarship uncovered the relationship between film festival success and domestic audiences, making it clear that value given to Chinese cinema on the world stage may not correlate with value given by ‘home’ audiences, ‘fifth generation’ Chinese cinema is still spoken of as representative of the Chinese cinema in much Anglo-American film criticism. In a similar way, the value given to \textit{XXY} on the international film festival circuit, where it picked up further awards following Cannes, left a trail of critical acclaim through

\textsuperscript{110} D’Lugo, ‘Authorship,’ p.110.
\textsuperscript{111} Noriega, ‘Introduction,’ p.xii.
paper and online journalism. Press articles within Argentina throughout 2007, and
official organisations such as the Official Promotional Portal for Argentina, then sold
this acclaim back to an Argentine public, establishing it as one of Argentina’s most
successful films of the year. Less well publicised was the fact that while *XXY*
achieved significant domestic box-office in the national market with 199,225
spectators, there were numerous Argentine films that were far more successful with
home audiences such as *Los incorregibles* (2007) which gained 741,816 spectators
and *Quien dice que es mas facil* (2007) with 416,804.114 Nonetheless, it is worth
noting that

prestigious competitive festivals that bestow awards are crucial to a film’s
critical capital even, and perhaps precisely, when it may not translate into box
office gold. For example, while the awarding of a Palme d’Or in Cannes
doesn’t promise box office success, it does signal crucial critical capital that
may aid a film’s entry into the canon.115

The prestige and value given to films has much to do with the way in which festivals
define relationships between audiences and the culture apparent within the film. The
most well known international film festivals take place in Europe and North America
and while festivals such as Cannes, Venice, Berlin, Toronto and Sundance do not
always have the largest attendance or number of films programmed, they are arguably
the most influential in terms of press coverage and distribution deals accrued from
their screenings. Each of these festivals is geographically and also culturally distanced
from South American film industries, leading to a type of gap in experience that is
encountered when audience members, be they press, industry or paying public, view
the films. At film festivals, this divergence between an audience member’s culture
and the culture apparent within the film is enhanced by the fact that international film
festivals act as sites where mixed audiences are most likely to come together. At any
one screening there may be viewers from the country playing host to the festival;
global visitors; and spectators from the same country and settings that are visualised
within the film. This is true whether the festival is open to the public, as is the case
with Toronto and Berlin, or a closed market such as Cannes where only press and
industry delegates are in attendance.
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The way in which mixed audiences come together in a shared physical space means that different audible and bodily reactions to moments of the film are infused with the personal cultural reactions that each spectator brings to the space and makes apparent to the other people in the auditorium. This type of event has the ability to produce what Shohat and Stam outline as the experience when mixed audiences come together in one site to watch a film from a distant location such as South America. They explain that there are the insiders (foreign) who get the inferred meanings and the outsiders (local) who do not and ‘experience an abrupt dislocation.’\footnote{Shohat and Stam, \emph{Unthinking Eurocentricism}, p.355.} They go on to say of local audiences watching the film:

\begin{quote}
Not conversant with the culture or language in question, they are reminded of the limits of their own knowledge and indirectly of their own potential status as foreigners. Thus First Worlders in their own countries come to share an experience common to dislocated Third World and minoritarian audiences; the feeling that “this film was not made for us.”\footnote{Shohat and Stam, \emph{Unthinking Eurocentricism}, p.355.}
\end{quote}

The idea that the film ‘was not made for us’ is, however, something that permeates international film festivals and is subsequently negotiated by the festivals and those that attend them. On the one hand it can be argued that the filmmakers themselves negotiate this idea by attempting to create films suitable for film festivals and their audiences. On the other hand, the festivals play a part by giving contextual spaces for viewing films. Crofts begins to formulate this concept when he discusses spectatorship of films from other cultures as defined by the ‘sun-tinted spectacles of armchair tourism.’\footnote{Crofts, ‘Reconceptualizing National Cinema/s,’ p.39.} Rather than finding dislocation when confronted by difference in South American films, film festival audiences from other cultures can look \textit{onto} cultural variation rather than engage with it directly. This is a similar process to what happens when different cultures are viewed through processes of travel writing and other forms of armchair tourism.

Because international festivals draw together such a large number of varied cultures within the content of the many films they show, spectators are frequently given a brief taster of each culture, often repeatedly in the same day. However, taking into consideration the work Pratt\footnote{Pratt, \emph{Imperial Eyes}, p.4.} and others have done on travel writing, frequently an imbalance is at work as it is those with cultural and economic capital that look on and
participate in these processes of tourism. At the same time, both Nichols and Lucy Mazdon highlight the positive outcomes that come from tourism of ‘other’ cultures at film festivals and the pleasure-forming experiences that take place for the spectator. In particular, Mazdon sees Cannes festival as congruent with tourism, not only because it was originally promoted with that focus in mind, but because cinema and tourism are both journeys of desire and thus matched in their aims. Nichols expands on the process of tourism in film spectatorship with the claim that viewers are expected to submerge themselves in difference when watching the new cinemas. He suggests that ‘the emphasis, in a climate of festivity, is not solely on edification but also on the experience of the new and unexpected itself’. Nevertheless, he does go on to say that the process can resemble that of observers looking over the shoulders of those to whom the culture belongs. When this takes place, the engagement with difference is less likely to happen and processes of transculturation are diminished in favour of a pleasure-based, one-way consumption of films. South American films caught up in this process are likely to find themselves in another market of consumption that, given the power festivals have to form new metacultural discourse through the presence of an international press and industry delegations, can override any desired authority for the home culture to determine how the film should be contextualised.

While influential international film festivals provide some of the more tricky contact zones for South American cinematic culture to negotiate an identity, there are exceptions in the shape of festivals that formulate a different type of space for presenting South American films in an international arena. The Donostia-San Sebastián International Film Festival has a history of working with South American films, particularly because it regularly presents them as part of an Iberoamerican culture that is shared with the festival’s host country Spain. Various South American films have featured in its Official Selection competition and the non-competitive Zabaltegi section: for example, Encarnación (2007), Calle Santa Fé (2007) and Madres (2007) each participated in 2007. Furthermore, it has a Horizontes Latinos section; a prominent space that mixes Spanish and Latin American films and provides
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a place to screen works that were successful during its Cine en Construcción programme. When I attended the festival in 2007, I found that in the majority of screenings in the Horizontes Latinos section, time was given before or after the film for the director, producer, or key actors to speak to the audience. Following the screening of *El asaltante* (2007) on September 20, 2007 the Argentine director Pablo Fendrick was able to explain how the film had largely developed out of improvisation during rehearsals and that, although the plot dealt with a number of robberies in private schools, it was not meant as a social commentary on private education. This dialogue between director and audience allowed both insight into production processes and an opportunity to unravel some of the social mechanisms at work in the content of the film. At another point in the festival, the director-protagonist of the documentary *Calle Santa Fé*, Carmen Castillo, was interviewed as part of the Encuentro Zabaltegi, a filmed series of discussions which aired on local television. Castillo was able to use this opportunity to highlight how events in the documentary related to her personal activities as a Chilean activist during the Pinochet dictatorship. Encounters such as these make it possible for filmmakers to bridge the gap between the cultural experiences they invest into their films and the referential points that spectators gain through the content of the film and the context provided by the festival.

Figure 5. Carmen Castillo interview during Encuentro Zabaltegi

Because Donostia-San Sebastián operates mainly in Spanish (even though it is officially tri-lingual with text translations provided in Spanish, English and Basque) most South American practitioners were linguistically at ease with the audience and
had the ability to express their opinions on the cinematic work through first address rather than translation. In 2007, South American directors could be seen moving throughout the festival’s spaces from delegate areas to press conferences and on to public screenings and debates with the confidence to discuss their work and articulate their film’s place within greater cultural circuits. It brought a type of contextualisation to the South American films on offer that is often lost when they are placed within the seemingly patchwork quilt effect of international films available at other festivals.

There are also other smaller South American and Latin American film festivals that operate outside of the region. Unlike international film festivals that bring together an assortment of films from around the globe to promote world cinema as an art form, these specialised festivals often have quite distinct agendas and objectives. The International Latino Film Society Festival based in California shows a wide variety of Latin American films and films made by North Americans with a strong Latino identity. It claims that it promotes positive Latino images throughout the Bay Area and beyond…We aim to educate and promote Latino talent, while combating stereotypes that harm our communities.122

In a similar way, the London based Latin American Film Festival explains that The film screenings and associated events we organise also raise awareness about Latin American culture and provide a positive image of one of the minority communities in the UK.123

Another London based event, Discovering Latin America Film Festival, promotes a comparable remit when it states that Discovering Latin America was founded in August 2002 with the aim of promoting Latin American culture worldwide and raising funds to finance development projects in the region. We are actively contributing to the transformation of Latin America.124

There is thus a sense that these festivals are engaging with projects to formulate links between a community of spectators in their local area and a greater Latin American culture that is articulated through films from the region. The attempt to work with

issues of stereotypes, awareness and images, suggests that there is a desire for transcultural exchange in which the receiving North American or UK culture is enriched by this interaction as much as the projecting culture benefits by gaining visibility for its cultural artifacts.

Nevertheless, this is not to say that producing programmes of work in this way is an uncomplicated endeavor. Schwartzman describes the questions she faced when curating the 1994 exhibition, “Venezuela: Forty Years of Cinema, 1950-1999,” at the Museum of Modern Art in New York. Her role as film curator had

the function of a kind of “cultural” translator between the original body of Venezuelan national cinema and its eventual decontextualisation and recontextualization for presentation abroad specifically in the U.S.125

One of the main difficulties was in negotiating the difference between passive and active curating: passive curating involves the acquisition of ready made programmes or makes use of familiar genres and structures while active curating means acting as a mediator and takes into account the power structures at play in its organising strategies. The latter approach would involve conscious processes of transculturation while the former could potentially conceal this aspect.

In many ways, Latin American film festivals appear to offer a type of passive curating since they depend upon open calls for submissions and contacts in the field to provide them with cultural works ready to be presented. The 2006 Latin American Film Festival in London presented an example of a particularly passive type of curating. Films of varying production quality from 35mm to DV were presented within the same schedule and all on the same platform without division into distinct sections. Although descriptions of each film were provided to the public as reference points there was little attempt to contextualise the films further. As a researcher at the beginning of my project, the experience of attending that festival felt very much as if I was being positioned as an onlooker to a series of cultural events that I was kept at some distance from. Nevertheless, even taking into consideration the distance that a spectator can feel when encountering films at these festivals, the programming work that goes in to developing and finalising the schedule of films, the choices undertaken with regard to which films to present and the way information is provided in publicity
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materials and catalogues all provide some kind of link between the cultural work and the receiving culture. There is thus the sense that contact zones are produced. Further to this, no matter how closely these festivals work with Latin American partners, there is still a sense of negotiation between the locations from which the films originate and a different, more developed world in which they are screened which thus brings back into play the uneven balance of power frequently at work in transculturation processes.

The film festivals which are most likely to bring about a transnational exchange between South American films and audiences without having to negotiate balances of power and inequality are those that operate within the continent. A film festival such as the Mar del Plata International Film Festival in Argentina has South American and Argentine culture at the base of its agenda when it hosts its world cinematic event. Although not as influential as the larger European or North American film festivals, Mar del Plata is nonetheless listed by the International Federation of Film Producers Associates (FIAPF) as one of only twelve accredited competitive feature film festivals.126

Each year it invites films from around the globe but also retains numerous sections set aside for Latin American films such as the Competencia Latinoamericana (*Latin American Competition*). The importance of the festival to an Argentine cinematic culture is reinforced by the opening statement for the 2007 festival brochure made by INCAA’s president Jorge Álvarez’s. He states that the festival

> es un evento privilegiado no sólo por tener como marco una de nuestras más bellas ciudades, sino porque es un lugar para presentar nuestras producciones y valorar las que vienen de todo el mundo, apostando a que en ese intercambio logremos enriquecernos, reconocernos y, a su vez, mostrar quiénes somos.\(^{128}\)

*is a privileged event not only because it is framed within one of our most beautiful cities, but because it is a place to present our productions and value those that come from all over the world, assuring that in this exchange we will be able to enrich ourselves, recognise ourselves and show who we are.*

Cultural exchange of this kind is supported in the programming of films but also in the other events presented at the festival. In the 2007 seminar series, Miradas Sobre el Cine (*Perspectives on Cinema*), critics from around the world were invited to speak on a range of subjects from piracy to exhibition spaces. As these events took place within an Argentine cultural space, with members of the Argentine press and public in attendance, they provided a site in which elements of European and North American cinematic culture were considered in relation to a host South American culture rather than the other way round.

This reordering of the cultural site from being a ‘developing nation’ that receives international media flows to a host location which produces the cultural context for audiovisual works is a facet that has also characterised the Festival Internacional del Nuevo Cine Latinoamericano in Havana, Cuba. As one of the primary sites for showcasing Latin American film in the 1980s and 1990s, the Havana festival retained a commitment to political filmmaking and the development of a Latin American identity at a time when the New Latin American Cinema movement was fragmenting. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, it programs a diverse range of films from around the world, including the United States, despite the trade embargo on the country. However, its prizes are awarded to ‘las obras en cine y video que por su significación y valores artísticos contribuyan a reafirmar la identidad latinoamericana
y caribeña.129 (those cinema and video works which due to their significance and artistic value contribute to the reaffirmation of a Latin American and Caribbean identity). Retrospectives and panoramas on European nations or North American films exist side by side with tributes to Latin American filmmakers and actors while the competition sections are dedicated to films originating on the continent. In this way it is very much an international festival yet one that establishes a Latin American core from which an outward looking international perspective can be achieved. The director of the festival Iván Giroud articulated this concept in 2008 when he stated that

tratamos a verlo todo porque hay un peligro: algunos programadores de otros festivales que seleccionan cine latinoamericano conocen solo las películas latinoamericanas exhibidas en Cannes, Berlín, Venice o Toronto. Nosotros preferimos hacer la selección en situ. Todos los años viajamos en los meses de mayo, junio y julio a los países de mayor producción (Argentina, México, Brasil, Chile y Venezuela).130

we try to view everything because there is a danger: some programmers of other festivals that select Latin American cinema encounter only the Latin American films exhibited in Cannes, Berlin, Venice or Toronto. We prefer to make selections in situ. Each year we travel during the months of May, June and July to the countries of greatest production (Argentina, Mexico, Brasil, Chile and Venezuela).

Statements like this acknowledge the Havana festival as part of a wider structure of global film circulation but nonetheless manage to situate it as a meaning-maker within a specific cultural context.

In a similar way to the Donostia-San Sebastián and Mar del Plata festivals, the physical structure and organisation of the Havana festival makes it an easily manoeuvrable site for South American filmmakers. Press conferences and other events for filmmakers are held in Spanish while there are frequent opportunities for filmmakers to address audiences at the beginning or end of the public screenings. The potential to encounter audiences and create dialogue with them is an aspect that has long been celebrated at the Havana film festival. Iván Giroud made the point that

uno de los hechos que más conmueve a los cineastas de América Latina y del mundo es llegar a La Habana y ver como el público se conecta con el cine. No

Hay festival de cine en el mundo con medio millón de espectadores, en una ciudad donde viven un poco más de dos millones de habitantes; o sea, una porción considerable de los habitantes de la ciudad participa en el festival.131 On arriving in Havana, one of the events that most moves filmmakers of Latin America is seeing how the public connects with the cinema. There isn’t a film festival in the world with half a million spectators, in a city where only a little over two million habitants live; or it is to say a considerable portion of the habitants of the city participate in the festival.

