Fall 2009

Moving cinema: Bolivia's Ukamau and European political film, 1966-1989

Dennis Joseph Hanlon
University of Iowa

MOVING CINEMA: BOLIVIA'S UKAMAU AND EUROPEAN POLITICAL FILM, 1966-1989

by

Dennis Joseph Hanlon

An Abstract

Of a thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the Doctor of
Philosophy degree in Film Studies
in the Graduate College of
The University of Iowa

December 2009

Thesis Supervisor: Associate Professor Kathleen E. Newman

ABSTRACT

This study considers the films and writings of Jorge Sanjinés, an influential Latin American filmmaker and theorist known for the collaborative methods of filmmaking he and the *Grupo Ukamau* created working with indigenous Andean communities, in light of two interrelated but overlooked aspects of his theory and practice: the extent to which his theories intervened in European debates about politics and cinema during the period 1966-1989 (the release dates for his first and last significant features) and his experiments using cinematic form to create a language capable of communicating an alternative, non-western subjectivity.

After reviewing the history of the *Grupo Ukamau*, including its most significant Bolivian precursors, Jorge Ruiz, Oscar Soria, and the *Insituto Cinematográfico Boliviano*, as well as the group's theories of spectatorship, form in revolutionary cinema, and the practice of making a cinema with the people, this dissertation turns to three topics key to understanding Sanjinés in a properly transnational context: the importance of Bertolt Brecht's theories for Sanjinés, the sequence shot as the basis for his new cinematic language, and political parallels with other European filmmakers.

Like several European political filmmakers of the period who experimented with rhetorical and non-realistic uses of the sequence shot, Sanjinés was more inspired by Brecht's theory of Epic Theater than Italian Neo-realism. Sanjinés adapted these techniques both to communicate with his local indigenous audiences and intervene in European theory, a process described here as dialectical transculturation. To create what he called the "Andean sequence shot," Sanjinés adapted Jean-Luc Godard's dialectical editing of long takes, Miklós Jancsó's portrayals of collective protagonists, and Theo Angelopoulos' use of multiple temporalities within a single shot. The final section explores the parallels among Sanjinés' theory and practice and those of Pier Paolo Pasolini and Jean Rouch, two European filmmakers contemporaneously engaged in

theorizing the representation of alternative subjectivities, at that time a marginal concern in Europe. The affinities between these three filmmakers' theories as well as Sanjinés contribution to European theorizing of cinematic subjectivity have been obscured, it is argued, by the politics of the period.

Abstract Approved: _____
Thesis Supervisor

_____
Title and Department

_____
Date

MOVING CINEMA: BOLIVIA'S UKAMAU AND EUROPEAN POLITICAL FILM, 1966-1989

by

Dennis Joseph Hanlon

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the Doctor of
Philosophy degree in Film Studies
in the Graduate College of
The University of Iowa

December 2009

Thesis Supervisor: Associate Professor Kathleen Newman

Graduate College
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

PH.D. THESIS

This is to certify that the Ph.D. thesis of

Dennis Joseph Hanlon

has been approved by the Examining Committee
for the thesis requirement for the Doctor of Philosophy
degree in Film Studies at the December 2009 graduation.

Thesis Committee: _____
Kathleen Newman, Thesis Supervisor

_____
Steven Ungar

_____
Corey Creekmur

_____
Paula T. Amad

_____
Laura Gotkowitz

To my wife, Nancy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank the members of my committee, Paula T. Amad, Corey Creekmur, Laura Gotkowitz, Steven Ungar, and, in particular, Kathleen Newman, the chair and supervisor of my thesis. Professor Newman had the wisdom to let me discover Latin American cinema on my own but never failed to provide encouragement when I needed it, even when a continent away. My time in La Paz was successful in large part thanks to the guidance of Armando J. de Urioste, executive director of CONACINE. The hours I spent listening to him, marvelling at the breadth of his knowledge, have informed this work in countless ways. Other people who generously shared time, knowledge and friendship with me in Bolivia were Antonio Eguino and Elizabeth Carrasco of the *Cinemateca Boliviana*, Mallku Sanjinés of the *Fundación Ukamau*, Paolo Agazzi of *Pegaso Producciones*, Reynaldo Yujra of CEFREC, and Guillermo Ruiz. For their friendship and support, I would like to thank, Clara Cecilia Rodriguez, Erick Rodriguez Lujan, and my *familia espiritual*, Griceldo Choquetarqui Quispe, Pamela Chuquima Condori, and Gabriel Choquetarqui Chuquimia. Thanks also to the Gill family of St. Louis and the Beck-Cornejo and Angell-Tamasy families of Evanston, who helped me and my family in countless ways. My profoundest thanks to my wife, Nancy, and my son, Nick, who lovingly bore all the disruptions of my sudden career shift. And finally, I would like to thank Jorge Sanjinés, whose extraordinary films inspired this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Once each year the Aymara of Bolivia's La Paz-El Alto conurbation rehearse the siege of the city. On Trinity Sunday, eight weeks after Easter (usually late May or early June), the city comes to a halt so the *Fiesta del Señor del Gran Poder* (Festival of Our Lord of the Great Power) can take place. Thousands of costumed dancers and musicians wind their way down from the neighborhoods clinging to the western side of the enormous crater-like bowl in which La Paz is built, slowly making their way to the city center, a parade that now lasts from sunrise to past sundown. Many more people line the streets to watch from miles of bleachers that seem to appear overnight. In recent years *Gran Poder* has grown so big that it now challenges the more established carnival in Oruro as Bolivia's national expression of folk culture.

Carnival in Oruro is known for the *diablada*, the devil dance performed by dancers wearing elaborate papier-mache devil masks. You will see the *diablada* as well as other dances in *Gran Poder*, but by far the most common is the *morenada*, which is performed by dancers wearing ornate, tiered costumes resembling wedding cakes and black masks with bulging eyes and protuberant lips that are a grotesque parody of African features. Atop their heads are fanciful miners's hats. No one is quite sure of the origins of this dance and its costume. Some anthropologists believe that the dress is modeled on wine casks and that the masks represent imported slaves working the vineyards in Bolivia's lowland regions. The miners's hat and the faces appearing to gasp for breath suggest that they are inspired by the agonies of Africans unaccustomed to cold and high altitudes forced to work in mines more than 4000 meters above sea level. Figures wearing white masks with European features drive them forward by cracking a whip. Are the dancers mocking their masters, or is this a ritualized image of submission? More than likely it is both. What can be said for certain is that *Gran Poder* and its *morenada*, in a complex image of racial displacement, is a means for the Aymara middle class of La

Paz to assert itself while reflecting upon and performing their transition from rural *indios* (Indians) to urban *mestizos* (mixed European and Indian) in Bolivia's highly fluid racial hierarchy based more on class and culture than blood.[1]

Anthropologist Jeff D. Himpele argues that *Gran Poder's* images of indigenous identity and excess—participants often spend upwards of $1000 on their costumes alone—are necessary preconditions for the construction of a uniquely Aymara capitalist modernity. The fraternities of dancers are a product of, and in turn reproduce, a middle class that exists in parallel to the traditional *criollo* (citizens of European heritage) one, while the dance itself dramatizes the community's efforts to claim its place in the city.[2] As such the festival celebrates the Aymara community's present accomplishments and envisions a distinctly less Europeanized future national culture. But it also evokes events in the collective memory of Bolivians of all classes and races, in particular the Indian rebellion against colonial rule of 1781. In that year Aymara warriors led by Julián Apaza laid siege to La Paz for more than three months before Spanish reinforcements finally arrived and defeated them. Apaza, who took the name Tupaj Katari, meaning Resplendent Serpent, and his wife, Bartolina Sisa, made their base camp at the edge of a cliff 1200 feet above the city of La Paz.[3] There they mocked their colonial oppressors by holding a satirical court, taking on Spanish names, dressing in Spanish garb, and eating with silver utensils. At night they and their troops sang and danced to unnerve the Spanish and keep them from sleeping.[4] Before he was drawn and quartered, Katari famously said, "I will return, and I will be millions," a prophecy that seemed to come true in 2003 when as many as 500,000 protestors marched down from El Alto and occupied the center of La Paz, precipitating president Gonzálo Sánchez de Lozada's precipitous flight to the U.S.

The ongoing protests emanating from El Alto and *Gran Poder*, centered in the middle class Aymara neighborhoods of La Paz, definitively merged in June 2005, when protestors called a three day truce so the festival could proceed.[5] With a change of

costume one resplendent serpent strangling the city became another. Himpele notes that as early as the mid-1990s the connection between *Gran Poder* and street protests were already obvious. Then police routinely forced Aymara protestors back up into their neighborhoods with a combination of tear gas and rubber bullets, much as the parade had been blocked from the city center in the 1950s-1970s. Eventually the protests became routinized, requiring prior notification of the authorities and street closings, as with the parade.[6] Himpele emphasizes the cinematic aspect of *Gran Poder*: "As the morenada dancers proceed through clothing changes over the course of the week of the festival, they perform a series of moving images in which men and women cinematically move through highly visible public space changing among multilayered cultural identities that articulate rural and urban, indigenous and modern identities."[7] Describing the parade, he writes, "And as I see it in cinematic form, there is no single unit inherent in the parade as the performance of a series of moving images; they must be understood as intrinsically in motion as they pass by."[8] To Himpele's cinematic allegory I would add, for reasons that should become obvious later, that if *Gran Poder* is cinema, then, with its uninterrupted motion, it is a sequence shot of magnificent proportion.

Himpele's description of the indigenous *Gran Poder* as cinema may seem a rhetorical flourish, but it is purposeful. First, because *Gran Poder*, as he is careful to point out, is an expression of Bolivian, or more specifically Aymara, modernity, but also because some of the most powerful and resonant images of modernity in the collective Bolivian imaginary come from cinema, and especially from the films of director Jorge Sanjinés and the *Grupo Ukamau*, the filmmaking collective he formed in the late 1960s. The opening scene of *El coraje del pueblo* (*The Courage of the People*, 1971) perfectly captures the fluid interplay of past, present, and future, as well as the dialectic of ritualized reenactment and action that we have noted in the *Gran Poder* and the protests of 2003. We see a group of striking miners and their families marching across the *altiplano*. They carry both union banners and *wiphalas* (flags symbolizing indigenous

nationhood), anticipating the coalitions that would later form in El Alto. The setting is 1942, and what we see is a recreation of the first of many army massacres of miners. The performers of this scene, though, are survivors of a massacre that took place a mere two years before in 1967. They are simultaneously recreating the past and expressing their own present while participating in a utopian project, a revolutionary film, aimed at the future. The film proclaims its status as a product of modernity through its self-conscious allusions to Sergei M. Eisenstein's modernist *Oktyabr* (*October*, 1928). But these images collide with long un-Eisensteinian takes that mark the film as a partial product of a specifically Bolivian or Andean modernity.

This study considers the films and theory of Jorge Sanjinés and *Grupo Ukamau* to be an instance of the encounter between this Andean modernity and European modernity. Chapter 1 chronologically details Sanjinés's career with particular attention to the pivotal experiences informing his theory of a "cinema with the people" and the events that propelled him into the international spotlight, such as the expulsion of the Peace Corps from Bolivia subsequent to his 1969 film, *Yawar Mallku* (*Blood of the Condor*). The rest of this work considers Sanjinés in a transnational context, but in this chapter I describe the impact important Bolivian precursor institutions and individuals had on his development.

The two major Bolivian film histories claim Sanjinés as a Bolivian filmmaker by either describing his work as the culmination of national trends or retroactively reading Bolivian film history as a prehistory of Sanjinés. Their claims for the importance of Sanjinés to Bolivian national cinema are paradoxically based on the critical acclaim his work garnered abroad. It would be tempting, but ultimately inaccurate, to divide his career into a Bolivian period, a more broadly Latin American period, and an even broader international period encompassing Europe and Asia. My narrative argues that Sanjinés positioned himself as a simultaneously Bolivian, Latin American, and world filmmaker

almost from the start. It calls into question the usefulness of national designations, especially for filmmakers working in small nations.[9]

Being from a small nation with a virtually nonexistent film industry impacted Sanjinés's theoretical work as well as his filmmaking. His writings on cinema, like his films, were designed to circulate among both local and international audiences. In Bolivia, where his films were banned throughout the 1970s, they were intended to communicate the results of his researches in an effort to open pathways of communication between *campesinos* and urban intellectuals. Abroad, especially in Europe, they had a dual function: on the one hand, intervening in European debates about politics and cinema earned the films recognition that could be parlayed into much needed financial support; on the other hand, they disseminated specific denunciations and a more general anti-imperialist critique. This strategy worked spectacularly in Europe, and during much of the 1970s European critics ranked Sanjinés among the world's most important directors. However, because this critical reception was always subtended by the politics of the day—something Sanjinés himself actively encouraged—the most innovative aspect of his theory, the exploration of the limits of cinema's ability to represent alternative subjectivities, remained obscured.

Sanjinés began his career as a theorist by considering the relationship between form and content in a work of art, traditional concerns in Marxist aesthetics, but he soon went well beyond these debates and advocated a functional transformation of the cinematic text and apparatus that would make it consonant with Andean expressive forms. Chapter 2 evaluates three major recurring concerns in his theoretical writings: (1) what constitutes a popular, as opposed to bourgeois, cinema; (2) the role of the filmmaker in political film practice; and, most importantly, (3) the culturally embedded nature of film spectatorship. Through comparative historical analyses, I examine how Sanjinés's concentration on indigenous, rural spectators distinguishes his theory from that of other New Latin American Cinema theorists. At the same time, I demonstrate how his

emphasis on the political necessity of beauty, and his rejection of universalizing psychoanalytic assumptions as well as the ideal of individual film authorship set him apart from European theorists.

This chapter focuses renewed attention on Sanjinés's writings, shedding light on previously overlooked aspects of his theory. Principal among these are the extent to which his theory engaged with European debates, and his sustained commitment to exploring formal means of representing non-western subjectivities.

In Chapter 3, I look at the European sources upon which Sanjinés and other New Latin American Cinema theorists drew. Their indebtedness to Italian neo-realism has become a truism in film studies. By this account, European postwar political art cinema and New Latin American Cinema share a myth of origin and point of separation. For scholars of Latin American cinema, positing a split between the two during the 1950s shields Latin American cinema from the appearance of being endlessly imitative. From a European perspective, this myth obscures the ongoing dialogue and exchange between the two movements. Both perspectives impoverish our understanding.

Critics who persisted in associating New Latin American Cinema films with neo-realism sometimes did so in order to downplay their politics and elevate their supposedly universal, humanistic qualities. Other times the association was used to argue that it was a political cinema that could be differentiated, on the level of style, from the European political cinema of Jean-Luc Godard and others. Either motivation obscures the profound affinity with Bertolt Brecht's theory of Epic Theater shared by European and Latin American political cinema of the period. Brecht's thought dominated the theory and practice of New Latin American Cinema at the same time as it did *Cahiers du Cinéma*, *Screen* critics, and the films of Jean-Luc Godard, Theo Angelopoulos, and others. Brechtian discourse became a bridge joining filmmakers and theorists on both sides of the Atlantic and creating spaces for dialogue. What constituted a Brechtian cinema was determined on both sides by the material basis of cinema as much as theoretical and

political concerns. Many New Latin American Cinema filmmakers, especially in the Andes region, made cinema in the absence of a cinematic infrastructure. This was, of course, a great impediment to production. At the same time, starting from virtually nothing presented them with the opportunity to pursue a wholesale transformation of cinema at every level, the creation of a Brechtian practice of cinema that went well beyond style. Experiments with production and exhibition practices were as central to the movement as formal experiments. In Europe during the same period, even radical political filmmakers like Godard, Miklós Jancsó, or Jean-Marie Straub were working within a highly developed industrial mode of film production. This limited their Brechtian interventions in film to textual operations, a move sanctioned by the "linguistic turn" in European theory. Sanjinés, Tomás Gutiérrez Alea, and other Latin American theorists were highly critical of the political effects of such aesthetic strategies.

Looking past debates about neo-realism in Latin America in favor of Brechtian discourse reveals the extent to which both Latin American and European political filmmakers were using the same theoretical frameworks. This is hardly surprising, given that both groups of filmmakers saw their project in the tradition of modernist avant-garde political cinema. However, Latin American filmmakers did not just take their Brechtian theory *from* Europe; rather, they used it to launch a critique *at* Europe.

Having established the reciprocal nature of exchange between Latin America and Europe in the previous chapter, Chapter 4 considers Sanjinés's appropriation of certain tropes from the European art cinema. According to Sanjinés, *Yawar Mallku* was his greatest success and his greatest failure. He speculated that his use of narrative techniques derived from European art cinema accounted for the film's popularity with international and middle-class Bolivian audiences as well as for its complete lack of impact on the *campesinos* to whom he screened it. In response, Sanjinés did not entirely abandon European cinema as a resource for creating a cinematic language consonant with the aesthetic norms of the latter group; rather, he became more selective in his

appropriation of European techniques and subjected them to processes of transculturation. Any formal devices he appropriated had to serve two ends simultaneously: first, they had to be useful for representing a collectivity; second, they had to be capable of representing time more malleably, in order to reflect indigenous Andean conceptions of time as polyvalent and cyclical. As it happened, he discovered the necessary resources in the works of European filmmakers experimenting with the non-realistic use of sequence shots in political films. The films of Hungarian director Miklós Jancsó became a model for representing the collectivity, and in the early 1970s films of Greek director Theo Angelopoulos he discovered ways of combining multiple temporalities within the shot. From Jean Luc-Godard he adapted methods of creating dialectics within the sequence shot and editing these shots in a dialectical manner appropriate to his didactic cinema.

The techniques Sanjinés appropriated from European cinema were legible, if defamiliarized, to European audiences, and in this way he was able to continue to appeal to them as he pursued a cinema with the people in the Andes. More importantly, though, his films introduced to European cinema a sustained effort to attempt representing a non-western subjectivity. As such, they could become a fundamental resource for postcolonial filmmakers working in Europe. Although the representation of alternative subjectivities would later play a much greater role in European filmmaking and film theory, there were filmmakers pursuing goals similar to Sanjinés's at the same time. Chapter 5 considers two of the most important among these, Pier Paolo Pasolini and Jean Rouch. Pasolini identified a limited cinematic equivalent to the literary figure of free indirect discourse, but thought it an expression of formalism in bourgeois art cinema. His allegiance to the prevailing scientific semiotic discourse of the early 1960s led him to deny the possibility of replicating alternative gazes, since, he argued, cinema had only one universal language. Sanjinés's theory proposes an alternative film language capable of representing a non-western gaze, something Pasolini came to by a different route at

about the same time in his *Trilogy of Life* (1971-5). As such, Sanjinés's writings provide a missing link between Pasolini's writings of the 1960s and films of the 1970s. Rouch, like Pasolini and Sanjinés, made anti-imperialist films. But his identification as an ethnographic filmmaker obscured this fact until lately. Likewise, the politics of Sanjinés's films obscured their anthropological value. Examining the way Sanjinés evokes Andean *kharisiri*, or vampire, legends in three of his films, I argue that anthropological knowledge can help us understand his poetics of storytelling, adding a so far overlooked dimension to his cinema with the people. Because of the politics of the period, critics failed to see the extent to which these three filmmaker-theorists pursued a common project. The full extent of Sanjinés's contribution to theories of subjectivity in cinema has yet to be reckoned with in Film Studies. Putting his theory in dialogue with that of Pasolini and Rouch reveals the extent to which he was in advance of his European counterparts in thinking through the political and aesthetic possibilities of representing alternative subjectivities.

In the Afterword, I examine how Sanjinés has adapted his practice to post-Cold War changes in geopolitics and global film markets. Of particular relevance is his turn toward Asia and away from Europe as a source of new audiences and support. This mirrors a growing tendency among Latin American countries toward establishing lateral trade and diplomatic relations with other countries of the Global South, bypassing North America and Europe, the traditional intermediaries for such relations. Briefly comparing Sanjinés's *La nación clandestina* (*The Hidden Nation*, 1989) with Hsiao-hsien Hou's *Hao nan hao nu* (*Good Men, Good Women*, 1995), I speculate that in addition to rethinking the transnational articulations between Latin American and European cinemas of the 1960s-1970s, we must also consider the possibility that Latin America has played a mediating role in the rise of a contemporary political art cinema of *auteurs* in Asia.

While it is true that Sanjinés introduced cinematic modernity to the population with whom he collaborated, rural indigenous peasants (*campesinos*) of the Andes region,

I begin with the assumption that they were already modern subjects. As Aníbal Quijano and Immanuel Wallerstein argue in an essay on "Americanity," a term they create to emphasize the crucial role of the Americas in the formation of modernity:

> The modern world-system was born in the long sixteenth century. The Americas as a geosocial construct was born of the long sixteenth century. The creation of this geosocial entity, the Americas, was the constitutive act of the modern world-system. The Americas were not incorporated into an already existing capitalist world-economy. There could not have been a capitalist world-economy without the Americas.[10]

The Andes region, and especially those portions of it which are now in Bolivia and Peru, were central to the development of modern Europe, which may not have been possible without the wealth extracted from Potosí and other mining areas. The Andes were, somewhat paradoxically, one of the centers of the periphery. At the same time, it was one of the regions of the Americas least successfully dominated by colonialism.[11] Nearly 500 years later this pattern repeated itself. Bolivia's New Economic Plan of 1985 was the most radical restructuring of a Latin American economy along neoliberal lines with the exception of Chile.[12] Harvard economist Jeffrey Sachs cut his teeth as the architect of this plan before going on to create "Shock Therapy" for the former Soviet Union and, more recently, teaming up with Bono to advance a new round of development initiatives for Africa. The U.S.'s historically high level of interference in Bolivia's domestic economy and politics assured that it would be a center of neoliberal restructuring in Latin America. But this center has failed to hold; resistance to neoliberal economic policies has been particularly fierce in Bolivia, earning it a reputation as a crucible for strategies of popular resistance far out of proportion with its size and relative economic and political power.

