LATIN AMERICAN PROGRAM

THE WILSON CENTER

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION BUILDING WASHINGTON, D.C.

WORKING PAPERS

Number 102

FILM ARTISANS AND FILM INDUSTRIES IN LATIN AMERICA, 1956-1980:

Theoretical and Critical Implications of Variations in Modes of Filmic Production and Consumption

Julianne Burton
University of California, Santa Cruz

Number 102

FILM ARTISANS AND FILM INDUSTRIES IN LATIN AMERICA, 1956-1980:

Theoretical and Critical Implications of Variations in Modes of Filmic Production and Consumption

Julianne Burton
University of California, Santa Cruz

Author's note: An earlier draft of this paper was presented at a March 1981 colloquium sponsored by the Latin American Program of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560.

1981

This essay is one of a series of Working Papers of the Latin American Program of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. Dr. Michael Grow oversees preparation of Working Paper distribution. The series includes papers by Fellows, Guest Scholars, and interns within the Program and by members of the Program staff and of its Academic Council, as well as work presented at, or resulting from, seminars, workshops, colloquia, and conferences held under the Program's auspices. The series aims to extend the Program's discussions to a wider community throughout the Americas, and to help authors obtain timely criticism of work in progress. Support to make distribution possible has been provided by the Inter-American Development Bank.

Single copies of Working Papers may be obtained without charge by writing to:

Latin American Program, Working Papers
The Wilson Center
Smithsonian Institution Building
Washington, D. C. 20560

The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars was created by Congress in 1968 as a "living institution expressing the ideals and concerns of Woodrow Wilson . . . symbolizing and strengthening the fruitful relation between the world of learning and the world of public affairs."

The Center's Latin American Program, established in 1977, has two major aims: to support advanced research on Latin America, the Caribbean, and inter-American affairs by social scientists and humanists, and to help assure that fresh insights on the region are not limited to discussion within the scholarly community but come to the attention of interested persons with a variety of professional perspectives: in governments, international organizations, the media, business, and the professions. The Program is being supported through 1982 by three-year grants from the Ford, Mellon, Kettering, Rockefeller, and Tinker Foundations, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, and the Xerox Corporation.

ABSTRACT

Film Artisans and Film Industries in Latin America, 1956-1980:
Theoretical and Critical Implications of Variations
in Modes of Filmic Production and Consumption

Traditionally, the attempt to articulate the political and/or ideological dimension of film has oscillated between the two poles of formal and content analysis. The 1970s witnessed an unprecedented increase in film scholarship--historical and critical-methodological, but above all, theoretical. This theoretical "boom" has its roots in French philosopher Louis Althusser's "rereading" of Marx; in structuralism and its heir, semiology--both based on essentially linguistic models; and in a reformulation of Freudian thought by French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan. In the name of a more politicized and progressive critical practice, the process of meaning production was confined within the text, realist modalities were discredited in favor of potentially infinitely regressive self-reflexivity, and theory was hypostatized as a privileged form of practice. In addition, this self-styled "modernist," "materialist" school of film theory and criticism, epitomized in the English-speaking world by the British film journal Screen, most often cloaked itself in hermetic vocabulary and tortuous syntax.

Both the underlying tenets and practical ramifications of this theoretical-critical approach are now being called into question. From various points of origin, but most coherently and persuasively from Great Britain, come calls to develop a new kind of politically-informed cultural theory and critical practice, capable of recognizing the totality of the film f/act, capable of reincorporating history and sociology into the concept of the creative process, capable of taking social and material aspects of production and consumption into account on a concrete rather than metaphorical level--not to substitute but rather to supplement the study of inner-textual relations.

The essay which follows, prelude to a larger historical, analytical, and interpretive project, attempts to lay the theoretical foundation for applying a contextual, process-oriented critical approach to a specific instance of oppositional cultural practice: 25 years of oppositional filmmaking in Latin America--the most sustained, concerted, and at the same time, varied effort in world film history to create a revolutionary cinema in all senses of the term.

From my point of view, the most compelling and significant aspect of the New Latin American Cinema movement, as it has evolved over the past quarter-century, has not been merely its ability to give expression to new forms and new contents, but above all its capacity to create alternative modes of production, consumption, and reception--ranging from the only apparently atavistic recourse, to artisanal modes, to the anticipation of more socialized industrial ones.

When films are transferred to other social, historical, political, and cultural contexts, they are subjected to an inevitable reification. They cease to be a process and become simply a product. Their nature as the intersection of dynamic historical and social forces and personalities cedes to the appearance of a static, particularized, "crystalized" object of contemplation, a reproducible and hence immutable commodity. My goal is to re-contextualize film not simply as a cultural artifact, but as a process of elaboration of a cultural artifact, and in so doing to make a case for both the feasibility and the necessity of this re-contextualization. It is an endeavor which necessarily draws as much from the social sciences as the humanistic disciplines and which has potentially important implications for critical theory and practice in both spheres.

FILM ARTISANS AND FILM INDUSTRIES IN LATIN AMERICA, 1956-1980: THEORETICAL AND CRITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF VARIATIONS IN MODES OF FILMIC PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION

Julianne Burton
University of California, Santa Cruz

Foreward

A decade ago, when the quest for "revolutionary" cinema was at its height and the theorists' call for a "materialist" cinema at its most insistent, a French film journal of some prominence on the left declared that bourgeois cinema would never be genuinely threatened "until films are produced which say everything about themselves: their economy and their means of production."[1]

Part I of the monumental documentary trilogy The Battle of Chile (1975-1979) ends with scenes from the abortive military coup of June 1973, "dress rehearsal" for September's successful takeover. Along the streets of downtown Santiago, incongruously, people run in the direction of the camera, scrambling for shelter. Searching beyond them, the lens locates and zooms in on a tank surrounded by military personnel--a surreal object on that all-too-ordinary streetcorner. One soldier, pistol in hand, looks directly at the camera for an instant, raises his gun, turns away, then abruptly turns back again, arm extended. The image wavers, seems to lose its axis and, after a momentary vertiginous blur, goes blank. The cameraman has apparently filmed his own summary execution at the hands of the Chilean armed forces.

What image could say more about itself and its "means of production" than that its recording cost the recorder his life? Yet to recognize this is to be simultaneously wrenched from sheltered security within the "closed world" of the film-text and ejected into the chaotic and threatening (because even less completely knowable) realm of history, politics, social context. Who was the victim? Did he really die? Why?[2]

In its overprescriptive extremism, Cinéthique's formula for revolutionary filmmaking is no more ideologically defensible than the illusionist imperative which requires a film to conceal everything about itself and its means of production. The blindspot of "modernist" criticism, based as it is on a restrictive definition of materiality, lies in the failure to recognize that "saying everything" about the process of production of an artifact within the artifact itself threatens to obliterate that artifact's potential relationship to any referent outside itself. Content is increasingly displaced by the contentlessness of self-reflexivity in a potentially infinite regression.

Yet the ultimate sterility of the extremist demand that film "say everything about itself and its means of production" neither cancels out the importance of some filmmakers' commitment to saying something about the means of production of the film text within the film text, nor does it obviate the potential validity--even necessity--of a line of critical inquiry which takes the material and social conditions of film's elaboration as its point of departure. As a corrective to an immanent reading which, in so scrupulously walling-off the text from its surroundings, betrays its own origins in an idealized "art for art's sake," this critical-methodological exploration will endeavor to steer equally clear of the inverted peril, materiality for materiality's sake.