His statement was supported by the Argentine journalist Diego Trerotola who, when speaking at the public event Dia de la Critica (Critic’s Day), suggested that because Havana still has large single-screen movie-theatres, rather than multiplexes, there is a greater chance of collective experience when viewing the films.132

At the same time, it is important to remember that while Mar del Plata and the Havana film festival offer a different type of encounter between South American cinema and the international arena, they do have the same qualities as other festivals in that they create a unique contact zone for the contextualisation of films that does not exist in other exhibition opportunities. De Valck conceptualises this aspect of the film festival when she outlines the way it forms a ‘liminal state’133, a zone that is connected to but outside of the considerations of the market place and global distribution channels. It is also worth considering Nichols’ statement that

the recovery of strangeness by means of induction into an international art cinema/film festival aesthetic clearly does not so much uncover a pre-existing meaning as layer on a meaning that did not exist prior to the circuit of exchange that festivals themselves constitute.134

International festivals whether in South America or other parts of the world, do not create a cultural origin for the films they exhibit. Instead, the film festivals create their own context for cultural exchange between the film and the various people in their audiences. It is the cultural content created in these events that is then circulated through metacultural discourse and emerges from the festivals to place South American films contextually on the global circuits of film circulation. The extent to which transculturation occurs is often dependent upon the efforts made to bridge

131 Garbey, ‘No hay festival de cine con un publico como el de La Habana,’ p.3.
133 de Valck, Film Festivals, p. 37.
meaning-making between the film and the international audiences rather than allow processes of ‘armchair tourism’ to dominate.

**Conclusion**

Although, on the one hand, it is understood that, in broad terms, the state reinscribes the national into cinematic practice while the private sector deterritorializes cultural products, the above analysis of the interaction between South American cinematic culture and international points of cultural production, reveals that there are complex ‘contact zones’ in place which allow South American cinema to engage with external influence in a way that is different from the efforts brought about by individual governments or the commercial circuit. Embedded within the complexity of the contact zones is the fact that processes of transcultural exchange are mediated and tempered by the relationships South American practitioners have to the external cultures they work with. There is often an imbalance of power at work which places conditions on the types of cinematic culture that emerges from these encounters.

Many of the ‘purpose’ driven contact zones favour films that fit into a global arthouse genre, often with an emphasis on the ‘Third world’ quality of the works. This is most evident in the films that gain access to film festivals and the international funds. Other modes of representation within film, particularly those coming from peripheral communities within the region, are often absent from the films that gain circulation through the international circuits produced by these contact zones. Although some projects, such as the UNESCO funded schemes, readdress this balance, they often support a separate circuit of film circulation.

Interestingly, although the increased mobility of films allows the opening up of border crossing and transnational links, much of the institutional and organised international intervention into South American cinematic culture attempts to reaffirm national and regionally specific culture. The efforts of these bodies seem to have more in common with that of governmental policy than the free-flow of works supported by the commercial circuit. In a similar manner to state-sponsored initiatives, opportunities provided by global cinema funds and organisations such as UNESCO reinforce rather than discard a South American, Argentine, Bolivian, Chilean or Peruvian identity. Metacultural discourses in film festivals and coproduction tendencies on screen more often than not support this consolidation of identity, meaning that even when a film is
transnational in its practice, it can be claimed for a particular cinematic culture. Critics such as Leonard Koos argue that

as borders are erased and redrawn, as globalization intensifies, and as people and cultures become increasingly mobile, the transcultural in contemporary cinema will prove to be neither a transitory nor a transitional phenomenon, but a running commentary on a world of borderless possibilities. ¹³⁵

However, the South American films that engage in these possibilities often depend upon institutional support and their cinematic practice within the contact zones outlined above will be dependent on the conditions that institutions and organisations set out.

Chapter Six: Alternative Practices

Introduction
The films produced and circulated under the umbrella of the aforementioned formal institutions and networks, be they state-funded organisations, commercial circuits or international bodies, are always, to some extent, conditioned by top-down processes that determine how films will enter into the national or regional cinematic culture. It is a situation that often sits uneasily with ideals of independent and democratic cultural modes of production. At the same time, working below, through and in between these systems are alternative activities and strategies that do not have institutional support or formal structures in place. These activities can include anything from local community groups creating their own exhibition events to guerrilla filmmaking practices.

It is often the case that technological developments allow ordinary citizens the ability to access these activities and engage in audiovisual production, reproduction and distribution facilities. While film industries and official organisations maintain the bulk of skilled personnel, resources, and knowledge assets pertaining to cinematic activity in South America, there are alternative groups and sites that are able to use technology to facilitate points of contact between themselves and cinema publics. Their activities frequently bring together communities and cinematic culture in a manner that allows engagement and communication between the two, creating a public sphere where the social and the cultural can be debated. This is not a strictly Habermasian public sphere as it has long been recognised that Habermas’ criteria for a politically influential public sphere has failed to materialise in contemporary societies, yet it is in line with Hansen and Chanan’s conception of localised and culturally influential public spheres. The alternative groups and sites involved in the development of a public sphere use their practices to offer a distinct mode of cinematic culture that differs from that which is proffered by formal bodies in South America. On the one hand, alternative production is created for local communities and
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potential audiences rather than ‘national’ credibility or commercial profits. On the other hand, alternative distribution allows local communities the possibility of reclaiming or appropriating cinematic works in a manner that they will find beneficial.

Integral to an understanding of these practices is the issue of access to cinematic culture. As copyright on cinematic works is continually extended and restrictions on distribution increased, fewer cinematic works enter the public domain. Although state institutions and non-profit organisations express a desire to open up cinema to wider publics, these bodies frequently work under the guidelines of film industries that constrict rather than widen access. Alternative cinema activities are at the cusp of the fight between cinema as an industrial product and cinema as a cultural right. This includes not only the right of citizens to see and have access to cinematic works but also the rights to self representation in audiovisual forms and the wider cinematic culture. The debate over cinema as art versus cinema as commercial product is not new, of course, but it is important to consider this topic in light of contemporary modes of compliance with and resistance to access restrictions, particularly under new forms of technology.

Within this chapter I have chosen to focus on four of the most significant and easily documented strands that offer alternative access to cinema outside of state and commercially regulated systems: piracy networks, grass-roots exhibition events, online engagement and indigenous groups’ cinema activity. The first section, concerned with film piracy, takes into consideration the way that new reproduction technologies allow illegal access to films, but also draws upon scholarship that understands piracy as forming an alternative mode of distribution. Film piracy does not operate in distinctly different channels from legitimate film circulation but instead works closely with and overlaps legal methods of accessing cinema. The second section outlines the way that grass-roots exhibition sites create alternative cinema events which also offer differing modes of film distribution. More so than piracy, the alternative cinema events bring together community groups so that public engagement with cinema can take place. The public spheres introduced by this type of interaction are then compared and contrasted with public spheres on the internet in section three. In particular, I offer an exploration of the way that some internet sites allow discourse on cinema to bring together various and overlapping public spheres. The final section
evaluates the possibility for peripheral groups, chiefly peoples from indigenous communities, to participate in cinematic culture and whether or not alternative production and exhibition can facilitate inclusion.

Section 1: Piracy

Film piracy creates the liminal circuits where the ordering, organisation and control of film circulation is dismantled in favour of anarchic practices. The interaction between piracy and cinematic culture, something that is almost always illicit, is driven by audience consumption and precise market demands. My analysis of state, commercial and international investment into South American cinematic culture has made it possible to understand that institutions and organisations seek complex returns when they fund and support film production and circulation. These are often returns that go beyond the needs and desires of the everyday spectator – national heritage preservation; long-term economic growth; Third World development – to name a few. Contrasting this, illicit networks are more closely matched to the specific and immediate demands of the spectator-consumer. The lack of regulation and frequent criminal risk involved in piracy means that films are reproduced, circulated and exhibited only when there is considerable demand and thus only when they are relevant to contemporary cinematic culture. If the cinematic work does not have a buyer it is highly unlikely that it will enter the piracy market.

Furthermore, film piracy is not simply an illegal distribution and sales network that acts as a parallel to its legitimate counterpart. Instead, acts of film piracy and their engagement with piracy networks can be understood to alter cinematic consumption and reformulate the ways in which spectators interact with film products.3 Brian Larkin points out that, ‘pirate infrastructure is a powerful mediating force that produces new modes of organizing sensory perception, time, space, and economic models.’4 It is within this context that film piracy in South America can be understood to open up engagement with films in a manner that allows heightened public access that is different from the top-down processes of distribution that operate amongst the authorised models.

In an analysis of the historical trajectory of pirated US film products, Kerry Segrave notes that organised trafficking of stolen films to South America was prevalent as early as 1917.\(^5\) It was often a simple manner of changing title cards for the silent films into the Spanish language and selling the films on to distributors who exhibited them in movie-theatres. As with many other parts of the world, this type of piracy continued on a fairly significant scale along with other methods, such as the refusal to pay proper rental fees on prints, the unauthorised copying of prints and the decisions by television stations to screen films without due rights.\(^6\) At the same time, one of the primary mechanisms for the expansion and continuation of film piracy in South America has been the development of new reproduction technology. When cheap home viewing technology was introduced in the 1970s, particularly the new VHS players, there was a worldwide increase in films made available to spectators along with wide-spread use of bootleg films. Whereas VHS recorders led to the possibility of quick and cheap illegal copies, the introduction of DVDs into the 1990s accelerated this through the minimal time and inexpensive costs involved in pirating copies of digital media.\(^7\)

As with many other parts of the ‘developing world’ such as Africa\(^8\) and Asia\(^9\), film piracy in South America has become particularly rife at the beginning of the twenty-first century. VHS or DVD copies of films are often more commonly available through a piracy distribution network than the legitimate film distribution system. Throughout South America there are personal film collections that are not only supplemented by pirate copies but in many cases consist solely of bootlegs that are a mixture of old VHS and new DVD. Significantly, although piracy networks operate in illicit, liminal spaces, their longevity and lengthy establishment means that, even within their shifting nature, they are nodes of contact that act as permanent points of cultural interaction.

\(^6\) Segrave, *Piracy in the Motion Picture Industry*.
\(^7\) See Yar, ‘‘The Global ‘Epidemic’’.
\(^8\) See Larkin, ‘Degraded Images’.
In Buenos Aires, the most predominant site for film piracy centres on an outdoor market-place in Parque Rivadavia, slightly outside the commercial centre of the city. In the spring of 2007, permanent stalls and tables that offered cheap DVDs stood side by side with stalls selling books and old editions of magazines. At the DVD stalls, thick books binding together laminated pages that contained lists of titles and pictures of the films lay around for customers to browse through at their leisure. Once a customer had chosen a film the workers on the stalls handed over a photocopied DVD jacket with a shiny disc on the inside. The stalls and their employees operated in the park on a permanent basis and many offer an informal customer service: ‘if there’s a problem bring it back and I’ll replace it.’ When I browsed through the stalls in 2007 I made enquiries about Argentine films. At each stall there was someone willing to help, guiding me to the right section of the laminated lists or searching around the deep piles of DVDs. Although I did not receive a receipt and could not pay by credit card, the commercial interaction had the feel of ‘normal’ commerce.

Figure 7. The market in Parque Rivadavia

Nevertheless, this type of piracy has traditionally been deemed as damaging to global film industries. In 2008 the International Intellectual Property Alliance (IIPA) announced that Argentina should remain on its Priority Watch List, estimating that the
trade loss due to film piracy in 2002 and 2003 had been US $30 million each year.\textsuperscript{10} The IIPA stated that ‘theatrical exhibitors and small video rental stores in the interior of Argentina are being harmed by illegal commerce of pirate DVDs’ and that it was possible for vendors to sell films more than a month prior to local theatrical release, and an average of six months prior to the official home video release.\textsuperscript{11} Adding to the concerns of the IIPA are the findings of Gonzales that few Argentine members of the public realise that using audiovisual material without Intellectual Property rights is illegal even though it is written into article 20 of the Ley de Cine and there are various regulations covering this practice.\textsuperscript{12}

When I returned to the Parque Rivadavia in October 2008, DVD sales had been closed down for over two weeks. Although the stands had been boarded up and official notices outlining their closure were placed on the empty stalls, the staff were still there. They were unable to show customers catalogues of the DVDs they had but if a person asked for something particular they would often find a copy to sell. While this situation was taking place, newspaper kiosks on the central avenue, Corrientes, in the city centre had well organised boxes of pirate DVDs, each standardised in plastic sleeves with the year, country, and director of each film clearly marked. The continuation of piracy sales on Corrientes, and the belief amongst vendors at Parque Rivadavia that they would be able to return to their stalls in the near future, point to the fact that piracy distribution in Buenos Aires may fluctuate but can normally evolve around restrictions implemented by the authorities. The continuation of piracy in the face of these restrictions suggests that it is established as a semi-permanent site of distribution.

Rising to the concerns of the IIPA, Chilean authorities in conjunction with the police force offer slightly stricter control on the sale of pirated goods in Santiago. There are no permanent structures housing the illegal sales and instead vendors linger around the city-centre streets with large blankets bunched up to hold bundles of discs in individual plastic covers. In 2008, large banners above the city-centre streets pointed out that piracy sales of any goods were illegal and shops in the same area had flyers

\textsuperscript{12} Gonzales, ‘Buen cine en Buenos Aires’.
made up by the government and the local council that stated ‘No compres en el comercio ambulante ilegal’ (Don’t buy from the illegal travelling market). The flyers explained that selling pirate items could result in a prison sentence of between 540 days and 3 years.

Nonetheless, in opportune moments vendors would roll the blankets out flat and scatter the DVDs into a rough kind of order. Discs often contained a programme of five different films grouped into genre categories such as recent Hollywood ‘slasher flicks’ or contemporary Chilean cinema. The quality would vary from one film that was in high digital resolution to another that had audience members crossing the screen to go to the bathroom, all on one disc. When police officers were seen nearby, vendors used one swift movement to gather up the discs into the blanket and move on to the next area. It was only outside the city, in smaller town such as Arica, that DVD vendors were more established, often in bustling market places where their stalls exerted a more permanent feel. However, in 2008, the IIPA recommended that Chile remain on its Priority Watch List and suggested that trade loss due to film piracy had jumped from US $2 million to US $10 million between 2004 and 2005.13 Although it did acknowledge that there was an effective system of fining street vendors that was
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enforced by local authorities, the IIPA felt that widespread piracy on the streets continued unabated.

In La Paz, various stalls, including those selling DVDs, line the pavements on El Prado, the main thoroughfare through the city centre. These stalls are small and easily packed away over night. In the permanent black-market a few streets above El Prado, there are larger booths and a more solid infrastructure. At each locations, stalls have small television sets connected to DVD players where the owners will play through the disc to attest to its quality. Although this is a little less ‘hi-tech’ than in Chile, where the vendors carry around portable players so that the customer can see the DVD playing in their own hands, this detail surpasses the kind of customer service normally available in legal outlets. The IIPA reported that in 2003 Bolivia had a 100% loss level to piracy, meaning that no trade was gained through legitimate sales. Its 2006 report also noted that the motion-picture industry did not have an anti-piracy presence in the country.\textsuperscript{15} The IIPA does not make it clear whether this is due to the fact that Bolivia’s low GDP means is not seen as a viable market for commercial returns, and thus not worth the money needed to implement an anti-piracy presence,

or if it is because film piracy is so ingrained in local consumer culture that there is little that can be done about it.

The black market, Polvos Azules, in Lima continues the trend of offering permanent housing to piracy sales. The blue fronted building looks similar to any number of cheap shopping-centres in the city. Housed on the basement floor of the multi-storey building are a number of sections selling DVDs. Each section has tall pillars of films stacked on top of each other and a counter with folders containing the lists of titles available for consumers to browse through and buy. Outside of the shopping centre copies may also be bought from street sellers who have handfuls of DVDs laid out on small tables. When Spiderman 3 was released worldwide in May 2007, vendors could be found walking between cars at busy junctions, selling copies already dubbed into Spanish within days of the cinema release. They also sold Spiderman masks and nylon suits: copies of the merchandise that have similar copyright to that used on the film. In 2008 the IIPA recommended that Peru be moved to the Priority Watch List and seemed particularly exasperated that another of its major black markets, Mesa Redonda, sold pirate material one block away from the police and Public Ministry’s headquarters.16

Although global film industries, mainly those based in the US, have obvious reasons to dislike the alternative trade in their film products, there is an issue over the fact that film piracy offers new modes of circulation that can provide different types of engagement for different users. Writing specifically on the Bolivian case, Himpele argues that film piracy alters the unequal flows of film products through class hierarchies.17 He suggests that traditionally in La Paz there was a situation whereby films entered middle-class cinemas first and were only later sent on to movie-theatres in poorer districts, often deteriorating during their journey:

*The debuts of pirated films on videotape reverse the class correspondences and itineraries of official film circulation and exhibition […] A pirated film can be available on video in the unofficial street markets before its debut in an official theatre in the city centre, offering the fastest access to world debuts to the popular classes and those who shop in the unofficial markets.*18
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Furthermore, Himpele notes that because Bolivian, or other South American, spectators can use pirate copies to view films at the same time as they are released in the US, piracy reverses a previous trend whereby ‘developing countries’ were given a delayed modernity and could only access film products from the ‘first world’ at a later stage. It is in this context that Shujen Wang suggests that consumer complicity in piracy, especially in Third World countries, can be seen as ‘a form of local resistance and self-empowerment.’  