The political struggles in Bolivia during the period 1995-2005 are, of course, a continuation of earlier struggles. The last time Bolivia so captured the world's attention was in 1967 during Ernesto "Che" Guevara's ill-fated guerilla war. Realizing, as Wallerstein argues, that "the very construction of culture becomes the battleground, the

key ideological battleground, in fact, of the opposing interests within the historical system," Sanjinés seized this moment to launch a cultural assault upon the center of the world-system made possible by the presence there of politically sympathetic audiences for his work.[13] During the 1960s and 1970s his films were screened from Italy to Norway and from Spain to Russia, and his writings were published extensively on both sides of the Iron Curtain, all of which served as a highly effective platform for the denunciation of political reality in the Andes region and neo-imperialist interference on the part of especially the United States. As interventions in the cultural politics of Europe during the 1960s-1970s, Sanjinés's films go well beyond merely being denunciations, as necessary and commendable as that goal alone may be. The true novelty of his films and theories lay in their systematic and coherent attempt to create a cinematic representation of a non-western subjectivity, something obscured at the time by a narrower concept of what constituted the political. As Wallerstein argues:

> As long as anti-systemic movements remain at the level of tactical ambivalence about the guiding ideological values of our world-system, as long as they are unsure how to respond to the liberal dream of more science and more assimilation, we can say that they are in no position to fight a war of position with the forces that defend the inequalities of the world.[14]

Sanjinés opposed the liberal dream with the wisdom of the Andean *campesinos*, inflecting European modernity with their sense of time and sociality to create a new front in the region's ongoing war of position with the forces imposing inequality upon it. His method was not to reject all European cinematic forms and techniques. Instead, he chose what was useful, primarily from the European art cinema tradition, and, after adapting it to local conditions, returned it to the center in the form of a challenge capable of generating a reciprocal exchange. The ultimate goal was to precipitate a "new rendezvous of civilizations" that might produce new, unforeseen universals or even eliminate the notion of the universal once and for all.[15]

Like Wallerstein, Mary Louise Pratt argues against the notion that modernity was late to arrive at the periphery, adding that center-periphery relations are a structure of inequality constitutive of the center. Furthermore, she notes that "the opacity and incoherence of accounts of modernity constructed at the center derive in significant degree from their elision of center-periphery relations, that is from a failure to recognize the diffusionist character of modernity as one of its central features."[16] I agree with Pratt that both the center and the periphery diffuse culture and that it is in their intermingling that modernity has been constituted.

I also appreciate Pratt's use of the term "diffusion" because its adjectival form "diffuse" can be related to Sanjinés's practice. Something diffuse is hard to locate, in part because it lacks spatial concentration, but also because it is in constant motion, in the process of being diffused. In referring to the cinema of Sanjinés as "moving cinema" I evoke just this sort of motion. These films traveled extensively across nations, continents and political fault lines. In the Andes region they traveled via mobile cinemas to audiences who remained, at that time, just beyond the reach of audiovisual technologies. Moving cinema also refers to the emotions these films elicit from the viewer, which Sanjinés saw as crucial to their political efficacy. Finally, moving refers to the act of advancing something. My historical readings of European and Latin American film theory at the interface between them reveals how Latin American theorists like Sanjinés were determined to move European debates on politics and cinema to a different level.

Why Sanjinés now? In an essay written in conjunction with the Edinburgh International Film Festival's 1986 retrospective of Third Cinema, Paul Willemen argues that Third Cinema theory might be capable of revitalizing film studies just as had an earlier turn to the "foreign," toward French theory in the 1960s.[17] Latin America's reformulation of the political avant-garde of the 1930's, he argues, might put the question of utopianism back on the table.[18] In retrospect Willemen's call was never answered, not because it was without merit, but more likely because it was premature. By 1986,

neoliberalism insisted that the future would proceed from the actions of individuals, but utopianism demands the collective construction of a chosen future. Bolivia's tenacious resistance to neoliberalism has done much to call into question the illusion of steady and inexorable progress radiating from the center. This challenge drew its strength from traditions of collective social organization and ways of knowledge that reject teleological interpretations of modernity. When time is conceived of as both multilayered and circular, the idea of the "end of history" is revealed as the absurdity it is. Sanjinés's films and theories address just such ideas, and now that the question of utopianism is back on the table, thanks in no small part to social movements in contemporary Bolivia, there is much to be gained from giving them a second look, one that, this time around, is sensitive to their contribution to new conceptualizations of subjectivity.

Notes

[1] David M. Guss, "The Gran Poder and the Reconquest of La Paz," *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 11.2 (2006): 328-9. For a detailed description of *Gran Poder's* history and organization see Xavier Albó and Matías Preiswerk, "El Gran Poder: Fiesta de aimara urbano," *América indígena* 51.2-3 (1991): 293-352.

[2] Jeff D. Himpele, "The Gran Poder Parade and the Social Movement of the Aymara Middle Class: A Video Essay," *Visual Anthropology* 16 (2003): 218, 237.

[3] Forrest Hylton and Sinclair Thompson, *Revolutionary Horizons: Past and Present in Bolivian Politics* (New York: Verso, 2007), 41.

[4] Benjamin Dangl, *The Price of Fire: Resource Wars and Social Movements in Bolivia* (Oakland: AK Press, 2007), 18.

[5] Guss, "The Gran Poder," 322.

[6] Himpele, "The Gran Poder Parade," 225.

[7] Ibid., 212.

[8] Ibid., 219.

[9] Mette Hjort and Duncan Petrie, "Introduction," in Mette Hjort and Duncan Petrie, eds., *The Cinema of Small Nations* (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 2007), 3-7. Hjort and Petrie use four criteria to define the small nation as an analytical tool for film studies. These are: population, geographical area, size of internal market, and the historical level of external domination. With an area of more than 424,000 square miles, Bolivia is significantly larger in area than the largest country presented as a case study in their book, Burkina Faso. But by every other measure Bolivia is well within their range of small nations.

[10] Aníbal Quijano and Immanuel Wallerstein, "Americanity as a Concept, or the Americas in the Modern World System," *International Social Science Journal* 44.4 (1992): 549.

[11] Ibid., 549.

[12] Benjamin Kohl and Linda Farthing, *Impasse in Bolivia: Neoliberal Hegemony and Popular Resistance* (London: Zed Books, 2006).

[13] Immanuel Wallerstein, *Geopolitics and Geoculture: Essays on the Changing World-System* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1991), 166.

[14] Ibid., 182.

[15] Wallerstein, *Geopolitics and Geoculture*, 183.

[16] Mary Louise Pratt, "Modernity and Periphery: Toward a Global Relational Analysis," in Elisabeth Mudimbe-Boyi, ed. *Beyond Dichotomies: Histories, Identities,*

Cultures, and the Challenge of Globalization (Albany: State Univ. of New York Press, 2002): 22.

[17] Paul Willemen, "The Third Cinema Question: Notes and Reflections," in Jim Pines and Paul Willemen, eds. *Questions of Third Cinema* (London: BFI, 1989), 2.

[18] Ibid., 13.

CHAPTER 1: HISTORY OF THE UKAMAU GROUP

The history of Bolivian cinema is a history of Quijotes.

Carlos D. Mesa Gisbert, *La aventura del cine boliviano*

Introduction: Histories of Bolivian Cinema

The collapse of General Luis García Meza's brutal regime in 1981 ended eighteen years of nearly uninterrupted military dictatorships in Bolivia and created an opening for the restoration of democratic governance. With political freedom came freedom for cultural activities as well, which allowed leftist Bolivian filmmakers and artists like Jorge Sanjinés to return from exile or emerge from clandestinity. Ironically for Sanjinés, whose films had been banned under successive military regimes, in the 1980s he found himself politically free but economically stifled. The debt crisis affecting the economies of the region was particularly acute in Bolivia, and by mid-decade the inflation rate neared 1000 percent. For Hollywood studios raw film stock is almost an incidental expense, but in Bolivia, where it is often the greatest single expense in a film's budget, the hyperinflation that racked the country throughout the eighties made importing film stock, the basic material of the filmmaker, prohibitively expensive[1].

This same period, though not productive for films, was productive for film scholarship and saw the publication of the only two attempts at a comprehensive history of Bolivian cinema written to date, histories written by authors with very different backgrounds and political agendas. The first to appear was Alfonso Gumucio Dagron's *Historia del cine en bolivia* in 1982, which was then published in Mexico a year later under the title, *Historia del cine boliviano*.[2] The second was *La aventura del cine boliviano* by Carlos D. Mesa Gisbert, published in 1985.[3]

Gumucio Dagron, born 1950, was an associate of Sanjinés's who represented the Ukamau Group in France during the years 1974-5. Like many aspiring Latin American filmmakers at the time, he studied at the *Insitut des hautes études cinématographiques*

(IDHEC), France's main film school. His thesis project, entitled *Señores generales, Señores coroneles* (1976), is a feature-length documentary exposé of the military officers who collaborated with the repressive regime of Bolivian dictator Colonel Hugo Banzer (1971-78), with particular emphasis on the role these officers played in the violent suppression of workers's resistance movements. Returning to Latin America in 1977, he worked with Sanjinés on the second of his two films made in exile during the 1970s, *¡Fuera de aquí!* (*Get Out of Here!*, 1977). Among his many books are three others, besides *Historia de cine en bolivia*, that engage in questions of history, state censorship and production of Latin American cinema. While studying in Paris he met the French critic Guy Hennebelle, with whom he co-edited *Les Cínemas de l'Amérique latine*, for which he also wrote the chapters on Bolivia, Colombia, and the Dominican Republic.[4] In 1979 he published a monograph in Bolivia documenting the history of film censorship in Latin America.[5] Fleeing the García Meza dictatorship in 1980, Gumucio Dagron first went to Mexico, then to Nicaragua, where he established a Super-8 filmmaking workshop under the auspices of the *Central Sandinista de Trabajadores* in 1981, an experience he documented in a book entitled *El cine de los trabajadores* (*The Workers's Cinema*).[6] More recently he has worked as a consultant on communications for various development non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and in 2004 he became the managing director of the Communication for Social Change Consortium, based in New Jersey, for whom he co-edited the volume *Communication for Social Change Anthology: Historical and Contemporary Readings*, in 2006.[7] Gumucio Dagron's work advancing the democratic use of communications technologies to further community development and his writing on communication and social change reflect the enduring influence of Sanjinés's theory and practice of filmmaking on his thinking.

The second history to appear was *La aventura del cine boliviano: 1952-1985* by Carlos D. Mesa Gisbert.[8] Mesa, born 1953, comes from a middle-class family of La Paz intellectuals, owners of one of the city's largest bookshops and a publishing house. He

co-authored with his parents, José de Mesa and Teresa Gisbert, a history of Bolivia that has become a standard text. In 1976 he took charge of the exhibition department of the newly founded *Cinemateca Boliviana*, which was charged with preserving and promoting Bolivian cinema. There, along with Pedro Susz K., he wrote many of the program notes for *Cinemateca* screening series, work which eventually led him to attempt a history of Bolivian cinema. When Bolivian television was deregulated in the mid 1980s, Mesa became the proprietor of a national network based in La Paz for which he produced historical documentaries and provided political commentary. He would still be best-known today as a television personality had Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada not tapped him to be his running mate during his second successful run for the presidency in 2002. When an October 2003 popular mobilization forced Sánchez de Lozada to leave office and seek asylum in the United States, Mesa became the somewhat reluctant head of state. Although implicated in the neoliberal policies of the administration to which he belonged, Mesa was perceived as being opposed to his predecessor's violent suppression of protests that had left at least 80 dead during 2003 in the greater La Paz area alone. Fatigued by violence and political instability, Bolivians across the political spectrum were willing to give Mesa a chance to rule. This period of relative quiet ended in 2005 with renewed protests against the planned sale of Bolivian natural gas to Mexico and the United States via a pipeline through Chile to be constructed by a consortium of multinational petrochemical corporations. What began as a series of protests by anti-globalization sectors of popular social movements soon picked up middle-class support because of the nationalist sentiments the plan aroused. The fact that Chile, which had taken Bolivia's access to the coast in the Pacific War of 1879, would benefit from this sale abroad of Bolivia's gas proved too much even for many supporters of Mesa's neoliberal policies. Unable to stop the protests without resorting to state violence, Mesa declared the country ungovernable in January 2005 and tendered his resignation to the congress, which rejected it, fearing that the ascension to power of the right-wing

president of the senate, Hormando Vaca Diez, would lead to further violence. In May of the same year Mesa attempted to resign a second time. This time, after some initial vacillation, Vaca Diez and the next in line after him, president of the chamber of deputies Mario Cossio, abdicated their constitutional claim to the presidency in favor of the chief justice of the supreme court, Eduardo Rodríguez, who was considered to be politically neutral.[9] As interim president, Rodríguez immediately called for a new election, which was held in December 2005 and won decisively by Evo Morales, who became Bolivia's first indigenous head of state in January 2006.

The differing interpretations of Bolivian film history provided by these two authors reflect their divergent political trajectories. A student of cinema in post-1968 Paris and collaborator with Sanjinés, Gumucio Dagron, although generally avoiding evaluative statements about specific films, valorizes political commitment and independent filmmaking. He is also careful to document the work of his fellow Bolivians in exile. Mesa, on the other hand, as a product of the Bolivian establishment, emphasizes institutional over individual factors in his history. Although measured in his political views and not wholly unsympathetic toward the goals of the 1960s-70s revolutionary left in Latin America, he consistently criticizes on aesthetic grounds the most politically radical films Sanjinés made in exile while praising the work of filmmakers who stayed behind and adopted a more accommodating stance toward censorship and political repression.

Both books are products of what Ana López has named the "third wave" in Latin American film histories that emerged from, and was heavily influenced by, the explicitly political filmmaking practice of New Latin American Cinema. According to López, for third wave historians, "writing film history comes to mean the political activation of the history of film in any given nation."[10] In a strictly Bolivian context, how an author approaches the politics of Bolivian cinema invariably depends on his or her attitude toward the defining event of that country's twentieth-century history, the revolution of

1952, which abolished serfdom, enfranchised the indigenous population, and promised agrarian reform and the nationalization of mineral resources. Even though he has chapters on filmmaking in the first half of the twentieth century, Mesa includes the date range of 1952 to 1985 in the title of his book in order to indicate the lasting impact the revolution had on Bolivian cinema, especially through the founding in 1953 of the state-sponsored *Instituto Cinematográfico Boliviano* (ICB). For Mesa, Bolivian cinema at its best carries forward the liberal modernizing goals of 1952. Revolutionary political processes manifest themselves, Mesa argues, in new rhythms in the conception and development of culture.[11] In this sense, he is in the mainstream of Bolivian intellectuals who aspire to elevating the Bolivian revolution to the level of significance of the other two great Latin American revolutions of the twentieth-century: Mexico (1910-20) and Cuba (1959). Implicit in his argument is the idea that cultural changes wrought by revolution are not so easily undone as the political processes themselves. Thus, although the Bolivian revolutionary process could be said to have come to an end with the military coup of General René Barrientos Ortuño in 1964, it lives on in the cultural sphere where acts of resistance seek to reinstate its political goals. Gumucio Dagron, on the other hand, shares with Jorge Sanjinés and other Bolivian leftist intellectuals a disenchantment with the revolution that began in the early 1960s when its failure to deliver completely on agrarian reform and nationalization became apparent. Rather than advocating a return to and continuation of the politics of 1952, intellectuals like Gumucio Dagron and Sanjinés advocated a local strategy of popular mobilization not to be co-opted by paternalistic authorities, whether revolutionary or reactionary, embedded within a larger global strategy of anti-imperialist struggle.

For all these differences, these two authors's books share something in common besides the fact that they are studies of a national cinema in the absolute strictest sense of the term: both place Jorge Sanjinés and his films at the center of their narratives. To a very real extent this is unavoidable. Sanjinés's first feature film, *Ukamau* (1966),

achieved greater international success than any previous Bolivian production, and he very quickly became the representative figure abroad for Bolivian cinema, a role one Peruvian critic asserts he played for Latin American cinema more generally.[12] Both authors cite prizes won by Bolivian films abroad, especially at European festivals, as evidence of the quality of Bolivian cinema, and Sanjinés's films have garnered far more of these prizes than any others, making them, at least by this quantitative measure, the most important.[13]

In his discussion of what may be the first Bolivian feature-length film, *Corazón aymara* (*Aymara Heart*, 1925), Gumucio Dagron describes the film much in the manner *Screen* critics of the early 1970s did the films of Douglas Sirk. He argues that romance in the film is only used as a façade from behind which it transmits a message of rebellion and class struggle.[14] Although the film has been lost, he uses contemporary newspaper accounts to speculate that it was received by urban Bolivians as a protest against the slavery of Indians.[15] The film, he argues, is "revolutionary for its time," and he concludes by drawing a specific thematic link between it and the later films of Sanjinés. "It would not be an exaggeration to say that a movie like *Corazón aymara* is a dignified precursor to the cinema of Jorge Sanjinés."[16] Thus the theme of many of Sanjinés's films, the revolt of the indigenous oppressed, acccording to Gumucio Dagron, already exists in kernel in the first attempts at Bolivian narrative cinema.

Mesa's reading of Bolivian cinema is similarly retrospective, but, being a historian by training, he avoids the sort of dubious claims Gumucio Dagron makes about *Corazón aymara*. Mesa's project is to demonstrate that Sanjinés was not an anomaly, and that his work from 1963-1971 represents the culmination of trends in Bolivian cinema largely initiated with the formation of the ICB. In doing so, he hopes to rescue the earlier work from obscurity and proclaim its merits to those who might think filmmaking in Bolivia began with Sanjinés. His interest is not all films made in Bolivia, like Gumucio Dagron, but Bolivian cinema and what constitutes its unique national character.

> The creation of the *Insituto Cinematográfico Boliviano* (1953) is, according to my criteria, the real point of departure for the new Bolivian cinema, that cinema whose baptismal moment many critics locate in 1966 with the premiere of *Ukamau*. Not because *Ukamau* represents a vigorous cinema emerging in the main current of the New Latin American Cinema, but because the first feature by Sanjinés (not coincidentally produced by the ICB) was precisely the product of an arduous journey of formal and ideological exploration begun with *Bolivia se libera* ([*Bolivia Liberates Itself*] 1952), and which continued with *Vuelve Sebastiana* ([Come Back, Sebastiana] 1953).[17]

Mesa goes on to write, "This book wishes to, among other things, demonstrate that the cinema of the 1950s is not a mere prelude to the great moment that started with *Ukamau*."[18]

This chapter will be devoted to a chronological history of the Ukamau Group that largely draws upon Gumucio Dagron and Mesa's work.[19] With my larger project, however, I hope, first, to dismantle the assumptions about Bolivian national cinema that underlie both and second, to read Sanjinés's work as it intersects with contemporary filmmaking practice and film theory outside of Bolivia, especially in Europe. The extent to which the films conform to the formal and thematic traits of Bolivian national cinema and the contribution they made to it are ultimately less important here than the mutual impact European and Latin America political cinema had upon each other. López notes of Gumucio Dagron's book, "his history does not attempt to account for the relationship of the Bolivian cinema to other world cinemas," a criticism that could be applied to Mesa's book as well.[20] Before beginning to redress this deficiency, I must note that I will not be able to overcome one of the other criticisms López has of Gumucio Dagron, which is that he "constantly discloses the sources of the information he presents, forcing the reader to evaluate the data alongside the historian," creating a "meta-historical style."[21] It is unfortunately the case that much of the published material on Sanjinés and his films is in the form of interviews given by Sanjinés himself. Gumucio Dagron's and Mesa's historical accounts often accord more credibility to information from these interviews than is deserved. Wherever possible I have tried to cite from the original

interview if it was published, keeping in mind that filmmakers granting interviews are usually attempting to control the reception of their work. They provide well-rehearsed stories about their films's production either to enhance the entertainment value of the film itself or as self-promotion or personal mythmaking. In the case of political filmmakers like Sanjinés, statements about the films, in addition to being efforts to promote them, are in themselves political interventions. But the fact that such statements are less self-promotion than promotion of a political cause or filmmaking movement does not guarantee that they are any more true in the strictly historical sense. With Sanjinés, this is somewhat more complicated for several reasons; first, he is at times speaking on behalf of a filmmaking collective; second, he often used interviews as an opportunity to articulate theory; and finally, the theory he puts forward is based on filmmaking practices, so the stories about what happened during the making of a certain film, no doubt simplified to a sort of shorthand, provide the basis for the theory. For these reasons, and, frankly, also because there are no other sources, it is impossible to avoid using Sanjinés's personal statements to create a history of the group. By scrupulously documenting the sources I hope to assist the reader in evaluating them without going into metahistorical overdrive.

Precursors: Jorge Ruiz, Oscar Soria, and the ICB

In the introduction to his essay "La experiencia boliviana (The Bolivian Experience)" Jorge Sanjinés cites two Bolivian films as being particularly noteworthy. The first is *Vuelve Sebastiana*, which he describes as "extraordinary." The second is *La vertiente* (*The Source*, 1958), of which he notes that the documentary passages are particularly good, providing ample evidence of its director's skills.[22] The director of both of these films is Jorge Ruiz, and the screenwriter for *La vertiente* is Oscar Soria, two men who would have a profound influence on Sanjinés as a beginning filmmaker, the first as

the only professional filmmaker then working in Bolivia and an early role model during his years of in film school, and the second as a collaborator and screenwriter.

Jorge Ruiz

Ruiz, born 1924 in Sucre, studied agriculture at the *Escuela de Agronomía de Casida* in Argentina during the early 1940s. While in Argentina he befriended a classmate who owned an 8mm camera. Together they began to make short documentaries illustrating the concepts they learned in class. In 1944 he moved to the farming community of Luribay, Bolivia, where he learned Aymara and made several 8mm films, one of which he entered in an amateur filmmaking contest in La Paz. There he met Augusto Roca, a student at what Gumucio Dagron refers to only as the American Institute of La Paz, who was also enamored with cinema. After several efforts at filmmaking on their own, Ruiz and Roca met up with Kenneth Wasson, an American residing in La Paz who was interested in documentary film production. After pitching the idea of a state film agency to various government officials and being rebuffed, he founded Bolivia Films and hired Ruiz and Roca. With equipment purchased by Wasson, Ruiz and Roca gained the experience needed to become professional filmmakers.[23]

One of Bolivia Film's projects, *Donde nació un imperio* (*Where an Empire Was Born*, 1949), a portrait of the Island of the Sun in Lake Titicaca, would be the first color film made in Bolivia. By far the most important film Ruiz was to direct for Bolivia Films was *Vuelve Sebastiana*. This film is shot among the Chipaya, an ancient Indian tribe of the *altiplano* that had all but disappeared by the early 1950s and was suffering encroachment of their pastures by an expanding ethnic Aymara population. The original idea for the film came from Jean Vellard, a French ethnographer, with whom Ruiz had worked on an earlier ethnographic film about another of Bolivia's native tribes, *Los Urus* (*The Uru*), two years earlier.[24] What makes *Vuelva Sebastiana* different from Ruiz and Vellard's earlier effort is their inclusion of a fictional narrative. Sebastiana is a young

Chipaya girl tired of the hunger and deprivation she and her family experience. One day, while bringing sheep to pasture, she meets a young Aymara boy whom she befriends. He shares his lunch with her, which contains bread and strikes her as incredibly bountiful, then suggests that she come see the city with him. She does, and we see her wandering the markets of an unnamed *altiplano* town, which impress her as being much more advanced than her home village. An uncle arrives in town looking for her and convinces her to go back home. On the way home the uncle has to stop from fatigue and send her ahead. Before doing so, though, he passes on to her the traditions of her tribe. As we hear his speech reported indirectly by a narrator, we see scenes of what he is describing taken in the Chipaya village. Synchronized sound was beyond the means of the filmmakers, but we do hear semi-synchronized recordings of the characters's dialogue overdubbed by a single narrator in Spanish. The narration, especially for a Bolivian documentary, is remarkably restrained in its commentary.