Latin American Filmmakers on Latin American Film: A Descriptive Montage

At the New Latin American Cinema festival in Merida, Venezuela in 1968--an event which marked the continent-wide takeoff of this politically-committed film movement with premiers of such documentaries as Fernando Solanas' and Octavio Getino's The Hour of the Furnaces (Argentina, 1968), Mario Handler's I Like Students (Uruguay, 1968), Jorge Silva and Marta Rodriguez' The Brickmakers (Colombia, 1968), and Carols Alvarez' Asalto (Colombia, 1968)[3]--the following characterization of the fledgling movement was put forth:

> A cinema which is committed to national reality. A cinema which rejects all evasive and deformative formulas, along with indifference and ignorance, in order to confront the complex of sociological, political, economic, and cultural problems which each country, according to its particular situation and characteristics, is living through. A cinema which creates works that exude realism, whether they be fictional or documentary; simple testimony, profound analysis, or agitational tools. A cinema born in impossible conditions of production, brought forth by an act of faith and the infinite patience of its authors.[4]

One year later, the makers of the epic documentary The Hour of the Furnaces, proponents of a "third" cinema in opposition to Hollywood ("first cinema") and European-style auteurism ("second cinema"), defined their project in the following terms:

> Countering a cinema of characters with one of themes, a cinema of individuals with one of masses, an auteur-dominated cinema with one created by an operative group, a cinema of neocolonial misinformation with one of information, a cinema of escape with one that recaptures the truth, a cinema of passivity with one of aggression. To an institutionalized cinema, [the third cinema] counterposes a guerrilla cinema; to movies as spectacles, it proposes a film-act or action; to a cinema of destruction, one that is both destructive and constructive; to a cinema made by and for the old kind of human beings, a cinema fit for a new kind of human being, for what each one of us has the potential to become.[5]

In 1969, Cuban filmmaker and theorist Julio García Espinosa proposed an "imperfect cinema" based on a "new poetics...whose true goal will be ...to disappear as such," a cinema of "process" rather than "analysis" which cultivates a plurality of forms and does not disdain film's natural vocation to entertain.[6] As part of the polemic generated by his essay, he wrote in 1972:

> Until now, we have viewed the cinema as a means of reflecting reality, without realizing that cinema in itself is a reality, with its own history, conventions, and traditions. Cinema can only be constructed on the ashes of what already exists. Moreover, to make a new cinema is, in fact, to reveal the process of destruction of the one that came before.... We have to make a spectacle out of the destruction of the spectacle. This process cannot be individual.... What is needed is to perform this process jointly with the viewer.[7]

In 1970, Brazilian feature filmmaker Glauber Rocha, assessing the accomplishments of the Cinema Novo movement in a U.S. film journal, concluded that "The great contribution of Cinema Novo is to change the old structure and to permit complete freedom and development of the director as his own producer and distributor."[8] As the 1970s progressed, various filmmakers and groups developed more specific and differentiated practices. In 1972, the Bolivian Ukamau Group, under the direction of Jorge Sanjinés, evaluated and criticized their own cinematic trajectory from films of "effects" (denunciation), to films of "causes" (analysis), to a new kind of interactional cinema which would recapture the Bolivian peoples' historical past while at the same time becoming itself a component in determining the future shape of that history. This goal, the filmmakers realized, presupposed a transformation on the level of film form:

> Since ours was a cinema which sought to develop parallel to historical evolution, but which also sought to influence the historical process and to extract its constitutive elements, it could no longer confine itself to conventional forms and structures. Such content demanded a complementary form which would break traditional molds.... If it was absolutely necessary to work with reality and the truth, manipulating live, everyday history, it was for the same reasons absolutely necessary to find forms which would not detract from or betray their content....[9]

In contrast, Argentina's clandestine Cine de la Base collective, accustomed to working in the documentary mode, began experimenting with fictional forms in the belief that narrative cinema was more accessible to their target audience, the working class, and that fictional film offered a greater potential for synthesis and subjective, personalized analysis. In their stylistic experimentation, they subordinated formal means to desired political ends:

> Our goal is to intervene on a very concrete level in the political relations of the Argentine process with a brand of cinema which we define as militant and class-based. We build this

> cinema based on the needs of the people's social and political organizations. Ours will consequently be a more utilitarian cinema than that of the bourgeoisie.[10]

Finally, as one last fragment in this collage of participant observations on the goals, characteristics, and functions of the New Latin American Cinema, we quote Cuban director Tomás Gutiérrez Alea's belief in the importance of realizing the "social function" of cinema: "equipping the spectator with critical insights into reality, to the extent that he ceases to be a spectator and feels moved to actively participate in the process of daily reality. In other words [what is needed are] not only works which help to interpret the world, but which also help to transform it."[11]

This assemblage of impressions, however inevitably arbitrary, touches upon several crucial issues which will receive more sustained and systematic attention in the pages which follow: issues dealing with realism (the concepts of reality, history, and change; of realism and antithetical forms; of the relationship between representation in the text and the complex contextual reality outside of it); issues of pluralism versus prescriptivism in cinematic genre, style, language, and form; the relationship between films of the developed world and films of the dependent sector (cultural nationalism, cultural colonialism); the material conditions of production and reception and the potential for transforming them; the possibilities for collaborative rather than individualized creativity and for extending that collaboration beyond the sphere of the producers and into the sphere of the consumers.

Realism and "Reality": A Direct or a Mediated Relationship?

It is obvious from the string of quotations above that, like Brecht in the theater, militant Latin American filmmakers began from the premise that film was a vehicle for apprehending the real world in order to change it. In contemporary critical thought, however, the concept of "the real" is highly problematic. While use of the notion among Latin American filmmakers has undergone a certain evolution, it has never been the target of as much suspicion as it has among critical circles in developed Western countries, where "rank empiricism" is as unwelcome as bad manners. The problem deserves consideration on its own merits, and for the light it sheds on other differences in concept and practice between the underdeveloped and the developed sectors--practitioners of "practical theory" on the one hand, and theoreticians of "theoretical practice" on the other.

Fernando Birri, founder of the first documentary film school in Latin America (La Escuela Documental de Santa Fe, Argentina, in 1956) begins the book which chronicles that seminal experience quoting Chilean poet Pablo Neruda:

> I speak of things that exist.
> God save me from inventing things while I'm singing![12]

At that time, Birri believed that certain techniques in and of themselves--specifically documentary realism--provided the means of discovering

reality and correcting the distortions imposed by economic, political, and cultural dependency. The documentary vision, he maintained, was the true vision: "how reality is; it cannot be otherwise."[13] According to Birri, "the Documentary Film School of Santa Fe was born as a realist response to historical circumstances and conditions which were also realist."[14] For many other Latin American filmmakers as well, especially at the inception of the movement, a commitment to film as an agent of social change in the real world translated into the obvious equivalent of formal realism.

As British feminist and film theorist Christine Gledhill aptly observes,

> Realism in [the] general sense is the first recourse of any oppressed group wishing to combat the ideology promulgated by the media in the interests of hegemonic power. Once an oppressed group becomes aware of its cultural as well as political oppression, and identifies oppressive myths and stereotypes, ...it becomes the concern of that group to explore the oppression of such images and replace their falsity, lies, deception and escapist illusion with reality and the truth.[15]

She goes on to identify some problematic aspects of this uncritical embracing of realist forms. "Realism" as a formal modality in film involves a complex interplay of technical and human mediations; "the real" therefore cannot simply be discovered but has to be constructed in order to be conveyed. Since "reality" is not after all a self-evident given, there is no simple alternative reality to fill the gap left by the displacement of the "false" reality which is being denounced, so the counter or alternative reality ("true" reality) must also be constructed in this second sense.