The issue of access to global media and the role piracy plays is something that Larkin highlights when he claims that, ‘in many places, piracy is the only means by which certain media – usually foreign – are available.’ Writing for the Chilean newspaper La Nacion, Betzie Jaramillo told the story of a number of ordinary Chileans that use piracy networks. She made the point that “gracias” a los piratas tienen videotecas, bibliotecas y discotecas dignas de un consumidor del primer mundo.” (”thanks” to the pirates, they have videotecues, libraries and disc collections worthy of a consumer in the first world.) In this way, piracy allows South American spectators to enter into a public sphere of cultural engagement with wide-ranging cinematic works which would otherwise be prevented by the restrictions on film circulation that operate in legal markets. This is a sentiment that was seen as important by Roberto Lanza, from La Fabrica film school in Bolivia, when he made the point that his students use and need pirate copies, whether downloads or illegal DVDs, to gain access to the history of world cinema. If they are to become versed in great filmmaking traditions as part of their historical education they cannot wait for the national Cinemateca or the small arthouse cinema in La Paz to put on retrospectives of these works. In the black-market in La Paz consumers can find stocks of film titles that far outnumber the capacity held in any legal store either in South America or in the West. By using computers, printers and other packaging devices, pirate distributors make use of digital technology to reproduce the film products in the most streamlined form.

---

22 Roberto Lanza, personal communication: interview, Cochabamba, Bolivia, 17 April, 2007.
Because pirate DVD vendors often reduce packaging down to the bare minimum, either through the use of simple plastic sleeves or through slim-line DVD cases, they have more DVDs stored in less space. They also have the capacity to keep their back catalogue on computers and burn off or make further copies according to demand in a way that is impossible for legal vendors. Often their collections are amongst the best in the world.

The quantity of material available through piracy networks is thus an advantage and in an attempt to counteract this fact, a long standing argument used by the global film industry is that the pirated copy will be of lesser quality. This was certainly true when copies on VHS were the standard format for illegal copies as deterioration in image quality, tracking problems, and inaudible sound were common. There are also issues of quality if a consumer buys a copy of a film currently playing in the movie-theatre as the copy is likely to be a low resolution reproduction filmed within the cinema or a copy of screeners sent to industry personnel. If, on the other hand, a consumer buys a copy of a film that has been released on DVD the pirate copy will most likely be an exact replica of the original product with extra features and subtitle options intact. It is almost always the case that as soon as commercial DVD copies are made available, pirate networks have the ability to make replicas that are identical in quality. Although the international industry, led by Hollywood, is in a constant battle to introduce new technology with embodied chips and other devices to prevent DVD copying, software hackers operate quickly to find solutions that can de-code or break protection technology. Pirate networks then use this knowledge to continue hacking into and copying the DVDs they wish to sell. While South American nations are often seen as technologically backwards in comparison to global hubs of computer expertise, the pirate DVD copies that I encountered more often that not embodied the most up-to-date versions of reproduction technology.

Another aspect of piracy is its network structure that improves spectator access to films. In La Paz, Lima and Buenos Aires, street vendors each showed a willingness to work together. If asked for a less well known title, particularly a South American film, individual vendors would disappear into other stalls or down the ends of streets to find
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23 Both Himpele, *Circuits of Culture* and Larkin, ‘Degraded Images’ see this as a significant factor in the consumption of pirated films.
other vendors that were currently holding copies. This facet of piracy creates a
network effect in which the film consumer does not merely support a singular
economic exchange but enters into a distribution circuit that is sometimes chaotic but
at times significantly systematic.

On a slightly different level, this networking also takes place through digital content
on-line. The use of computer technology in piracy has played a key role in expanding
spectator access to films through various download sites that are available. Operating
in a legal grey area where the majority of sites are housed in servers in non-regulated
countries and working on a policy where they keep material on-line until the
copyright holders actively seek its removal, these sites have libraries of film beyond
any video store’s physical capacity. They allow the possibility for a new type of
collection to emerge in which the cinephile no longer stores VHS and DVDs along
bookshelves or stacked up beside the television but instead backs up copies onto
external hard drives and creates virtual collections. Although scholars have heralded
the potential that legal film downloads have for challenging the way audiences view
film, by 2008 film studios remained slow to come up with sufficient rights and
rental agreements to make their films available online. Legal DVD rental sites and
other providers online had only a fraction of the studios’ film libraries available for
download. Contrasting this situation, large numbers of people across the world and in
South America have been able to access an array of unauthorised download sites that
can provide a far greater quantity of films.

Varying types of film piracy are often conflated and understood as a singular concept.
However, it may be useful to unpick the difference between these illegal downloads
and street sales. While street sales operate for speedy economic gain and the films on
offer closely reflect trends of audience consumption, illegal downloads often provide
space for a more permanent engagement with cinematic culture. The process of illegal
downloading, through access to on-line databases, can be understood as a version of
library interchange, so long as the material is not then replicated for commercial
reasons. The distinction is highlighted in Douglas Thomas’ work on the ethics of
digital reproduction where ‘piracy and ownership in the digital age, from software to

24 See Wasko, ‘The Future of Film’; Klinger, Beyond the Multiplex.
emerging forms of new media are more about the right to distribute than the right to reproduce information. At the Mar del Plata film festival in 2007 a number of film critics, including the US film journalist Jonathan Rosenbaum, came together for a debate on cinema and found themselves entering into a conversation on the peer-to-peer programs that allow the exchange of illegal film libraries to take place. In a discussion that would most likely have disturbed members of the film industry, the critics unanimously agreed that these programs should exist as a means of forming a global video library and more importantly, it should be the right of every global citizen to have access to each of the films that have been digitised, whether by legitimate means or illegitimate means. There was thus support for a technologically based public sphere in which access to cultural works would be supported through the dissemination of films. This type of thinking conceptualises the cultural notion that works of art benefit humanity as a whole and simultaneously introduces the liberating potential of digital technology. However, their opinions conflict with the commercial aims of the industry, particularly global companies, and with the legitimate cultural institutes such as cinemathecas and film councils that are under pressure to support these industries. For government organisations, institutes and cultural bodies that speak highly of the importance of making national and even international culture accessible to citizens, there is a difficulty in coming to terms with the unrestrictive potential that digital media provides. For film industry personnel, the external policy line is often that there is no difficulty in understanding this area as any unauthorised, and thus non-commercially beneficial, reproduction of their products is simply illegal.

This attitude is apparent in the large amounts of money and resources that film studios spend on publicity material designed to inform consumers that they should not engage in piracy. The general premise of many information-videos screened in theatrical exhibition, or on VHS and DVD rental copies, is that piracy is intrinsically linked to organised crime and buyers of pirate DVDs are thus agents in a chain of culpability. There is often information in the videos and posters that press home the message that buying a pirate video or DVD makes the consumer as much a criminal as the person selling the copy. In 2007 an information video in Peru shown before theatrical

26 Personal Observation: Public Meeting, Cine y Mañana (Cinema and Tomorrow), Mar del Plata Film Festival, Argentina, 15 March 2007.
27 Yar, ‘The Global ‘Epidemic’.”
screenings showed a young child receiving a reprimand for stealing answers for a school test. When questioned, the child tells his father that he thought it was okay to take things without permission as that is what he had seen his father do when he bought pirate DVDs. The advert states clearly, just in case any audience member has missed the message, that piracy is theft. On DVDs of South American films released in 2006 and 2007 there was another common information video that was inserted into the DVD before the beginning of the film. Fast electronic music provided the soundtrack to a series of images of people stealing items such as handbags and cars with the accompanying

\begin{verbatim}
no robarías un auto…no robarías una cartera…no robarías un celular…no robarías una película…comprar películas pirateadas es un robo…el robo es ilegal…piratería es un crimen.
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
you wouldn’t rob a car…you wouldn’t rob a purse…you wouldn’t rob a cell phone…you wouldn’t steal a film…buying pirate films is robbery…robbery is illegal…piracy is a crime.
\end{verbatim}

This was a Spanish-language version of the same video that was being inserted onto DVD copies around the world, in a variety of languages.

Yet as hard as film industries try to create a link between pirate DVD use and criminal action in the public imagination, it is not an easy link to make, particularly in the poorer regions of South America. The press officer for Conacine Bolivia, Carola Antezana, explained that piracy was of course a problem for the industry yet she also noted that she could understand why it is hard to criticise people using piracy networks.\textsuperscript{28} She pointed out the problem in expecting a family of four to buy cinema tickets when the price was far beyond their means. It would also be almost impossible for the majority of Bolivians, of whom many live under the poverty line in under-developed rural areas, to find the money for a DVD import that would be ten times the price of the pirate copy. This was a point emphasised by Marcelo Cordero, of the Yaneramai distribution group in Bolivia, when he also noted that the majority of the Bolivian population cannot afford to go to the cinema.\textsuperscript{29} In the more developed but non-metropolitan areas such as Arica in the north of Chile where there is only one small cinema and very few rental stores, the idea of paying $20 dollars or more to sample a film is equally difficult.

\textsuperscript{28} Carola Antezana, personal communication: interview, La Paz, Bolivia, 10 April, 2007.
\textsuperscript{29} Marcelo Cordero Q., personal communication: email, 7 Nov, 2008.
During an interview with a Peruvian blog, Conacine Peru’s president, Rosa María Oliart explained that there are two issues. We have a representative of INDECOPI [National Institute of Defence for Competition and Intellectual Property] on our board and, institutionally, we participate in the anti-piracy crusade. Without doubt, the other side of this issue is the access to the culture in cinema products that we don’t have another means to see. But we prefer not to debate this as it is not politically correct, much less for me as president of CONACINE.

Much of the problem of access is due to the fact there is a counter-productive impact from pricing strategies that encourage consumers to turn to more affordable pirate copies. For this reason there is a close correlation between per capita GDP and piracy levels. With this in mind, David A. Cook and Wenli Wang advocate an incentive-compatible economic model should not only deliver social surplus but also discourage illicit economic behaviours. Hence, we believe that a more effective approach to neutralizing piracy of motion pictures is to reengineer the industry’s supply chain in such a way that it can offer legal, cheaper, more convenient, and more enjoyable entertainment than anything illicit copies can provide.

However, the fact that piracy networks often offer not only an economic incentive but also access to a distribution network that is normally unobtainable for South American spectators, suggests that changing pricing strategies may not necessarily provide a solution to the industry’s concerns.

At the same time there is something to be said for trying to allow more easy access to legitimate films in South America. In 2007, piracy levels in Bolivia had reached the stage where producers did not seem to see the point in releasing their films on DVD. The proliferation of piracy in La Paz combined with the low disposable income of its inhabitants led to a situation in which there were no legal outlets for DVDs in the city.
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This made it impossible to buy legal copies of Bolivian DVDs in the domestic market (although they may be released abroad through an external international distributor). In turn, this meant that there were no means for Bolivian production companies to make back money in the domestic market beyond box-office sales in the limited movie-theatres available. Dependencia sexual (2003) received acclaim at international film festivals and was critically praised in Bolivia yet it was never released on DVD in the domestic market as there were no outlets where it could be sold. Instead, the rights were picked up by international distribution companies and legal DVDs were only available to buy abroad. When Quien mato a la llamita blanca (2006) broke all previous box-office records for a Bolivian film, La Fabrica, who produced it, knew that pirate copies would be available to buy within days of its release and so they attempted to negotiate with the street vendors to ask if they would sell legitimate copies instead.33 The negotiations fell through and, as is the situation with other Bolivian films, the production company could not regain any further costs apart from selling rights to companies abroad. A situation such as this leaves the production companies short on funds to invest in further films with the on-going effect that the national film industry struggles to grow. It also leaves cinematic tradition and preservation in the hands of the limited institutions such as the cinemateca (that suffers financially), private collections, or international distributors.

Although this situation is most acute in Bolivia due to the lack of legal DVD sales sites, the majority of South American countries find that their domestic film industries suffer from piracy. On the one hand there is Jaramillo’s argument:

¿Cómo explicarles a ellos que es raro encontrar alguien de un país subdesarrollado que tenga problemas morales con lesionar un poquito los intereses de la Universal, Paramount o Sony? […] Que nadie se siente ladrón por no contribuir a la fabulosa fortuna de Tom Cruise, que no se sienten obligados a financiarle otra mansión a Spielberg.34

How do you explain to [the US industry] that it is rare to encounter someone from an underdeveloped country that has moral problems with injuring slightly the interests of Universal, Paramount or Sony […] Nobody feels as if they are a thief for not contributing to the fabulous fortunes of Tom Cruise, they do not feel obliged to finance another mansion for Spielberg.

33 Roberto Lanza, personal communication: interview, Cochabamba, Bolivia, 17 April, 2007.
34 Jaramillo, ‘Mi Cultura Pirata’.
On the other hand, this argument does not explain how it is possible to deal with the same piracy which affects the large numbers of domestic filmmakers in South America who consistently struggle to make ends meet. The IIPA stated in 2008 that, ‘five years ago, there were 1,200 video stores operating in Chile; today, this amount has shrunk to 300.’ There are thus conditions of production and consumption that complicate simple arguments against tight controls on intellectual property or in favour of allowing unrestricted access to cultural works.

Section 2: Alternative Spaces
If piracy predominantly offers alternative networks for engagement with cinematic culture at the home-viewing level of VHS and DVD, it is worth asking what the alternative opportunities are for public engagement. The standard movie-theatres across South America, even the arthouses and the cinematheques, tend to follow certain norms and regulations that increasingly reduce the potential for audience members to interact with each other. In a similar manner to cinemas across Europe and North America, they have little of the ‘public sphere’ quality that Hansen celebrated in early cinema. However, there are local groups across South America that use cinematic practices in a way which makes social engagement with cinema paramount, creating as they do, their own micro-public spheres.

The importance of engaging local spectators and understanding their relationship to cinematic spaces feeds into a tendency that developed across the region during the New Latin American Cinema movement. Chanan briefly addressed this issue in his lecture at the 9th International Festival of New Latin American Cinema in Cuba (1987) when he called for an understanding of the relationship of space to Latin American cinema. He said:

Si los personajes de una película muestran un comportamiento distinto en sitios distintos, ocurre lo mismo con el espectador. Quiere decir que la película como objeto material queda igual dondequiera que se proyecta, pero el espacio entre la pantalla y el espectador es distinto.

*If the characters of a film demonstrate different behaviour in different locations, the same occurs with the spectator. This is to say that the film, as*
material object, remains the same wherever it is projected but the space between the screen and the spectator is distinct.

This aspect of cinematic relations became particularly important when government censorship and repression during the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s forced exhibition of left-wing films associated with the movement into illegal screenings and clandestine meetings. In Chile in the late 1970s activists had to make use of an illicit VCR network across community centres, churches, union halls and social clubs to show copies of banned work such as Patricio Guzmán’s *La batalla de Chile* (1975).\(^{38}\) In a similar manner in Argentina, the ground breaking documentary *La hora de los hornos* (1968) was shown at underground screenings\(^{39}\) while cinema clubs and university departments in Ecuador showed political films to workers, peasants and students.\(^{40}\) These exhibition moments created unique events between local spectators and the radical films that they were encountering.