Although the thirty-one minute film was shot in less than a week, the filmmakers spent a substantial amount of time living in the village of Santa Ana de Chipaya and speaking Aymara with its inhabitants before broaching the subject of a film. Ruiz recalls how he first kept the camera hidden, then would bring it out little by little, taking it with him on walks around the community without filming, all in an effort to make them comfortable with his and the camera's presence so that, once he had earned their trust, he could coax them into participating.[25]

Thanks to the intervention of the Bolivian ambassador to Uruguay, *Vuelve Sebastiana* competed in the 1958 SODRE Festival in Montevideo.[26] Since it was an independent production the state could not stop its showing, but Soria recalls that Bolivian authorities were unhappy with the international exposure the film was receiving, because they thought that a "a movie of Indians did not represent the country."[27] Sanjinés describes a similar incident that occurred ten years later when *Ukamau* was shown at the Paris Cinémathèque, with a pointed response on his part. "At the end of the

screening the Bolivian ambassador approached me and whispered, 'I am so ashamed. Everyone will think we are just a race of Indians.' I said, 'What do you think we are, then?'"[28]

According to Gumucio Dagron, the innovations of *Vuelve Sebastiana* were a product of Ruiz's concern at the time with a search for themes, content and narrative structures appropriate to cinema that would be capable of revealing the reality of indigenous Bolivian life to urban spectators wholly ignorant of it and, what's worse, indifferent.[29] Again, this description of Ruiz seeks to connect *Vuelve Sebastian* with Sanjinés and his own efforts to develop a cinematic language that could communicate the reality of indigenous life. Unfortunately for Ruiz, his ability to continue working full-time as a filmmaker depended almost entirely upon commissions from various state entities or international organizations such as the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID); this lack of independence limited his ability to experiment with cinematic form. When Ruiz showed *Vuelve Sebastiana* with another one of his ethnographic documentaries, *Voces de la tierra* (*Voices of the Earth*, 1958) at the SODRE festival in Montevideo, the guest of honor, John Grierson, founder of the British school of documentary and one of documentary film's major theorists, was impressed with what he saw and accepted Ruiz's invitation to make a trip to La Paz to view more films.[30] Nothing he saw in La Paz compared to the films he had seen at SODRE, and at the end his stay he told Ruiz that the rest of the films suffered from too great a deference to their sponsors, a criticism to which Ruiz, a pragmatic filmmaker in a tenuous to non-existent national film industry, did not object.[31]

Ruiz's experiences making *Vuelve Sebastiana*, his cautious approach of and attempt to live with an indigenous community before asking them to perform in this film, would later serve as a model for Sanjinés, especially when he was to make *Yawar Mallku* (*Blood of the Condor*, 1969). As we shall see, Sanjinés's encounter with the people of

the remote village of Kaata where he made that film would prove crucial to the evolution of his theory and practice of filmmaking. There are several other ways in which Ruiz's experience as a filmmaker in Bolivia set precedents that would be followed and expanded upon by Sanjinés. In 1950, he made *Bolivia busca la verdad* (*Bolivia Seeks the Truth*), a documentary about the census that was the first film to be shot in Bolivia with synchronized sound, and, more importantly, was the first film dubbed in indigenous languages (Aymara and Quechua) for distribution in the countryside.[32] In 1954, The World Health Organization hired Ruiz to make *Los que nunca fueron* (*The Ones That Never Were*), a documentary about malaria prevention. Filmed in Ecuador, it became the first of his many films made in other South American countries and marked the first time a Bolivian filmmaker had been asked to participate in an international coproduction. Ruiz asked Soria to write a script based on one of his stories, and in this way Soria was introduced to cinema, and the two began a collaboration that would last the better part of the decade.[33] In 1960-1961, Ruiz took a commission from the United States Information Service (USIS), which became very active in Bolivia at the outset of the Cold War and even more so after the Cuban Revolution, to produce a newsreel series entitled *Bolivia lo puede* (*Bolivia Can Do It*). According to Mesa, this first large-scale effort at distributing films in the countryside using portable projectors and generators in improvised settings "preceded by almost a decade Sanjinés's own distribution projects and his theory of parallel cinema, even though the intentions were quite different."[34] The intention of these US-funded films, according to Mesa, was to produce a sort of "didactic—informative—indoctrinating cinema."[35] Much as he may not care to admit it, committed as he is to aesthetics over politics, if we leave off the word "indoctrinating," Mesa's description could just as well apply to Sanjinés's films. Ruiz was able to be Bolivia's only full-time professional independent filmmaker during the 1950s because of his ability to secure commissions, and he considered festivals essential to his ability to market himself and claims to have never declined an indication to appear at one.[36] He knew that

for filmmaking in Bolivia to survive it would be necessary to create markets for the films outside of the country, and that the best and most economical way to do this was to attend, and hopefully win at, festivals. Sanjinés would occasionally disparage festivals abroad as a distraction from the real work of communicating with indigenous Bolivians, but at the same time he has appeared repeatedly at European and Latin American festivals over the years and has acknowledged on many occasions the crucial financial support such exposure led to as well as the benefits to be obtained from meeting with other similarly engaged filmmakers. Finally, Ruiz preceded Sanjinés as director of the ICB (1957-1964), bringing into that organization much of the talent that would work on Sanjinés's first feature.

Oscar Soria

Before he began his career as a screenwriter in 1954, Oscar Soria (1917-1988) was already known as a short story writer with a talent for capturing the vernacular speech of workers and peasants, and his stories, which were first anthologized in 1966, the year of *Ukamau's* release, are largely composed of dialogue. He fought in Bolivia's disastrous Chaco War (1932-1935), which provided him with experiences he would draw upon for his first stories. More overtly political than Ruiz, he was an enthusiastic supporter of the 1952 revolution and was commissioned by President Paz Estenssoro to write a story celebrating the nationalization of the mines.[37]

Of the many films Soria scripted in the years prior to the beginning of his collaboration with Sanjinés in 1960, the most significant, at least in terms of its influence on the latter's work, is *La vertiente*, a short feature of fifty-six minutes that mixes documentary and fictional elements and marks the first appearance of a collective protagonist in Bolivian cinema. The idea for the film came from a conversation Ruiz and Soria had with a teacher in Rurrenabaque, a small town on the Beni River in Bolivia's tropical lowlands where the film was eventually shot.[38] *La vertiente* tells the story of an

idealistic young urban-born teacher who realizes that the lack of access to potable water is the single greatest threat to the town's residents. After one of her students becomes gravely ill from contaminated water, she cancels classes and takes her students to the hillside above town, where she and the students begin to make an aqueduct for carrying fresh spring water. Her example, and above all the injuries she sustains and the danger she places the children in, shames the town, including the layabout crocodile hunter who is courting her, into action. Working together with materials donated by the government, the townspeople build a pipeline connecting the spring to the fountain in the town square. Ruiz and Soria pitched their idea directly to Hernan Siles Zauzo, then president of Bolivia, and the film is a propagandistic endorsement of the revolution, with the teacher embodying its developmentalist ethos. The melodramatic fiction of the teacher and her courtship, which takes up roughly the first half of the film, with its musical interludes and charming ruffian male lead, is reminiscent of Mexican *comedias rancheras* of that era, which were popular throughout Latin America. The transition to the documentary section is an abrupt shift in stylistic register. The long sequence of the building of the pipeline is accompanied only by music and a few sound effects. The working figures are made heroic looking by low-angle shots reminiscent of Sergei Eisenstein or certain British documentaries influenced by Eisenstein, like Basil Wright's *Song of Ceylon* (1934). During these passages all traces of the love story and its protagonists disappear, with Ruiz meticulously documenting the process of constructing the pipeline and the collectivity that accomplishes it. If the first half seems derived from Mexican commercial cinema, the second half seems inspired by Socialist Realism and the Griersonian social documentary. According to Gumucio Dagron, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) offered to provide financial support for what was then a highly ambitious Bolivian production in return for including shots showing pieces of pipe stamped with the USAID logo, an offer which Ruiz and Soria refused.[39] The film itself is thoroughly nationalist in tone, but this story circulating

around its production creates the impression that it was at least indirectly anti-imperialist as well, which Sanjinés must have found admirable.

Instituto Cinematográfico Boliviano (ICB)

The Instituto Cinematográfico Boliviano (ICB) was founded by President Paz Estenssoro's Supreme Decree of March 20, 1953, less than one year after the revolution. The first director was Waldo Cerruto (1953-57), Estenssoro's brother-in-law and the person who convinced him that the revolution needed a documentary film unit for government propaganda.[40] The second film made by the ICB, *Estaño, tragedia y gloria* (*Tin, Tragedy and Glory*, Cerruto, 1953), was the first film made in Bolivia depicting the daily lives of miners, and it included a reconstruction of a military massacre of miners performed by the actual historical protagonists, anticipating Sanjinés's later *El coraje del pueblo* (*The Courage of the People*, 1971). In 1954, the ICB published the first and only edition of a film magazine, *Wara-Wara*, which, over the course of more than 200 pages, documents in detail the ICB's first two years of production and includes historical articles on the 1929 feature film from which the magazine took its name, *Wara-Wara*, directed by the composer and amateur filmmaker, José María Velasco Maidana. In 1954, the ICB sponsored Bolivia's first film club, which was devoted almost exclusively to Bolivian films. Ruiz assumed the directorship of the ICB from Cerruto in 1957 and ran it until René Barrientos closed it when he came to power in 1964. Sanjinés was the next director, from its reopening in 1964 until it was definitively shut down in 1967.

The ICB was responsible for the greatest portion of film production in Bolivia between 1953 and 1967. Since Bolivia did not have a film lab (and still does not), the ICB stored its negatives at the Alex Laboratories in Buenos Aires, Argentina, where they were processed and printed. Years later, during the 1970s, the Bolivian government allowed the lab to destroy the negatives rather than pay accrued storage fees. Some of the prints of ICB newsreels and other productions were cannibalized for news broadcasts

on the Bolivian state television network founded in 1968. Others were destroyed by being stored under too humid conditions in the network's offices.[41] Retrieving, preserving and exhibiting as much of this material as possible have been the principal tasks of the *Cinemateca Boliviana*, founded in 1976, under the leadership of Carlos Mesa and Pedro Susz.

Sanjinés: The Years Before the ICB (1936-1964)

Details about Jorge Sanjinés's life before he returned to Bolivia from studies in Chile are sketchy and sometimes contradictory. Gumucio Dagron gives his place of birth as Sucre, Bolivia, while the *curriculum vitae* at the back of a collection of essays and reviews published in 1999 says he was born in La Paz.[42] All accounts agree, however, that he was born in 1936.

Sanjinés gives his most comprehensive statement on his youth and education in an interview conducted by two Venezuelan film students in 1977, which is included in his book, *Teoría y práctica de un cine junto al pueblo*.[43] Here he mentions his youthful attempts to write fiction and poetry and describes his father as an economist opposed to US intervention in Bolivia as well as the racism of Bolivian whites and *meztizos*, without going into any further details about his family background and class origins.[44] According to Sanjinés, after studying philosophy for two years at the *Universidad Mayor de San Andrés* (UMSA) in La Paz (1955-57), he left for Chile with the intention of taking a summer course in cinema at a university in Concepción, Chile. The course was taught by Bolivian architect Lisímaco Gutiérrez, who, in addition to teaching, ran an informal salon in Concepción for leftist intellectuals interested in cinema. At the end of Gutierrez's class all of the students proposed a film and one was selected to be made with the rest of the class serving as crew. Sanjinés's story idea won, and he made his first film in 8mm. The music for the film was composed by Chilean folk singer Violeta Parra, who was a member of Gutiérrez's salon. Sanjinés had had doubts about his ability to make it

as an author, and according to him, this first exposure to cinema made him forget all other interests and ambitions. In this interview he suggests indirectly that Gutiérrez was responsible for his interest in radical politics as well as cinema. He notes that Gutiérrez was killed trying to cross into Chile from Bolivia in 1972 and voices his suspicion that he was a member of the ELN (*Ejército de Liberación Nacional*), a guerilla group.[45] Once the course was over, instead of returning to Bolivia, where he would not be able to study film, he stayed in Santiago, Chile, where he was enrolled in the recently established *Instituto Fílmico* (Film Institute) at the *Universidad Católica de Chile* (Catholic University of Chile) from 1958 to 1960. Sanjinés describes in some detail his precarious finances at the time and the series of poorly paid jobs he took on to pay his tuition and rent. Because of the exchange rate, any money sent to him by family in Bolivia disappeared rapidly. According to Sanjinés, his experiences in Chile of poverty, hunger, cold, and toiling alongside working-class people in exploitative conditions were all instrumental in the development of his social consciousness.[46]

Other accounts differ as to exactly when, where, and for how long Sanjinés first went abroad. Soria simply remarks without elaboration that Sanjinés spent much of his childhood in Peru and Chile with his father in exile.[47] José Sánchez-H has Sanjinés first leaving Bolivia in 1954, and writes that he practiced journalism in Arequipa, Peru, but this would seem to contradict the oft-repeated claim that he studied at UMSA from 1955-57.[48] Gumucio Dagron hints at a possible explanation for exile from Bolivia earlier than 1957. He mentions that as a youth Sanjinés was a member of the *Falange Socialista Boliviana* (FSB), a political party composed of wealthy landowners that was established in 1937, taking as its inspiration the fascist movement in Spain. The FSB were implacable foes of the post-1952 MNR government and especially opposed its promise of land reform. While Gumucio Dagron minimizes this part of Sanjinés's background as "more a result of family inertia than anything else," it does provide a window into Sanjinés's class background and suggest that his first exile, whenever it was, may have

also been for political reasons, however opposed to his later ones.[49] Sanjinés is known by his friends and associates in Bolivia to be a very private person not given during interviews to sharing details of his personal life unrelated to his profession. In recent years, though, he has spoken with some nostalgia of his late teen years, during which he was first exposed to European art cinema and decided to become a filmmaker. In doing so, he has clarified somewhat where he was during the years preceding his studies at UMSA and why he went abroad. In a 2003 interview published in the Mexican online film journal *El ojo que piensa* he says:

> Yo recuerdo con infinita nostalgia mis días de cinéfilo e impenitente espectador en la bella ciudad de Lima, en el Perú de los años 50. Había llegado allí acompañando a mi padre, exilado político. Era sólo un adolescente pero tuve la fortuna de tener un amigo boliviano mayor que era un amante enfervorizado del cine y acompañándolo en su insaciable pasión por ver películas adquirí, a mi vez, la misma pasión.
>
> (I recall with infinite nostalgia my days as a cinephile and unrepentant spectator in the beautiful city of Lima, in the Peru of the 1950s. I had arrived there with my father, a political exile. I was only an adolescent, but I had the good fortune to have an older Bolivian friend who was a feverish lover of the cinema, and I accompanied him in his insatiable passion for watching films and, at the same time, acquired my own similar passion.)[50]

It is highly likely that Sanjinés spent all or most of the time between the Bolivian revolution of 1952 and his first year at UMSA, 1955, in Peru with his father. Nor would this have been unusual; many wealthy families left Bolivia, temporarily or permanently, in the years immediately after the revolution. Sanjinés's acknowledgment of his filmgoing years in Lima also account for his formative exposure to the classics of European art cinema, which he discusses at greater length than usual in the interview quoted above. Compared to La Paz in the same period, Lima had a much more developed film culture during the 1950s. We can safely say that Sanjinés had his first serious exposure to cinema in Lima during the early to mid 1950s, while his education as a filmmaker took place in Chile during the end of the decade.

In 1960, Ruiz founded a production company called Cineam in Santiago, Chile, along with two Chilean filmmakers, Patricio Caulen and Enrique Campos.[51] According to Mesa, Sanjinés first met Ruiz touring Cineam's small studio.[52] In his memoir, Ruiz recalls several such visits by Sanjinés, whom he describes as having been an "obstinate scrutinizer of aesthetics and technique." He goes on to write, "It did not surprise that after the passing of some years this young director of prodigious talent would give such universal glory to our cinema."[53] According to Guillermo Ruiz, Jorge Ruiz's son, his father intervened on Sanjinés's behalf when his increasingly radical politics nearly provoked the Catholic University to expel him.[54] When he returned to Bolivia in 1960 after completing his studies in Chile, Sanjinés first tried to work with Ruiz, still the only full-time professional filmmaker in Bolivia, and was rebuffed. According to Sanjinés, Ruiz told him that filmmaking was expensive and impossible in Bolivia and that he would do best to go abroad. Sanjinés suspected that Ruiz did not want either the competition or the trouble of starting a new group.[55] More likely is that Ruiz, despite perceiving Sanjinés's talent, wished to keep his distance from the younger filmmaker's radical politics, which he knew would be anathema to his institutional and governmental sponsors.

Although he failed to find work with Ruiz, Sanjinés soon met and began to collaborate with one of Ruiz's former associates, Oscar Soria, and this meeting proved crucial for Sanjinés's development as a political filmmaker. Sanjinés met Soria when both were working at the USAID-financed *Centro Audiovisual* (Audiovisual Center) in La Paz; Soria was the in-house scriptwriter and Sanjinés ran the photography department. Another one of Soria's jobs was to distribute films in mining communities. By 1960, Soria was beginning to feel that his work in film had become routine. He agreed with Grierson's scathing assessment of the work he had been doing with Ruiz and saw in Sanjinés a potential filmmaker who was not only more politicized but also more likely to take risks.[56] They soon embarked upon a number of film-related enterprises together.

When the Bolivian National Lottery announced a contest for the chance to make a promotional film, Soria and Sanjinés entered and won. They quickly formed a company called Kallasuyo Films, along with Ricardo Rada, a sociology professor at UMSA, in order to produce their first film together, which would eventually be called *Sueños y realidades* (*Dreams and Realities*, 1961).[57] As described by Gumucio Dagron, the film is a mixture of fiction and documentary, like *La vertiente*, with the fictional parts conveying something of the hard lives of urban immigrants from the countryside, a theme that would appear in later Sanjinés films. In *Sueños y realidades* a young man comes to La Paz from Viacha, a city in the altiplano, looking for work. He first gets work selling candy on the street. Then he meets a vender of lottery tickets who takes him on a tour of the National Lottery's facilities, the documentary part of the film. Later he wins the lottery and returns to Viacha. Now wealthy, on the way to Viacha he leaves his candy in the minibus, where it is picked up by a poor youth.[58] According to Sanjinés the lottery officials were displeased with the film and never showed it.[59]

At the same time they were making *Sueños y realidades*, Sanjinés, Soria, and Rada were also involved in various other cinematic initiatives; they established a film school, started a cine-club, and published a film magazine, *Estrenos* (*Openings*). Their film school, *Escuela Fílmica Boliviana*, had an arrangement with the ICB that allowed them to use some of their equipment on the weekends, and they used the school to train the crew that would assist on *Sueños y realidades*. The film school did not stay open long; when the Minister of Education insisted they become an official institution in return for a permit to operate, its founders refused.[60] Their cine-club held screenings in an auditorium at a university in La Paz, and, like the ICB's cine club before it, screened mostly Bolivian productions. During this period Kollasuyo received a contract to organize screenings from COMIBOL, the state mining company, giving Sanjinés his first contact with miners and mining communities.[61]

Another of the films from this period that Sanjinés lists in his filmography was the result of a commission Kollasuyo received from the government to make a film celebrating the tenth anniversary of the revolution and promoting the government's plan for the next decade. *Un día Paulino* (*One Day, Paulino*, 1962) uses a proleptic structure to show the future benefits to be gained from the government's developmentalist plans. At the end, the peasant Paulino has gone from poverty to being the owner of his own truck.[62]

While working on *Un día Paulino*, Soria and Sanjinés conceived the idea of another film about the Bolivian revolution, one that would express their increasing disenchantment with the post-revolutionary governments. They made this film in their spare time over a period of two years using the ICB's facilities through an arrangement with their film school, shooting it on the tail ends of rolls used to make commissioned films like *Un día Paulino*, *Sueños y realidades* and the newsreels, *Bolivia avanza* (*Bolivia Advances*), that Kollasuyo was commissioned to make for the Corporación Boliviano de Fomento.[63] While still forced to do commissions for state institutions, Sanjinés and Soria saw their work on the revolution film as a chance to create a truly independent and critical cinema.