Fifteen years after Birri and his students shot the "first social survey film" made in Latin America--Tire dié (Toss Me a Dime, 1958)--a team of Chilean filmmakers began meeting to develop a methodology for a documentary on the broadest possible scale: a "survey" of the political, economic, social, and cultural configuration within their nation as it struggled to make the first "legal and democratic" transition to socialism. That the epistemology of documentary realism had, by this subsequent historical moment, become immeasurably more problematic is evident from the fact that the Equipo Tercer Año spent two months analyzing existing approaches to documentary filmmaking and formulating their own composite methodology. They opted for a synthetic method precisely because they recognized that social and political "reality" could no longer be captured by simply aiming a camera and shooting, given that "too many events result from many invisible processes which culminate very often in an external event of little or no historical relevance."[16] This acknowledgment of components of the real which are not immediately manifest is a crucial step in developing more nuanced, complex, and functional notions of the relationship between film and the world outside it which it simultaneously purports to apprehend and to transform.

Franco-Swiss filmmaker Jean-Luc Godard's famous dictum--"Bourgeois filmmakers focus on the reflections of reality. We are concerned with the reality of the reflection."[17]--clearly inspired in Bertolt Brecht's "metarealistic" devices to denaturalize and rupture the process of representation, stands as a kind of rallying cry for a whole generation of "modernist" filmmakers, critics, and theoreticians who, according to a growing number of writers, betrayed the motivating spirit behind Brechtian aesthetics. Sylvia Harvey summarizes the crux of this difference in her important book May '68 and Film Culture:

> Like the modernist filmmakers, Brecht certainly places an emphasis on the fact of representation, and on the problems entailed in the selection of certain means of representation. But this emphasis is made only in terms of a tension which exists between the fact of representation and "that which is represented." What is preserved is a sense of something outside of and beyond the fact of representation, ...a social reality to which the representation refers.[18]

Among Latin American filmmakers who have also drawn inspiration from Brecht, the transformative impulse linking formal strategies to potential changes in the world beyond the film-text has been much more urgently conserved. As Octavio Getino observed recently in assessing oppositional film practice in Argentina:

> Given the smog of falsehood and equivocation which invades every last pore of a dependent nation, in our countries the representation of multiple and contradictory facets of whatever reality requires research, study and first-hand knowledge. But such activities in turn require a social practice oriented toward positively transforming that reality which one aspires to know. Without this commitment, it will prove difficult if not impossible to achieve genuine first-hand knowledge.[19]

The Illusion of Reality Versus the Reality of Illusion

This split between the "immanent" and the "external"--between those for whom the film-text constitutes the only universe of discourse and (theoretical) action, and those who maintain that transit between the real world and the text and back again is not only possible but essential and inevitable--replicates itself in several critical and theoretical issues which recur in the following pages. It is, in fact, pivotal to the central project of this essay: the postulation of a critical methodology based on "modes of filmic production and consumption" defined not as exclusively immanent to the film-text but as originating in and exerting an impact upon the world outside it. Marc Zimmerman, a literary critic and theorist, expresses the dilemma as between a linguistics-derived epistemology based on Ferdinand Saussure and the notion of exchange, and a Marxist epistemology rooted in production. "At stake, then," he summarizes, "is the issue of whether the world is to be conceived in terms of a metabolism between thought and reality or between thought and sign... and, at the extreme, whether reality includes, or is nothing more than, a system of communication or of signs."[20]

To acknowledge that representation is inevitably also interpretation--partial, selective, mediated, imperfect--is not necessarily to conclude that representation is inevitably false or futile. The difference between these two positions is, in the last analysis, not so much an epistemological or intellectual as an ideological or political one. The obsession with film's suspect nature as an inherently "illusionist" mode and the hypostatization of the relations within the text as the only possible object of analysis correlate all too neatly with the kind of relativizing critical agnosticism of a critic like Roland Barthes who, for all his brilliance and political savvy, failed to see that the doctrine of infinite polysemousness (the meanings of a text can never be fixed) in fact assumes a hegemonic position even as it pretends to abdicate one. Only if one is prepared to renounce one's stake in the social issues addressed by the (film) text can one afford to maintain that no reading is "privileged," that is, more compelling, effective, or real than any other. To take refuge in the inviolability of the text, in the jouissance of its "infinite productivity," cloaking oneself in "the myth of the purity of eternal becoming," to use Jonathan Culler's apt phrase, is to attempt to live outside history. Only those fully secure in the status quo can permit themselves the luxury of such an illusion. Among Latin American political filmmakers, the price of participation has been abandoning such illusions.

"Revolutionary Cinema": An Idea Whose Time Has Passed?

As I undertake the following assessment of two decades of oppositional Latin American filmmaking practice, I am painfully aware that the issue of defining revolutionary cinema is not the burning question it was a few years ago--in Europe and North America at least. There is a certain historical irony in trying to address this problem at a time when three not-unrelated phenomena are obvious: first, films from the Third World are less fashionable in the metropolitan countries than they were a few years ago; second, film production itself, in many Latin American countries at least, has been considerably curtailed; and, finally, the artificiality of the "Third World" as a political and ideological construct, even within the socialist sector, has been made patently clear by recent events in Africa and Asia.

Traditionally, the attempt to define a revolutionary cinema has oscillated between the two poles of formal analysis and the articulation of explicit content. This attempt to define revolutionary cinema on the basis of the forms and relationships immanent in the film-text itself has met with dubious success and has been to a large extent abandoned by bourgeois film critics not only because of changing historical circumstances, but also, and more important, because of a basic misconception in the enterprise itself. The project of defining a phenomenon described by a signifier ("revolutionary") which denotes sweeping transformations of power relationships in society is doomed to failure if it insists on inviolate textual self-sufficiency and the extraneousness of the larger social context out of which the film is generated and to which it is directed. To try to "revolutionize the means of representation" or to verify that achievement, intertextually and without recourse to

extratextual referents and receptors--however frequently it may have been attempted--is an undertaking doomed to failure.

The capacity of the "culture industry" to expropriate, co-opt, and neutralize subversive or potentially revolutionary themes is notorious and needs no further amplification here. The cooptability of form is a more complex issue; but, at the risk of grossly oversimplifying, the problem might be briefly discussed in the following terms. Since forms exist in history, they also evolve. In fact, the very essence of form evolution seems to hinge on a rather pendular oscillation between poles of classicism and experimentation in which the "new" is in another sense simply the "different" in a process which seems ultimately constrained to repeat variations of itself, renewed but seldom completely deflected by occasional modifications from outside this pendular swing. Many Latin American filmmakers have insisted upon the dialectical unity of content and form while tending to view the latter as a function of the former. As Armando Roffe, editor of the Venezuelan film journal Cine al día, expresses it, "Form is content transforming itself into form."[21] We have but to recognize the historical and practical impossibility of sui generis formal innovation and the lack of any guarantees against its enlistment in the service of a less-than-altruistic master before acknowledging that, as the custodian of the "revolutionary" essence of art, form is virtually as pessimistic as content.