When the filmmakers Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino screened their *La hora de los hornos*, at clandestine events in the 1960s they found that certain advantages arose out of these processes. Because the screenings took place in community spaces and often with the filmmakers in attendance they had the chance to hold debates concerning the themes of the films with the spectators. They said, ‘We thus discovered a new facet of cinema: the participation of people who, until then, were considered spectators.’\(^{41}\) This brought about the idea that the exhibition event could be a *filme-acto* in which each screening became an act in itself that encouraged spectators to take its social message out into the world and produce change.\(^{42}\) Furthermore, the filmmakers believed that because the screenings were illegal, the spectator, in the action of attending and watching the films, became an actor in the political act of resistance which was concurrent with the themes of the films. This was only possible outside the traditional movie-theatre space and had the effect that:

> This means that the result of each projection act will depend on those who organise it, on those who participate in it, and on the time and the place; the
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\(^{39}\) See Jakubowicz, and Radetich, *La Historia Argentina*.


\(^{41}\) Solanas and Getino, ‘Towards a Third Cinema,’ p. 76.

\(^{42}\) See Bustos, *Audiovisuales de Combate*. 
possibility of introducing variations, additions, and changes is unlimited. The screening of a film act will always express the historical situation in which it takes place.43

Another advocate of the importance that the cinema-goer plays in relation to film was Jorge Sanjines. When making films in Bolivia, and later in neighbouring countries under exile from the Banzer government, Sanjines and his team produced and screened films that were concerned with highlighting the subjugation of indigenous communities in Latin America.44 He placed great emphasis on allowing audience discussion to determine future processes of filmmaking, stating that due to criticism and suggestions from spectators, the filmmakers made attempts to incorporate the languages and storytelling devices of the local communities they were working with.45 The use of community input was, he stated, apparent in El coraje del pueblo (1971) and El enemigo principal (1973). Furthermore, it was important to Sanjines that the films circulated widely yet in a manner that allowed spectator interaction and discussion about the film to take place. He noted that:

The circulation of El Enemigo Principal among Ecuadorian workers and peasants, who all speak Quechua, reassured us, since this film really established connections, communication and participation to an optimum degree. Sometimes the peasants took the initiative of projecting the film to other peasants so as to provoke discussion on matters that concerned them greatly.46

Exhibition thus became a central concern as did particular engagement between the films and local communities.

Latin American filmmakers’ concern with screening films in a way that engaged the spectator was sufficiently significant to gain a place on the agenda put forward at the 1973 Resolution of Third World Filmmakers Meeting in Algiers. The first committee put forward the statement:

Films being a social act within a historical reality, it follows that the task of the Third World filmmaker is no longer limited to the making of films but is extended to other fields of actions such as: articulating, fostering and making the new films understandable to the masses of people by associating himself with the promoters of people’s cinema, clubs and itinerant film groups in their

44 King, Magical Reels; Schnitman, Film Industries in Latin America.
45 Sanjines, ‘Problems of Form and Content’.
dynamic action aimed at disalienation and sensitization in favour of a cinema which satisfies the interests of the masses.\textsuperscript{47}

Chanan notes that

These examples point to a critical factor: this was a cinema which flourished at the margins of the market and beyond its confines, where cultural voluntarism was more important than commercial viability and cinema could make direct contact with the community.\textsuperscript{48}

It was a situation of exhibition that was motivated by the political aims of the filmmakers as much as the material conditions that forced certain screenings underground.

What is interesting is that when the return to democracy, and the end of censorship, made cinema production and distribution a less illicit endeavour, many of the alternative exhibition practices continued. In 2002, Patricia Aufderheide noted that groups such as CineMujer in Colombia and TV dos Trabalhadores in Brazil worked to create alternative networks of exhibition for film and media with radical content.\textsuperscript{49} By 2008 there were a number of other significant organisations undertaking similar practice, such as the Asociación NÓMADAS that works across communities in Peru and Ecuador using mobile cinema screens, or the Yaneramai group that bring cinema to rural communities in Bolivia.

The attempt within alternative exhibition networks to constitute a space in which audiences are taken into consideration and, in turn, are able to constitute the meaning that arises from the exhibition events, is important to the facilitation of the micro-public spheres. Following Habermas, Chanan notes that

the public sphere is a constitutive aspect of civil society, a multiple, heterotopic form of social space – which developed differently in different countries – where citizens engage in debate about public issues and concerns independent of authority and the state, and where they exercise common powers of reasoning precisely in order to compel political authority to legitimate itself before public opinion.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{48} Chanan, ‘Latin American Cinema,’ p. 42.
\textsuperscript{49} Aufderheide, ‘Grassroots Video in Latin America’.
\textsuperscript{50} Chanan, ‘Documentary and the Public Sphere,’ p.221.
Hansen has already adapted aspects of this model for early cinema but it is also a concept that can be used for specific alternative exhibition practices to see how they have an impact across South American countries.

For the remainder of this section I would like to concentrate on three groups across South America that provide examples of exhibition practices which operate outside of sanctioned state or commercial control and, through their methods, create spaces of engagement: Grupo Chaski; El Centro Cultural América Libre; and Cine Libre Parque Abierto. The first organisation, Grupo Chaski, operates in Peru. Its involvement in cinema began in 1982 when the founding filmmakers Fernando Espinoza, Alejandro Legaspi, Stefan Kaspar, María Barea and Fernando Barreto dedicated themselves to making socially responsible shorts, feature films and documentaries. Many of these films gained international acclaim and the group were commended for a type of filmmaking that engaged with socio-political issues at work in both Peru and the greater Latin American region. At the Havana Film Festival in 1985 Grupo Chaski presented Miss Universo en el Peru (1982) and Gregorio (1985). The former interrogated how Peru absorbs global matters while the latter approached domestic problems which generate suffering in urban areas. Throughout its work, Grupo Chaski has always retained a commitment to working with remote and marginalised communities across the country and states that:

el Grupo Chaski defiende desde sus inicios una actitud y una metodología orientada hacia un cine responsable, inmerso en lo cotidiano, con personajes auténticos y con la experiencia social compartida de todos los días. Es allí donde se encuentran las bases de su estética y de sus conceptos. Grupo Chaski has, since its beginnings, defended an attitude and methodology orientated towards a responsible cinema, immersed in daily life, with authentic characters and with the shared social experience of the everyday. It is here that one can encounter the basis of its concepts and its aesthetic practice.

In its twenty-first century projects, Grupo Chaski continues to engage with ‘responsible cinema’ in Peru yet its main focus is less on film production and more on specific distribution and exhibition ventures across the country.

52 Kleinhans and Lesage, ‘Havana Film Festival Report’.
53 McClennen, ‘The Theory and Practice of the Peruvian Grupo Chaski’.
54 Grupo Chaski (2008b) ‘Quienes Somos’ in Grupo Chaski
http://www.grupochaski.org/index.php?id=229,0,0,1,0,0 (accessed 15 Jan 2008).
In 2003, the group realised that the *cambio digital* (digital change) could bring about opportunities for improvement in the areas of Latin American cinema that have historically had the greatest weaknesses: distribution and exhibition. Executive Director, Stefan Kaspar stated that the group wanted to be engineers for the new information society.\(^{55}\) He had found that although many development projects in Latin America were based around new communication tools, the majority were in relation to the internet. Grupo Chaski, on the other hand, wanted to use the new technology for more traditional audiovisual purposes. Whereas it costs hundreds of thousands of dollars to build a new cinema in Peru, the group found that they could use digital projectors and screens costing only a couple of thousand dollars to bring films to local communities that are normally without access to cinema. Taking these factors into consideration, Grupo Chaski began to focus almost exclusively on distribution and exhibition projects. The group developed the term *Microcines* to describe both the makeshift cinemas they were creating with such digital technology and the overall project that networked these cinemas together. In 2006, the group attended a Latin American symposium for development projects during which the Microcines plan was one of the few projects selected for further support.\(^{56}\) Following this, a strong business plan and strategic development outline were put in place to allow a systematic expansion of the Microcine projects. However, concurrent with the aims of the New Latin American Cinema movement, Grupo Chaski explicitly states that it is a non-profit organisation.\(^{57}\) This means that while it has business plans in place, and is responsible to external investors such as the the Ashoka foundation, Grupo Chaski does not have the same commercial aims as other distribution and exhibition companies currently operating in Peru.

Kaspar describes commercial cinema as a ‘McDonald’s cinema’ – a ‘fast cinema’ – and claims that in contrast, Microcines are cinemas that nourish and work with the spirit and the soul.\(^{58}\) Key to this ‘nourishment’ is the content of films on offer through the Microcines and, for this reason, Grupo Chaski has a library of films with socially

\(^{57}\) Grupo Chaski, ‘Quienes Somos’.
engaging themes and subject matters. The library includes short and full length documentaries which have an educational basis and are highlighted as potential pedagogical tools for communities that have limited access to education facilities. By mixing cinema with education, Grupo Chaski implies a commitment to using cinematic sites for social projects that go beyond entertainment. It is not a particularly novel idea but this process does set Grupo Chaski apart from the commercial cinema sites that dominate access to cinema in Peru. The group also provides various feature films such as *Dias de Santiago* (2004) and *Paloma de papel* (2003) that investigate issues affecting Peruvians such as urban and rural social problems and inequalities.

In Argentina, there are two groups that, while autonomous from each other, share friendly relations and parallel practices. El Centro Cultural América Libre (América Libre) in Mar del Plata inhabits a small arts space in the city centre. Working as a collective run by a number of small committees, América Libre has space for a number of arts-based activities such as theatre and dance, along with an area set aside for cinema screenings. Although there was a prior collective working in Mar del Plata, it was only in 2006 that América Libre as a physical space came into existence by occupying a disused shop space. When the police attempted to evict América Libre, members of the community and other supporters – workers, students, teachers, filmmakers and artists – came together until the authorities agreed on the current situation in which América Libre has an indefinite right to remain in its space. As with Grupo Chaski, the centre places emphasis on socially responsible cinema and stresses the importance of screening films that act as alternatives to the mainstream commercial cinema normally offered in Argentina’s cities. Entrance fees are not demanded for the screenings and funding comes from the donations that audience members make. The space itself is not rigid and at times the films are shown on an outdoor cinema screen erected in the park opposite the centre.

---

59 Grupo Chaski (2008c) ‘Programación de Películas’ in *Grupo Chaski* http://www.grupochaski.org/index.php?id=237,0,0,1,0,0 (15 January 2008).


Cine Libre Parque Abierto (Cine Libre) in Buenos Aires operates in a similarly liminal space. The group organises film screenings every Saturday in Centenario Park on an outdoor screen that they set up. Cine Libre currently has access to use the park in this way due to a campaign by local artisan craft workers to keep the space available to artists who want to use it. However, as with América Libre’s centre, there is always the risk that the authorities will take action to shut down the space. The group also operates as a collective with committees that can be joined by people wishing to take part in the organisational structure. Their open call for films means they receive work from filmmakers across Argentina and from other countries in South America. All of the films they show fit in with their desire for a politically motivating cinema that is sympathetic to alternative narratives, aesthetics and ideas. One of the organisers, Ignacio Perez Fernandez, indicated that the work of Cine Libre is much larger than simply a cinema project as they want there to be a space within which they can engage with larger social issues.62 Both groups articulate a belief in the fact that small revolutions can begin through cultural practices such as this and that there is a real potential for political and social change. In the interest of sharing their socio-political ideas, open links are maintained with both the community to whom they show the films and also to the filmmakers working across the continent on

---

similar issues. There is also a link between Cine Libre and América Libre as they pass on promotional material and share other resources amongst one another.

Joining together Grupo Chaski, América Libre and Cine Libre are various factors that shall be discussed below but perhaps one of the most overarching elements is the way in which they create micro public spheres through the singular and particular events within each cinema screening. Commercial distribution of a film often relies upon selling the same film product, packaged in the same viewing experience, as a means to maximise profits. In contrast to this, Grupo Chaski, América Libre and Cine Libre focus attention towards making each screening a unique event that engages local communities in a particular way. With Grupo Chaski, this involves promoting debates with the public both before and after the film so that there is an engagement with the screening that is unique to the social make-up of the members of the public in attendance. In Cine Libre’s weekly screenings, the committee often decides upon a theme and pieces together a variety of documentaries, shorts and feature films, meaning that every week there is a distinctive feel to the cinema process. América Libre also programs films as specific, singular events, and the placement of the films in the arts centre means that they can interact with other related art forms and performances. Spatially, the events are made unique because a screening in one community will involve audience debates that are particular to the geographical and social background of those spectators. Temporally, the events are made unique as an earlier or later screening will be reformulated by the exhibitor and will involve differing interaction with the attendees.

In addition to these points, the particular nature of the alternative screening event removes the cinematic experience from a wider context of mediated discourse. By showing independent films that are not on general release and re-screening older classics that are not in current theatrical circulation, Grupo Chaski, América Libre and Cine Libre disengage spectators from the plethora of reviews, articles and marketing material that accompanies a film in its first round of release. It can be argued that this process of disengaging spectators actually allows spectators to re-engage with the film through their own experience and the surrounding audience, rather than through the lens of the international and national media. In Latin America there has often been the complaint that a conservative media and large audiovisual conglomerates control both
the way in which cultural practices are discussed and the types of audiovisual materials that are promoted. Similarly, it has also been said that the media frequently upholds the lifestyles and values of a minority elite while it simultaneously ignores the large numbers of indigenous populations and the urban and rural poor. Kaspar agreed with these claims, explaining that one of the main reasons that Grupo Chaski became involved in cinema was to counteract control over the cinema sphere. He noted that, although cinema can be a tool for education, the types of commercial films currently on sale lead to domination, discrimination and exclusion. Using cinematic works such as Madeinusa (2006), Grupo Chaski’s Microcines exhibit films that promote multiple Latin American identities, including under-represented indigenous communities. Furthermore, by bringing about direct engagement between the audience, the film, and its content, Grupo Chaski’s films are not mediated by the types of discourse found in the dominant media.

Engagement is also fostered by the way in which space is created and managed in the cinema screenings. Rather than using fixed exhibition sites that have been created solely for projecting films Grupo Chaski, América Libre and Cine Libre use places that range from community centres to outdoor screens. Without the carefully controlled darkness of the movie-theatre or the ordered seats that make it difficult to view other members of the audience, the alternative screenings have a visual and audible space in which the audience exists before the projection. In a large city such as Buenos Aires, where Cine Libre takes place, the visibility of fellow spectators makes them something more than just strangers, even if only for a few hours. In the smaller, marginal communities where Grupo Chaski operates, it can be a strengthening of community that takes place when familiar faces are seen together in one location. Spectators can be seen as they arrive and leave but also as they move and interact with the films when they are being shown. This can lead to seeing another spectator laugh or cry as a part of the film touches them. It can mean sensing someone’s interest peak as they come in from the edge of the park to take a seat in front of the screen. It can also mean hearing someone’s interest wane as the door to the town hall bangs on their way out. At times these are distractions; at times these are elements that can allow an audience member to sense the way in which their viewing

experience is part of a collective act. Eleftheriotis talks of similar processes that took place in the Greek open-air cinemas of the 1960s when spectators shouted at the screen, joined in with songs and interacted in other ways. He begins by calling these elements ‘interruptions’ but goes on to say that, in their positive moments, they can be better defined as ‘looking around’. They are processes that allow the spectator to see beyond themselves and into the world in which they exist. Rather than expecting spectators to consume films in an individual and passive manner, all three of the groups allow space for distractions, interruptions, interventions and looking around. They speak of the importance of encouraging debate, of making sure that the film does not end as the credits roll. This type of exhibition is in contrast to the multiplexes, where audiences are commonly encouraged to exit by a side door under dimmed lights, and instead they bring the lights up on the space, allowing audiences to stay and make the space their own afterwards.

By encouraging the collective use of space, there is a return to the moment of rupture that occurred when early cinema moved from the small and personal peep show to the larger scale film projection. Belton documents the way early cinema technologies such as the Kinetescope were based upon machines that allowed one spectator at a time to watch and control the moving images. He notes that while the shift towards larger scale projection may have been motivated by simple economics it had a radical impact through the way in which it enabled the spectator to become a social subject:

> With projection, the spectator’s relationship with the image is no longer private and direct but public and mediated (by the presence of other spectators). In this shared space, the spectator’s gaze becomes a collective look. For that reason, it is impossible to describe the spectator-screen relationship as simple, voyeuristic trajectory consisting of an unseen, solitary spectator-subject looking (as it were) through a keyhole at an unseeing, exhibitionistic image-object.