According to Soria, during the shooting of *Sueños y realidades*, as they were attempting to get a better shot of the National Lottery Building, a large skyscraper in downtown La Paz, he and Sanjinés set up their camera on a nearby bit of barren land, where they encountered a group of beggars who lived in hand-excavated caves, subsisting off the trash dumped there. They turned their camera to record what would two years later become the opening shot of *Revolución* (*Revolution*, 1963), the film that would garner Sanjinés his first attention abroad when it won the Joris Ivens Award at the Leipzig Festival of Documentary and Short Films in 1964.[64]

In an essay on short films Sanjinés explains how *Revolución* finally came into being. He and Soria had only been able to shoot around ten percent of the planned

material. While in Buenos Aires awaiting the completion of the post-production on *Sueños y realidades*, the idea came to him to create a montage using what they had shot so far. Since he had nothing else to do, he began assembling the footage on an old moviola the lab had available. In very little time he had a cut that he was able to give the lab for post-production, saving the expense of a second trip.[65]

Revolución is a ten-minute long film divided into three sections. First we see a series of images of human misery: the beggars crawling out of their caves, men carrying impossible loads on their backs with only a rope around their forehead holding it in place, a coffin maker's shop with lines of children's coffins on the shelf. This section is accompanied by a melody played on the guitar. After a fade to black, we see a crowd at a political rally shot from behind the speaker. Sound effects of applause appear on the soundtrack, and we see a crowd of workers and miners looking on. Soldiers appear and again the image fades to black. The third sequence is accompanied by drum music. A rapid sequence of images of people carrying the injured away from a demonstration, handcuffs, men crowded into jail cells. This is followed by an execution, then a funeral procession through the streets. The camera singles out faces in the crowd, then feet as they march by. A siren sounds; people pick up poles, wrenches, any weapon at hand, and use them to ambush soldiers and take their guns. While the image track shows close ups of various workers ready with their confiscated rifles, on the soundtrack the marching of soldiers in formation gets louder and louder. The last shot is of children. The camera tilts down to their bare, dirty feet, as the sound of gunfire erupts on the soundtrack.[66]

Revolución is a reconstruction through associative montage of the events leading up to the 1952 revolution, concluding with stirring images of civilians arming themselves to support the popular insurrection that swept Víctor Paz Estenssoro and the MNR (National Revolutionary Movement) to power. Unlike *Un día Paulino*, which ends with an image of material plenty and financial security thanks to the revolutionary government's ten-year plan, *Revolución* ends on a decidedly ambiguous note. Haunting

the film are the documentary images of extreme poverty, clearly shot in the early 1960s, not the late 1940s, images that contradict the official propaganda, like *Un día Paulino*, touting the government's achievements, past and future, in bringing development and greater equity to Bolivian society. Unmentioned in the film is what everyone on the Bolivian left knew; that MNR governments, fearing they had unleashed a power they would not be able to control, had gradually disarmed the popular militias that had installed them in power while rearming the armed forces. Ostensibly an evocation of Bolivia's mid-century revolutionary moment, *Revolución* is, at the same time, a call to armed rebellion, and certainly it was primarily seen as such outside of Bolivia. The film was banned in 1963 by Estenssoro's government, according to Sanjinés, because of its implicit critique of the current revolutionary government, although, he notes, more than 30,000 were able to see it at screenings he and Soria organized in mines and at universities throughout Bolivia.[67]

Sanjinés in the ICB (1964-1966)

The MNR's second ten-year plan lasted only two years. In November of 1964, a few months after Estenssoro had won reelection, the army overthrew his government and placed control in the hands of a military junta headed by Vice President René Barrientos, beginning a period of military rule that would continue almost without interruption until 1981. Rightly suspecting that it was a stronghold of MNR support, Barrientos ordered the ICB closed in 1964, then reversed course the next year, offering future president Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada the opportunity to run it, which he declined.[68] Barrientos then chose Sanjinés to be the new director, thanks to the intercession of Wálter Villagomez, an old friend of Sanjinés's father.[69]

Now installed in the ICB and with access to its equipment, Sanjinés brought in his team of Soria as scriptwriter and Rada as producer and began plans to make a medium length film in 35mm as a rehearsal for a future attempt at feature filmmaking. The

composer Alberto Villalpando, who would compose the music for Sanjinés first two features as well, was brought in to do the soundtrack.

The resulting film, *¡Aysa!* (*Landslide!*, 1965), is forty minutes long, and, like *Revolución*, is accompanied only by music and sound effects, with the exception of the title word, the only one spoken in the film.[70] It is a portrait of a *pirquiñero*, a mixed Quechua and Spanish word for a sort of gleaner of mines who lives off of what he can recover from abandoned mining sites, a particularly dangerous occupation. At the end of the film he is killed by a landslide triggered by a dynamite explosion. His son, looking on, screams "*aysa*" to warn him.[71]

Alberto Villalpando remembers convincing Sanjinés to make the film without dialogue. On a trip to Argentina he had just seen and been very impressed by the Japanese film *Hadaka no shima* (*The Naked Isle*, Kaneto Shindo, 1960), which uses no speech and, like *¡Aysa!* is about the miserable lives of an isolated family.[72]

¡Aysa! was Sanjinés's first time working in 35mm (he would later go back to 16mm to obtain a more fluid, uninterrupted camera style), and it was also the first time he would work with the non-professional actors who would be the leads in his first two features, Benedicta Huanca and Vicente Verneros.[73] It was also the first time he would attempt to document the lives of miners. More importantly, though, it exposed the group of filmmakers to the full range of vicissitudes and ordeals that filmmaking in Bolivia entailed. According to Sanjinés, it took six people to carry the batteries used to record sound effects into the remote, mountainous locations.[74] They had to wait at least two weeks to see the rushes, and the lab reported having lost one long scene they had taken great pains to shoot in bitterly cold weather. After reshooting the scene, Sanjinés found the original "lost" version while doing post-production at the lab in Argentina.[75]

With *¡Aysa!* successfully completed, Sanjinés and his cohort felt prepared to embark on a feature length film, and they soon began shooting *Ukamau* (*Ukamau*, 1966) on location on the Island of the Sun in Lake Titicaca, the mythical birthplace of the Incan

gods.[76] Most of the dialogue is in Aymara, the indigenous language spoken in the area around the capital, La Paz, and it was released with Spanish subtitles. Though this in itself was a radical step for Bolivian filmmakers, it was overshadowed by the incendiary theme of the vengeful Indian that shocked the government sponsors of the ICB.

Andrés Mayta (Vicente Verneros) and Sabina (Benedicta Huanca) are a peasant couple farming on the Island of the Sun. One day, while Andrés is crossing to the shore to attend a market fair, Rosendo Ramos, a mestizo who lives by trading the island's farmers's produce on the mainland, stops by the Mayta house looking for Andrés. Seeing he is not home, he rapes Sabina, who is mortally wounded defending herself. After the incident Rosendo crosses paths with Andrés, who is walking home playing a melody on his flute. When Andrés arrives at home he sees signs of a struggle and learns from Sabina's dying words the identity of the culprit. One of Andrés friends suggests he notify the police, but he silently refuses. The middle part of the film alternates between showing Andrés and Rosendo engaged in their everyday activities. The mestizo is a dissolute cheater who lives off the exploitation of the Indians, while Andrés is shown to be devoted to his dead wife and an honorable member of his community, who is nevertheless awaiting the opportunity to seek revenge. One day he follows Rosendo, who has left the town with a pack mule. We seldom see Andrés, but we hear his flute melody, which pursues Rosendo, mixing with the wind of the altiplano and nearly driving him insane. In the end, Andrés overtakes Rosendo and beats him to death with stones.

Ukamau scandalized the government sponsors of the ICB. According to Sanjinés, the government ministers attending the opening publicly hailed the ICB's successful creation of a feature-length film, while privately telling its makers they considered it an act of treason likely to incite the Indians.[77] *Ukamau* won the Best New Director and Critics's prizes at Cannes in 1967, making it the most celebrated Bolivian production to date and thrusting its director into the international spotlight. Despite this success, or perhaps because of it, the Barrientos regime ordered the ICB closed again, this time for

good. There are conflicting stories as to why this was done. Sanjinés always maintained that it was the content of the film that directly led to the ICB being shut down. In one interview he adds that he and Soria were given a chance to stay on as long as they agreed to make a hagiographic portrait of Simon Patiño, one of Bolivia's tin barons, an offer they indignantly refused.[78] According to Soria, personal factors, especially what he calls Sanjinés's difficult personality, were equally responsible for government's failure to rally in defense of the ICB when the *Ukamau* scandal erupted.[79] Soria also suspected that certain officials were envious of the success of *Revolución*, *¡Aysa!*, and *Ukamau* in Bolivia and abroad. Officially, Sanjinés and his associates were expelled for mismanaging funds; more specifically, for not having the proper invoices for all costs. But as Soria notes, it is not always possible to obtain a proper invoice from a farmer whose mule you rent, and he defended Sanjinés against these accusations.[80] In any case, with the establishment of state television two years on the horizon, the ICB and its claim on scarce government resources for audiovisual propaganda were probably numbered anyway.

Sanjinés would later criticize *Ukamau*, saying that it failed to be a weapon in the liberation of the indigenous Bolivians because of its "concesión a una tendencia esteticista aún vigente (concession to a still prevailing aestheticizing tendency)," which, as we shall see, he considered derived from bourgeois European cinema.[81] Although for Sanjinés and Soria *Ukamau* was a subversion of a state-sponsored film program, for Mesa, who considers it to be Sanjinés's most formally accomplished work, it is the ultimate expression of tendencies within the ICB that can be traced back to the 1950s.[82] Mesa, who opposes the political and formal radicalism of Sanjinés's later films made in exile, criticizes *Ukamau* on political grounds as well, noting that the film presents a simplistic interpretation of race in Bolivia as constituting class.[83] At this point Sanjinés had not achieved the dialectical conception of race and class at the center of *La nación clandestina* (*The Clandestine Nation*, 1989), which he would develop through his work

with indigenous communities and the articulation of an increasingly elaborated theory of spectatorship. In a 1970 interview, his conflation of race and class during this period is evident. Speaking of *Ukamau*, he says, "We thought it necessary to analyze the relationship between the two classes which make up Bolivian society, the Indians and the 'mestizos' (half-castes): then to show that the Indians are capable of liberating themselves."[84] For the Bolivian literary critic Leonardo García Pabón, Andean *indigenismo* literature is an important but overlooked intertext for Sanjinés work, and with *Ukamau* Sanjinés reveals a clear indebtedness to Alcides Arguedas's *Raza de bronce* (*Race of Bronze*, 1945), which has a similar setting and established the trope of rape as a metaphor Sanjinés uses in the film for the exploitation of Indians.[85] Arguedas portrays the mestizo as deracinated and dissolute in his novel, much as Rosendo is portrayed in the film. After *Ukamau*, Sanjinés's stories would represent racial and class tensions in a less static, more fluidly dialectical manner. Cinematically, his representation of the indigenous subject would move away from the conventionally psychological portrait in *Ukamau* to an attempt to represent the indigenous subject's collective social sense and cyclical perception of time.

Out of a job and without immediate prospects for future films, Sanjinés took his family into the countryside for two years in order to save money and become better acquainted with the rural peasantry.[86] Three years later the reformed *Grupo Kollasuyo*, comprising Sanjinés, Soria, and Rada, now called the *Grupo Ukamau*, would be back with the independently produced feature *Yawar Mallku* (*Blood of the Condor*), which would achieve unforeseen political and commercial success and establish Sanjinés as one of Latin America's most significant revolutionary filmmakers.

The First Ukamau Group (1966-1971)

Two encounters involving *Yawar Mallku* would have a decisive impact on the trajectory of Sanjinés's filmmaking practice and theory. The first took place in Kaata, a

small town high in the Quechua-speaking Bolivian altiplano, when the Ukamau Group arrived to begin shooting the film. The second took place after the film was complete, when Sanjinés and Soria screened it in urban slums, mines, and remote villages.

In 1966, Sanjinés's prospects for directing another feature film in Bolivia would have been bleak indeed had *Ukamau* not been such a success abroad, emboldening him to look for financial support outside of Bolivia for the first time. In 1968, Sanjinés attended the second Festival of New Latin American Cinema in Mérida, Venezuela, where he screened *Ukamau*. This was an important gathering of members of the nascent New Latin American Cnema movement that included, in addition to screenings, roundtable discussions and talks on film and politics and the logistical problems faced by Latin American independent filmmakers. There he made contact with the members of Renacimiento, a film distribution company founded by Wálter Achugar with offices in Uruguay and Argentina, who offered to secure credit for his next production at an Argentine lab.[87] Lab work, along with raw stock, is one of the major expenses for any Bolivian production, and having this covered allowed the Ukamau Group to contemplate making another picture. Sanjinés, Soria, and Rada joined Antonio Eguino to form the production company Ukamau Ltda., the group's legal entity. Eguino, a childhood friend of Sanjinés's, returned in 1966 from nearly ten years living and studying engineering abroad in New York. His family had left Bolivia in response to the revolution, as had Sanjinés's. While living in New York, Eguino took classes in photography and film at the City University (CUNY), financing his studies by working as an assistant to various professional photographers. When he returned to Bolivia, his growing interest in film led him to look up his friend, who was beginning to make a name for himself as a director, and he joined the Ukamau Group as a cinematographer, a role which he would perform on the next two films.[88] To complete the financing, they accepted small donations from left-leaning La Paz doctors and other intellectuals. Soria took out a mortgage on his home, and Eguino sold some of his camera equipment. In this way, they were able to

gather enough money to purchase the necessary stock and an old 35mm motion picture camera.[89]

The original script called for a film about a rural teacher, a plot line reminiscent of *La vertiente*. Plans changed when first a La Paz daily newspaper, then the Catholic station *Radio Fides*, reported a rumor that Indian women were being sterilized without their consent while giving birth in health clinics staffed by the U.S. Peace Corps.[90] The group recognized immediately that forced sterilization was a perfect metaphor for the U.S.'s imperialist intervention in Bolivian affairs. According to Antonio Eguino, who is skeptical that the rumored sterilizations ever took place, as they met to develop the script, the members of the group never thought of sterilization as anything more than a political allegory, and that asserting the reality of such sterilizations was not their goal.[91] Sanjinés sums up the allegorical appeal of the incident for the group when he writes:

> Esa acción contenía en sí toda una suerta de posibilidades alegóricas que podrían permitir una visión más amplia de lo que significa la labor depredadora del capitalismo que corrompe lo que explota, que busca la destrucción de los pueblos física y culturalmente.
>
> (This action contained in itself all kinds of allegorical possibilities that could permit a more expansive vision of the meaning of the predatory work of capitalism, which corrupts that which it exploits, which seeks the physical and cultural destruction of the peoples.)[92]

Allegorical functions aside, Sanjinés has consistently maintained that interviews he conducted with gynecologists who had inspected sterilized women and later government investigations proved the veracity of the rumors, something U.S. authorities continue to deny. Whether or not he actually had such first-hand evidence, Sanjinés's opinion on the matter is well within the Bolivian mainstream; even the comparatively conservative Mesa reports the sterilization as fact.[93]

With the finances in place and the new script about sterilization ready, the group only needed to find a community in which they could work. Sanjinés met Marcelino Yanahuaya, a *mallku*, or traditional indigenous authority, from the remote village of

Kaata, at a screening of *Ukamau* in La Paz.[94] Sanjinés proposed that the group come to his village to make a film, and Yanahuaya eventually agreed after some initial reluctance. The trip to Kaata, 400 kilometers from La Paz, was arduous, and they had to cover the last 15 kilometers on foot, using pack mules to carry their equipment.[95] Eguino recalls that, traveling with their families in tow, they looked more like a "gypsy caravan" than a professional film crew.[96] In almost any circumstances their appearance would not have inspired trust; in Kaata it inspired immediate mistrust. Yanahuaya seemed enthusiastic about the film, but no one else did, and even his wife was reserved around the crew. Despite the fact that they were being offered ten times a normal daily wage and free medical attention, no one would agree to participate in the film, and women would hide their faces and run when approached. Only one person in the group of filmmakers spoke Quechua, making communication difficult. When they asked Yanahuaya for an explanation he only shrugged. The next morning the townspeople's suspicion turned to open hostility when the district mayor told them that the filmmakers were dangerous communists come to rob and kill them. That night rocks hit the door of Yanahuaya's house, where the group bedded down, and they heard people yelling that their chief had sold out to communists. Despairing of their situation, the filmmakers tried to understand where they had gone wrong. Suddenly it occurred to one of them that they should submit to a *jaiwaco*, a ceremony in which coca leaves are read by a *yatiri*, a specialist in indigenous rituals.[97] The entire population of the town gathered around a fire for the ceremony while the filmmakers huddled in their quarters awaiting their fate. With the first reading of the coca leaves, the *yatiri* announced that they came with good intentions. From that point, the group had all the volunteers they could use, and the filming proceeded without a hitch. They understood their original mistake had been to approach the villagers as they would bourgeois Bolivians, assuming that as long as they had the consent of their leader they would be able to do what they pleased, not realizing that the needs and opinions of the collective were paramount, and that these could only be

determined in a collective manner.[98] The group incorporated the *jaiwaco* ceremony into the film to reveal that Marcelino's wife is infertile.

In *Yawar Mallku*, Marcelino Yanahuaya plays a *mallku* who is concerned by the high infant mortality rate and low number of recent births. After interviewing the women of the village he comes to suspect that their inability to bear children can be traced to a local medical center run by U.S. volunteers where each last gave birth. He leads an attack upon the center in which the male volunteers are castrated. The local police shoot Marcelino and his accomplices in retribution, leaving him for dead. His wife, played by Benedicta Huanca, takes him to the city, seeking the help of his brother, Sixto, played by Vicente Verneros, who works in a factory there, and, in an effort to acculturate, denies his Indian roots. To save Marcelino's life, he must raise several times his monthly income to purchase blood for a transfusion. His unsuccessful efforts to do this make up a large part of the film, an odyssey through La Paz that forces Sixto to confront the indifference of the white elites toward the suffering of the indigenous majority. The film ends with a freeze frame of arms raising rifles against the sky, a call to combat. Gumucio Dagron calls this "a shot that has been incorporated into the history of New Latin American Cinema."[99] According to Eguino, there was considerable argument among the group about including this shot. Eguino personally opposes political violence and, in addition, feels that the shot has no context in the film.[100] For Sanjinés, the shot emblematizes the move from a cinema on the defensive to an offensive, rather than merely denunciatory cinema.

The premiere of *Yawar Mallku was* set for July 17, 1969, at the Cine 16 de Julio just off the *Plaza de Estudiantes* and a few blocks from UMSA in downtown La Paz. Hours before the opening, Soria received a memo from the municipal authorities that the screening was cancelled due to instructions from "higher authorities," widely believed to be the U.S. Embassy.[101] Fearing that the theme of the film would provoke censorship, Sanjinés and Soria had the foresight to mobilize groups of university students from the

cities of Oruro and Cochabamba and notify local journalists and intellectuals that the film would no doubt be banned.[102] A crowd of students had already gathered in front of the theater to buy tickets when the authorities announced the screening was cancelled. One group marched on the U.S. Embassy, another to the City Hall Plaza, where they were dispersed by tanks with water cannons. Faced with these demonstrations and the hostile reaction of journalists, the municipal authorities reversed their decision a few hours later, and the screening proceeded.

The students and journalists who protested the censorship of *Yawar Mallku* were defending the right to make political denunciations, but they were also defending cinema itself as an art form, something that would not have happened even a few years earlier in Bolivia. Since Sanjinés's return from Chile there had been enormous growth in film culture in La Paz, to which his early efforts at forming a cine-club and film school had contributed. In 1961, Eduardo Quiñones, a Catholic priest and one of Bolivia's first serious film critics, founded the *Centro de Orientación Cinematográfica* (COC).[103] In 1963, the COC established the *Cine Club Luminaria* with a membership of intellectuals, artists, and critics, the goals of which were to provide regular screenings of films that would otherwise be ignored by La Paz's commercial theater owners and foster the appreciation of cinema as a serious art form. In 1968, the *Colegio Don Bosco* in La Paz opened a large, non-commercial theater auditorium, the *Cine 16 de Julio*, which became the home to the *Cine Club Luminaria*'s screenings. The *Colegio Don Bosco*'s press began publishing small books on film intended for use in classrooms and cine-clubs, the first of which was a handbook on how to run discussions after screenings written by another priest, Renzo Cotta.[104] Thus by the time *Yawar Mallku* was scheduled to be shown at the *Cine 16 de Julio*, there was already a substantial, recognizable audience in place that took film seriously as an art form and as a means of intervening in political debates. According to the authors of a history of the theater's first decade, the censorship of *Yawar Mallku* provoked debates and works of criticism that demonstrated how the

public had, little by little, come to recognize the significance of cinema.[105] This audience was largely middle class, though, and as instrumental as they could be in affecting elite opinion, they were not the audience Sanjinés was hoping to reach.

Yawar Mallku performed even better than *Ukamau* in Bolivia's commercial theaters but remained inaccessible to the rural peasantry and miners, who lived where there were no theaters, and to the urban poor, who could not afford the price of admission. Sanjinés and Soria had learned how to bring cinema directly to the people while organizing screenings in mining communities for COMIBOL, and they put this knowledge to use staging numerous non-commercial screenings of the film, which became the second crucial encounter surrounding *Yawar Mallku*. The reaction to the film among popular audiences was less than they had hoped, and they realized there were two main problems with this and their previous films that rendered them of little use as tools for political mobilization. First, the film showed popular audiences what they already knew; in fact, in its attempt to represent the misery and oppression of indigenous Bolivians, the film was showing them something they knew much better than the filmmakers themselves. The film depicted a graphic example of U.S. penetration into indigenous culture and what Sanjinés refers to as captalism's work of cultural sterilization, especially in the scene in which the doctor's wife speaks to her children in English, but it did not explain why this was happening, knowledge necessary for effectively combating imperialism. Second, the narrative form of the film itself left these particular audiences unmoved. The narrative focus on a single representative family that so effectively awakened the sympathies of middle-class, western-oriented urban audiences seemed foreign to the indigenous and working class audiences who, like the people of Kaata, thought of themselves in collective terms. The narrative structure, with most of the story told in flashbacks as the wife recounted it to Sixto, proved a further impediment to the popular audiences's comprehension of the film, since, on the one hand, they were generally unfamiliar with the conventions of cinematic narrative, and, on the

other, it violated their experience of time, which was continuous and not conceived of in terms of discreet, measurable segments. According to Soria, he and Sanjinés had considered two types of narrative from the start, one chronological and the other using flashbacks, and, only after long debate did they settle upon the latter as a way of conveying the sense of two worlds existing simultaneously but separately in Bolivia. To rectify the problems this created for popular audiences they recut some prints of the film.[106] They also tried having a narrator present at the screening who would tell the story of the film before the screening began, a technique then still in use by itinerant storytellers on the *altiplano*, and one that dated back to the Incan period. Sometimes the narrator would hold up photographs of the performers as he spoke to further familiarize the audience with what they were going to see.[107] These experiments in narrative form conducted on the fly during screenings of *Yawar Mallku* formed the basis for the group's subsequent overhaul of their filmmaking practice, compelling Sanjinés to turn his attention to theorizing about how to make a cinema that would be culturally coherent with and useful to his target audience of indigenous Bolivians.