Armand Mattelart, a leading communications theorist who, prior to the 1973 coup d'etat, had lived and worked in Chile for several years, argues a propos of that experience that "New forms, new contents, even new media are not enough. The new content of a new means of communication must be tied to a new social practice."[22] If both form and content have been proved assimilable by late capitalism's all-devouring drive to contain expressions of dissent, process is the one component element of the cultural artifact that has proved itself less palatable, as recent experiments with "partial" versions of workers' control in advanced capitalist factory production have indicated. Process, or practice, is accessible through an investigation of the social, historical, political, and economic context of the film in the course of its elaboration and reception and, more specifically, through the analysis of the modes and relations of filmic production, distribution, and exhibition as the most promising tool for articulating the dialectical relationship between text and context.

Towards A Contextual Criticism: The Praxis Connection

The extent to which the contextualizing impulse lies at the very foundation of the New Latin American Cinema is obvious from Fernando Birri's assertion that "What was needed was a school which would combine the basics of filmmaking with the basics of sociology, history, geography, and politics, because the real undertaking was a quest for national identity...."[23] It is thus not surprising that Latin American filmmakers have consistently, if sometimes only implicitly, called for a more contextualizing kind of criticism. According to Venezuelan filmmaker Jacobo Borges, "If this cinema forms a part of that process of breaking off from the patterns of dependency, its stage of definition corresponds to the

stage of that process. Thus, its conceptualization cannot be understood except to the degree that one perceives the (historical) movement which gives it form and context."[24] Brazilian filmmaker Leon Hirszman offers a complementary admonition: "The critic, if s/he wishes to truly understand Third World cinema, must keep in mind that the material conditions of production exert a determining influence on the form."[25] Leading Brazilian critic Jean-Claude Bernardet stipulates that "The material of the film must not mask the original social situation which gave it birth," but, on the contrary, make it manifest. He cites the early documentary Aruanda (Linduarte Noronha, 1959), shot in the Brazilian Northeast under particularly precarious conditions, as having "succeeded in conveying the expressive potential of an aesthetic which assumes the poverty of its own means as fully as [it assumes] that of the film's protagonists."[26] Jacobo Borges has declared that "Third World cinema is neither a form nor a style but an attitude."[27] Because that unifying attitude realizes itself at the level of actual praxis--a praxis consistent with and potentially capable of transforming the world which the filmmakers simultaneously depict and address--one essential role of the critic is to provide entry into that context and discern the components of the filmmakers' constitutive practice.

The importance of this role is perhaps particularly apparent to a critic from the metropolitan sector whose primary scholarly-critical focus has been on the emerging cinema of the Third World. The inevitable sense of disorientation at the absence of a common cultural ground translates into the search for a core of contextualization sufficient to the task of making the film under study accessible in another cultural context. Although films can be transferred to other social, historical, political, class, and cultural contexts, the act of abstracting them from their original context necessarily subjects them to a certain inevitable reification. They cease to be a process in order to (appear to) become simply a product. Their nature as the intersection of dynamic historical and social forces and personalities cedes to the appearance of a static, particularized, "crystalized" object of contemplation, a reproducible and hence immutable commodity.

The most constructive and meaningful critical relationship to the tradition of oppositional filmmaking in Latin America seems to me to consist in the investigation and articulation of the range of alternative modes of production and consumption developed in diverse circumstances over the past two decades in all their variety and specificity. Basic to this critical ambition is the belief that the transformation of relations of production and consumption which particular Latin American films have catalyzed in their original social, historical, geographical, and political context(s) and of which they are themselves the product, is somehow inscribed within them at the level of form and content--though not, however, in any mechanical, automatically perceptible, or completely knowable way. Although these inscriptions are selective, inconsistent, perhaps contradictory, at times invisible, and resistant to quantification or schematization, the task of the critic must include the attempt to demonstrate how interacting contextual factors impact upon the film text itself and the interpretation of that text at a given point of reception (cognizant that the latter is also a product of interacting contextual factors).

It is not a matter of substituting extrinsic for intrinsic (immanent) criticism, but rather of allowing the extrinsic to illuminate the intrinsic by reconstituting part of the process by which the extrinsic originally informed the intrinsic. This effort is both motivated and validated by the general recognition that the creation of a film is in most circumstances a more socialized and externalized--in short, knowable--phenomenon than the creation of a piece of fiction, for example, or a painting. The point is not to attempt to constitute a single "objective text" but to argue that a film's contextual environment at the time of production is relevant to any historically sensitive subsequent interpretation of that text's content, form, and function.

Towards A Theory of Artistic Production: The Precursors

In "The Author as Producer," one of the few charting essays into this unmapped territory, Walter Benjamin called for a reformulation of the question: not "how does a work of art stand in relation to the relationships of production of a period," but "how does it stand in them?"[28] Benjamin draws a distinction between attitude and actual practice. The former position can be deduced from the content of the work; the latter can only be verified through knowledge of the actual process of creation, through what Benjamin calls "technique"--both the aesthetics (form) and the actual technical (and social) means by which the work is produced.

Benjamin observes that "the place of an intellectual in the class struggle can only be determined, or better, chosen, on the basis of his position in the process of production."[29] Believing with Marx that material conditions determine consciousness and not vice versa, Benjamin insists that a writer (artist) must experience his solidarity with the proletariat not merely ideologically, but as a producer. He credits Brecht with elaborating the concept of "functional transformation" (Umfunktionierung): "...do not simply transmit the apparatus of production without simultaneously changing it to the maximum extent possible in the direction of socialism."[30] Benjamin offers two criteria for determining the "exemplary character" of a production (i.e., productive process or productive apparatus): first, that it lead other products to itself and, secondly, that it "present them with an improved apparatus for their use."[31] "And," he adds, in a challenge which reveals the link between production and the modes of perception (one which Cuban theorist Julio García Espinosa will echo two decades later), "the apparatus is better to the degree that...it is capable of making co-workers out of readers or spectators."[32]

In order to "operationalize" Benjamin's concept of the author (or filmmaker) as producer, it is clear that the critic must extend his or her energies into the related fields of economic and social history and, above all, sociology. In Marxism and Literature, Raymond Williams explains that, "As so often, the two dominant tendencies of bourgeois cultural studies--the sociology of the reduced but explicit 'society' and the aesthetics of the excluded social remade as a specialized 'art'--support and ratify each other in a significant division of labour.... It is this division now ratified by confident disciplines which a

sociology of culture has to overcome and supersede, insisting on what is always a whole and connected material process."[33]

A third and final source of inspiration and endorsement comes from the work of a Latin American theorist. In La producción simbólica: Teoría y método en sociología del arte (1979), the Argentine sociologist Néstor García Canclini, writing from his Mexican exile, proposes a sociology of art based on the social relations of art as a symbol-making process. "Art," he maintains, "not only represents relations of production; it realizes them."[34] He concludes his investigation into the practice of the plastic arts in Argentina during the 1960s with the assertion that "Changes in the works themselves are more intelligible when interpreted as part of the transformation of social relations among the members of the artistic field. The consequence of this sociological affirmation for artistic practice is obvious: as much as a complex of images never before seen, creating a new art requires another way of producing those images and of understanding them: generating a new mode of relationships between human beings."[35]

Out of the "Absent Center" and Into the Breach

The present essay is an attempt to locate and fill the "absent center"[36] of a theoretical discourse which increasingly calls for, but to date has not succeeded in, producing a sustained and systematic analysis of the "modes of cultural production." The goal is to redeem for film criticism the social and material nature of artistic activity; to argue why the style, forms, and content of a filmwork merit consideration as products of a specific social practice and expressions, among other things, of an artist's social relations. My "data field" derives from a quarter century of politically-committed Latin American film practice--the most sustained, concerted, and at the same time varied effort in world film history to produce a revolutionary cinema in all senses of the term. Like Raymond Williams, I am interested in those points in the history of art when creative practice becomes struggle. "The active struggle for new consciousness through new relationships"[37] is a phrase which aptly defines the New Latin American Cinema movement.