Belton then suggests that the advent of television is a return to the peep-show event where the film object is consumed by an individual spectator. I would argue, however, that contemporary movie-theatre exhibition practice is itself an attempt to keep the spectator individual and within an artificial privacy. The work of Grupo Chaski, América Libre and Cine Libre is not in resistance to the practices of television
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watching, that have their own social mechanisms and complex relations with groups of people, but to the practices of standardised movie-theatre going. Their work is in line with the radical potential that existed in the move towards projection but has subsequently been lost through long processes of standardisation.

One of the many processes of standardisation that have taken place has been that of language. The majority of films screened in Latin America are in the English language due to the abundance of US films at the box-office. One of the effects this has is not so much the domination of the English language but the domination of the Spanish language as the meaning provider in the cinema sphere. Each commercial movie-theatre in Spanish-speaking Latin America provides either subtitles or dubbing in Spanish yet there are almost none providing subtitles in the variety of indigenous languages spoken across the region. This is particularly problematic for communities in which Spanish is neither the first language nor at times commonly spoken. In many ways, there are technical restrictions that make it both simpler and more cost effective to provide translation in only one language but the dominance of the one language is also consolidated by the set up of the exhibition space in commercial theatres. Hansen points out that

the implementation of the rule of silence in the motion picture shows not only imposed a middle-class standard of spectatorship; by suppressing a locally and regionally specific linguistic environment – foreign languages, accents, dialects – it contributed to the cultural homogenization of a mass audience.  

The freer flow of space within the alternative exhibition practices, where people come and go more easily, means that rules of silence are far less likely to be engaged. The encouragement of voices during debate before and after the films also opens up the possibility of a variety of expression. Furthermore, the small and localised nature of the cinema groups means that it is possible for them to find alternative ways of engaging local language difference. Grupo Chaski works against the cultural homogenization in language by respecting the varied idioms of the communities it works with, particularly as it understands language as a fundamental issue in preventing exclusion from the cinema. Kaspar stated that 70% of the Peruvian public cannot read subtitles and so need a film which has dialogue in their own idiom.  
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many of the rural communities do not speak Spanish, this means that films should ideally be provided in a local language. Although it can be difficult to find films that have dialogue in the indigenous languages of Peru, such as Quechua and Aymara, and although the cost of dubbing into these languages is high, Grupo Chaski still understands this is an aim that has to be met whenever possible. When translations are not possible and a film is shown in Spanish the encouragement of spectator voices during debate, before and after the films, means the possibility of introducing expression in different languages. In this way, the cinematic experience does not need to be confined to a Spanish-language event.

Language is one of a variety of elements that set up hierarchies within the exhibition space, in this case the dominant colonial idiom. Balances of power, and importantly, an attempt to reduce hierarchies, are all essential concerns of Grupo Chaski, América Libre and Cine Libre. When Grupo Chaski describes the Microcines it states:

el Microcine es un espacio de encuentro y participación donde se exhiben películas que fomentan valores, reflexión y sano entretenimiento. Es gestionado por líderes de la comunidad que son capacitados para desempeñarse como promotores culturales que buscan la autogestión y la sostenibilidad.69

the Microcine is a space for meeting and participation where films that promote values, reflection and healthy entertainment are shown. It is administered by leaders of the community that are capable of working as cultural promoters that seek autonomy and sustainability.

Rather than setting up a network of exhibition spaces that are managed top-down by the directors of Grupo Chaski, the organisation prefers to train up members of the community so that they can take control of the exhibition space for their own local people.70

A similar sentiment is seen in América Libre’s manifesto in which it is made clear that there is no set authority governing the way in which their space operates. It says

no hay un solo grupo, sino muchas organizaciones, que el proyecto no le pertenece a ninguna en particular, sino a todos, porque es un proyecto colectivo y autónomo, y que no tenemos dirigentes en el sentido tradicional, sino compañeros con responsabilidades eventuales y que todo lo importante lo

69 Grupo Chaski (2008a) ‘Nuestra Historia’ in Grupo Chaski http://www.grupochaski.org/index.php?id=576,0,0,1,0,0 (accessed 15 January 2008).
70 See also McClenen, ‘The Theory and Practice of the Peruvian Grupo Chaski’.
decidimos entre todos en asambleas, en comisiones o en lugares donde coordinamos estas cosas con delegados y voceros.\footnote{CCAL (2007) \textit{Resumen de la Incipiente Historia del América Libre}, Mar del Plata: CCAL.}

there is not only one group but lots of organizations. The project does not belong to anyone in particular but to everyone because it is a collective and autonomous project. We don’t have leaders in the traditional sense but instead we have colleagues with responsibilities and everything that is important is decided between everyone in assemblies, in committees or in places where we coordinate these things with delegates and speakers.

Cine Libre shares the same openness in its operating structure and tries to make sure that everyone in the group is in favour of the films before they decide to show them. There is also belief in the participation of the local community in its screenings. One of the organisers of Cine Libre, Patricio Peluca Lemos, said that he believed the space is for the people, for his mother, his girlfriend, his grandfather, for everyone.\footnote{Patricio Peluca Lemos, personal communication: interview, Buenos Aires, Argentina, 25 May 2007.}

Importantly, however, Grupo Chaski goes beyond merely inviting participation in the structure of the exhibition space. Kaspar explained his belief that the films which are shown, and the context in which they are shown, act as a base to encourage audience members to participate more fully in the larger practices of cinema.\footnote{Stefan Kaspar, personal communication: interview, Lima, Peru, 16 May, 2007.} He argued that the overwhelming nature of US films, with the large amount of resources put into them, leaves the spectator feeling small and unable to either participate in or produce films. Because Grupo Chaski provides films that are independent and often filmed on a very low budget, Kaspar is confident that audience members can see that the production of cinema does not have to involve huge costs and Hollywood-like levels of expertise. He believes that this factor acts as an incentive to stimulate spectators into producing their own ‘copy-cat’ work which is local in its production and engages with issues that are of importance to the communities in which the Microcines operate. The attempt to open production beyond the privileged minority who have the economic resources and technical tools to undertake cinema is another aspect of Grupo Chaski’s work which is in line with the original aims of the New Latin American Cinema movement. Practitioners advocated using a variety of tools and personnel to move cinema towards independent filmmaking that was not reliant upon
what they saw as a bourgeois capitalist and commercial ‘system’. In a statement originally published in 1962, Birri noted that

such a conception and practice of making films not with the resources one would like but with those which are possible, will determine a new kind of language, hopefully even a new style, the fruit of convergent economic and cultural necessity.

By providing films that act as a blueprint for successful low budget productions, Grupo Chaski encourages democratic film production, and in this way generates the potential for further agency amongst the audience groups that the Microcines work with. In a similar manner, América Libre and Cine Libre screen works from filmmakers in the region and allow their events to act as platforms for low budget film productions dealing with a variety of local concerns, normally political and socially engaging.

In discussing the debates around New German Cinema, Hansen notes that

…neither the so-called consumer-orientation of commercial film nor the emphatically independent stance of ‘art’ or auteur film acknowledge the participation of the spectator as the basis of their productions; they both fall short of creating a public sphere for and through the cinema.

Much of this statement remains relevant to South American cinema in the twenty-first century as the various state initiatives, commercial networks and altruistic interventions concentrate on the cultural product rather than its interaction with spectators. Contrasting this is the work of organisations such as Grupo Chaski, América Libre and Cine Libre that create space for a public sphere to operate through their exhibition events and also at the level of production.

Section 3: Internet Technology

Whereas the above mentioned exhibition spaces create public spheres at a local level, there are other formulations of the public sphere that work on a disembodied and geographically dispersed scale. With access to the internet rising towards the end of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first, online space has been
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proposed as the potential site for a new public sphere. Much critical work on this topic has uncovered the limitations of the internet in providing an effective political public sphere but there is, nonetheless, recognition that new technology and new spaces can create the conditions for public engagement. Important to this is Gitlin’s call for a dismantling of the singular public sphere in favour of public sphericules: ‘the diffusion of interactive technology surely enriches the possibilities for a plurality of publics— for the development of distinct groups organised around affinity and interest.’78 The operation of the South American alternative exhibition groups displays this tendency towards multiple public spheres on a micro level. Furthermore, the groups’ recognition of their place within a larger cultural sphere relating to cinema, suggests the potential for overlapping levels of public spheres. In a similar manner, the potential for publics to use piracy, the internet and communal cinema spaces for engagement in socio-political cultural practices means that the overlap between different public spheres continues. Taking this into consideration, I would like to turn to the way in which specific internet sites offer space for publics to engage with South American cinema and how these interlock with the wider public spheres involved in South American cinematic culture.

The two sites which offer the most extensive possibilities for online engagement with cinematic culture are Youtube.com and IMDB.com. Each site operates on a global scale and offers a significant platform for the dispersal of South American film content and information. Because they both offer significant levels of user-generated content, they tend to operate outside of state or industry controlled cinematic spaces. Furthermore, it is precisely because these online public spaces do not float free from the cinematic products which are offered in national and regionally specific locales, that they interact with a greater South American cinematic culture. Although some production companies are beginning to note the online voices that contribute to dialogue on film and have used their input in the creation of new works,79 the majority of production companies do not enter into a two-way dialogue and ‘fall short of

77 See for example Papacharissi , ‘The Virtual Sphere’; Poster, ‘Cyberdemocracy’; Dahlberg, ‘The Internet and Democratic Discourse’.
78 Gitlin, ‘Public Sphere or public sphericules?’ p.173.
creating a public sphere for and through the cinema’.\textsuperscript{80} In light of this, it is sites such as Youtube and IMDB which offer spectators the opportunity to reclaim their participation in cinema at a global level.

Although Youtube did not debut until 2005, by July 2006 its users were using the site to watch more than a million videos a day and these accounted for 60\% of all videos watched online.\textsuperscript{81} It has become notorious for quirky home videos and pirated film and television content yet its continued popularity, and the way in which it allows users to upload media content in an easy manner, means that it offers an important site for engaging with local cinematic cultures. Grupo Chaski has used it to promote its cinema projects, allowing audiences to interact with Grupo Chaski on a global as well as a local level.\textsuperscript{82} The most well known Grupo Chaski films, \textit{Gregorio} (1985) and \textit{Juliana} (1988) are available on the site (albeit in various segments) and underneath each video there is space for users to comment on the film. This promotes discussion amongst various Youtube users who may not be geographically linked but share an interest in the same cinematic material. There are other users in South America who upload short films and documentaries to the global community, such as Angel. R. Romero Pacheco and his company La Jirafe, Arte y Comunicaciones who have used Youtube to distribute a number of short documentaries on indigenous traditions in Peru.\textsuperscript{83} The discussion fields underneath these works show the scope of international and local engagement as comments vary between Spanish, Quechua and English.

Because videos on the site cannot be longer than 10 minutes in length, there is not the opportunity to present full length feature films on Youtube.\textsuperscript{84} Nevertheless, the site continues to offer the opportunity for users to engage in cinematic culture through the metacultural material it presents such as video trailers, individual scenes and other auxiliary material. Within a grey area of legality, this material is normally uploaded by everyday users of the site and represents public participation in determining which

\textsuperscript{80} Hansen, ‘Cooperative Auteur Cinema,’ p.40.
\textsuperscript{82} McClemen, ‘The Theory and Practice of the Peruvian Grupo Chaski’.
aspects of cinematic culture will be engaged with. The impact this can have was significant enough for the Chilean film council CALA to run an article on the decision to screen a trailer of the Chilean film *Malta con huevo* (2007) on Youtube. The producer of the film, Sebastián Varela explained that

> estar en You Tube es una forma de llegar a más personas, una herramienta mucho más masiva. Además, hay feedback con el público, porque el sitio te permite dejar comentarios, expresar si la sinopsis te gustó o no, y eso para nosotros es muy importante.  

*to be on Youtube is a way of accessing more people, a much greater tool. Furthermore, there is feedback with the public because the site allows people to leave comments, express whether or not they liked the trailer, and for us this is very important.*

The fact that Youtube is available on a worldwide scale also allows audiences the possibility of by-passing the various territory agreements which restrict the global flow of commercial film. The Argentine/Peruvian *Chica tu madre* (2006) was given a certain degree of circulation when it was presented at film festivals in Europe and Latin America but was not distributed commercially outside of South America. Foreign audiences have no official means of accessing this film but because Youtube users have uploaded the trailer for the film, there is the possibility of accessing a part of the film that is not made available in other arenas.

At the same time, the circulation of images on Youtube often reflects the global circulation of media flows offline. Cinema products that are supported by large industries within the infrastructure of developed nations, often garner more coverage and attention. CALA and Sebastián Varela were right to enthuse about the possibilities offered by Youtube as *Malta con Huevo’s* trailer received 870 views by July 24th 2007, 19 days after it had been posted online. However, this pales in comparison with the *Live Free or Die Hard* (2007) exclusive trailer which received 967,000 views between July 21st and July 24th. Because the users of Youtube interact with the metacultural flows that exist in the offline world, the expensive marketing campaigns employed by Hollywood and other large production companies feed into heightened popularity on sites such as Youtube. Smaller film cultures such as those in South America have to rely, instead, on a word-of-mouth flow for film culture to spread on this site.

On the Internet Movie Database (IMDB) site, there is a slightly different relationship between cinematic culture and participating audiences. The main body of IMDB consists of small datasets on feature films, shorts and television programs which are then linked together to form a larger database. Begun by movie fans in 1990, IMDB was bought over by the Amazon Company in 1998. The information in the database, mainly provided by film industry workers and other personnel, is given an authentic status by the employees of IMDB who process and upload the information. The main information on the site is thus provided through an authoritative body. However, there is also a significant amount of user generated content provided in the message boards attached to each page and it is within these spaces that public engagement begins. Although the internet has created various opportunities for audiences to come together to discuss films, these are often based in fan sites that create specific communities relating to individual films, directors or actors. Other sites rarely have the wide ranging scope that IMDB has, nor do they bring together the same mass of data that has allowed IMDB to become the de facto film encyclopedia. The database also attaches permanence to films by allowing information on films to exist side by side in horizontal relationships without preference given to newer additions.

Research into on-line fandom often looks at the interaction between specific on-line groups and their preferred media, as an online community forming process. Often in relation to television, rather than film audiences, this research provides detailed analysis of how users interact in the ‘virtual’ world rather than how they represent voices participating in a public sphere that is made through relations with the off-line world. An area in current need of attention is the question of how on-line sites such as IMDB can be used by spectators to position themselves in relation to an external cinematic culture, particularly when this ties in with perceived national and regionally bound identities that exist off-line.

Due to the fact any registered user may log-in and post a message, reply to a thread or continue a discussion, the message boards act as a somewhat democratic space. Normally the message boards centre on films that users have seen (either in the cinema or at home) or that they have knowledge of due to metacultural material such as trailers, reviews and advertising. When users write their voices into the site they undertake a Bakhtian dialogic orientation:

The living utterance, having taken meaning and shape at a particular historical moment in a socially specific environment, cannot fail to brush up against thousands of living dialogic threads, woven by social-ideological consciousness around the given object of an utterance; it cannot fail to become an active participant in social dialogue.88

Each person speaks as a member of IMDB, reflecting the opinions and voices of previous threads and comments. But they also speak as a member of an external community, bringing in reference to the way their lived experience forms their interaction with the filmic material discussed. Rather than creating an internal community confined to the space of IMDB (as happens with many other online sites89), the message boards offer a public sphere of voices that speak for and about an external situation.

With regards to South American cinematic culture, the message boards often provide an insider opinion on the cinematic culture of their country. Discussing Fuga (2006) one user, Carnosaurio, states that

si la gente apoyara cualquier porqueria que sea cine chileno claramente vamos a surgir, pero que calidad de cine vamos a estar mostrando afuera?, esta pelicula es una basura, los chilenos somos capaces de mucho más.90

If the public support whatever junk because it is Chilean cinema then clearly we are going to continue ahead but what quality of cinema are we going to show abroad? This film is rubbish, Chileans are capable of much more.