If the response of popular audiences proved a setback, the film was an unqualified success as *agit-prop*. In 1971, during the brief, left-populist rule of General Juan José Torres, Bolivia became the first country to expel a U.S. Peace Corps mission. James F. Siekmeier, a historian who has written a case-study of the expulsion, argues that anti-American sentiment grew in Bolivia during the late 1960s and early 1970s as a result of the murder of Che Guevara, the Vietnam war, and the lack of results from the much-heralded Alliance for Progress, "but the most important factor behind increasingly virulent anti-U.S. sentiment…was the controversy that erupted over the Corps's program to provide birth control information and materials to Bolivians."[108] Seikmeier attributes Bolivian opposition to birth control to two factors: first, the fear that, given Bolivia's high infant mortality rate, especially in rural communities, it might lead to families having few or no children; and second, the threat men felt from a woman's ability to control her

fertility. He adds, "While such sentiments were important sources of strained relations between nations, the provocative 1969 film, *Blood of the Condor*, …proved the coup de grâce."[109] Sanjinés, like many Bolivians, opposed birth control not on religious or moral grounds, but because it appeared to be calculated to clear Bolivia of its indigenous population, opening the land and its resources to foreign development. In an interview he said, "I realize that a program of birth control is necessary in many Third World countries—on the condition that it be accompanied by education of the people involved as to its significance. But it so happens that Bolivia is not an overpopulated land, with only 4 inhabitants per square kilometer and an infant mortality rate of 40%."[110] When the Peace Corps returned to Bolivia in 1990, screenings of *Yawar Mallku* became part of the official training.[111]

Ironically, the National Symphony Orchestra, which performed Alberto Villalpando's compositions for the soundtrack, was partially made up of a number of Peace Corps volunteers, including the conductor, Gerald Brown. According to Villalpando, Brown and the other volunteers agreed to work on the film even after they were told what it portrayed.[112] Sanjinés makes no allusion to this incident, but he does claim that the National Symphony was attacked, and some of its Peace Corps members threatened with lynching, before a performance in Achacachi, a traditional center of Aymara activism.[113]

Sanjinés could justifiably claim that the film dealt a blow to U.S. imperial interests, thereby proving that a film could be a weapon in the people's struggle against domination. Because of the controversy, as well as the film's artistic merits, it was highly successful another way as well. In 1970, Walter Achugar, founder of Renacimiento in Uruguay, brought *Yawar Mallku* to the U.S., where he had arranged for it to screen in the San Francisco International Film Festival. The screening, according to Achugar, caused quite a sensation, and afterwards he was approached by three young Argentines who knew little about film, but according to him,

> were committed to political change in Latin America and fervently believed that films like *Blood of the Condor*, if made available to U.S. audiences, could make a difference in American attitudes and policy toward Latin America. They were Gino Lofredo and Rodi and Carlos Broullon, and that conversation was the beginning of the Tricontinental Film Center, later renamed Unifilm. The organization inspired by that first U.S. screening of *Blood of the Condor* would become the major North American distributor of Third World and political cinema until it shut down in 1983.[114]

In Europe, where in 1969 the film won the Georges Sadoul award from French film critics for the best foreign feature and a prize at the Venice festival, among others, sales of the film were so strong that they permitted the group to pay off their debts and purchase new equipment for use on future projects.[115]

After the extraordinary success of *Yawar Mallku*, the next film the Ukamau Group undertook, *Los caminos de la muerte* (*The Roads of Death*), would be a complete disaster. Although it was never completed or released in any form, Sanjinés still referred to it as the most important of their films.[116] The confrontations between popular audiences and *Yawar Mallku* forced the group to reexamine their methods; with this film they would collaborate on the story and dialogue with actual participants in the events depicted, depict a collective protagonist, and experiment with longer takes, all techniques that Sanjinés would continue to refine throughout the decade. Above all, rather than simply demonstrating and denouncing an injustice, the film would analyze the political mechanism behind it and suggest strategies for combating it. The story was based on an incident from the last years of Estenssoro's rule, when the Bolivian army, with U.S. assistance, provoked a fight between two tribal groups, the Laimes and the Jucumanes, so that the army could step in and pacify that region of the department of Potosí, providing a base from which it could launch attacks against the miner's union in the nearby Catavi mines, one of Bolivia's largest.[117] The film argues that Estenssoro, by the end of his second term, had no qualms about attacking the miners when bid to do so by U.S. military and economic interests, but, because he had relied upon these same unions to bring him to power a decade earlier, he could not do so openly. More than simply an

indictment of the revolution for failing to deliver on its promises, as in *Revolución*, *Los caminos de la muerte* argues that even before the Barrientos regime came to power, the MNR-led revolution had already sold out the people to imperial interests.

Los caminos de la muerte was Ukamau's first internationally financed co-production, another consequence of the extraordinary success of *Yawar Mallku* abroad. It was produced by a West German Catholic television production company, Provobis, which contracted a West German company, Mosaik, to do the lab work. Arguments among the group as well as technical problems, especially with the four cameras they had acquired, beset the production from the beginning. After shooting more than half of the film over several months in 1970, they sent it off to Germany for processing, where the negatives were damaged and rendered unusable. Sanjinés suspected sabotage. In an interview with *Cahiers du cinéma* he recounts how, although they had attempted to keep the subject matter of the film a secret, a French television crew managed to locate them and insisted on the right to film them at work. This made them suspect that they were under surveillance, and it was at this point that they decided to suspend the shoot while awaiting the development of what they had so far.[118] The cinematographer, Antonio Eguino, who accompanied the footage to Germany and was present as it was processed, has always maintained that it was an error, not sabotage, that ruined the film.[119] According to Peter B. Schumann, a German historian of Latin American cinema, Provobis had to abandon the project because they could not afford to finance the reshoot of a scene that included masses of people.[120]

Sanjinés traced the breakup of the first Ukamau Group to the experience of working on *Los caminos de la muerte*, but he saw the problems the group faced as going well beyond frustrations about logistics and equipment failures. He felt that his style of working was too anarchic to thrive within a commercial structure like Ukamau Ltda. and that his temperament did not make him a good partner in such a firm.[121] Before they could dissolve, though, another international opportunity presented itself, and the team of

Sanjinés, Soria, Rada, and Eguino came together one last time. In 1971, *Radiotelevisione Italiana* (RAI), the Italian state television network, in response to the popularity of Latin American cinema in Italy, had decided to produce a six-film series entitled "Latin America Seen by its Directors." Walter Achugar put RAI in contact with Sanjinés, and Ukamau Ltda. was subsequently hired to make a one-hour film about Bolivia.[122] The group was ready to accept this commission immediately, having already researched and prepared a script during their tours of the mines with *Yawar Mallku* the previous year. At the Siglo XX mine, Sanjinés and Soria met with survivors from several massacres of miners by the Bolivian military. They found out that the most recent massacre had taken place in June of 1967, the evening before the feast day of St. John, an important local festival in the towns around the mine. The military junta had suppressed news of this massacre. Soria compiled the information he obtained from interviews to produce a story, "La noche de San Juan (The Night of St. John)", which became the basis for the new film. Among the people they met at Siglo XX were Domitila Barrios de Chungara and Federico Vallejo, two survivors of the massacre who would become important collaborators on, and performers in, the film.[123]

The left-populist General Juan José Torres, who was appointed president by the military junta in October 1970, promised greater freedom in Bolivia and openly supported leftist organizations like the miners's unions. Besides expelling the Peace Corps, Torres also accepted foreign aid from eastern European countries for the first time. Although their contract with RAI granted the network control of distribution in Europe, the Ukamau Group maintained the rights for Bolivia and Latin America, where, with Torres in power, they felt reasonably certain the film would not be banned. Unfortunately, Torres was overthrown by Banzer two days after Sanjinés completed post-production in Rome, and it would be almost ten years before the film, *El coraje del pueblo* (*The Courage of the People*, 1971), could be shown in Bolivia.

El coraje del pueblo begins with a section reconstructing the first military massacre of miners, which took place in 1942. The next section gives the dates and estimated number of victims for all subsequent massacres, the information appearing as text over still photos. Sanjinés had heard from audiences at screenings of *Yawar Mallku* that they wanted to know the details about exactly who was responsible for the sterilization campaigns and other atrocities. The most provocative aspect of the first part of *El coraje del pueblo* is the naming of names and showing of faces of the military and political leaders responsible for each massacre. After the report of each massacre, the word "Responsables" ("Those responsible") expands to fill the screen, to be replaced by a photo with the name and position of those who are to blame. The next section gives a documentary style glimpse into life in the mining communities, with interviews providing voice-over commentary. The remainder of the film is a reconstruction of the events leading up to the massacre on the night of St. John. The day after the Feast of St. John there was to be a large meeting of miners and radical students at Siglo XX at which they would vote on whether or not to support Che Guevara's guerilla army, then fighting in Bolivia. The Barrientos regime initiated the massacre, with tactical support from the U.S., in order to head off this incipient oppositional alliance and deprive the guerillas of much needed support.

Knowing it would be impossible to continue making revolutionary cinema under the Banzer regime, which swiftly and brutally reversed Torres's policies, jailing leftists and restoring U.S. influence over military and economic policies, Sanjinés decided not to return to Bolivia. Soria, Eguino, and Rada preferred to continue developing Bolivian national cinema despite the difficult conditions, and at a meeting in Chile the group decided to split.[124] According to Eguino, Sanjinés sold his share in Ukamau Ltda. to the remaining three partners, who retained the exclusive legal right to use the name.[125] From this point on there were two Ukamaus, one led by Sanjinés abroad and another that continued to produce feature films in Bolivia, including *Chuquiago* (1977), directed by

Eguino from a script by Soria, which became the most successful Bolivian film domestically, beating *Jaws* (1976) at the Bolivian box office.[126]

Sanjinés in Exile (1971-1978)

Sanjinés's essay "Cine revolucionario, la experiencia boliviana" was published in *Cine cubano* during his first year of exile. An appendix to the essay not included in later versions quantitatively sums up Ukamau's accomplishments to date. In a period of six years (1966-1971), they had completed three films, the production of which had occupied eighteen months combined. He calculates that the remaining fifty-four months were spent writing scripts—fourteen in all, of which only four were produced, if one counts the abandoned *Los caminos de la muerte*—but mostly securing the means to produce films.[127] At this point Sanjinés could not have known that he would never again be able to direct films at the rate of one every other year—a rate which in 1971 seemed intolerably slow—although he might have suspected as much. During eight years of exile he directed only two films, *El enemigo principal* (*The Principal Enemy*, 1974) and *¡Fuera de aquí!* (*Get Out of Here!*, 1977). Although they circulated less widely than *Yawar Mallku* and *El coraje del pueblo* abroad, and were not shown in Bolivia until the 1979 retrospective that accompanied his return, these two films are key works in Sanjinés's *oeuvre*, because much of his theoretical writings from the 1970s references their production. They demonstrate a break with the past on the formal level only hinted at in *El coraje del pueblo*, as Sanjinés pursues the creation of a new cinematic language consonant with the *Weltanschauung* of his desired spectators, the Andean *campesinos*.

The protagonists of *El enemigo principal* are the people of the community of Rajchi, near Cusco, where much of the film was shot. Additional sequences were filmed in Chile and Bolivia. It begins with a montage of static shots of Machu Picchu. An elderly man steps out from among the stones and walks to the center of the frame, from which he addresses the camera in a full shot. He is Saturnino Huillca, a well-known

Peruvian peasant syndicate leader.[128] Sanjinés structures the film around a narrator, as he and Soria had done at certain screenings of *Yawar Mallku* before indigenous audiences. The narrator, who appears at intervals throughout the film, usually stepping from off screen into a space recently vacated by the players, tells what is going to happen so that the audience is not involved in the intrigue and can focus their attention on analyzing the actions represented. The story was adapted from *Peru 1965*, the memoir of Héctor Béhar, an ELN guerilla who fought in Ayacucho, Peru.[129] It begins with a campesino, Julian, confronting Carillo, the local landowner, about a bull of his that the landowner sold as his own. Carillo kills Julian, beheading him with a shovel, while his henchman holds Julian's wife. She takes his head back to the village, and the villagers rise up, capture Carillo, and decide to take him to the local judge rather than killing him on the spot. The judge insists that only a few of the villagers meet with him, and that there be only one plaintiff. After the villagers he meets with make their complaint, he frees Carillo and arrests the peasants's representatives for kidnapping and other damages. The judge and Carillo toast each other as the men are led away.

The middle section of the film concerns the arrival of the guerillas in the village. There is a series of sequences showing how they introduce themselves to the community and get acquainted with them. Only after a while do they speak of politics; they tell the villagers that their real enemies are the North Americans who expropriate the country's resources. With the help of the guerillas, the villagers capture Carillo and his henchman again, and put him on trial, with the guerillas acting as prosecution and judge. After the members of the community have all had a chance to make their accusations, the two are found guilty and sentenced to die. The guerillas carry out the execution.

The final section of the film concerns the guerilla war. The guerillas wait outside the village while the inhabitants debate whether or not to support them and if so, how many people they will send to join. Only three eventually integrate themselves into the guerilla unit; others explain that they would but cannot abandon their land, or that they

feel that they must carry out the fight in their home village. The army moves in to occupy the village, burning the huts and rounding up young men and throwing them from cliffs, then calling in a napalm strike. The guerillas escape into the forest, pursued by the army, and the film ends ambiguously with the narrator exiting the frame, the sound of gunfire and bombing on the soundtrack as the camera holds the empty shot.[130]

This was the first film Sanjinés attempted to make using mostly sequence shots, although the bulkiness of the 35mm camera and sound equipment, the ruggedness of the terrain, and the inability of the non-professional performers to remember lines and actions all combined to limit the team's ability to pull off long takes.[131] Even though the end result remained far from what Sanjinés had originally envisioned, viewers's responses to those parts of the film where long takes were achieved convinced him that, despite the difficulties it presented in production, this technique resulted in effective communication.

El enemigo principal was also shot entirely with synchronized sound, which allowed the performers to improvise their lines. In one particularly powerful scene, after capturing Carillo a second time, the peasants take turns accusing the landlord of various crimes. Their accusations become more and more impassioned, and it becomes clear that the performers are denouncing their own condition of exploitation rather than repeating lines in a script. For his next film, *¡Fuera de aquí!*, Sanjinés would switch back to 16mm, since the lighter cameras could be moved with greater ease and stability. Except for *Los hijos del último jardín* (*The Sons of the Last Garden*), which was shot on digital video, Sanjinés would continue to use 16mm, blowing it up to 35mm, for all of his subsequent films.

When he began making *El enemigo principal* in Peru in 1974, Sanjinés presented the people of Rajchi with two completed scripts to choose from; the one they did not select became *¡Fuera de aquí!* three years later, shot in the community of Kalakala, Ecuador. This film became possible when Beatriz Palacios, Sanjinés's second wife and

his collaborator until her death in 2003, arranged a co-production with film departments of the *Universidad Central de Ecuador* and the *Universidad de los Andes* in Venezuela. Free copies of the completed film were given to various labor and peasants organizations in Ecuador to distribute as they saw fit, and, if Sanjinés's estimates of a total viewership of 900,000 in Ecuador alone as of March 1978 are correct, it may be the most widely seen of his films, at least in South America.[132] The production of *¡Fuera de aquí!* was beset with problems, some of which arose from basic lack of materials, while others resulted from the perennial problem of the absence of nearby laboratory facilities. The crew had only outdated film stock with which to work. Their efforts to obtain more led to disaster; while an unnamed associate in Bolivia was attempting to smuggle stock over the border into Peru, the police discovered her. In order to make her getaway, she had to abandon what she was carrying, which, in addition to the stock, included a print of *El coraje del pueblo*. The seizure of this print by the police in 1975 led to the arrest of Antonio Eguino, who was held responsible by the authorities because of his connection to the film. Eguino spent two weeks incarcerated, after which the government freed him in response to a campaign for his release in which international filmmakers participated. The loss of this stock led to an eight month interruption of the filming, some of which would have been necessary anyway in order for the performers, who worked on the film in their spare time, to complete their harvests. According to Sanjinés, the delay allowed the community time to discuss the issues in the film and led to a sharpening of the political debate between those members of the community who interpret the events in terms of race and those who believe it is a class conflict.[133] Instead of the simple conflation of race and class found in *Ukamau*, in *¡Fuera de aquí!* the peasants themselves debate the relationship between the two and the relative value of each as a tool for analyzing their situation.

¡Fuera de aquí! begins with a presentation of newspaper articles purporting to document sterilization campaigns conducted by the USAID and the UN in Bolivia and

Colombia. The action begins with the arrival of a politician in the village of Kalakala. On the soundtrack, a narrator in voice off who does not appear in the film but provides sporadic commentary announces the purpose of the film—to help people identify their enemy.[134] While the politician gives his speech, the locals quietly bury the jeep he arrived in with rocks, and then chase him and his associates off. Despite this demonstration of the community's ability to protect its interests and keep away outsiders, the narrator next announces that the community was not prepared to receive the real enemy. A cut to a group of people singing hymns suggests that these are missionaries. Missionaries arrive along with members of a linguistic institute; the former divide the once uniform community into Catholics and Protestants, while the latter study its ways to facilitate penetration into the community by outside forces. Both are acting as shock troops for a group of geological engineers studying the region. The missionaries dispense medicine and food in USAID marked cans that contains sterilizing substances. A group of peasants from the village travel to a government office in Quito, where they are told that substantial mineral deposits have been found under the village and offered jobs in any mines that might be developed there. Back in the village they explain this offer to the assembled community; the Protestant members argue that the mines are the will of God, the others say they will not give up farming their traditional lands to become miners. A fight breaks out among the divided community.

In the second half of the film, government officials arrive as in the beginning, this time to tell the villagers that the land is now the property of the mining company and that they must leave it immediately. The American developers of the mine have secured the eviction of the residents in return for campaign contributions to the authorities in Quito. The residents are put on trucks and their huts bulldozed and burned. Abandoned miles from their former homes, the people go back on foot, and the narrator announces that four elderly people and two children die along the way. Back in the area of Kalakala, they meet with surrounding communities who decide to combine forces and form a roadblock.

They confront the army at the roadblock and a massacre ensues, which, rather than dispiriting the communities, further unifies them. When another group of missionaries arrives they are immediately run off, and the film concludes with a sequence showing the communities working together to rebuild Kalakala, a scene reminiscent of the construction of the pipeline in *La vertiente*.[135]

Sanjinés Back in Bolivia (1978 to the present)

When the Banzer regime fell in 1978 and Bolivia began to make tentative moves toward democratic rule, Sanjinés and Palacios returned to La Paz, dedicating themselves to the distribution of Sanjinés's cinematic *oeuvre*. Sanjinés also began compiling and rewriting the texts that would be published the following year as *Teoría y práctica de un cine junto al pueblo* by Siglo XXI in Mexico. Commercial cinemas would not show Sanjinés's films, so the *Cinemateca Boliviana* mounted a retrospective including the two films made in exile. *El coraje del pueblo*, which had not been officially shown in Bolivia, proved the most controversial of the films. Right-wing provocateurs attempted to stop it from being screened by throwing an explosive into the empty theater, and the film was banned by municipal authorities, this time at the insistence of the Bolivian military, in which many of the officers named as responsible for the massacres still served.[136] One of these officers, General Ramón Azero, sued the Ukamau Group and Sanjinés for defamation.[137] Since the atmosphere in Bolivia was so tense, the Cinemateca suspended the retrospective until after the 1979 elections.[138]

In November of 1979, when Colonel Alberto Natusch Busch overthrew the caretaker government of Dr. Wálter Guevara, who had been selected by the legislature to lead the country until national elections could be held in 1980, Sanjinés and Palacios began shooting a documentary about the pro-democracy resistance movements among the *campesinos* and miners. The film, titled *Las banderas del amanecer* (*The Flags of*

Dawn) and completed in 1983, concludes with the fall of the García Meza dictatorship and the return to democracy in October of 1981.[139]

Bolivia's hyperinflation of the mid-1980s brought the already limited film production to a halt. During this time Sanjinés and Palacios continued traveling throughout the country screening their own and other works of the New Latin American Cinema. Sanjinés was also very active in Cuba during this period, serving on the executive council of the *Fundación del Nuevo Cine Latinoamericano*, founded in 1986, and in the late 1980s he was a member of the committee charged with selecting students from Bolivia to attend the International School of Film and Video in San Antonio de los Baños, Cuba.

In 1985 Sanjinés finished the scripts for *La nación clandestina* and *La guerra del Chaco Boreal* (*The War of the Chaco Boreal*); the latter was a project he had begun planning in the 1970s. Sanjinés has called *La nación clandestina* the film for which all his previous works had been rehearsals, and in Bolivia it is generally regarded as his masterpiece. He began shooting it in 1987, but continued fallout from Bolivia's economic chaos soon halted the production. The bank holding the money for the film went bankrupt, and Sanjinés could not resume filming again until the end of 1988. The film was released in 1989, his first feature length film in six years, and the first fiction feature he had made in Bolivia since 1971.[140]

La nación clandestina tells the story of Sebastian Mamani, an Aymara who has settled in El Alto, the immigrant city above La Paz, changing his name to the less conspicuously indigenous Maisman. When his father dies, his brother, a teacher and militant, finds him and brings him back to their village. He is convinced to stay, marries and then, because of his experience in the larger world, selected to serve a year as the village's *mallku*. When developers seek to get the village to hand over their land in return for assistance, the majority of the villagers are opposed to the deal. Ignoring the collective will, Sebastian goes to La Paz and signs on to the deal on behalf of the village.

For this violation of the community's trust he is ostracized and told never to return on pain of death. After several more years in the city, Sebastian decides to return to his village to perform *la danza de jacha tata danzante*, a now almost forgotten ritual sacrificial dance, in which the dancer dances to his or her death. In reviving this custom Sebastian is reunited with his community and born again. The last shot of the film shows Sebastian, dressed in black, at the end of his own funeral procession.

In 1989 Sanjinés and Palacios opened a small theater in the colonial center of La Paz, the *Sala Ukamau*, which was dedicated to repertory screenings of Sanjinés's films. The *Sala Ukamau*, which seats about 100, is equipped for video and 16mm projection and is located in a building owned by the *Fundación Grupo Ukamau* that also contains Sanjinés's offices and the prints he distributes.

In 1991 the Consejo Nacional de Cine (CONACINE) was given funds by the Bolivian government that it could advance against future receipts to filmmakers. Two years later, using funds from this source, Sanjinés made his most expensive film to date, and his first film since *Ukamau* to be made with official government support, *Para recibir el canto de los pájaros* (*To Hear the Birds Singing*, 1995). This was also Sanjinés's first film to use a recognizable star, Geraldine Chaplin. This self-reflexive *film a clef* is about a film crew that goes into the countryside to make a movie about the Spanish Conquest in collaboration with indigenous peasants. It combines Sanjinés's experiences in Kaata making *Yawar Mallku* with that film's original storyline about a rural teacher to examine racism in contemporary Bolivia.