Towards a Working Definition of Modes of Production in Film

In contemporary critical parlance, "production" can refer to the material or technological apparatus, to organizational infrastructures, to the social relations which constitute and are constituted by the film-artifact, or to its "self-production as a chain of significations."[38] Contemporary film theory and criticism have concentrated their attention virtually exclusively on three of these four meanings. The study of the signifying practices within the text, directly indebted to structuralism and semiotics and only indirectly influenced by Marxist thought (primarily through Louis Althusser's idiosyncratic reading of Capital), has tended to concentrate on articulating the ideological dimension of the film-text. (The most extreme embodiment of this tendency occurs not in film but in the literary theory of Pierre Macherey, who argues that "the text produces itself--unfolds and activates its multiple lines of meaning

without conformity to 'intention,' pre-given narrative model, or external reality.")[39] Parallel to this celebration of immanence, there has been a marked interest in film technology, often referred to as "the material apparatus," largely motivated by the potential function of this apparatus as a bearer of ideology. This line of inquiry's ability to postulate the relevance of phenomena external to the film-text on the film-text is largely dependent on how the concept of ideology is understood. A disproportionately smaller amount of research, most of it historical rather than sociological in nature, has taken the organizational infrastructure of the film industry as its object--notably in studies of the Hollywood studio system. Such studies are seldom informed by any concept of a mutually influential dynamic between the film product, the organizational structure in which it is produced, the organization structure in which it is consumed, and the larger social context.

In order to integrate the dynamics of social relations and other extratextual phenomena into the concept of artistic production, it is therefore necessary to abandon the humanists' realm and to make camp instead with the sociologists and political scientists among whom "modes of production" in the concrete socioeconomic sense is, at present, very much at the center of discourse--constituting, in fact, a hotly contested terrain.

Back to the Source: Marx's Concept of Modes of Production. Marx states in Capital:

> Whatever the social form of production, laborers and the means of production always remain factors of it.... For production to go on at all they must unite. The specific manner in which this union is accomplished distinguishes the different economic epochs of the structure of society from one another.[40]

In the capitalist mode of production, the only conceptually and analytically developed mode examined in Marx's work, he stipulates that "the separation of the free worker from his means of production is the starting-point given."[41] One of his most suggestive passages on the general topic of production and consumption, from the Gründrisse, directly addresses the question of artistic production and formulates a dialectical interaction between production and consumption:

> Production not only supplies a material for the need but it also supplies a need for the material. As soon as consumption emerges from its initial state of natural crudity and immediacy--and, if it remained at that stage this would mean that production itself had been arrested there--it becomes mediated as a drive by the object. The need which consumption feels for the object is created by the perception of it. The object of art--like every other product--creates a public which is sensitive to art and enjoys beauty. Production thus not only creates an object for the subject, but also a subject for the object. Thus, production produces consumption (1) by creating the material for it; (2) by determining the manner of consumption; (3) by creating the products initially posited by it as objects, in the form of needs felt by the consumer. It thus produces

> the object of consumption, the manner of consumption, and the motive of consumption. Consumption likewise produces the producer's inclination by beckoning to him as an aim-determining need.[42]

Thus, for Marx, "production, distribution, exchange and consumption" constitute "members of a totality, distinctions within a unity."[43]

Out from the Source: Marx Interpreted. Among social scientists, the concept of modes of production is open to dispute on both the level of theoretical elaboration and that of practical application: what are the noncapitalist modes of production and in what societies do they exist or have they existed? The "Asiatic mode" is a case in point. While some social scientists go about employing the concept as the basis of their analysis of specific societies, others insist that there is not now nor ever was any such mode of production. Other alleged modes of production, "coined" subsequent to Marx--the colonial mode, the lineage mode, the colonial slavery mode, etc.--are just as subject to having their existence called into question as soon as they are identified.

Among the various modes-of-production theorists, I have found John G. Taylor's work the most useful. In From Modernization to Modes of Production: A Critique of the Sociologies of Development and Underdevelopment, he ties the entire problematic to questions of dependency and "transitional social formations" in the Third World. Taylor rejects the sociologies of development and underdevelopment as "teleological and economistic," arguing instead for using the discourse of historical materialism to analyze Third World reality "as a social formation which is dominated by an articulation of two modes of production--a capitalist and a non-capitalist mode--in which the former is, or is becoming increasingly, dominant over the other."[44]

Taylor distinguishes three historical periods in the development of capitalism's penetration of the noncapitalist world: the export of merchant capital, commodity export, and the export of finance capital. Imperialism as such only occurs with the latter phase. The degree to which capitalism is actually complicitous in maintaining precapitalist divisions of labor and relations (a thesis which Taylor puts forth convincingly) is open to general debate, much of which hinges on such competing concepts as "articulation," "dislocation," "dissolution," and "transcendance." However the relationship between coexisting capitalist and precapitalist modes is conceptualized, the important point is that this postulation of two or more modes of production whose "interdependence" is a function of their eventual incompatibility, opens up a crucial space for maneuver, as Taylor's discussion of the notion of "dislocation" makes clear:

> Imperialist penetration intervenes economically, politically and ideologically within these dislocated levels in order to ensure the increasing dominance of the capitalist mode of production and to create that restricted and uneven form of development [characteristic of Third World formations].... Yet it is also the case that the existence of these dislocations, and the effects that imperialist penetration has upon them in

> trying, as it were, to adapt them to the political and ideological reproductive requirements of a capitalist mode of production, can produce--in specific conjunctures in the transition--the possibility for the emergence of the preconditions for the constitution of a different mode--a socialist mode--of production.[45]

Precisely the uncertainty, relativity, and unpredictability of the process of establishing hegemony of capitalist over precapitalist modes of production accounts for the inextricably related phenomena of oppression --either physical (direct violence) or ideological (indirect violence through manipulation, "cultural colonization," etc.)--and resistance-- again, either on a direct physical level (land takeovers, popular uprisings) or an indirect ideological level (political slogans, for example, or the means of artistic expression). Taylor grants the indirect means more weight than the direct: "The forms of physical oppression can establish pre-conditions...[but] it requires both an ideological and a political foundation, a commitment to its adequacy as a superior form of production in the ideologies that structure daily life, and a permanent access to political power to guarantee its perpetuation."[46]

Among the oppositional media in Latin America, film has been the most outspoken, the most trenchant, and the most generalized in challenging the hegemony of dependent (or "transitional") capitalism on both the ideological and the political levels. Most significantly, it has also posed that challenge on the much more concretized level of social relations in the labor process, access to the means of production and the means of distribution, and appropriation of the surplus of creative labor.

Under the capitalist mode of production, direct producers are separated from their means of production and are thus no longer able to maintain themselves through their own unmediated labor. Deprived of agricultural crops or handicraft production or whatever constituted the basis of their prior subsistence, they are left with only their labor power to sell. In "selling themselves" as the only possible response to their severance from their original means of production, their relationship to their own reproduction becomes mediated by capital (in the form of wages or salary) and by the appropriator of the surplus-value which they produce, the capitalist.