The personal tone of the statement suggests a Chilean member of IMDB that not only has an opinion on a national film but sees him/herself as part of a collective cinematic culture.

89 See Baym, ‘Tune In, Log On’.
Following a debate about whether or not *Dias de Santiago* (2004) sufficiently represented Peru a number of comments arose including:

Edwin_fh: I'm from Peru as well but I think this movie try to show a part of the big problem in Peru and specific in Lima, unfortunatelly the economic in Peru is so bad, and the social problems are big, This movie show a part of the social life and some real sites of the capital of Peru: Lima [sic].91

Rodrigodlcf: yo tambien soy de peru compatriotas amantes del cine unamones en el imdb, es cierto lo que dices, realmente esta pelilcula no imita el neorrealismo italiano sino mas bien es el realismo limeño unico y caracteristico!92

I am also from Peru. Compatriots, lovers of cinema, lets unite on imdb, it’s certain what you say, actually this film does not imitate Italian neo-realism but better than this is the realism from Lima: unique and characteristic!

Sabes_90013: Soy peruano y, sinceramente, ya estoy cansado de que las peliculas peruanas muestren con cara larga la "cruda realidad de nuestra sociedad". Inventen algo diferente porfavor!! Algo menos machista, mas cómico y menos DRAMA!!93

I am Peruvian and, sincerely, I am tired of the Peruvian films that show, with a long face, the "crude reality of our society." Invent something different please!! Something less macho, more comic and less DRAMA!!.

Within the debate on *Dias de Santiago* were a number of opinions but many, like the ones above, took the personal tone of speaking from within a certain culture, while simultaneously presenting a relationship to it.

The debates on *Fuga* and *Dias de Santiago*, talk unequivocally of the films as national products but there are other message board debates which question easy demarcation. The Argentina, Mexico, Peru and USA coproduction *La mujer de mi hermano* (2005) has a post that begins with the heading ‘This movie is Peruvian not Mexican’.94 The user who began the discussion thread, Slipk505, put forward the case that, ‘there are Mexicans and Peruvian actors but the story is based on the book of Peruvian Jaime Bayly. The director is peruvian also.’ This was quickly refuted by a number of comments such as Rraffor’s claim that

92 IMDB, ‘Board: Dias de Santiago’.
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La prodecencia de una película es determinada por la prodecencia del capital que se invierte para realizarla. El capital de esta película es de México.95

The origin of a film is determined by the capital invested in it to make it. The capital for this film is from Mexico.

Another member, Cgreene-3 displayed detailed knowledge of the film’s production when suggesting that there was no one country of origin for the film:

El director es peruano, igual que un protagonista y el otro es colombiano, sin embargo los 2 interpretan a Mexicanos, las actrices son mexicanas, la historia está ambientada en México, y fue filmada íntegramente en Santiago de Chile.96

The director is Peruvian, so is the protagonist and the other is Colombian, but without doubt they play Mexicans, the actresses are Mexicans, the story is based in Mexico and it was filmed in Santiago de Chile.

Within the discussion there was no easy agreement to be reached but there was the possibility for members to outline how they understand cinematic cultures working, as representational and industrial.

At times the debates focus on the quality of the films, their form and means of expression. At other times there is a concern with how the films represent a certain society that the IMDB members claim as their own. On the message boards for La niña santa (2004) a message thread by Iluvlex begins, ‘This movie doesn’t represent the Argentine Society’.97 There follows a discussion in which members debate not only which parts of Argentina the film does or does not represent but also whether or not it is the duty of the film to represent certain aspects of the country. Frequently, members invoke their own nationality, and the specific social situation in which they see themselves existing, as a means to add authenticity or weight to their argument.

One of the most significant aspects of the message board debates is that there is rarely a full consensus of opinion. This facet reveals spectatorship as an uneven process of identification and misidentification with what is seen on screen, particularly when members position themselves within a specific national or regional cinematic culture. Furthermore, the lack of consensus within the debates, the broad topics and opinions that are brought in, along with the political undertones that often underline the various threads, move the discussions towards the types of debate that practitioners such as
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Solanas and Getino were looking for in the *filme-acto*. While groups such as América Libre, Cine Libre and Grupo Chaski attempt to promote these debates in local community settings, IMDB offers space for these debates to take place on a global scale, albeit in a delayed and more temporally dispersed manner. And even though these debates occur on-line, and seemingly away from the ‘real world’, this does not mean to say that they are not connected to social events and actions. Although online users often show strong affinities with their online networks and may classify these communities as part of their identity, this does not necessarily erase the local. As Thompson points out:

> the appropriation of media products is always a localized phenomenon, in the sense that it always involves specific individuals who are situated in particular social-historical contexts, and who draw on the resources available to them in order to make sense of media messages and incorporate them into their lives.

The same can be said of images and messages that originate online as they still carry with them references to and engagement with lived experiences off-line.

At the same time, the extent to which Youtube and IMDB offer public spheres is conditioned by the ongoing problem of unequal access. They open up public spheres for those that are connected to fast internet (Youtube) or are literate in English webpage navigation (IMDB). Gitlin makes the point that:

> technology, in other words, aggravates a certain class division – the division between the political class and the rest. The global – even national – village turns out to have two tiers. Such segmentation casts doubt upon the feasibility of a unitary public sphere – even reduces the hope to a pale nostalgia.

There is thus a situation whereby engagement in these public spheres is restricted by problems of access that mirrors the lack of access certain South American publics have to formal sites of cinematic culture such as the multiplex and DVD sales points.

**Section 4: Different Voices**

The potential for technology to allow the development and evolution of the public sphere(s) is not confined to the criss-crossing of debate at the macro levels of the national, international and inter-regional. Hansen highlighted this aspect when she
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uncovered the way in which cinema technology during the early cinema era allowed an alternative public sphere to operate at a very local level.\(^{101}\) It is technological developments which have facilitated the exhibition and communication strategies that are critical for the alternative public spheres created by groups such as Grupo Chaski, América Libre and Cine Libre. In a similar way, technology has often been understood as a key facilitator for allowing disenfranchised groups in South America to find a voice within an audiovisual capacity. Aufderheide notes that, following the proliferation of VHS players in the 1980s and 1990s, there was a boom in video production at the amateur level which was often associated with politically or socially motivated causes.\(^{102}\) Video production became important in indigenous communities for education and as a means to put expression into the hands of the subjects taking part. As mentioned in Chapter Five, indigenous communities were typically placed on film by the ethnographic researcher in the twentieth century, but by the 1970s indigenous people were increasingly taking the camera into their own hands to produce images belonging to themselves.\(^{103}\) Much of this was aided by the fact that both video cameras and reproduction devices, such as VHS, were cheap enough to be made accessible to groups who were more commonly peripheral to technological development.

Although technology has effectively allowed the production and exchange of marginalised and periphery cultures’ audiovisual forms, there is a question concerning the extent to which these forms develop into a significant part of the public sphere, that overlaps with political aims, or whether ‘public sphericules’ develop that continue to be marginalised from other, dominant public spheres. Hartley and McKee have developed the notion of an Indigenous Public Sphere that creates space for issues concerning indigenous subjects but can also reach out through global networks to connect indigenous subjects in different geographical locations. They explain that the concept of the ‘Indigenous Public Sphere’ is intended to describe the highly mediated public ‘space’ for developing notions of Indigeneity, and putting them into work in organizing and governing the unpredictable immediacy of everyday events.\(^{104}\)

\(^{101}\) Hansen, *Babel and Babylon*.
\(^{102}\) Aufderheide, ‘Grassroots Video in Latin America’.
\(^{104}\) Hartley and McKee, *The Indigenous Public Sphere*, p. 3.
Audiovisual communication plays a significant part in their Indigenous Public Sphere and helps move representations of indigenous subjects away from disenfranchised margins and into a space where their cultural, social and political beliefs can be expressed. In South America this Indigenous Public Sphere appears to exist through a number of communication networks, particularly those using the internet, such as the Mapuche International Link concerning the major indigenous group in Chile and Argentina\(^{105}\) or the Quechua Network that works with indigenous peoples in the Andean regions\(^{106}\). To what extent, then, do cinematic works that form a part of this Indigenous Public Sphere overlap with other public spheres created through and facilitated by cinema in South America?

As mentioned before, Jorge Sanjines was one of the most renowned cinema practitioners to bring indigenous identity to the big screen in South America with his work in the late 1960s, 1970s and 1980s.\(^{107}\) Indigenous people in South America had previously been represented in the cinema: the Cuzco school made documentaries about Quechuan life in Peru\(^{108}\) and many earlier Bolivian feature films focused on or included indigenous characters.\(^{109}\) However, Sanjines captured critical acclaim for his attempts to uncover and reveal the social concerns of indigenous populations in South America through methods that interacted with their own cultural forms and subjectivity. Although he was an outsider to the communities he filmed, Sanjines has been given credit for involving indigenous peoples in his filmmaking process. His earliest films had focused on campesinos (peasants) and self-reflection in the 1970s led him to realise that there was a need for a different cinematic language\(^{110}\) that involved not only a new type of aesthetic but a new way of transferring meaning through the link between cinematic form and cultural expression. He found


\(^{108}\) Shohat and Stam, Unthinking Eurocentricism; King, Magical Reels.

\(^{109}\) Schnitman, Film Industries in Latin America; Himpele, Circuits of Culture.

\(^{110}\) Sanjines, ‘Bolivia,’ p. 31.
a film about the people made by a screenwriter isn’t the same as a film made by the people through a screenwriter, inasmuch as the interpreter and translator of that people becomes their expressive vehicle.  

His primary concern was that simply showing indigenous subjects was not enough; the only way to ensure that the traditions and cultures of indigenous groups were expressed was through the involvement of local community members in the creative stages of production. Thus, later films such as *El enemigo principal* (1973) included Quechua-Aymara oral traditions to inform the narrative structure.

Sanjines’ work has, to some extent, been carried on by his son Ivan Sanjines the founder of CEFREC. Himpele write of CEFREC’s film projects thus:

> Just as indigenous political movements are indigenizing popular politics and the state’s relation to transnational corporations, video makers are indigenizing popular culture and media with their own transcontinental networks, opening new venues for cultural representation in national and international channels of distribution.

Since 1991, CEFREC has produced more than 100 works, operating closely with members of indigenous communities to train them as filmmakers in their own right. The support they receive from UNESCO and other organisations such as the Native Networks media site based in the US allows them to develop transnational and regional links, connecting their work to other Indigenous Public Spheres. They also work with CLACPI, a Latin American organisation of independent filmmakers that specifically supports indigenous filmmaking across the region. At the same time, it is worth considering the fact that CEFREC mainly makes short films and, since the work of Sanjines, there have been few full length feature films that appear to involve indigenous community members producing agency through their own cinematic work.

This facet of production can be seen across South America and was visible in two events taking place simultaneously in Santiago during 2008. From October 28 to 31, the Muestra Cine y Video de Realizadores Indigenas: El Universo Audiovisual de los
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111 Sanjines, ‘Problems of Form and Content in Revolutionary Cinema,’ p.63.
112 Sanjines, ‘Language and Popular Culture’.
113 Freya, ‘Indigenous Media’.
Pueblos Indígenas (Exhibition of Indigenous Filmmakers’ Cinema and Video: The Audiovisual Universe of the Indigenous Peoples) took over the Centro Cultural de España (Spanish Cultural Centre) in the city centre. Organised by CLACPI and the Grupo de Estudios y Comunicacion Mapuche Lulul Mawidha (Mapuche Lulul Mawidha Studies and Communications Group), the daily events were a selection of the films exhibited in the IX Festival de Cine y Video de los Pueblos Indigenas (IX Cinema and Video Festival of Indigenous Peoples) which took place in Bolivia in September 2008. This cinema and video festival began in 1985 and continues to be one of the most extensive sites for showing indigenous audiovisual works across the region. Using works from the festival, the exhibition in Santiago included a number of short fictional films, and documentaries. While the use of experimental forms and fiction in some of the works, such as the short films Che Uñüm (2008) and Perimontun (2008), developed interesting forms of agency, these forms were not extended into feature-film length works.

At the same time in Santiago, another program of indigenous films was taking place: the Cine + Video de Pueblos Indígenas Latinoamericanos (Cinema and Video from Latin American Indigenous Peoples), sponsored by UNESCO, the National Council for Culture and Arts, and the National Museum of the American Indian. The event took place across a number of venues from the Universidad Católica and the Cineteca Nacional to the Chilean Museum for Pre-Colombian Art before continuing on to other sites across Chile. In the press notes, the organisers stated that

Las exhibiciones en estas 3 salas simultáneas y su itinerancia al Norte y Sur del país vienen a crear un espacio propicio para difundir los valores, las problemáticas y las formas de vida de los pueblos indígenas latinoamericanos desde su propia visión. La muestra también busca el reconocimiento de la producción audiovisual indígena en otras sociedades y la visualización de los diversos procesos de comunicación indígena que se están dando desde la voz de sus propios protagonistas.117

The simultaneous screenings in these three sites and the itinerary from the North to the South of the country will create a favourable space for disseminating the values, the difficulties and the forms of life in Latin American indigenous communities from their own point of view. The exhibition also seeks to recognise indigenous audiovisual production in other societies and the visualisation of the diverse processes of indigenous communication that come from the voices of their own protagonists.

As with the other event, all films were short and medium length feature films or documentaries. There is thus a question to be asked about why the feature-length format is not being used in the production of indigenous audiovisual images and the implications this has for their part in wider cinematic cultures. Furthermore, the spaces in which these events took place were commonly museums and cultural centres, suggesting that there are different exhibition circuits in which audiovisual material of this kind circulates.

The extent to which these works can exist autonomously and outside a dependency on aid-orientated organisations such as UNESCO is a question introduced by Torrico, Gomez and Herrera when they discuss the Bolivian context. They make the point that

> los productores de este circuito aseguran que las ONGs no han desarrollado un política que incluya a la producción de video dentro una lógica comercial que permita un grado de autofinanciamiento o autogestión.\(^{118}\)

> the producers of this circuit make sure that the NGOs have not developed a policy that will include the production of video inside a commercial infrastructure that permits a degree of self-financing or self-management.

Although an aid-orientated approach is useful in supporting filmmakers, it seems to restrict peripheral communities to separate public spheres and thus has certain limitations. This point is very much in line with the comments I made about UNESCO in Chapter Five: that it is often confining production and distribution rather than opening it up to fruitful collaboration.

Related to these issues is the fact that members of indigenous and peripheral communities are often vocal in explaining that they do not want to participate in separate public spheres. The continued problem of the access indigenous peoples have to cultural spheres, such as cinema, is an issue which flared up during the 2007 Film Festival of Lima. The festival employed the publicity agency Toronja Comunicaciones to design its annual poster and the agency complied with a picture of numerous people queuing to buy tickets at the box-office. During the festival, however, Alfredo Vanini, a programmer for the National Library, gave an interview in which he began by discussing the participation of the National Library in the festival

\(^{118}\) Torrico, Gomez and Herrera, *Industrias Culturales*, p.74.
and the issues of whether or not Cholos (roughly translated as poorer, darker skinned or indigenous people) went to the cinema. He moved on to analysing the poster with the firm declaration that ‘el afiche del festival es racista’ (the poster for the festival is racist). Vanini explained how each person standing in line had light skinned, European features more common to people in Argentina than in Peru. He then explained that there was only one person in the poster that appeared to have dark feature and that this person, ‘El mestizo [...], que representa noventa por ciento de la población de este país esta dando la espalda al cine.’ (The mestizo – person of mixed European and indigenous heritage – [...] that represents ninety percent of the population in this country is turning his back to cinema.) Vanini noted that this is symbolic of the attitude towards the poorer, mestizo and indigenous people where cinema is concerned: that they have no relationship with cinema and there is no need to include them.