Sanjinés and Palacios established the *Escuela Andina de Cine* in the early 2000s, Sanjinés's second attempt at founding a film school in La Paz. The school was located in the *Fundación Grupo Ukamau's* building and hosted visiting instructors like the Cuban filmmaker Julio García Espinosa. In 2003 Sanjinés shot his most recent feature film to date, *Los hijos del último jardín*, on digital video using his students as a crew. This story, told in reverse chronological order, is about La Paz street children who steal money from

a corrupt politician and take it back to the rural community where they were born. Palacios had a talent for interviewing street kids, and she told their stories in newspaper pieces, some of which Sanjinés collected in the volume, *Los días rabiosos*. The impetus for making a film about street kids came from her; unfortunately, Palacios died one week before the filming was completed.

As of this writing, Sanjinés was busy trying to raise money to finance *La guerra del Chaco Boreal*, which he hoped to begin making at the end of 2009. CONACINE, which lent money for the production of around forty features since 1991, including Sanjinés's two most recent, no longer had funds at its disposal to lend, since none of the films it had previously helped finance had turned a profit. Sanjinés was therefore meeting with producers in Venezuela and Spain. Thirty years earlier, in "Cine revolucionario, la experiencia boliviana," he had lamented the amount of time he had to spend securing the resources to make a film. For Sanjinés and other Bolivian intellectuals, the roots of Bolivia's current anti-globalization movements and policies can be traced to the Chaco War of 1932-1935, which, in one interpretation, was provoked by competing petrochemical multinationals. Whether or not Sanjinés will be able to tell this story is largely dependent upon the forces of globalization that, in realms outside of culture, Bolivians have proved adept at resisting.

The situation is, if anything, even worse today. Although the precipitous decline in the number of motion picture screens during the 1990s has reversed of late, thanks to the construction of multiplexes in the major cities, Bolivia still has far fewer screens per capita than most other Latin American countries, making it virtually impossible for a film to recoup its costs through ticket sales. As in much of Latin America, Hollywood-dominated distribution companies exclude domestically produced films from local screens. When films do manage to obtain a commercial release, they immediately appear on the streets as bootleg DVDs, undermining their already limited commercial potential. In the U.S., an important market for New Latin American Cinema in the 1970s, audiences

for foreign-language films continue to dwindle, even with widespread availability on DVD.

Notes

[1] Compounding the high cost of film stock, which could only be purchased with dollars, were the import taxes assessed by the Bolivian government. Since the late 1970s filmmakers had argued for an exemption from these taxes, and this became one of the primary legislative goals of the *Consejo Nacional Autónomo de Cine* (CONACINE) when it was established in 1982. It was finally achieved with the passage of a comprehensive film law in 1992. See José Sánchez-H, *The Art and Politics of Bolivian Cinema* (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 1999), 171.

[2] Alfonso Gumucio Dagron, *Historia del cine en bolivia* (La Paz: Editorial Amigos del Libro, 1982). Gumucio Dagron's book is an impressively comprehensive and meticulous work, produced under difficult conditions over a long period of time. Besides the political instability and repression, Gumucio Dagron, like the filmmakers he writes about, suffered from a lack of access to technology. Today photocopy machines are ubiquitous in urban Bolivia and have largely supplanted the commercial publishing industry, much in the way that bootlegged DVDs have the commercial VHS/DVD industry. In the 1970s, when he was conducting his primary research, photocopy machines were considerably less common. Since the libraries he conducted his research in were not equipped with them, Gumucio Dagron was forced to record primary sources using his 35mm still camera.

[3] Mesa, *La aventura del cine boliviano*.

[4] Guy Hennebelle and Alfonso Gumucio-Dagron, eds., *Les Cínemas de l'Amérique latine* (Paris: Nouvelle Editions Pierre Lherminier), 1981.

[5] Alfonso Gumucio Dagron, *Cine, censura y exilio en América latina* (La Paz: Editores Film/Historia, 1977). A second edition was published in Mexico in 1984.

[6] Alfonso Gumucio Dagron, *El cine de los trabajadores* (Managua: Editorial Central Sandanista de Trajabadores, 1981.

[7] Alfonso Gumucio Dagron and Thomas Tufte, eds. *Communication for Social Change Anthology: Historical and Contemporary Readings* (South Orange: Communication for Social Change Consortium, 2006).

[8] Mesa, *La aventura del cine boliviano*.

[9] For more on the Gas War and the Mesa presidency see Forrest Hylton and Sinclair Thompson, *Revolutionary Horizons: Past and Present in Bolivian Politics* (New York: Verso, 2007, 118-126 and Benjamin Kohl and Linda Farthing, *Impasse in Bolivia: Neoliberal Hegemony and Popular Resistance* (New York: Zed Books, 2006), 173-175.

[10] Ana López, "A Short History of Latin American Film Histories," *Journal of Film and Video* 37.1 (1985): 61.

[11] Mesa, *La aventura del cine boliviano*, 11.

[12] In 1979, Isaac León Frias wrote of Sanjinés in the introduction to a collection of interviews with New Latin American Cinema filmmakers, "But his progressive radicalization and above all the change in the political situation in Bolivia, which forced

him to go into exile, converted him into a figure, *the figure* in reality, of Latin American political cinema" (translation mine: italics in the original). See Isaac León Frias, *Los años de la conmoción: 1967-1973 Entrevistas con realizadores sudamericanos*, Cuadernos de cine, no. 28 (México D.F.: UNAM, 1979), 12.

[13] Festival prizes from abroad are an important means of marketing Bolivian cinema in Bolivia to audiences sceptical of the "local product." Official DVDs currently sold at the Cinemateca Boliviana are covered with logos for festivals, however small, that the films were invited to. Bootleg DVDs have similar, although less reliable information on their Photoshop-created covers. In a 1971 interview Sanjinés comments on the impact the prizes given *Ukamau* at Cannes had on the film's popularity at home: "But the bourgeoisie, the mestizos and whites did not come see the film when it first came out. It was only after the film had had a good critical reception in Europe and several successes here and there that they became interested. We conducted an inquiry into this bourgeois public (without, of course, saying that we were the makers of the film) and in general people said, 'It's a Bolivian film, that must be bad' in accordance with the anti-national mentality which makes people look only outside the country." See Jorge Sanjinés, "Ukamau and Yawar Mallku: Interview with Jorge Sanjines," interview, *Afterimage* no. 3 (1971): 45. For a list of international prizes won by Bolivian films see Sánchez-H, *The Art and Politics of Bolivian Cinema*, 191-7.

[14] Gumucio Dagron, *Historia del cine en bolivia*, 72.

[15] Ibid., 71.

[16] Ibid., 72 (translation mine).

[17] Mesa, *La aventura del cine boliviano*, 12 (translation mine).

[18] Mesa, *La aventura del cine boliviano*, 13 (translation mine).

[19] Another key source will be Sánchez-H, *The Art and Politics of Bolivian Cinema*. I have not considered this a third history of Bolivian cinema per se since much of the information, and even how it is organized, is clearly derived from Mesa. However, Sánchez-H does include some very valuable interviews, especially with film composers, whose contribution to the films is largely overlooked in the Bolivian histories. This is surprising, given the prominence of composers like Alberto Vilallpando and Cergio Prudencio, both of whom scored films for Sanjinés, in Bolivian cultural life. Sánchez-H has also updated through the 1990s Mesa's lists of Bolivian feature films and the awards they have won.

[20] López, "A Short History," 63.

[21] Ibid., 62.

[22] Jorge Sanjinés y Grupo Ukamau, *Teoría y práctica de un cine junto al pueblo* (México D.F.: Siglo Ventiuno, 1979), 13-14.

[23] Gumucio Dagron, *Historia del cine en bolivia*, 163-165.

[24] Ibid., 176

[25] Ibid., 176

[26] Sánchez-H, *The Art and Politics of Bolivian Cinema*, 39. This was the same year Fernando Birri, one of the founding figures of New Latin American Cinema and much later an associate of Sanjinés's, showed his first film, *Tire dié* (*Throw a Dime*, 1957), at SODRE. Accounts of Ruiz's visit to SODRE emphasize his meeting with John Grierson, and unfortunately there is no record of an exchange between Ruiz and Birri. For Birri at SODRE see Ana M. López, "An 'Other' History," in Michael T. Martin, ed. *New Latin American Cinema* (Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1997), 1.147.

[27] Gumucio Dagron, *Historia del cine en bolivia*, 179 (translation mine).

[28] Sanjinés, "Ukamau and Yawar Mallku," 45.

[29] Gumucio Dagron, *Historia del cine en bolivia*, 176.

[30] *Voces de la tierra* was scripted by Oscar Soria and contains a sequence showing the ritual performed by the residents of the Island of the Sun to protect their crops from hail damage. This same ritual appears in *Ukamau*, also written by Soria.

[31] Gumucio Dagron, *Historia del cine en bolivia*, 205. Gumucio Dagron derives this information from interviews with Ruiz. It should also be noted that the same year (1958) *Vuelve Sebastiana* screened at the Karlovy Vary film festival, a major festivals of the Soviet bloc that would be later become an important showcase for New Latin American Cinema films.

[32] Mesa, *La aventura del cine boliviano*, 58.

[33] Gumucio Dagron, *Historia del cine en bolivia*, 180.

[34] Mesa, *La aventura del cine boliviano*, 68 (my translation).

[35] Ibid, 68 (my translation). Mobile cinemas were used extensively in Cuba beginning in the early 1960s as well. Their first use can be traced back to the kino trains in Russia during the 1920s. Russian director Alexander Medvedkine's writings on the kino trains were read by Sanjinés and other Latin American filmmakers. For a complete history of Cuban mobile cinemas see José Manuel Pardo, "El cine-movil ICAIC," *Cine cubano* 73-5 (1972): 93-101. For a documentary on the Cuban mobile cinemas, see "Por primera vez" (Octavio Cortázar, Cuba, 1967).

[36] Jorge Ruiz, "Propaganda no es una mala palabra," *Decursos* 5.10 (2003): 8.

[37] Sánchez-H. *The Art and Politics of Bolivian Cinema*, 68-70.

[38] Gumucio Dagron, *Historia del cine en bolivia*, 200.

[39] Ibid., 201.

[40] Ibid., 187.

[41] Ibid., 237.

[42] Ibid., 213. *El Cine de Jorge Sanjinés* (Santa Cruz: FEDAM, 1999), 312.

[43] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 129-149.

[44] Ibid., 137.

[45] Ibid., 132-133.

[46] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 135-7.

[47] Sánchez-H., *The Art and Politics of Bolivian Cinema*, 67.

[48] Ibid., 77.

[49] Gumucio Dagron, *Historia del cine en bolivia*, 218 (my translation). Sanjinés's father was most likely landlord of a large landholding, or *hacienda*. For a life on a *hacienda* before the 1952 revolutions see James Dunkerly, *Rebellion in the Veins: Political Struggle in Bolivia 1952-1982* (New York: Verso, 1984), 18-25 and Laura Gotkowitz, *A Revolution for Our Rights: Indigenous Struggles for Land and Justice in Bolivia, 1880-1952* (Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 2007), 134-46.

[50] Jorge Sanjinés, "El tiempo circular de Jorge Sanjinés," interview by Ricardo Bajo Herreras, *El ojo que piensa*, no. 0 (2003): [journal online], available from http://www.elojoquepiensa.udg.mx/espanol/numero00/cinejournal/01_jorgesanjines.html; Internet; accessed 23 April 2009.

[51] Mesa, *La aventura del cine boliviano*, 69.

[52] Ibid., 69.

[53] José Antonio Valdivia, *Testigo de la realidad Jorge Ruiz: memorias del cine documental boliviano* (La Paz: Centro de Información para el Desarrollo, 1998), 134 (translation mine).

[54] Guillermo Ruiz, Interview, La Paz, Bolivia, 4 May 2008.

[55] Jorge Sanjinés, "Jorge Sanjines una entrevista," interview by Fernand Pérez. *Cine cubano* no. 71-2 (1971): 54.

[56] Mesa, *La aventura del cine boliviano*, 125.

[57] Gumucio Dagron, *Historia del cine en bolivia*, 214. Kollasuyo is the Incan name for the territory that includes the Bolivian altiplano.

[58] Ibid., 214.

[59] Sanjinés, "Jorge Sanjines una entrevista," 54.

[60] Mesa, *La aventura del cine boliviano*, 126.

[61] Ibid., 78.

[62] Gumucio Dagron, *Historia del cine en bolivia*, 217.

[63] Ibid., 218.

[64] Mesa, *La aventura del cine boliviano*, 128.

[65] Jorge Sanjinés, "Sobre el cortometraje," in *El cine de Jorge Sanjinés*, 31.

[66] For the "pre-guión" or preliminary outline of the film, see Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 161-164.

[67] Sanjinés, "Jorge Sanjines una entrevista," 58. It should be noted that Gumucio Dagron does not mention this in his account of film censorship in Latin America, *Cine, censura y exilio in américa latina.*

[68] Gumucio Dagron, *Historia del cine en bolivia*, 220. Sánchez de Lozada, discovered his love for filmmaking while studying literature at the University of Chicago in the late 1940s, and, upon returning to Bolivia had worked with Ruiz on a failed attempt to make a feature film in the early 1950s. In 1954 he founded a production company, Telecine, but left film out of frustration in 1958 to pursue a career in mining and later, politics. According to Ruiz, Sánchez de Lozada once said, "We are not going anywhere with cinema. In this country there are only two things worth dedicating oneself to, mining and politics." Qtd. in Jeff D. Himpele, *Circuits of Culture: Media, Politics, and Indigenous Identity in the Andes* (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 2008), 133.

[69] Mesa, *La aventura del cine boliviano*, 78.

[70] "Aysa" is Aymara for "landslide." This is one of two major works by Sanjinés, along with *Las banderas del amanecer* (*The Banners of Dawn*, 1985), that I have been unable to see, so I am entirely dependent upon published accounts. *Sueños y realidades*, *Un día Paulino*, and all of the newsreels and other shorts Sanjinés made at the ICB and before are currently unavailable as well, and they may no longer exist.

[71] For Sanjinés's own synopsis see Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 237-238.

[72] Sánchez-H., *The Art and Politics of Bolivian Cinema*, 155.

[73] Gumucio Dagron, *Historia del cine en bolivia*, 223.

[74] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 101.

[75] Jorge Sanjinés, "Conversacion con un cineasta revolucionario: Jorge Sanjines," interview. *Cine cubano* nos. 73-5 (1972): 4.

[76] "Ukamau" is an Aymara expression meaning "that's the way it is." This title was never translated for international releases.

[77] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 18-19. Sánchez-H, *The Art and Politics of Bolivian Cinema*, 83.

[78] Sanjinés, "Jorge Sanjines una entrevista," 55.

[79] Mesa, *La aventura del cine boliviano*, 130-1.

[80] Ibid., 130-131.

[81] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 18.

[82] Mesa, *La aventura del cine boliviano*, 84-86.

[83] Ibid., 85.

[84] Sanjinés, "Ukamau and Yawar Mallku," 42.

[85] Leonardo García Pabón, *La patria íntima: alegorías nacionales en la litertura y el cine de bolivia* (La Paz: Plural Editores, 1998), 251-2.

[86] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 102.

[87] Jorge Sanjinés, "Testimonio in Madrid," in *Hojas de cine: testimonios y documentos del nuevo cine latinoamericano* (México D.F.: UNAM, 1988) 1:101.

[88] Antonio Eguino, interview by the author, La Paz, 5 June 2007.

[89] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 121.

[90] Jorge Sanjinés, "A Talk with Jorge Sanjines," interview, *Cinéaste* 4.3 (1970-1): 12.

[91] Eguino, interview.

[92] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 20.

[93] Mesa, *La aventura del cine boliviano*, 87.

[94] For a discussion of the *mallku's* place in Andean structures of authority, see Sinclair Thompson, *We Alone Will Rule: Native Andean Politics in the Age of Insurgency* (Madison: Univeristy of Wisconsin Press, 2002), 29-34.

[95] Ibid, 26-27. Sanjinés recounts this version on several occaisions. The summary here is based on the account given in his essay, "Cine revolucionario: la experiencia boliviana," published in *Cine cubana* and *Teoría y práctica*. A substantially altered English version is available in Julianne Burton, ed., *Cinema and Social Change in Latin America: Conversations with Filmmakers* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), 36-47.

[96] Eguino, interview.

[97] For a description of the *yatiri*, see Libbet Crandon-Malamud, *From the Fat our our Souls: Social Change, Political Process, and Medical Pluralism in Bolivia* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1991), 128-132.

[98] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 26-31.

[99] Gumucio Dagron, *Historia del cine en bolivia*, 231.

[100] Eguino, interview.

[101] Gumucio Dagron, *Historia del cine en bolivia*, 232.

[102] Sánchez-H., *The Art and Politics of Bolivian Cinema*, 67. Sanjinés, "Ukamau and Yawar Mallku," 53. Students groups from these two Universities are listed as supporters in the opening credits.

[103] *Cine 16 de Julio 10 años 1968-1978* (La Paz: Escuela de Artes Graficos del Colegio Don Bosco, 1978), 12.

[104] Renzo Cotta, *El cineforum* Cuadernos de Cine no. 1 (La Paz; Editorial Don Bosco, 1972). In this text Cotta advocates discussion of films as a way of heightening appreciation of film artistry but also as a means of inserting film into public debate on social issues. Cotta is listed as a financial supporter in the opening credits of *Yawar Mallku*.

[105] *Cine 16 de Julio*, 32.

[106] Antonio Eguino, "Neo-realism in Bolivia: An Interview with Antonio Eguino," by Udayan Gupta, *Cinéaste* 9, no. 2 (1978-9): 27.

[107] Sanjinés, "A Talk with Jorge Sanjines," 12.

[108] James F. Siekmeier, "A Sacraficial Llama? The Expulsion of the Peace Corps from Bolivia in 1971," *Pacific Historical Review* 6.1 (2000): 77.

[109] Ibid., 80-1.

[110] Sanjinés, "A Talk with Jorge Sanjinés," 12.

[111] Joshua Partlow, "Policy and Passions Collide in Bolivia," *Washington Post*, 23 October 2008, A01.

[112] Sánchez-H. *The Art and Politics of Bolivian Cinema*, 157.

[113] Sanjinés, "Conversacion con un cineasta," 7.

[114] Burton, ed., *Cinema and Social Change*, 230.

[115] Sanjinés, "Jorge Sanjines una entrevista," 55.

[116] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 103.

[117] Dunkerley describes this conflict but not any military intervention into it. See Dunkerley, *Rebellion in the Veins*, 99-100.

[118] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 104-105.

[119] Gumucio Dagron, *Cine, censura y exilio en América latina*, 73. Eguino, interview.

[120] Peter B. Schumann, ed. *Kino und Kampf in Lateinamerika: Zur Theorie und Praxis des politischen Kinos* (München: Hanser Verlag, 1976), 167. This information appears in note 6 at the end of a German translation of "Cine Revolucionario, la experiencia boliviana" by Oscar Zambrano, one-time member of the Ukamau Group in exile and later a professor of cinema in West Berlin.

[121] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 138.

[122] Gumucio Dagron, *Historia del cine en bolivia*, 233.

[123] Jorge Sanjinés, "The Courage of the People an Interview with Jorge Sanjines," *Cinéaste* 5.2 (1972): 19. Domitila Churanga is the author of a well-known testimonial narrative, available in English as Domitila Barrios de Chungara, *Let Me Speak! Testimony of Domitila, a Woman of the Bolivian Mines* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1978). For the Spanish orginal see Domitila Barrios de Chungara, *"Si me permiten hablar": Testimonio de Domitila, una mujer de las minas de Bolivia* (Mexico: Siglo XXI, 1987).

[124] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 138.

[125] Eguino, interview.

[126] *Cine 16 de Julio*, 34. This claim is based on statistics kept by the *Cine 16 de Julio* in La Paz, where both films premiered. 123,351 tickets were sold there for *Chuquiago* in 1977, compared with 84,206 for *Jaws* the year before.

[127] Jorge Sanjinés, "Cine revoluionario, la experiencia boliviana," *Cine cubano* nos. 73-75 (1972): 14.

[128] Gumucio Dagron, *Historia del cine en bolivia*, 296.

[129] For an English translation of the incidents that form the plot of the film see Héctor Béhar, *Peru 1965: Notes on a Guerilla Experience*, trans. William Rose (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1969), 93ff. For the orignal Spanish see Héctor Béjar, *Perú 1965: Apuntes sobre una experiencia guerilla* (Lima: Campodonico Ediciones, 1969).

[130] For Sanjinés's synopsis of the film, see Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 243-245.

[131] The term sequence shot can be confusing because of the confusion between a sequence, which can be made of several scenes, and a scene. Only a sequence comprised of one scene can be filmed using a sequence shot. To further complicate things, the term is often used to refer to shots that do not actually encompass an entire scene. Timothy Corrigan and Patricia White, in the glossary of their introductory text to film studies, define the sequence shot as, "A shot in which an entire scene is played out in one continuous take." Timothy Corrigan and Patricia White, *The Film Experience: An Introduction* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2004), 524. A more flexible definition can be found in a piece on Theo Angelopoulos by Raymond Durgnat. "A vague term: it can mean a whole scene—*not* sequence—in one shot, or just a long*ish* shot instead of several

short*er* shots." Raymond Durgnat, "The Long Take in *Voyage to Cythera*: Brecht and Marx vs. Bazin and God," *Film Comment* 26, no. 6 (1990): 43. References to sequence shots in Sanjinés are really references to what Durgnat calls "long*ish* shots," in part because of the gap between what Sanjinés attempted and what he could actually achieve during the period in which he formed his ideas on the subject, and also because in his later films and writings he maintains a flexible approach to the sequence in order to avoid the appearance of rigid formalism, bordering on mannerism.

[132] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 123.

[133] Sanjinés, "Bolivia Sanjinés", *Framework* no. 10 (1979), 32.

[134] The narrator is Sanjinés himself, according to Gumucio Dagron. Gumucio Dagron, *Historia del cine en Bolivia*, 303.

[135] For Sanjinés's synopsis see Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 245-247.

[136] Mesa, *La aventura del cine boliviano*, 211.

[137] Gumucio Dagron, *Cine, censura y exilio*, 75.

[138] Mesa, *La aventura del cine boliviano*, 211.

[139] For an account of the clandestine filming of interviews with miners for the film, see Beatriz Palacios, *Los días rabiosos* (La Paz: Grupo Ukamau y Editorial Gente Común, 2005), 43-55.

[140] Sánchez-H., *The Art and Politics of Bolivian Cinema*, 90-94.