Hangovers and Harbingers: Old Artisanal and New Industrial Modes

To the degree that they have been consciously aware of constituting their films through an alternative mode of production, and circulating their films through an alternative mode of consumption, many Latin American filmmakers in the dependent sector have referred to the "artisanal" nature of their work. The connotation of feudal crafts production is not fortuitous. Under the feudal mode of production, craftspeople constituted an exception to the defining criteria in that their relations of production "were not marked by relations of economic dominance."[47] Unlike the feudal peasantry, who had practical control of, but did not own, their means of production, feudal artisans enjoyed both practical

control of the tools and materials necessary to their production ("real appropriation" in Marxist terminology) and actual [or "formal"] ownership of the same tools and materials. Experiments in cooperative production and distribution have represented an intermediate strategy between the atavistic reassertion of artisanal modes and a more anticipatory attempt to reorganize the industrial bases of film production and consumption under the principles of a socialist rather than capitalist mode of production.

Marx's affirmation (already cited) of the unitary nature of production, distribution, and exchange provides the theoretical basis for postulating the category of "modes of filmic consumption" as a necessary complement to "modes of filmic production." Even without this theoretical support, however, the necessity of such a formulation is obvious from only the most elementary grasp of film as an art form which developed under capitalism and from the specific nature of this commodity which is the schizophrenic offspring of an unholy marriage between art and industry.

Sylvia Harvey observes that with the development of cultural production as commodity production under capitalism and the consequent exchange of cultural objects in the marketplace, "the most powerful instance of ruling class control lies in the control...over exchange and distribution."[48] For the majority of oppositional filmmakers in Latin America, this was not a self-evident truth, but had to be learned the hard way. Filmmakers first concentrated their efforts on reappropriating the means of production. The victory of having actually produced a finished film was subsequently undercut, if not negated, by the difficulties of guaranteeing that product access to its intended (or to any) market. Filmmakers thus realized that in addition to producers (in the traditional cinematic sense), they had to become distributors as well. The numerous obstacles to the successful outcome of this battle prevented the combatants from seeing that another guarded fortress loomed on the horizon: the exhibition sector. Only relatively recently have filmmakers succeeded in penetrating this bastion, finally cognizant of the need to take control of the entire three-part process.[49]

For the purposes of analysis, rather than specifying "modes of distribution" and "modes of exhibition," it has seemed more practical to subsume both categories under the single formulation, "modes of filmic consumption." This category also includes the process of reception which, consistent with "reception theory" in literature, conceives of the spectator as subject rather than object, as active rather than passive or inert.

GENERAL MODEL

MODES OF PRODUCTION

MODES OF CONSUMPTION { MODES OF DIFFUSION { MODES OF DISTRIBUTION
MODES OF RECEPTION { MODES OF EXHIBITION

The Possible Versus the Necessary

Some theorists would call into question the validity of not only the concepts of "modes of filmic production" and "modes of filmic consumption" but the very attempt to address the modes-of-production question in any sphere but the strictly economic. Immanuel Wallerstein, for example, is quite categorical on this issue: "Neither individual units of production nor political or cultural entities may be described as having a mode of production; only economies.[50]

That discord is so rife among social scientists is dismaying to a humanist who looks to those "more solid" disciplines for greater rigor and, by (no doubt naive) extension, consistency. Short of abandoning the specific practical project at hand in order to plunge into the melee currently taking place in the theoretical arena, the alternative to critical action would mean consigning oneself to spectator status and standing by as competing theoreticians slug it out among themselves, patiently awaiting the unlikely eventuality that one might sooner or later be declared "the winner." To paraphrase Fernando Solanas' and Octavio Getino's position on the feasibility of creating revolutionary cinema prior to the revolution, there eventually comes a point when the debate as to whether or not a theory of modes of artistic production is possible must be subordinated to consideration of whether or not it is necessary. Having concluded that it is necessary, and well apprised by now of the intricacy of (some of) the issues involved and the fragility of the instruments available to examine them, let us declare, at the risk of wantonly debasing the coinage, the following: (1) that the term "modes of production" is here used loosely--as is the wont of humanists--to denote the various and variable component processes of film production, distribution, exhibition, and reception, and (2) that there exists in Latin America a spectrum of oppositional film practices ranging from the artisanal to the industrial mode wherein both poles are counterposed against the dominant production mechanisms and relations within the capitalist mode.

An Art Form Born Under the Sign of Capital

At the end of the nineteenth century, when filmmaking was in its infancy, the act of making a film could be as individualized and private as the composition of a symphony or the sculpting of a block of wood. In this incipient medium, the artist retained potential control over all aspects of the creative process--from the conception of a theme and selection of participants and location, through the actual filming, and including the processing, editing, and exhibition of the final product. Sometimes these multiple functions were shared, but even this cooperative model retained basically artisanal forms of organization. This situation was, however, extremely short-lived. As the commodity potential of this novel curiosity, this frivolous amusement (whose status as an art form would only be conferred by the passage of time and the impact of the market), became quickly apparent, the organization of its production and dissemination became proportionately more complex and fragmented. Technological developments worked to reinforce this increasing division of

labor, as did economic tendencies toward agglomeration and control of the maximum number of components inherent to the filmmaking process. The structural analogies between the organization of a studio or film production company and an automobile manufacturing plant are not coincidental, but instead testify to the fact that both production processes were organized under and by a capitalist economic system.

Soviet documentarist Dziga Vertov was one of the first to point out how closely the development of the cinema was linked to the development of an advanced capitalist mode of production. "The camera," he observed, "hasn't had a chance. It was born when there was not a single country where Capital did not reign."[51] Vertov succeeded in winning that machine over to his own and his government's purposes through the kind of brilliant and innovative strategies which are in fact the subject of a film such as Man with a Movie Camera. Others express a more pessimistic view of the film medium's potential to serve an alternative form of social organization or even contribute to the project of subverting the form under which it was itself conceived. Stanley Aronowitz, who argues this negative position appropos of even the films of the Soviet "Golden Age" in his article, "Film--The Art Form of Late Capitalism,"[52] maintains in another essay on the labor process and the logic of capital that "Technology that is developed within the framework of bourgeois relations of production is nothing but the objectification of those relations, and would tend therefore to subvert the socialist intentions of a society that refused to recognize that formulation."[53] Others, believing in the relative autonomy of the technological apparatus, would argue vehemently against the "gross determinism" of such an assertion.

Throughout its history, the film medium has always revealed its double edge to anyone who scrutinized it. Like Marx's oft-quoted appraisal of religion as both the highest expression of human aspirations and an opiate which dulls those same aspirations, film (indeed, all cultural production) must be appraised in terms of its positive and negative, constructive and destructive, alienating and liberating effects and potential. Eisenstein saw this clearly. His enthusiasm for art and specifically film as a vehicle for cultural and political reinfranchisement was counterbalanced by his suspicion of the "narcotic" effects of the medium. Among the insights in that cornucopia of observations on the nature of "Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" was Benjamin's subtle perception that, in addition to transforming the art object itself, the new medium also transformed the viewers' attitudes and forms of perception, encouraging passive, "distracted" viewing rather than a more active involvement.

Thus the apparent "democratization" of the film medium when compared to older art forms is problematic. The potential for an ever-expanding radius of participation and access is effectively contained because the new technology is "deployed within a patriarchal, discriminatory and class system, which both organizes demands and stigmatizes popularity."[54] The tendency away from privatization is kept in check by the countervailing mechanisms of alienation.