The interview prompted wide spread debate across Peruvian blogs and the Youtube page on which the interview was hosted. Some comments stated that the issue had
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120 Youtube, ‘Festival de Lima’.
been over-exaggerated while others were in agreement with Vanini that the poster was deeply racist. Toronja Comunicaciones responded with their assertion that the poster should not be understood as racist but should nonetheless raise awareness of a difficult situation in Peru.\textsuperscript{121} Other bloggers and internet users added to the debate with comments ranging from the feeling that they had been personally offended to the belief that racism and marginalisation were institutionalised in Peru and thus unchangeable. Although no consensus was reached amongst the various debates, the poster did raise the issue that certain (somewhat large) sections of the population are excluded from participation in an active cinematic culture. This issue is mirrored by the fact that in Argentina, Bolivia, Chile and Peru, cinematic activity, whether production or cinema-going, tends to be centralised within the major cities and marginalisation of external locations takes place. Because many indigenous cultural forms are at their strongest in rural locations, where indigenous traditions and native languages have been maintained, they are isolated and marginalised from their countries’ central cinema hubs.

This marginalisation is sometimes played upon in films that acknowledge the distance between the metropolis and the cultures that exist outside of them. In \textit{Una estrella y dos cafés} (2006), the protagonist, Carlos, is from Buenos Aires but faces a traditional problem of the city dweller: of being the outsider when entering rural space. In this case the plot focuses on his attempts to construct houses in the remote area of Jujuy which are then thwarted by the villagers lack of respect or attention to the city-created ‘laws’ of inheritance rights. One of the villagers, Tomas, cannot explain where the legal limits of the terrain in the valley are which suggests a rural lack of understanding of, or lack of necessity for, the boundaries and limits that have physical presence in the city. The rural is thus constructed as a place outside certain laws, an aspect which is then conflated with modes of indigeneity. The different cultural make-up of the villagers is apparent in comparison with the Porteños (Buenos Aires people) who are represented by Carlos and his classically Spanish looking wife: there is a subtle but notable ethnic division as all of the Juyjuy inhabitants are of darker, indigenous features. The ethnic mix is sometimes used for comic effect such as when Carlos asks

if Tomas is speaking Quechua but the young girl who befriends him, Estela, replies that he is only speaking ‘castellano borracho’ (*drunk Spanish*). Later, when Carlos and Estela are on top of the hill, Estela makes a joke about the expectations placed upon her community by feigning fright that the photo Carlos wants to take will steal her soul. To counteract the stereotypes associated with the indigenous, such as the one that Estela highlights in this instance, the camera shows a certain amount of respect to tradition through its focus on the coca leaves that Estela’s grandfather, and many indigenous communities in South America, use. At the same time, there are reverse expectations as Estela asks Carlos if he knows how to dance the tango. Carlos replies that he is not of that generation. Later, there is a gentle approach to this cultural divide when Estela asks which is better, ‘here or Buenos Aires’ to which Carlos replies ‘neither’

To some extent, the cultural divide presented within the content of a film such as this mirrors the divide that exist in the cinematic cultures of the region, an aspect highlighted by the Lima festival poster debate. The attitude, created symbolically on screen, is that the problem of marginalisation of certain peoples is so entrenched that the issue can only be highlighted and explored, rather than overcome, through cinematic and extra-textual discourse. It is for this reason that the work of bodies such as CEFREC in Bolivia and Grupo Chaski in Peru continue to be significant to the region. Organisations such as these attempt to transfer the balance of agency into the hands of people in marginalised communities so that a cinematic culture can be produced which is based in the community rather than in relation to ‘civilization’ as represented by the metropolitan cities. Stam finds that

> within indigenous media the producers are themselves the receivers, along with neighbouring communities and, occasionally distant cultural institutions or festivals such as the Native American film festivals held in New York and San Francisco [...] At their best, indigenous media become an empowering vehicle for communities struggling against geographical displacement, ecological and economic deterioration, and cultural annihilation.122

Although there is an on-going issue whereby indigenous media is confined to limited distribution circuits, in 2008 the Cinemateca Boliviana screened films that had played at the 8th Internacional Cinema and Video Festival of the Indigenous People in Mexico 2006. Included in the program were films from various indigenous
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communities across Latin America. Using the cinemateca, the films played in a space which brings together the cinematic culture of the country: the cinemateca screens the majority of domestic films and a selection of popular foreign films including Hollywood hits. The films were thus made available to a wider audience than the producers/receivers Stam discusses and, in this way, the indigenous public sphere was able to overlap with other public spheres. Nevertheless, it is worth remembering that the Cinemateca is government funded and a non-commercial organisation. There are few commercial spaces in South America that are able to incorporate the alternative public spheres created throughout the region.

**Conclusion**

Many of the above mentioned activities and processes are explicitly illegal (piracy) or exist in liminal spaces where their legality is a grey area (América Libre and Cine Libre). At other times, there are practices and sites that are entirely lawful (Grupo Chaski, Youtube and IMDB). Nonetheless, the common theme connecting them is that they offer points of engagement between the public and cinema in South America that are outside the formally sanctioned nodes of contact provided by film industries and official organisations. In the case of indigenous groups’ film production and distribution, it is not so much that their practices are unsanctioned but that they are often marginalised to the extent that they operate at a level which precludes their access to wider spheres of cinematic culture. In their various ways, each of the above-mentioned activities creates a type of public sphere and the engagement created within these public spheres often offers a greater, democratic, access to cinematic culture than that which is presented by state institutions, commercial bodies or international organisations.

In line with the developments that have helped commercial circuits of South American film, technological advances have been instrumental in allowing low-level production, distribution and exhibition groups to provide access to cinema. Piracy networks and exhibition groups provide cinematic works in a manner that sometimes mirrors film industry processes while at other times provide completely different modes of experience. Other technological developments such as those leading to the databases and media sites available online have been able to provide new means of
engaging with a locally based cinematic culture even when working at a geographically dispersed level.

Nonetheless, these practices remain marginal or outside of those sanctioned by formal organisations and this can lead to their exclusion from wider fields of cinematic culture. More often that not, these activities have some kind of overlap with national and regional cinematic culture. In the case of the internet sites, users acknowledge and reference their participation in local cinematic culture while piracy depends upon customers coming into contact with metacultural discourse that will inform their decision to purchase a film. However, the potential for overlap is frequently diminished when the authorities attempt to prevent activities from taking place or a self-confinement takes place (particularly when indigenous media practice is segregated). These factors do not prevent the alternative practices from forming a vital and extensive part of South American cinematic culture but this situation does mean that they may be under-acknowledged in official discourse. The extent to which alternative practices will continue to operate may depend on whether certain activities become absorbed into mainstream cinematic practice – supported by film industries and formal organisations – or whether rules and policy concerning the distributing of film content will become further regulated to the point that these practices cease to operate.
Conclusion

The various institutions, organisations and practices that have been discussed throughout this thesis come together to form a network of interlocking interests that have formal and informal, authorised and unauthorised attributes that are all closely connected. It would be impossible for a film produced in South America to reach audiences without negotiating various aspects of this network and, in many cases, films become part of a long-lasting cinematic culture through their participation in the network at a number of different stages. An example of this would be a film that interacts with the state when applying for funding, receives support from an international body for post-production and distribution, enters the commercial sphere’s exhibition sites, finds itself circulated through pirate practices, engages with a public sphere during internet debate and is finally reclaimed by the state during heritage drives that give it a place in the cinemateca.

Each of these processes has been discussed in detail as they are all influential in generating a systematic, yet fluctuating, cinematic culture which determines the strength and visibility of South American cinema practice. The cinematic culture is systematic due to the fact that flows and circuits created by state and institutional involvement; commercial bodies; international interests; and alternative practices are well-worn paths that determine the mobility of films. At the same time, cinematic culture in the region fluctuates due to the fact these various interests gain or lose prominence at different times. For example, state intervention in Peruvian cinema failed to have an impact for a number of years because Conacine was not given much-needed funds by the government. By 2008, however, Conacine’s president, Rosa Maria Oliart, was securing year-on-year increases in funding and thus enhancing state influence on cinema practice.¹ Another example would be the fact that piracy offers strong modes of alternative distribution but the combined efforts of the commercial sector and state agencies can limit its impact.

Throughout the processes mentioned above there is a flux between reterritorialization and deterritorialization due to the fact national, regional and global contexts

¹ El Comercio, ‘Aumenta el presupuesto’
simultaneously exist. With regards to the national context, specific programs by state organisations such as funding initiatives and heritage drives were most clearly outlined in Chapter Three. At the same time, external interests such as film festivals, international funding bodies and internet discussion boards frequently play their own part in reinscribing national determinants. Complicating this situation, a regional context sometimes presides over the national due to press and marketing that claims a South American or Latin American framework and it is a factor that is supported by organisations such as CAACI and Recam or through programs such as Ibermedia. Nevertheless, state organisations and filmmakers are often able to retain a national context within the larger regional structures. In a similar way, the commercial circuit discussed in Chapter Four has the greatest power to deterritorialize film products by moving them into global flows yet the metacultural discourse that accompanies these flows rarely erases the domestic origin of the films. Frequently these contexts are undercut by indigenous film practice that suggests a national, regional or global context yet one that is at the margins of mainstream practice.

These factors point to the fact a nuanced approach must be undertaken when understanding the way national, regional and global factors converge with regards to twenty-first century South American cinema. It is an aspect that has been illuminated through the use of transculturation to understand the complex processes that take place when different cultural modes come together. Chapter Five dealt specifically with processes of transculturation by looking at coproductions, international film festivals and funding bodies yet the work on indigenous film practice throughout the thesis also highlighted the way transculturation within individual nations takes place through the interaction between dominant and peripheral cultural modes.

The concept of the public sphere also made it clear that each of these processes is not confined to the inner workings of the cinematic text but instead gain importance when they engage the films, filmmakers, policy-makers and other agents with the active audiences that make use of cinematic culture in the region. Issues of public access to discourse on South American cinema were emphasised in Chapter Six but they were also highlighted throughout the various points made about commercial exhibition and cinematic heritage. Furthermore, investigation into these areas brought about some
significant answers to the question of the type of access that South American publics have to their local cinematic culture.

In the first instance, enhanced state support has meant an increase in film production which, in turn, has meant that more South American films are entering commercial distribution circuits and are thus available to audiences. This situation is complemented by international funds and even the film festivals that help to promote films and increase distribution. Improved facilities and funding for cinematecas have meant greater access to cinematic history while grass-roots organisations have been able to bring about alternative modes of engaging with local films. They are aided by technological developments such as screening technology and the internet that make it easier for publics to gain more direct contact with cinematic culture. However, these celebratory accounts need to be tempered by an overview of the private sector that still dominates much cinematic practice in the region. Increasingly, commercial movie-theatres exclude poorer communities from access to cinema and there is still preference given to foreign imports rather than local films. There is also the fact that audiences are gaining better access to certain types of South American films, particularly the arthouse films supported by international organisations, but a cinematic culture that truly represents the diversity on the continent has not yet been achieved.

These factors lead on to the question concerning the types of discourses and conditions that are applied when various organisations and institutions have an input into the region’s cinematic culture. The state frequently seeks some kind of national exposure while region-wide bodies such as Recam, CAACI and Ibermedia prefer to strengthen the Iberoamerican framework of cinematic practice. These desires have an effect on the kind of cinematic practice that is encouraged but they also come up against the desires of a private sector which places strong emphasis on economic returns. As was demonstrated in Chapter Five, international organisations that are altruistic by nature also place certain conditions on cinematic practice and this can have an effect on the films that enter the region’s cinematic culture.

The fact that these are often competing desires leads to a situation in which the various institutions and organisations do not always work together. Their practices
and programs intersect but it is the conflict between them which adds to the richness of the cinematic culture. There is not one force or agent within South America that has control over the region’s cinematic practice but the state, commercial, international and alternative organisations combine in a manner that allows a complex and fully rounded cinematic culture to develop. It has been useful to situate the processes taking place at the beginning of the twenty-first century within an historical trajectory so that their relationship to past and present cinematic practice can be understood. However, it is only through an overview of the region, and by comparing significant national contexts within this region, that it is possible to fully comprehend the interlocking nature of these interests and the effects they have.
### Appendix A: Coproductions

#### Section 1: Coproductions with multiple national content:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title &amp; Year</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Main National Locations Portrayed in Film</th>
<th>Main Nationality of Characters in Film</th>
<th>Countries involved in co-producing Film</th>
<th>Companies and Institutions involved in Film production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Visa (2005)</td>
<td>Juan Carlos Valdivia (Bolivian)</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Bolivian, North American</td>
<td>Bolivia, Mexico</td>
<td>IMCINE, Oscar Quintela, Producciones X Marca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicha tu madre (2006)</td>
<td>Gianfranco Quattrini (Peruvian)</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Peruvian, Argentine</td>
<td>Argentina, Peru</td>
<td>Primi Quattrini, BD Cine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependencia sexual (2003)</td>
<td>Rodrigo Bellot (Bolivian)</td>
<td>Bolivia, USA</td>
<td>Bolivian, Colombian, North American</td>
<td>Bolivia, USA</td>
<td>BoSD films, Bods films</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarios de motocicleta (2004)</td>
<td>Walter Salles (Brazilian)</td>
<td>Argentina, Chile, Peru, Bolivia</td>
<td>Argentine</td>
<td>Argentina, Chile, Cuba, Germany, Mexico, UK, USA, Peru, France</td>
<td>FilmFour, South Fork Pictures, Southfork Pictures, Tu Vas Voir Productions, BD Cine, Inca Films S.A., Sahara Films, Senator Film Produktion GmbH, Sound for Film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di buen dia a papa (2005)</td>
<td>Fernando Vargas (Mexican)</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Argentine Brazilian, Chilean, European</td>
<td>Argentina, Bolivia, Cuba</td>
<td>INCAA Matanza Cine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuga (2006)</td>
<td>Pablo Larraín (Chilean)</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Chilean, Argentine</td>
<td>Chile, Argentina</td>
<td>Primer Plano, Fabula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokas (2008)</td>
<td>Gonzalo Justiniano (Chilean)</td>
<td>Chile, Mexico</td>
<td>Chilean, Mexican</td>
<td>Chile, Mexico, France</td>
<td>Banco Estado, CORFO, Sahara Films, Bastidas Cinecorp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Source: Internet Movie Database
## Section 2: Coproductions with single national content:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title &amp; Year</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Main National Locations Portrayed in Film</th>
<th>Main Nationality of Characters in Film</th>
<th>Countries involved in co-producing Film</th>
<th>Companies and Institutions involved in Film production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cachimba (2004)</td>
<td>Silvio Caiozzi (Chilean)</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Chilean</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El bonaerense (2002)</td>
<td>Pablo Trapero (Argentine)</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Argentine</td>
<td>Argentina, Chile, France, Netherland</td>
<td>Andres Wood Producciones, CNC, Ibermedia, INCAA, Pablo Trapero Productions, Pol-Ka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Source buenaondafilms.com
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Co-Country</th>
<th>Producciones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La nana (2009)</td>
<td>Sebastián Silva (Chilean)</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Forastero Tiburon Filmes Punto Guion Punto Producciones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonera (2008)</td>
<td>Pablo Trapero (Argentine)</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Matanza Cine Patagonik Film Group, Cineclick Asia, Video Filmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machuca (2004)</td>
<td>Andrés Wood (Chilean)</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Wood Producciones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeinusa</td>
<td>Claudia Llosa (Peruvian)</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>Oyeron Cinematografica, Vela Producciones, Wanda Vision SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The films listed above represent a cross-section of films produced in Argentina, Bolivia, Chile and Peru. Some have had more success internationally than others while some have had more success in the domestic market. Each of the films has been chosen because it has had some degree of commercial exhibition. In the first group, each film has been chosen because there is a more obvious suggestion of transnational interaction evident in the content of the film. In the second group, each film has been chosen because its content suggests to the spectator that the film is from one national location. The tables are only a snapshot and could be extended to include the nationality of the actors and other production staff.
Appendix B: International Funding Given to Argentine, Bolivian, Chilean and Peruvian Films

**Hubert Bals**

2005
- Agua y sal – Alejo H. Taube, Argentina
- Dioses – Josué Mendez, Peru
- Liverpool – Lisandro Alonso, Argentina
- Primaveral crecimiento cosechante prueba – Alejandro Hartmann, Argentina
- Verano – José Luis Torres Leiva, Chile
- El custodio – Rodrigo Moreno, Argentina
- Glue – Alexis Dos Santos, Argentina
- Play – Alicia Scherson, Chile