CHAPTER 2: UKAMAU'S THEORY

> They have first a pedagogical effect, then a political one, and last a poetic one.
>
> Walter Benjamin, "Bert Brecht"

Introduction

Although he wrote only one book, *Teoría y práctica de un cine junto al pueblo* (*Theory and Practice of a Cinema With the People*, 1979), Jorge Sanjinés is one of the most prolific theorists of New Latin American Cinema. In numerous articles, interviews, and speeches, he has articulated a remarkably consistent theory, which, because its principal concern is how to capture authentically the subjectivity of the indigenous peoples of the Andes, is unique among Latin American theoretical writings on film. In the 1970s, when these articles appeared with frequency in Latin American, European, and U.S. film journals, many critics regarded Sanjinés as one of the most incisive Latin American theorists on the relationship between cinema and politics. But because of the ephemeral nature of the journals in which his writings appeared (especially in Latin America) and the unsystematic manner in which his writings have been translated into other languages (the English version of his book contains only about half of the original text, omitting key sections such as the ones in which he discusses the historical precedents for his work), it has become increasingly difficult to obtain a complete picture of Sanjinés's remarkable contribution to film theory. The goal of this chapter is to provide an overview of the main concerns of Sanjinés's written texts that will be drawn upon in later chapters, in which the dialogue he was engaged in with European political art cinema of the same period begins to be sketched out.

Constructing a chronology of the publication of Sanjinés's writings is easy, but determining exactly when they were written is not. Still, it can be established that there were two main periods in which he focused on theoretical writings. The first is the mid-1970s, during the period of exile and the radical renovation of his cinematic practice.

The pieces from this period that comprise the bulk of his book. Then, in the mid to late 1980s, as he prepared to make *La nación clandestina*, his first feature film in almost a dozen years, Sanjinés produced a remarkable series of articles in which he distilled and deepened the ideas he had first put forth a decade earlier. In these works he becomes increasingly concerned with issues of indigenous identity and how indigenous subjectivity can be expressed cinematically. This leads him to confront the question of time in cinema and how cinematic time can be manipulated to make it consonant with indigenous Andean perceptions of time. The most important of these pieces, "El plano secuencia integral (The Integrated Sequence Shot)" will be touched upon briefly in this chapter and then looked at in depth in Chapter 4.

Sanjinés's first theoretical interventions center around a debate that places his work squarely in the tradition of Marxist aesthetics, the relationship between form and content in revolutionary art. Like many political filmmakers of his day, both in Latin America and in Europe, he advocates a total rejection of what he calls the "bourgeois" qualities of the cinema. But because his intended addressees are at best only glancingly familiar with cinema, he is unable to pursue for long a negative dialectic, predicated as such a strategy is for its effect on the spectator's familiarity with western cinematic conventions. Something new must take the place of what is rejected, which he theorizes must be cinematic forms consonant with the aesthetic practices of the Andean peoples (their sense of beauty) and their perceptions of social organization (the collectivity) and time (circular, recurrent), the latter of which he refers to as the "Andean cosmovision." This positive aspect of his writings, an analog to the austere beauty of the films, is what makes them so pleasurable and inspiring to read. In the films he usually depicts characters *in extremis*, often confronting certain death at the hands of their oppressors. The horror of the situations is tempered with an unusual beauty that, rather than merely putting a pretty gloss on things, evokes the extreme resilience of indigenous Andean cultures, primarily through use of the landscape from which it emerged, suggesting that

whatever its people may suffer, they not only will not be destroyed, but will eventually triumph out of sheer tenacity. Reading Sanjinés and watching his films, one experiences what Bertolt Brecht held to be the highest goal of art, "cheerful, militant learning."

Sanjinés's preoccupation with how to create a cinema consonant with indigenous Andean subjectivity is what sets his writings apart from the other major bodies of theory produced by New Latin American Cinema filmmakers. Glauber Rocha, Fernando Solanas, Julio García Espinosa, and Tomás Gutiérrez Alea, made their films for urban, cosmopolitan audiences who attended commercial cinemas, even when, as in the case of Rocha, they turned to the rural, underdeveloped portions of their lands for sources of cultural renewal. Rocha and the Cubans, despite the ethnic diversity of their native lands, did not make race and ethnicity even a minor component in their theory. All, Sanjinés included, wrote for educated, urban intellectuals, in Latin America and abroad, but only Sanjinés derived his theory from the experience of integrating himself with the non-white population of his country, actively collaborating with them in the production of cinema. Because his access to commercial circuits in Latin America became increasingly restricted, and because in Bolivia the commercial cinemas remained inaccessible to the indigenous, rural majority, Sanjinés, more than his fellow New Latin American Cinema theorists, was forced by circumstances to engage in a thoroughgoing *Umfunktionierung* (functional transformation) of the cinema and its institutions, in order to reach his desired audience. This not only set him apart from other theorists but also provided him with a strong incentive for publishing his theory, the documentation of his unique experiments and their results.

Because the spectator Sanjinés conceives for his films is grounded in a specific culture and history, this also places his work at odds with much western theorizing about film spectatorship during the same period, which tended to be based in universalizing, psychoanalytical assumptions. Sanjinés's theorization of the representation of a non-western subjectivity in cinema was certainly important for Bolivia. But it has profound

implications for western film theory as well. Although the specific techniques he developed are grounded in one culture, the process by which he arrives at them provided a powerful example of thinking cinematically in non-western terms, during a period (the 1970s) when such concerns in western film theory were limited to, or contained within, feminist film theory.[1] Sanjinés's writings continue to be a valuable resource for anyone inquiring into non-western subjectivities and their relation to such fundamental questions of cinema as the spectator's perception of time.

Because of the horizontal working method Sanjinés developed, in which he engaged the active participation of his potential spectators, his writings challenge another prevailing assumption guiding film theory in the 1970s, the role of the film director as presumed author, a foundational assumption of the art cinema circuits in which his films circulated outside Bolivia, especially in western Europe. If a film author can be identified as such because of his or her ability to translate into film a distinctly *personal* way of seeing the world, then Sanjinés is no film author in the traditional sense. After *Yawar Mallku* his films increasingly stage a mediation, or mingling, of two ways of seeing the world, the western Cartesian way of dominant power, and the "Andean cosmovision." His films are a hybrid negotiation of what Javier Sanjinés describes as the fundamental conflict at the heart of modern Bolivia, that between the unresolved coloniality lived by its indigenous majority and modernity, the attempt to build a nation-state advocated by the *criollo* (white) and *mestizo* (mixed white and indigenous, or fully acculturated indigenous) elite.[2] According to Javier Sanjinés,

> Bolivians have traditionally tried to resolve the confrontation between modernity and coloniality, between linear time and cyclical time, without generating an authentic dialogue that might create relations among our different cultures. Without such a dialogue, without putting real effort into identifying and adapting to traditional society, mestizo-criollos instead tried to force it, through pressure and violence, to adapt to modern culture. This unidirectional process, which has generated only skepticism and resentment, is the process of *mestizaje*, a tool used by the elite to co-opt indigenous consciousness.[3]

In contrast to the *mestizaje* of official Bolivian culture, and indeed of the class of his origins, Sanjinés used film to create a dialogue between coloniality and modernity. His films and theoretical wrtitings were an attempt to open up new lines of communication between urban intellectuals and workers and peasants in the Andean nations.

Not surprisingly, given Europe's colonial legacy and, beginning in the 1970s, an increasing awareness of the presence within it of former colonial subjects, Sanjinés's films and theories resonated particularly strongly there. They did so for several reasons. First, because of European movements of solidarity with Latin American peoples, which must be seen as at least partially motivated by a working through or disavowal of a colonial past. Second (and this is what the rest of this study sets out to prove), Sanjinés's films found a receptive audience in Europe because they adadpted, through a complex process of transculturation, tropes and techniques from the European art cinema, returning them to Europe transformed yet recognizeable, and capable of undermining the European spectator's casually received relationship with ideology as well as the Other in his or her midst.

After briefly examining the various audiences for which Sanjinés wrote and the function he intended his written texts, as opposed to his films, to have, the remainder of the chapter will be devoted to a detailed synthesis of his theory, arranged according to the main recurrent concerns: the relationship between form and content and the necessity of beauty in revolutionary cinema; the characteristics of popular, as opposed to bourgeois, cinema; the role of the revolutionary filmmaker; and the nature of the cinematic spectator.

The Theory's Audiences and Functions

"Un cine militante (A Militant Cinema)," published in *Cine Cubano* in 1971, is the first manifesto written by Jorge Sanjinés, and it contains in embryonic form most of the concerns that dominate his later theoretical writings on cinema. Absent only are an

explicit statement as to whom the films should be addressed and the problem of distribution. The latter omission is no doubt because the piece was published before Sanjinés went into exile and when his films still had considerable commercial potential within Bolivia. At the center of the essay, though, is a treatment of a subject to which he would seldom return; how Latin American filmmakers, presumably middle class intellectuals like himself, become radicalized through film practice. The language of this section, in its use of cinematic metaphors, is self-consciously poetic in a way the later pieces scrupulously are not, and, despite the fact that he is writing about militant filmmakers generally, seems highly autobiographical.

> Los que vienen de los países más pobre, allí donde la miseria es la única cara del día, comenzaron por destapar sus objectivos y a descubrir sólo harapos, basura y ataúdas de niños. Allí donde enfocaron estaba la muerte, la inanición y el dolor del pueblo. Habían transitado años esas mismas calles "sin mirar" y era la cámara para ellos como una lente de aumento por la que miraban honestamente la realidad objectiva. Se les planteó la pregunta, ¿qué hacer?
>
> (Those who came from the poorest places, there where misery is the only face of the day, began by uncovering their lenses and thereby discovering only rags, trash, and infants's coffins. There where they would focus was present death, inanition, and the pain of the people. They had traversed for years these same streets "without looking", and it was the camera, which was for them like a magnifying lens, through which they looked honestly at objective reality. The suddenly posed to themselves the question, "What is to be done?")[4]

The simple faith expressed in the camera lens's inherent ability to capture objective reality, the youthfully romantic and autobiographical tone, and the specific imagery ("rags, trash, and infants's coffins"), which is more reminiscent of Sanjinés's "first" film, *Revolución*, than his subsequent ones, all suggest that this piece was written considerably before its publication date. But what distinguishes this piece most from Sanjinés's subsequent theoretical writings and most strongly suggests an earlier writing is the first of the two omissions referred to above, the statement as to whom the films are addressed. This ultimately dates the piece before 1969-70, a transformative period for Sanjinés as a

filmmaker. *Yawar Mallku's* failure to communicate effectively to Bolivia's indigenous peasantry, the obverse of its extraordinary success with middle class Bolivian audiences and audiences abroad, provoked a wholesale rethinking of their cinematic practice among Sanjinés and the other members of Grupo Ukamau. Beginning with their next film, the uncompleted *Los caminos de la muerte*, the group focused on how best to communicate with Bolivia's indigenous majority, who, in addition to all of their other cultural differences from *criollo* and *mestizo* Bolivians, were, for the most part, wholly unfamiliar with the cinema. Clearly the use of dialogue in Aymara (*Ukamau*) or Quechua (*Yawar Mallku*) alone would not suffice in making the films capable of communicating to, and, above all, being useful to, the group's intended addressees. The question of how to communicate cinematically with indigenous Bolivian (and later, Andean) spectators dominates Sanjinés's film practice and the theory which resulted from it. And his effort to reconcile a form of non-western subjectivity with a western tradition of political filmmaking practice constitutes his signal achievement.

With the renewed dedication to an indigenous addressee came a political change in the tone of Sanjinés's writing. The paragraph from "*Un cine militante*" quoted above continues with a description of how the many suffer so that a few may have privilege. It concludes with the statement that the filmmaker, on account of his privilege, is greatly indebted to the people. A militant cinema, the essay suggests, is a means of repaying that debt. Such frank acknowledgments of the filmmaker/author's class origins disappear almost completely in the later texts; in keeping with the revolutionary rhetoric of the period, the class struggle is represented as being between the oppressed people, the indigenous Bolivians, and their oppressors, the combined forces of western imperialism and its local agents, the Latin American bourgeoisie. In such a schema the filmmaker presents himself as an instrument of the people's political self-realization. His class origins are ambiguous at best, if not wholly obscured. The obscuring of the individual, authoritative author can be seen in the films themselves, which are sometimes "signed"

Grupo Ukamau, and to a lesser extent in the theory; the authors of *Teoría y práctica de un cine junto al pueblo* are officially Jorge Sanjinés and *Grupo Ukamau*. I do not in any way wish, however, to suggest that Sanjinés's gestures towards the suppression of his individuality are mere rhetorical flourishes, concessions to a prevailing revolutionary correctness. To the extent that these works really were the product of collaboration with their subjects and an effort to approximate the collective subjectivity of indigenous Bolivians, the "author as instrument" rhetoric is justified and not simply an evasion. And, as I will argue below, it has serious implications for the group's theoretization of film authorship.[5] There is a similar dialectic at play in Sanjinés's writings as in his films. On the one hand, the writings attempt to describe a specifically indigenous subjectivity and theorize a cinematic form appropriate for that subjectivity. In doing so they adapt to their own purposes a western rhetoric. The familiar aspects of this rhetoric then facilitate the transmission of what is new in the texts by locating them in a larger, preexisting discursive context. In the same way the films adapt specific techniques from European art cinema to express a non-European subjectivity. These same techniques, adapted and inflected as they were, thus guaranteed that the films would be received as art cinema by European audiences, who, although not the films's principal addressees, were essential for the financial support that allowed Sanjinés to continue producing. It is worth adding that this body of theory was written at a time when even European filmmakers were adopting the rhetoric of revolutionary Latin America. In 1967, Jean-Luc Godard included the following statement paraphrasing Ernesto "Che" Guevara in the press book for his film *La Chinoise* (*The Chinese*, 1967): "Fifty years after the Russian Revolution the American industry rules cinema the world over. There is not much to be added to this statement of fact. Except that on our own modest level we too should provoke two or three Vietnams in the bosom of the vast Hollywood-Cinecittà-Mosfilm-Pinewood-etc. empire."[6]

If the films are principally addressed to Bolivian *campesinos*, the same cannot be said of the theoretical texts, which were written in Spanish and published outside Bolivia. There are three audiences simultaneously being addressed in most of Sanjinés's texts published prior to 1980, all very different from the principal addressees of the films: first, other New Latin American Cinema filmmakers; second, prospective and future militant filmmakers; and lastly, European and North American audiences for art film and people in solidarity with the liberation struggles of Latin American peoples. In the third group there was considerable overlap between audiences motivated by aesthetics and audiences motivated by politics during the 1970s; in many western European and North American art cinema circles the political became the prevailing aesthetic criteria, while in eastern Europe the official politics of solidarity mediated the distribution and reception of the films and texts.

Historians of New Latin American Cinema have debated its status as a coherent film movement. Zuzana M. Pick has argued that it was a true "continental project."[7] For Ana M. López, the very term "New Latin American Cinema", "represents an attempt to impose unity on a number of diverse cinematic practices; a political move to create an order out of disorder and to emphasize similarities rather than differences."[8] The question is as difficult to answer as whether or not the films Sanjinés made after his period working at the *Instituto Cinematográfico Boliviano* (ICB) are part of a Bolivian national cinema. I propose throughout that this debate can and should be avoided by placing New Latin American Cinema in a larger international context of political cinema that encompasses the various European new waves, both East and West, and in the context of other Third World filmmaking. Still, the term *nuevo cine latinoamericano* appears frequently in the writings of the filmmakers associated with it, and Sanjinés is no exception, so the fact that the filmmakers identified themselves as a movement needs to be taken seriously. Although not unified by government funding apparatuses or industrial infrastructure, the filmmakers were unified through the circulation of texts,

very often written ones, since opportunities to view each others' films were very often limited to festivals in Latin America (e.g. Viña del Mar, Chile, 1967 and 1969) or in Europe (e.g. Pesaro, Italy, beginning 1964). Since the films themselves failed to circulate widely and frequently in Latin America, texts about these films became all the more important as sources of information for the filmmakers. During the 1960s and 1970s numerous film magazines were published in Latin America, many of which were dedicated exclusively to the films of the New Latin American Cinema, rather than the continent's industrial cinemas. Among these were *1X1* (Ecuador), *Cambio 16* (Panama), *Cine al día* (Venezuela), *Cine cubano* (Cuba), *Cine del tercer mundo* (Uruguay), *Cine y liberación* (Argentina), *Hablemos de cine* (Peru), and *Octubre* (Mexico).[9] Sanjinés's theoretical pieces were mostly published in *Cine cubano*, although reprints somethimes appeared in the others as well. As with the films, so too with the Latin American film magazines; it is important to keep in mind that this was not a closed system of textual exchanges but one open to and reliant upon articulations with European and North American publications. Many of these magazines, which had their origins in the postwar film club movements in Latin American capitals, were inspired by *Cahiers du cinéma*, which in turn published interviews with and manifestos by various New Latin American Cinema filmmakers. The English-language film journals *Cinéaste*, *Framework*, and *Jump Cut* published numerous translations from Latin American film journals during the 1970s. East European film journals like *Film und Fernsehen* in the German Democratic Republic published translations of essays from *Cine cubano*, including one by Sanjinés. After the Pinochet coup in 1973, *Film und Fernsehen*, the in-house publicity organ of DEFA, the East German film studio, devoted a significant amount of space to Latin American film and political issues, and the magazine was distributed widely in Latin America as part of a Cold War era effort to counter the Federal Republic of Germany's promotion of its own cinematic culture through the Goethe Institutes.

In addition to film publications, there were more informal means of circulating texts, such as mimeographs distributed at festivals and meetings of filmmakers. One such text is "Cine militante: Una categoría del tercer cine (Militant Cinema: A Category of Third Cinema)", written by Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino and distributed at the meeting of Latin American filmmakers held in Viña del Mar in 1969. In this short text, Solanas and Getino acknowledge the emergence of a militant cinema in Latin America that had already been celebrated at previous meetings and encourage their fellow filmmakers to take the movement to the next level by defining what constitutes a militant cinematic practice and what distinguishes it more generally from Third Cinema. The responsibility for those engaging in militant cinema is higher, they argue, than that which devolves upon those pursuing Third Cinema.

> And it is greater precisely because the ones driving a *cinema of militants* are not now only attempting a work of cultural decolonization or the recuperation of a national culture, but rather they propose to assist through their militant attitude (which their political-cinematographic works assume above all) a *revolutionary politics*, one which leads to the destruction of neocolonialism, the national liberation of our countries and the national construction of socialism (italics in the original).[10]

They conclude this brief manifesto by noting that their goal is less to define a set of strategies or tactics than to stimulate a search and provoke a more profound problematization of the road upon which they already see radical Latin American cinema set out.[11] Within the dialogue this and similar texts generated, as Sanjinés became increasingly more devoted to the specificity of working with indigenous Bolivian populations, he became associated with a particularly Andean form of militant cinema which both participated in and distinguished itself from the continental movement, such as it was. The results of Sanjinés's work with indigenous Bolivians was a unique contribution to the corpus of New Latin American Cinema theory, and, as the sole representative militant filmmaker from the Andes region, he was well-positioned for widespread exposure abroad.

The second group of readers for whom the texts were written were prospective militant filmmakers in Latin America and other places for whom they might serve as a an example, especially for filmmaking practices in collaboration with oppressed peoples.[12] While seldom expressed openly in the texts themselves, this purpose can be inferred from Sanjinés's own comments on how he himself had learned about cinema. In 1979 *Cine cubano* distributed a questionnaire to many of the leading New Latin American Cinema filmmakers asking them what the influence of Soviet revolutionary filmmaking was on their work. In his response, Sanjinés writes that the classic works of Soviet silent cinema remained unknown in Bolivia, at least as of 1971 when he went into exile. But, he notes, he and other Bolivians interested in film were able to find books by Pudovkin, Kuleshov and Eisenstein in the bookshops of La Paz. "Esos libros tuvieron poderosa infuencia y los conceptos y teorías sobre el montage y sus posibilidades facilitaron en gran medida la formación teórica de esos cineastas (que no pasaban de seis personas) (These books had a powerful influence, and the concepts and theories of montage and their possibilities to a great degree facilitated the theoretical formation of those filmmakers [who never numbered more than six]).”[13] Although he does not mention the original provenance of these books, we get some idea of how they came to Bolivia from a talk Sanjinés gave at a 1977 festival in Varna, Bulgaria. "Our first encounter with these theoretical texts was in Chile, while studying in one of the film courses in Santiago, where we read Kuleshov's *Foundations of Film Directing*. When we returned to Bolivia, we took some of these books with us.”[14] He goes on to say, "Only very recently, we started reading the remarkable work by Medvedkine and Vertov.”[15] Together these books, according to Sanjinés, form "the basis for the training of any filmmaker in our country who takes his profession seriously.”[16] As "traveling theory" they are borrowed, as is always the case, according to Edward Said, in order to "elude the constraints of our immediate intellectual environment.”[17] In this case the constraints are a near total absence of a national film culture.

1979, the year in which Sanjinés answered the questionnaire on the influence of Soviet cinema, was the same year in which he published his compilation of theoretical pieces, interviews, and fragments of scripts. In an interview given during his first visit to the Moscow film festival in 1979, Sanjinés makes this goal of his theoretical writing clear, describing how his writings on film function within Bolivia as a kind of *samizdat* and how these texts can further the larger political goals of a militant cinema absent the films.

> Porque si bien las peliculas han sido prohibidas, gracias a textos téoricos nuestro grupo y a través de las gentes nuestras que se quedaron en Bolivia, se ha podido conocer nuestro trabajo, y se ha pedido reflexionar sobre la necesidad de una integración cultural del país.
>
> (Since the films have been banned, thanks to the theoretical texts of our group and through the efforts of our people who remained behind in Bolivia, the people have been able to know about our work and reflect on the need for a cultural integration in the country.)[18]

In Europe, where the films were widely seen, Sanjinés articulated the theory elaborated during their production in numerous interviews. In Bolivia, the theoretical pieces were all that was available, since they were more easily brought into the country than film prints. In part this was the result of political repression. But the economics and logistics of cinema are equally responsible. In Latin America, and especially in countries like Bolivia, independent filmmaking has always been a more marginal practice than in the West. Archives are rare and, if existent, incomplete, and access to prints highly restricted because of the lack of non-commercial distribution networks. In such a context, texts written by filmmakers, considered in the West to be a supplement to the film texts themselves, can in fact be of primary importance for political, non-commercial filmmakers.[19]

Writing for his third audience—European and North American spectators interested in art cinema, Latin American anti-imperialist struggles, or both—Sanjinés engaged in what Mette Hjort, writing about Danish cinema, has named a "politics of

recognition." She writes, "The recognition of Danish cinematic culture depends on the extent to which filmmakers are able simultaneously to appeal to multiple audiences."[20] This is certainly true of the cinema of Sanjinés as well, but with one significant difference. In her article Hjort is writing about the ability of Danish filmmakers to appeal to multiple European national audiences and U.S. audiences. In order to finance his work, Sanjinés's films needed to appeal to these same audiences, but, at the same time, they needed to communicate effectively with indigenous people in the Andes as well. Simultaneously appealing to these two very distinct audiences accounts for the intriguing resonances and transformations of diverse film styles that characterize his cinema. A "politics of recognition" is doubly meaningful in respect to Sanjinés's films as well. First, there is Hjort's use of the term, which, in turn, leads to a recognition of the politics in the films. Sanjinés encouraged European distribution of his films as a source of income, but also because it provided him with a platform from which he could deliver his denunciations to an international audience.