Necessarily and inevitably, any project to "revolutionize" the film medium, to convert it to the needs of society rather than the exigencies of capital, must develop ways to challenge the alienation of the producer

and the receiver intrinsic to the medium as it has been organized under capitalism. For if--as members of the Frankfurt School have maintained--science, technology, and the components of everyday life have been increasingly "subsumed" under and transformed by the sign of capital, art, though certainly not impervious, is arguably the sector which is most resistant to this process. Yet, on the other hand, within the sector of potential resistance constituted by artistic production, given its industrial base and its highly developed requirements for technological infrastructure and capital investment, film is the most vulnerable medium. If the industrial side of its nature explains and reinforces its vulnerability to simply becoming a passive reproducer and disseminator of capitalist ideologies, its artistic dimension is the locus of its subversive potential.

The range of choices involved in the selection of themes, materials, techniques, styles, kinds of technology, levels of collaboration and participation, and alternatives to organized methods of production and exchange generates a space for potentially subversive action. For to exist and be structured under a late capitalist mode of production is not necessarily to replicate it. As Néstor García Canclini observes, "A fundamental difference, above all in capitalist societies, exists between the general socio-economic structure and the particular socio-economic structure of the artistic field."[55] To actively oppose existing modes of production and consumption, to subvert existing structures and invent new ones, is to bridge the gap between art as imaginary or symbolic practice and art as social practice. "Fantasy" and "reality" become united at the level of action.

The "Utopian" Element in Artistic Practice

The divorce between the imaginary and the real, the subjective and the objective, the imperfect actuality and the utopian possibility, is a cleavage which pervades Western thought. Herbert Marcuse, examining the legacy of Freud in the light of Marx and other social theorists, finds this split at the core of repressive social forms. Against the repressive "reality principle" he explores the liberating potential of fantasy and utopia:

> Imagination [phantasy] envisions the reconciliation of the individual with the whole, of desire with realization, of happiness with reason. While this harmony has been removed into utopia by the established reality principle, phantasy insists that it must and can become real, that behind the illusion lies knowledge. The truths of the imagination are first realized when phantasy itself takes form, when it creates a universe of perception and comprehension--a subjective and at the same time objective universe. This occurs in art.
>
> ...The artistic imagination shapes the "unconscious memory" of the liberation that failed, of the promise that was betrayed.... Art opposes to institutionalized repression the "image of man as a free subject...."[56]

For Marcuse, then, "art is opposition." The oppositional qualities of the work of art, however, are for him confined to its form, and the final result is a tragic paradox: "The very commitment of art to form vitiates the negation of unfreedom in art." Thus, rather than providing the basis for a genuine liberation, art at best can only exercise a dual function: "both to oppose and to reconcile; both to indict and to acquit; both to recall the repressed [image of liberation] and to repress it again--'purified.'"[57]

Stanley Aronowitz, meditating on the oppositional potential of the film medium, on the one hand locates it at the level of form and, on the other, suggests that it is at present defined by and confined in "the play of contradictions" between the (ultimately futile because unfeasible) return to the "relative autonomy of the artisan mode of artistic production" and an equally untenable resignation in the face of existing production conditions as structured by late capitalism.[58]

But to return is not necessarily to revert. The "risk of privileging an anterior art, one that corresponds to handicraft production,"[59] should not blind us to the constructive, transformative potential of opting for and demonstrating, however microcosmically, a less alienated and alienating mode of artistic production. As Sylvia Harvey correctly perceived, a "hangover" from a prior mode may act as a harbinger of a future mode:

> Just as there is a possibility that a particular form of cultural production may be a "survival," an anachronistic hangover from the class needs of an earlier epoch, so also it is theoretically possible for cultural production to anticipate future class needs, and to play a part in the transference of political hegemony from one class to another in advance of a radical change in the relations of production.[60]

"De-Alienation" as a Strategy for Social and Artistic Transformation

In their search for alternatives to the dominant capitalist mode of filmic production and consumption, Latin American filmmakers not only drew upon past modes, they also attempted to anticipate future ones. These attempts to create cinema under alternative conditions have constituted a kind of "utopian" impulse to live out, at least in miniature, other, less alienating social forms. The parameters of this quest have allowed for a broad range of experiments:

> *a "one-man" film like Mario Handler's I Like Students (Uruguay, 1968)--conceived, shot, edited, and (initially) exhibited by its maker, who only made one copy of a film which was to become a banner of the international student movement because he thought that such a crude and imperfect little short "was not going to interest anyone;"
>
> *a film school like Fernando Birri's Escuela Documental de Santa Fe;

*the semi-clandestine activity of groups like Patricio Guzmán's Grupo Tercer Año in Allende's Chile or Jorge Sanjinés' Grupo Ukamau in Bolivia;

*the fully clandestine elaboration and dissemination of The Hour of the Furnaces by a pair of filmmakers who supported their efforts to produce "guerrilla" cinema by working in commercial publicity;

*the attempts at producers' cooperatives organized by members of Brazil's Cinema Novo movement and Mexico's Nuevo Cine;

*the attempts at nationalization of production, distribution, and exhibition by Chile Films under the Allende government;

*the creation of the first socialist film industry in the Americas in Cuba.

Naturally, this explosion of alternative models exerted a marked impact on the content and the form of the works produced, but these innovations are best understood as the result of a larger quest to transform the modes of filmic production and consumption.

Where the dominant cinema prioritized exchange value, oppositional filmmakers emphasized use values. Where dominant procedures turned filmmakers into virtual "piece workers" or managers, alternative procedures sought a reintegration at all levels of the creative process. Where the dominant practices required large amounts of capital, a complex infrastructure, expensive equipment, studio sets, professional actors, elaborate systems for lighting and camera movement, professional screenplays, and fixed shooting schedules, oppositional filmmakers, in Glauber Rocha's phrase, simply went out to the streets "with a camera in their hands and an idea in their heads." Where the structures and conventions of traditional filmmaking required a passive and socially fragmented audience, relatively heterogeneous and isolated, who did their viewing in the "ritualized" space of the conventional movie theater, their opponents sought organizational and stylistic forms to encourage audience participation, response and feedback. These included bringing films to the targeted audiences through mobile cinema projects or 16mm "parallel circuits" which would temporarily appropriate the communal space of schools, union halls, community centers, or public squares.

The common thread which links all of these efforts is the will to "de-alienate" alienated and alienating social relations. In the last analysis, all social commitment and transformation is actualized at the level of individual experience. Latin American filmmakers' attempt to create a revolutionary cinema took as its point of departure not simply the introduction of a new content or the transformation of cinematic forms, but the transformation of the subjective conditions of film production and film viewing. However "unconscious," uneven, and discontinuous these efforts, they have been consistent with the view that social change has its deepest roots in self-realization and that, furthermore, (proto-revolutionary) "subjectivity must have a material basis within the process of production, in the alienation of human labor from itself...."[61] The sense of personal integration into a common project

and of interpersonal unity generated by a common purpose is apparent in the writings, declarations, and practice of many Latin American filmmakers. To close with a single example--Patricio Guzmán's recollections of the experience of shooting what was to become The Battle of Chile:

> We went out to film almost every day. We had a clearly defined work plan. We came to be so in tune with one another that in the final months of the filming...communication between us on the shoot was virtually reduced to an exchange of glances.
>
> We usually ate in the same factories where we were filming. Often we would sleep in the truck. There was a great sense of fraternity generated by this process, not just because we were...all very fond of one another, but also because we understood one another, and knew that what we were doing together was of crucial importance. We were all convinced of the relevance of the project, and that was extremely important in binding us together and in helping us to develop a smooth work process.
>
> ...The film was an incomparably intense experience for all involved, not just in its historical dimension or for whatever virtues it may have as cinema, or because of the fact that we managed to rescue it from the chaos and devastation that followed the coup, but because it was a monumental experience in each of our lives.... It marked us all, forever. Everything else is merely a figure of speech.[62]

REFERENCES

[1]Gerard Leblanc, "Direction," Cinéthique No. 5 (Paris) September-October, 1969 (translated by Susan Bennett) in Screen Reader #1: Cinema/Ideology/Politics (London: The Society for Education in Film and Television, 1977), p. 18.