2006
- La sangre brota – Pablo Fendrik, Argentina
- Una semana solos – Celina Murga, Argentina
- El otro – Ariel Rotter, Argentina
- Network Of Microcinemas – Stefan Kaspar, Peru
- Ausencias- Milagros Mumenthaler, Argentina
- Las cenizas - Raúl Del Busto, Peru
- Ganges - Ernesto Baca, Argentina

2007
- Las malas intenciones – Rosario Garcia Montero, Peru
- Yo me llamo, historias de call centre – Rubén Plataneo, Argentina
- El cielo, la tierra, y la lluvia – Jose Luis Torres Leiva, Chile
- Ocaso – Théo Jose Court, Chile

**World Cinema Fund**

2005
- El custodio – Rodrigo Moreno, Argentina
- El otro - Ariel Rotter, Argentina
- Las vidas posibles – Sandra Gugliotta, Argentina
- El abrazo partido – Daniel Burman, Argentina
- Bombón el perro - Carlos Soria, Argentina
- Días de Santiago - Josue Mendez, Peru

2006
- El cielo, la tierra y la lluvia - Jose Luis Torres Leiva, Chile
- Dioses Dioses – Josué Mendez, Peru
- Huacho - Alejandro Fernandez Almendras, Chile
- Liverpool - Lisandro Alonso, Argentina
- La teta asustada – Claudia Llosa, Peru
- Madeinusa– Claudia Llosa, Peru
- El viento – Eduardo Mignogna

2007
- Agua y sal Argentina - Alejo H. Taube, Argentina
- La león – Santiago Otheguy, Argentina
Cine en Construccion

2005
La demolición - Marcelo Mangone, Argentina
Monobloc - Luis Ortega, Argentina
El rey de San Gregorio - Alfonso Gazitúa, Chile
La sagrada familia - Sebastián Campos, Chile
La perrera - Manuel Nieto, Uruguay, Argentina and Canada

2006
La punta del diablo - Marcelo Paván, Argentina
Rabia - Oscar Cárdenas, Chile
El cielo elegido - Víctor González, Argentina
Fiestapatria - Luis R. Vera, Chile
Una novia errante - Ana Katz, Argentina

2007
Acné - Federico Veiroj, Uruguay, Argentina, Spain and Mexico
A festa da menina morta - Matheus Nachtergaele, Brazil, Argentina and Portugal
La extranjera - Fernando Diaz, Argentina
Una semana solos - Celina Murga, Argentina
El asaltante - Pablo Fendrik, Argentina
Las niñas - Rodrigo Marín, Chile
Por sus propios ojos - Liliana Paolinelli, Argentina

Global Film Initiative

2005
99% Murdered – Esteban Schroeder, Chile and Uruguay
Asleep In The Sun – Alejandro Chomski, Argentina
El Asesino Entre Nosotros – Daniel Benavides, Chile
Lluvia – Paula Hernandez, Argentina

2006
Cordero de Dios – Lucia Cedron, Argentina
The Old Woman At The Back – Pablo José Meza, Argentina
Las vidas posibles – Sandra Gugliotta, Argentina
The Watercolorist – Daniel Rodríguez, Peru

2007
Huacho – Alejandro Fernandez Almendras, Chile
Veronica's Passion – Cristian Pellegrini, Argentina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Film Funding for 2005-2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hubert Bals Fund (Rótterdam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Interview Guide

Filmmakers
1. What types of films are you interested in making/ producing?
   ¿Qué tipo de películas les interesarien hacer (crear) o producir?

2. Is it easier to get funding for certain types of films than it is for others?
   ¿Es más fácil obtener becas para ciertos tipos de películas que para otras?

3. What kinds of conditions are placed on filmmakers by different funding bodies?
   ¿Qué tipos de condiciones o restricciones hay sobre las becas que puedan afectar a los cineastas?

4. Are any forms of censorship in place?
   ¿Existe algún tipo de censura?

5. What are the benefits of coproductions?
   ¿Cuales son los beneficios de las co-producciones?

6. Do you feel it is important to promote a national identity in South American films?
   ¿Es importante promover una identidad nacional en las películas sudamericanas?

7. Is there a difference between regional coproductions and international coproductions?
   ¿Existen diferencias entre las co-producciones sudamericanos e internacionales?

8. How are language-barriers overcome when working on coproductions?
   ¿Cómo se superan las barreras del idioma en las co-producciones?

9. How are coproductions marketed domestically?
   ¿Cómo funciona el marketing a nivel nacional en las co-producciones?

10. Are there any types of new technology that have benefited South American film production and distribution?
    ¿Existen nuevos tipos de tecnología que hayan beneficiado a la producción y distribución del cine sudamericano?

11. Can filmmakers target the audiences they desire through direct forms of distribution?
    ¿Puede un realizador tratar con la audiencia desea directamente, o necesita de un intermediario?

12. When the films are sold abroad, who does the subtitling for the films?
    ¿Cuando las películas se venden en el extranjero quien se encarga de hacer los subtítulos?

13. How important is it that subtitles are done correctly?
    ¿Qué tan importante es que se hagan los subtítulos correctamente?

14. How important are film festivals?
¿Qué tan importante son los festivales de cine?

Institutes

1. What are the main aims of institute in regards to South American films?
¿Qué objectivos primero tiene el instituto respecto al cine sudamericano?

2. Does institute work with institutes in other countries?
¿Trabaja el instituto con institutos de otros países?

3. What kinds of projects attempt to promote South American films outside of the major cities?
¿Existen proyectos para promover las películas sudamericanas afuera las ciudades mayores?

4. What types of films are supported by institute?
¿Qué tipos de películas las supera el instituto?

5. Are there any themes such as violence, sex or politics that institute does not want to promote in the films?
¿Hay temas, como violencia, sexo o la política que el instituto no quiere promover en las películas?

6. What kinds of conditions are placed on filmmakers when they are given funding from institute?
¿Qué tipos de condiciones o restricciones hay sobre los fondos del instituto que puedan afectar a los cineastas?

7. Are South American coproductions primarily for economic or cultural reasons?
¿Las co-producciones existen para beneficios económicos o culturales?

8. Are there differences between regional coproductions and international coproductions?
¿Existen diferencias entre las co-producciones sudamericanos y las co-producciones internacionales?

9. How are language barriers overcome when working with sponsors and partners from other countries?
¿Cómo se superan las barreras del idioma cuando se trabaja con socios y institutos de otros países?

10. Is it important that coproductions show some kind of national identity?
¿Es importante promover una identidad nacional en las películas sudamericanas?

11. Are there any types of new technology that have benefited South American film production and distribution?
¿Existen nuevos tipos de tecnología que hayan beneficiado a la producción y distribución del cine sudamericano?

12. Can filmmakers target the audiences they desire through direct forms of distribution?
¿Puede un realizador tratar con la audiencia desea directamente, o necesita de un intermediario?

13. How important are film festivals?
¿Qué tan importante son los festivales de cine?
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Filmography

199 recetas para ser feliz (2008) Directed by Andrés Waissbluth, Chile and Spain, 14 Pies

Abrigate (2007) Directed by Ramón Costafreda, Spain and Argentina, Continental Producciones

Acta General de Chile (1986) Directed by Miguel Littin, Chile and Cuba, Alfil Uno Cinematografica

American Visa (2005) Directed by Juan Carlos Valdivia, Bolivia and Mexico, IMCINE

Arena Viva (2005) Directed by Joel Figari, Peru, ACIAW

Beverley Hills Chihuahua (2008) Directed by Raja Gosnell, USA, Walt Disney

B-Happy (2003) Directed by Gonzalo Justiniano, Chile, Spain and Venezuela, Sahara Films

Blindness (2008) Directed by Fernando Meirelles, Canada, Brazil and Japan, Rhombus Media


Cachimba (2004) Directed by Silvio Caiozzi, Chile, Andes Films

Calle Santa Fè (2007) Directed by Carmen Castillo, Chile, France and Belgium, Agnes B

Chicha tu madre (2006) Directed by Gianfranco Quattrini, Argentina and Peru, Primi Quattrini

Cocalero (2007) Directed by Alejandro Landes, Argentina and Bolivia, Fall Line Films


Dependencia sexual (2003) Directed by Rodrigo Bellot, Bolivia and USA, BoSD films

Derecho de familia (2006) Directed by Daniel Burman, Argentina, Italy, Spain and France, BD Cine

Dia de boda (2008) Directed by Rodrigo Ayala Bluske, Bolivia, Toborochi Films
Diarios de motocicleta (2004) Directed by Walter Salles, Argentina, USA, Germany, Mexico, Chile, Peru and France, FilmFour

Dias de Santiago (2004) Directed by Josue Mendez, Peru, Chullachaki

Di buen día a papá (2005) Directed by Fernando Vargas, Argentina, Bolivia and Cuba, Matanza Cine

Dioses (2008) Directed by Josue Mendez, Peru, Argentina, France & Germany, Chullachaki Producciones

El Abrazo Partido (2004) Directed by Daniel Burman, Argentina, France, Italy and Spain, BD Cine

El asaltante (2007) Directed by Pablo Fendrik, Argentina, Magma Cine

El bonaerense (2002) Directed by Pablo Trapero, Argentina, Chile, France and Netherlands, Pablo Trapero Productions

El cielo, la tierra y la lluvia (2008) Directed by José Luis Torres Leiva, Chile, France and Germany, Jirafa Films

El coraje del pueblo (1971) Directed by Jorge Sanjines, Italy and Bolivia, Group Ukamau


El custodio (2006) Directed by Rodrigo Moreno, Argentina, France, Germany and Uruguay, Rizoma Films

El destino no tiene favoritos (2003) Directed by Alvaro Velarde, Peru, Alvaro Velarde Producciones

El enemigo principal (1973) Directed by Jorge Sanjines, Bolivia and Peru, Grupo Ukamau

El frasco (2008) Directed by Alberto Lecchi, Argentina and Spain, Quimera Films

El húsar de la muerto (1925) Directed by Pedro Sienna, Chile, Film Andes

El regalo (2008) Directed by Cristián Galaz and Andrea Ugalde, Chile, Delirio Films

Encarnación (2007) Directed by Anahi Berneri, Argentina, Venezuela and Spain, BD Cine

Familia Rodante (2004) Directed by Pablo Trapero, Argentina, Brazil, France, UK, Germany and Spain, Lumina Films

Fuga (2006) Directed by Pablo Larrain, Chile and Argentina, Fabula Films
Glue (2006) Directed by Alexis Dos Santos, Argentina and UK, Diablo Films

Gregorio (1985) Directed by Grupo Chaski, Peru, Grupo Chaski

High School Musical 3: Senior Year (2008) Directed by Kenny Ortega, USA, Walt Disney

Historias minimas (2002) Directed by Carlos Sorin, Argentina and Spain, Guacamole Films,

Impunidad (2008) Directed by Javier Torre, Argentina, Ayacucho Films

Juliana (1988) Directed by Grupo Chaski, Peru, Grupo Chaski

La batalla de Chile: La lucha de un pueblo sin armas - Primera parte: La insurrección de la burguesía (1975). Directed by Patricio Guzmán. Venezuela, France and Cuba, Tercer Año


La Cienaga (2001) Directed by Lucrecia Martel, Argentina, France and Spain, 4k Films

La frontera (1991) Directed by Ricardo Larraín, Chile and Spain, Cine XXI

La hora de los hornos: Notas y testimonios sobre el neocolonialismo, la violencia y la liberación (1968) Directed by Octavio Getino and Fernando E. Solanas. Argentina, Grupo Cine Liberación

La mano del muertito (1948) Directed by José Bohr, Chile

La mujer de mi hermano (2005) Directed by Recardo de Montreuil, Argentina, Mexico, Peru & USA, Shallow Entertainment

La mujer sin cabeza (2008) Directed by Recardo de Montreuil, Argentina, Mexico, Peru and USA, Aquafilms

La nana (2009) Directed by Sebastián Silva, Chile and Mexico, Forastero

La niña santa (2004) Directed by Lucrecia Martel, Argentina, Italy Netherlands and Spain, Lita Stantic Producciones

La proxima estacion (2008) Directed by Fernando E. Solanas, Argentina, Primer Plano

La sagrada familia (2004) Directed by Sebastián Campos, Chile, Andes Films

La señal (2007) Directed by Ricardo Darín and Martin Hodara, Argentina and Spain, Fenix
Leonera (2008) Directed by Pablo Trapero, Argentina, South Korea and Brazil, Matanza Cine

Live Free or Die Hard (2007) Directed by Len Wiseman, USA and UK, Twentieth Century Fox


Los Andes no creen en Dios (2007) Directed by Antonio Eguino, Bolivia, Conacine

Los incorregibles (2007) Directed by Rodolfo Ledo, Argentina, Sono Films

Machuca (2004) Directed by Andres Wood, Chile, Spain, UK and France, Wood Producciones

Madagascar: Escape 2 Africa (2008) Directed by Eric Darnell and Tom McGrath, USA, Dreamworks Animation

Madeinusa (2006) Directed by Claudia Llosa, Peru and Spain, Oberón Cinematográfica

Madres (2007) Directed by Eduardo Félix Walger, Argentina, Primer Plano

Malta con huevo (2007) Directed by Cristobal Valderrama, Chile, Cinepata

Mamma Mia (2008) Directed by Phyllida Lloyd, UK, USA and Germany, Universal Pictures

Mánzora (2008) Directed by Ricardo de Montreuil, Spain and Peru, Hispafilms

Mantenidoas sin sueños (2005) Directed by Martín De Salvo & Vera Fogwill, Argentina, France, Netherlands and Spain, Avalon Productions

Memoria obstinada (1997) Directed by Patricio Guzmán, Canada and France, La Septe-Arte

Mi mejor enemigo (2005) Directed by Alex Bowen, Argentina, Chile and Spain, ALCA Producciones

Mirageman (2007) Directed by Ernesto Diaz Espinoza, Chile and USA, Mandrill Films

Miss Universo en el Peru (1982) Directed by Grupo Chaski, Peru, Grupo Chaski

Motivos para no enamorarse (2008) Directed by Mariano Mucci, Argentina, BD Cine

**Paloma de papel** (2003) Directed by Fabrizio Aguilar, Peru, Luna Llena Films

**Perimontun** (2008) Directed by Jeannette Paillán, Chile

**Pizza, birra, faso** (1998) Directed by Adrian Caetano and Bruno Stagnaro, Argentina, Palo y a la Bolsa Cine

**Play** (2005) Directed by Alicia Scherson, Chile and Argentina, Parox

**Quien dice que es mas fácil** (2007) Directed by Juan Taratuto, Argentina, Primer Plano

**Quien mato a la llamita blanca** (2007) Directed by Rodrigo Bellot, Bolivia, Buena Onda

**Santos** (2008) Directed by Nicolás López, Japan, Spain and Chile, Drive Cine

**Secretos** (2008) Directed by Valeria Sarmiento, Chile, Margo Films

**Tan de Repente** (2002) Directed by Diego Lerman, Argentina and Netherlands, Lita Stantic Producciones

**Tierra del Fuego** (2000) Dir. Miguel Littin, Chile, Spain and Italy, Surf Film

**Tony Manero** (2008) Directed by Pablo Larraín, Chile and Brazil, Fabula Productions

**Twilight** (2008) Directed by Catherine Hardwicke, USA, Summit Entertainment

**Una semana solos** (2007) Directed by Celina Murga, Argentina, Tresmilmundos Cine

**Un novio para mi mujer** (2008) Directed by Juan Taratuto, Argentina, Patagonik Film Group

**Una estrella y dos cafes** (2006) Directed by Dir. Alberto Lecchi, Argentina, Primer Plano Film Group

**Uñüm** (2008) Directed by Francisco Huichaqueo, Chile

**Üxüf xipay: El despojo, sucesos históricos sobre el conflicto mapuche** (2004) Directed by Dauno Tótoro, Chile, Ceibo Producciones

**XXY** (2007) Directed by Lucia Puenzo, Argentina, France and Spain, Pyramide Films
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