[2]The gunshots which caused Argentine Leonardo Heinrickson to lose control of his camera were, in fact, fatal.

[3]Film titles given in English indicate availability through U.S. distributors; Spanish-language titles indicate films which are not in distribution here (except in those rare cases when the original title has been retained).

[4]"Editorial," Cine al día (Caracas), 6 (December 1968), 2. Unless otherwise specified, all translations are my own and all indications of emphasis in quotations appear in the original.

[5]Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino, "Hacia un tercer cine," Cine, cultura y descolonización (Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI, 1973), p. 88.

[6]Julio García Espinosa, "Por un cine imperfecto," Pensamiento crítico (Havana, 1970). English translation, "For an Imperfect Cinema," by Julianne Burton in Jump/Cut: A Review of Contemporary Cinema 20 (May 1979), 24-26.

[7]Julio García Espinosa, "Carta a la revista chilena Primer plano," in Una imagen recorre el mundo (Havana: Editorial Letras Cubanas, 1979), 26-27.

[8]Glauber Rocha, in Gordon Hitchens, "An Interview with Glauber Rocha," Filmmakers' Newsletter, 3:2 (September 1970), 21.

[9]Jorge Sanjinés, "Cine revolucionario: La experiencia boliviana," Cine cubano 76/77 (n.d.), 7.

[10]Cine de la Base declaration, September 1974 (Distributed in mimeographed form at the Mostra Internazionale del Nuovo Cinema, Pesaro, Italy, September 1975).

[11]Gerardo Chijona, "Gutiérrez Alea: An Interview," Framework: A Film Journal (Norwich, England) 10 (Spring 1979), 29. (Reprinted from Cine cubano 93).

[12]Fernando Birri, La Escuela Documental de Santa Fe (Santa Fe, Argentina: Editorial Documento del Instituto de Cinematografía de la Universidad Nacional del Litoral, 1964), p. 14.

[13]Ibid., p. 13.

[14]Gustavo Montiel Pages, "Entrevista a Fernando Birri," Imágenes (Mexico) 5 (February 1980).

[15]Christine Gledhill, "Recent Developments in Feminist Criticism," Quarterly Review of Film Studies 3/4 (Fall 1978), 462.

[16]Patricio Guzmán, "La Batalla de Chile: El Golpe" (translated by Don Ranvaud), Framework: A Film Journal 10 (Spring 1979), 14.

[17]Jean-Luc Godard, quoted in Sylvia Harvey, May '68 and Film Culture (London: British Film Institute, 1978), p. 66.

[18]Ibid., p. 71. For a comprehensive discussion of the problematics of realism, see Terry Lovell, Pictures of Reality: Aesthetics, Politics and Pleasure (London: BFI, 1980).

[19]Octavio Getino, Cine y dependencia: El cine en la Argentina (Buenos Aires/Lima: Cine Liberacion, 1976/1978) (mimeo), p. 87.

[20]Marc Zimmerman, "Exchange and Production: Structuralist and Marxist Approaches to Literary Theory," Praxis 4 (1978), 152.

[21]Armando Roffe, "Problemas de la elaboración," Cine al día 6 (December 1968), 12.

[22]Armand Mattelart, Mass Media, Idéologies, Mouvement Révolutionaire (Paris: Ed. Anthropos, 1974), p. 38.

[23]From a personal interview, December 1979.

[24]Jacobo Borges, "Cineastas frente al tercer cine: Una encuesta," Cine al día 14 (November 1971), 4.

[25]Osvaldo Capriles, Peran Erminy, Fernando Rodriguez, "Por la linea viva del Cinema Novo: Entrevista con Leon Hirszman," Cine al día 19 (March 1975), 10.

[26]Jean-Claude Bernardet, "Le 'Cinema Novo' Bresilien," in Guy Hennebelle (ed.), Quinze ans de cinema mondial (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1975), p. 201.

[27]Borges, op. cit., p. 4.

[28]Walter Benjamin, "The Author as Producer," The New Left Review 62 (July-August 1970), 85.

[29]Ibid., 89.

[30]Ibid., 89.

[31]Ibid., 93.

[32]Ibid., 93.

REFERENCES

[33]Raymond Williams, Marxism and Literature (Oxford University Press, 1977), pp. 139-140.

[34]Néstor García Canclini, La producción simbólica: Teoría y método en sociología del arte (Mexico: Siglo XXI, 1979), p. 73.

[35]Ibid., p. 28.

[36]A reference to an important article by Terry Lovell, "The Social Relations of Cultural Production: Absent Centre of a New Discourse," in Simon Clarke et al., One-Dimensional Marxism: Althusser and the Politics of Culture (London: Allison & Busby, 1980), pp. 323-56.

[37]Williams, op. cit., p. 212.

[38]Terry Eagleton, "Pierre Macherey and the Theory of Literary Production," The Minnesota Review 5 (Fall 1975), 134.

[39]Ibid., 137.

[40]Karl Marx, Capital Vol. II, as cited in John G. Taylor, From Modernization to Modes of Production: A Critique of the Sociologies of Development and Underdevelopment (Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press, 1979), p. 107.

[41]Taylor, ibid., p. 107.

[42]Karl Marx, Gründrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy, translated by Martin Nicolaus (London, 1973), p. 92.

[43]Cited in Aidan Foster-Carter, "The Modes of Production Controversy," New Left Review 107 (January-February 1978), 69.

[44]Taylor, op. cit., pp. 101-103.

[45]Taylor, op. cit., p. 103.

[46]Taylor, op. cit., pp. 236-237.

[47]David Gartman, "Marx and the Labor Process: An Interpretation," The Insurgent Sociologist VIII:2 & 3 (Fall 1978), 100.

[48]Harvey, op. cit., p. 92.

[49]This insight is drawn from a conversation with Brazilian director-exhibitor Gerardo Sarno and Uruguayan producer-distributor Walter Achugar, Havana, 1979.

[50]Quoted in Foster-Carter, op. cit., 74.

[51]Dziga Vertov, Articles, journeaux, projects, quoted in Hennebelle, op. cit., p. 295.

[52]Stanley Aronowitz, "Film--The Art Form of Late Capitalism," The Social Text 1 (Winter 1979), 115.

[53]Stanley Aronowitz, "Marx, Braverman and the Logic of Capital," The Insurgent Sociologist VIII:2 & 3 (Fall 1978), 130.

[54]Tabloid Collective, "On/Against Mass Culture," Tabloid: A Review of Mass Culture and Everyday Life (Stanford, California) 1 & 2 (Summer 1980), 1-2.

[55]García Canclini, op. cit., p. 72.

[56]Herbert Marcuse, Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud (New York: Vintage, 1955), p. 130.

[57]Ibid., pp. 131-132.

[58]Aronowitz, "Film--The Art Form of Late Capitalism," op. cit., 127-128.

[59]Ibid., 127.

[60]Harvey, op. cit., p. 105.

[61]Karl Marx, cited in Stanley Aronowitz, "Marx, Braverman and the Logic of Capital," op. cit., 137.

[62]Julianne Burton, Politics and the Documentary in People's Chile: An Interview with Patricio Guzmán on the Battle of Chile (Somerville, Mass.: New England Free Press, 1978), pp. 12, 33.