Another concept Hjort uses to explain the international impact of Denmark's Dogma 95 Group is metaculture, as developed by Greg Urban, which is useful for examining the function of Sanjinés's written texts as well.[21] By considering Sanjinés's own experience with texts by Russian filmmakers, I have attempted to sketch the source of inspiration for the metacultural aspects of his own texts and place them in a historical perspective. The Russian theorists were not only a resource for Sanjinés as a developing filmmaker; they also provided the metacultural framework in which his films were first discussed internationally. Gumucio Dagron, like other Bolivian critics, refers to *Revolución* as Sanjinés's *Battleship Potemkin*, noting the Russian film's influence on Sanjinés's short.[22] In his response to the *Cine cubano* questionnaire on the influence of Russian revolutionary film, Sanjinés amplifies this association, while correcting its source.

> Nos llamaba la atención el hecho de que algunos críticos hablaban de la influencia de la película de Eisenstein sobre nuestro pequeño trabajo…En verdad esa influencia es innegable pero no partió de la película *El Acorazado*, sino vino de los ensayos de Eisenstein sobre el montaje.
>
> (We took notice of the fact that some critics were speaking of the influence of Eisenstein's picture on our little work…In reality that influence is undeniable, but it does not come from *Battleship Potemkin* but from Eisenstein's essays on montage.)[23]

There is metacultural double movement at work here. First, the influence of Eisenstein's texts about his film on *Revolution*, then the critics's use of Eisenstein's film to explain the aesthetic of Sanjinés's work. Sanjinés in turn points out this correlation to acknowledge a debt to Eisenstein, but also to further the idea that the two films share a common lineage and attempt to define the parameters within which it is received. The linking of Eisenstein and Sanjinés persisted long after it was applicable to his work, at least on a formal level. The first mention of Bolivian cinema in the *International Film Guide* was in 1972. Part of the entry reads, "*Yawar Mallku*, which dealt with the U.S.-sponsored sterilization program in Bolivia, was reminiscent of the style of filmmaking prevalent in Russia during the silent era, as were the group's shorts, *Aysa* and *Revolution*."[24] Whatever relevance the comparison may have to *Revolution*, it is not an accurate description of *Yawar Mallku*; one suspects that the authors did not actually see the latter film and were merely passing on a critical consensus derived from the earlier ones. To conclude this brief account of the metacultural functions of the Sanjinés-Eisenstein connection, I will note that his response to the *Cine cubano* questionnaire was translated into German and published separately in *Film und Fernsehen* in 1987.[25]

Eisenstein as metacultural intertext links Sanjinés's films and theory to the past. Before proceeding to a fuller explanation of his texts's metacultural function, I wish to link them to their future, in particular Hjort's example of the Dogma 95 manifesto. In the above discussion of the rhetoric Sanjinés deploys, I noted that it functioned as a sort of lubricant facilitating the transnational movement of his texts. A surprising aspect of the Dogma 95 manifesto, given that it was written in Denmark in 1995, is its careful

approximation of the sort of rhetoric used by Sanjinés; in fact, certain lines sound as though they could have been written by Sanjinés or any other New Latin American Cinema theorist theorist; for example, "The anti-bourgeois cinema itself became bourgeois, because the foundations upon which its theories were based was the bourgeois perception of art. The auteur concept was bourgeois romanticism from the start and thereby…false! To DOGME 95 cinema is not individual!"[26] Lars von Trier and the other signatories of the Dogma 95 manifesto rehearse Godard's appropriation of the rhetoric of Third World revoltion nearly thirty years earlier, and thus this text resonates with his own "Manifesto" and the various manifestos of New Latin American Cinema as well.

According to Hjort, Dogma films are effective in reaching international audiences because each one generates metacultural moments that intensify public interest in the corpus of films.[27] The texts by and about Sanjinés and his films operated in a similar way, especially in Europe, generating a crucial market for the films, or what Urban would call "new social pathways for dissemination."[28] And, in return, the films facilitated the dissemination of the theory in a metacultural feedback loop. For all of its reproducibility, cinema can also be disseminated without the reproduction of the film itself through metaculture, most often in the form of texts about films. The banning of a film, for instance,which would seem to block off pathways of dissemination, can have the effect of stimulating interest and thus opening up new pathways. In his chapter on film reviews, Urban notes that film reviews, like metaculture more generally, are a form of retelling.[29] Sanjinés seems to have been aware of this and how an unseen film could have the desired political impact through retelling. After recounting how two communities in the Bolivian *altiplano* impeded the Peace Corps from entering their area after *Yawar Mallku* was shown there, he says, "Otra tercera comunidad que no vio la película pero que conoció su historia a través de la radio, también les impidió el aceso (Another third community that had not seen the film but knew its story from the radio also denied them entry)."[30] If the

purpose of the film was to enlighten the Bolivian populace as to the presumed sterilization campaign of the Peace Corps, then that could be achieved without the reproduction of the film itself, merely through the controversy surrounding it broadcast on the radio.

Theory of a Cinema with the People

All of the New Latin American Cinema theorists begin with the assumption that the revolutionary content of the their films demands new forms, that adopting the formal strategies of the existing commercial cinema would vitiate, if not negate, this content. Glauber Rocha succinctly expressed the problem of form and content when, playing on the proverb about new wine in old bottles, he rhetorically asked whether the Brazilian filmmaker should sell Coca Cola, coconut milk, or coconut milk in Coca Cola bottles.[31] Sanjinés, who lacks Rocha's ability with the witty metaphor, makes much the same argument when he writes, "A revolutionary film that advocates revolution using the same commercial language is selling its content, betraying its ideology in its form."[32] In "Towards a Third Cinema," Solanas and Getino argue that since the revolutionary filmmaker begins with the intention of transforming the world, "it remains to the filmmaker to discover his own language, a language which will arise from a militant and transforming world-view and from the theme being dealt with."[33] For these authors, the search for new forms was the artist's particular contribution to the struggle for cultural decolonization. To succeed, the artist must have the capacity to create a critical inventory of the forms he or she has inherited and engage in a type of auto-decolonization through filmmaking practice. Sanjinés writes, "The decolonization of the filmmaker and of films will be simultaneous acts to the extent that each contributes to collective decolonization. The battle begins without, against the enemy who attacks us, but also within, *against the ideas and models of the enemy to be found inside each one of us*."[34] Solanas and Getino, along with Julio García Espinosa, argue that the revolutionary filmmaker cannot look to

Europe for adequate formal models. On the contrary, it is Europe that is looking to Latin America for the forms that will allow it to fulfill the revolutionary promise the French New Wave held out but ultimately failed to deliver. In "For an Imperfect Cinema" García Espinosa argues that Europeans accord critical accolades to Latin American cinema because it points a way out of a formal conundrum in which European cinema finds itself. "Europe can no longer respond in a traditional manner but at the same time finds it equally difficult to respond in a manner that is radically new."[35] His "Cine y revolución," a manifesto read at the Pesaro Festival in 1969, is a sustained attack on European filmmakers who claim to be making a revolutionary film but remain trapped within the old forms calculated to appeal to bourgeois consciences.[36] Although he is not mentioned directly, one target of this intervention is presumably Costa-Gavras, New Latin American Cinema's favorite example of a self-proclaimed revolutionary filmmaker that scrupulously adheres to old, and thus counterproductive, forms.[37] García Espinosa's colleague Tomás Gutiérrez Alea begins his examination of the problem of form and content in a slightly absurd manner reminiscent of Rocha. What would be the result for the spectator, he asks, if the figure of Tarzan was replaced with a *guerrillero* in a typical Tarzan movie, all formal attributes remaining the same?[38]

As New Latin American Cinema is an oppositional movement, there is a strong tendency among its theorists to define their cinema's form in terms of what it is not, i.e. bourgeois cinema, and in this Sanjinés is no exception. Having defined what this cinema is not, the more vexing problem remains of what would be appropriate new forms and what their sources would be. For most of the New Latin American Cinema theorists, as we shall see in the next chapter, the answer to this question lay in Bertolt Brecht's theory of the epic theater, and again, in this Sanjinés is no exception. One of Sanjinés's major contributions to these debates, and one that distinguishes him from many of his fellow theorists, Latin American and European, is his interposition of a third, mediating term

between form and content, a term rarely taken seriously by 1960-1970s theorists of political cinema: beauty.

Sanjinés begins his "Problems of Form and Content in Revolutionary Cinema," one of the foundational texts of New Latin American Cinema, with these words: "Revolutionary cinema must seek beauty not as an end but as a means. This proposition implies a dialectical interrelation between beauty and cinema's objectives. If that interrelation is missing, we end up with a pamphlet, for example, which may well be perfect in its proclamation but which is schematic and crude in form."[39] Here Sanjinés takes a stand clearly in opposition to Solanas and Getino, who write in "Towards a Third Cinema," "Pamphlet films, didactic films, report films, essay films, witness-bearing films—any militant form of expression is valid, and it would be absurd to lay down a set of aesthetic work norms."[40] For Sanjinés, though, the political urgency motivating the revolutionary filmmaker does not excuse him or her from an aesthetic obligation, does not permit "sad, ugly films," to use Rocha's description of *Cinema Novo*, because such films will fail to communicate.[41] Rocha also describes militant films from Asia, Africa, and Latin America as "films of discomfort. The discomfort begins with the basic material: inferior cameras and laboratories, and therefore crude images and muffled dialogue, unwanted noise on the soundtrack, editing accidents, and unclear credits and titles."[42] Sanjinés's art, by contrast, is characterized by a quixotic effort to create a cinema devoid of such aesthetic discomforts using the most impoverished of means, the result of Bolivia's severely underdeveloped cinema infrastructure, compared to which the equipment available to Rocha and others would have seemed luxurious.

Sanjinés notes in "Un cine militante," "El mejor cine revolucionario que existe es también el más hermoso (The greatest revolutionary cinema in existence is also the most beautiful)," signaling what would become a major preoccupation in his later pieces.[43] In this essay, though, only this one isolated remark about beauty appears, and it seems essentialist. In later essays Sanjinés is careful to describe the function of beauty in his

work, and eventually he attempts to define what constitutes the beautiful in these works. For Sanjinés, the formal searches of a revolutionary filmmaker are guided by the need for efficacy in a double sense. First, the films must be efficacious as tools in the revolutionary struggle. But before they can do this, they must communicate effectively with their desired audience: "A revolutionary content, born of a revolutionary attitude, finds the forms adequate to it, and these cannot but be responsive to the needs of communicability."[44] The revolutionary filmmaker, to the extent that he or she is engaged in a search for new forms, participates in the project of modernist art. But for the revolutionary filmmaker, beauty is not to be found in newness alone, just as the new forms cannot be the mere obverse of the bourgeois. Although pursuing researches within the modernist tradition, the work of the revolutionary filmmaker is circumscribed by the urgency of his or her political situation.

> También nos refirimos a la necesidad de abandonar la complacencia estitzante, a la obligación de darnos cuenta que hacíamos cine en el continente del hambre, que no había tiempo para los juegos inocuos de la búsquedas formalistas tendientes a lograr la originalidad por la originalidad. No había tiempo para los rebusques plásticos ni para indefinición.
>
> (We also refer to the need to abandon aesthetic complacency, to the obligation to realize that we have been making cinema on a continent of hunger, that we have not had time for inocuous formalist searches that tend to arrive at originality for its own sake. We have not had time for formal overelaborations or indecisiveness.)[45]

None of which implies, however, that the artist must abandon the search for beauty, "Porque la belleza era un medio para lograr la eficacia (Because beauty has been a means of achieving efficacy.)"[46]

When Sanjinés uses the term "beauty," he does so in a manner similar to the classical equation of beauty with harmony, with the crucial difference that this harmony is not internal to the work of art but externally oriented. Rather than locating this harmony, as does Aristotle, in the relationship of part to part and each part to the whole

within the work of art, Sanjinés identifies beauty as the harmony between the work of art's form and its intended addressee's way of seeing and expressing the world:

> But this work does not contradict beauty and art. Quite the reverse! We are anxious to transmit the cultural view of our people[,] and the film, located within the rhythms of our Andean culture, transmits its beauty. That is why it is not a political tract, for it communicates a sense of identity and creativity. It expresses not just a subject but a whole cultural universe. This process is dialectical and for this reason greatly facilitates communication.[47]

The search for a form, then, becomes a search for a means of cinematically expressing the rhythms of Andean culture. "El desafío consiste en captar los ritmos internos poético-imaginativos de nuestros pueblos, sus maneras de recrear realidad. (The challenge consists in capturing the internal poetic-imaginative rhythms of our peoples, their ways of recreating reality.)"[48] Alternatively, Sanjinés refers to these "internal rhythms" as an "*estructura mental* (mental structure)," to suggest the culturally specific cognitive basis of the beautiful. As in a functional art object, a weaving, or a piece of pottery, beauty in the films will be a form of collective expression:

> Beauty has to have the same function that it has for the indigenous community, where everyone is able to create very beautiful objects; where someone makes a weaving and that weaving not only serves as clothing but as a beautiful work of art that expresses the spirituality of the whole community. And this is what we want for ourselves: that our films also represent in some way the spirituality and beauty of our people. Through the film's imagery, music, dialogue, etc., we attempt to be coherent with that culture; we pose the question of aesthetic coherency.[49]

The revolutionary and the cultural are linked for Sanjinés. Since indigenous Bolivians have a culture threatened with extermination by western imperialism, and since that culture has historically resisted imperialism, a popular work of art, in the sense that it is coherent with that culture, will necessarily be revolutionary as well.

> El arte popular es arte revolucionario, es arte colectivo y en él siempre encontraremos la marca del estilo de un pueblo, de una cultura que comprehende a un conjunto de hombres con su general y particular manera de concebir la realidad y con su estilo de expresarla. Este arte popular es revolucionario porque su objectivo es fundamentalmente la verdad y esta verdad se nos manifiesta a través de la bellaza con la fuerza de lo imperecedero.

> (Popular art is revolutionary art; it is collective, and in it we encounter the stylistic traits of a people, of a culture comprised of a group with its own general and specific manner of conceiving of reality and its own way of expressing it. This popular art is revolutionary because its objective is truth which manifests itself to us through beauty with the force of the imperishable.)[50]

For this reason Nestor García Canclini characterizes the cinema of Sanjinés as "verdades por intermedio del la belleza (truths through the intermediary of beauty)."[51] The search for new forms, then becomes a search for beauty, defined as aesthetic coherence with the addressees's culture. And this search requires a critique of inherited forms and a rejection of those lacking this coherence. Out of this motivation comes Sanjinés's rigorous critique of the formal attributes of what he terms "bourgeois cinema."

Hollywood Cinema was the principal enemy for all New Latin American Cinema theorists, in part because of the ideology they claimed it espoused, but also because the subsidiaries of the major U.S. studios maintained and increasingly tightened a stranglehold on distribution throughout Latin America, effectively blocking access to commercial theaters for anything other than Hollywood films. The most viable commercial alternative to Hollywood of the postwar era, the European cinema of auteurs or art cinema, though perceived in the West as a movement in opposition to Hollywood, received only muted praise from New Latin American Cinema theorists. Although they would single out individual films or filmmakers, acknowledging their impact on their own aesthetic, most did not see the European art cinema as a potential model for New Latin American Cinema in its efforts to create a non-bourgeois, popular cinema. In the writings of New Latin American Cinema theorists, Jean-Luc Godard in particular appears as a sort of touchstone around whom they register their skepticism about the possibility of Europe producing a revolutionary popular cinema.

In the first major manifesto of New Latin American Cinema, Solanas and Getino's 1968 "Towards a Third Cinema," Godard appears as a caveat in their general rejection of the European cinema of auteurs. They write of this second cinema, "That this alternative signified a step forward inasmuch as it demanded that the filmmaker be free to

express himself in non-standard language….But such attempts have clearly reached, or are about to reach, their outer limits."[52] While praising Godard for his efforts to "conquer the fortress of official cinema," efforts they regard as the most daring of second cinema to date, they also quote his self-description as "trapped inside the fortress."[53] The second major piece of New Latin American Cinema theory to appear was García Espinosa's "For an Imperfect Cinema." García Espinosa spends no time dwelling on European cinema, except to argue, like Solanas and Getino before him, that its options have run out. In later pieces, though, García Espinosa specifically cites Godard as the definitive revolutionary European filmmaker, "With *Breathless* Godard marks a turning point in the history of cinema. Godard breaks completely with a cinematographic tradition in the use of time and space."[54] The Brazilian filmmaker and theorist Glauber Rocha was to appear in *Le Vent d'est/Wind From the East* (1970), a production of Godard's Dziga Vertov collective.[55] In an article written for *Cahiers du Cinéma*, he singles out Godard as the most useful European political filmmaker, "His cinema becomes political because it proposes a strategy, a valuable set of tactics, usable in any part of the world."[56] As late as the 1980s, by which time European art cinema production and its distribution circuits had already undergone massive change, Godard still functioned as a touchstone for New Latin American Cinema theorists. In his *Dialéctica del espectador* (*The Spectator's Dialectic*) from 1983, Gutiérrez Alea is concerned with the problem of "popular cinema," which for him means a cinema that maintains a proper dialectic between responding to the spectator's immediate desire for pleasure and his or her more basic need, the fundamental transformation of reality for the betterment of humanity.[57] In this text he has the highest praise for Godard, but not without reservations. "Godard stands out as the great destroyer of bourgeois cinema….He succeeded in making an anti-bourgeois cinema, but was unable to make a popular one."[58] His comments on the films of Jean-Marie Straub and Danielle Huillet are similar. For all the clarity and force of their political engagement and the elegance of their form, the

films of these Europeans fail to be popular, both in the sense of reaching non-bourgeois audiences and in the sense of transforming for the better the reality out of which they are a part, because they deny their audiences the pleasure they seek in going to the movies.

The positions these theorists take in relation to Godard, or European art cinema more generally, are the surface traces of a deeper theoretical conflict pertaining to one of the key influences on both movements, Bertolt Brecht, that will be explored in greater detail in the next chapter.

Unlike Solanas and Getino or Rocha, Sanjinés does not explicitly distinguish European art cinema from Hollywood cinema. He tends to lump them together under the rubric "bourgeois cinema," which, in his simplest formulations, is defined by the following formal and narrative characteristics: an individual protagonist, use of closeups, and a suspenseful plot or intrigue, all elements he would completely remove from his cinema in the phase that followed *Yawar Mallku*. According to Sanjinés, "De igual manera que el protagonista individual crea poderosos nexos de identificación subjectiva con el espectador, la intriga como recurso narrativo manipula la atención cerrando espacios y tiempos reflexivos. (In the same way that the individual protagonist creates powerful nexuses of subjective identification in the spectator, suspense as a narrative resource manipulates the attention, closing off spaces and times for reflection)."[59] The conflict between the individual and the collective lies at the heart of the anti-imperialist struggle in Bolivia, with the West attempting to impose its notion of the individual on a population with a centuries old collective self identity and self perception. His critique of bourgeois cinema, although it does not explicitly condemn European art cinema, implies that it is the most bourgeois of cinemas precisely because it appears to emanate from the imagination of an individual, rather than collective, author:

> El cine burgués, en su mejores obras, es el cine del autor que nos transmite una visión subjetiva de la realidad y del director que intenta seducirnos con su mundo propio, con su mundo personal, o que en última instancia lo proyecta hacia nosotros sin ningún propósito de hacerlo comunicable, o sea importándole solamente

> que reconozcamos su existencia […] Es el cine del individuo y del individualismo, del creador que ubicado en una etérea altura hacia cine para sacarlse obsesiones personales.
>
> (The bourgeois cinema, in its greatest works, is the cinema of the author who transmits to us a subjective vision of reality and of the director who tries to seduce us with his own world, or who, in the last instance, projects himself at us without making any effort to be understood, only caring that we recognize his existence[…] It is the cinema of the individual and individualism, of the creator who, from an ethereal height, makes cinema to relieve himself of personal obsessions.)[60]

The European auteur is suspect from the start, precisely because of the art cinema market's demand that the filmmaker develop an individual, clearly recognizable, style. That demand was the signal change that led García Espinosa, Gutiérrez Alea, and Rocha, whatever their reservations about art cinema, to welcome the European auteur as a step forward, however limited, in the revolutionizing of cinema. To Sanjinés, for whom individual expression is ineluctably linked to a western ideology bent on exterminating the last vestiges of collective social organizations, be they labor unions or Aymara communities, an auteur marked as such by an individual style cannot be a revolutionary filmmaker.

When Sanjinés writes of cinematic language, he does not use the term as auteurist critics do to refer to personal style. Nor does he advocate a "non-standard language" like Solanas and Getino, a strategy which gives the films a primarily negative, rather than liberatory force. [61] As Sanjinés puts it, the goal is "violentar los códigos occidentales, no para ser diferentes sino para ser nosotros mismos (to violate the western codes not in order to be different but to be ourselves)." [62] Freed from the burden of negating a cinematic language quite literally unknown to his desired spectators, Sanjinés focused on developing a cinematic language coherent with the folkways of the Aymara and Quechua peoples.[63] As a developing language, its governing rules would be determined by a mixture of cinematic and non-cinematic practices, with the latter being privileged. Sanjinés recognized that it was neither possible nor desirable to wipe the slate clean of all previous cinematic language:

> Do we have to start from scratch, and if we find that the spectator we are addressing does not understand the language of modern cinema, must we reject everything? The language of modern cinema presents grammatical difficulties but also contains ideological vices. It would seem, therefore, that there is nothing left to use. But to reject everything would be to underestimate the people's creative and receptive potential….What we must reject are the objectives, methods and aims of bourgeois art.[64]

One of the revolutionary Bolivian filmmaker's principal tasks, then, is to screen the available techniques for their aesthetic coherence with Aymara and Quechua culture as well as their utility for revealing "the hidden logic of historical phenomenon."[65]

Thus for Sanjinés the role of the revolutionary filmmaker is more akin to that of a facilitator than a film author; in keeping with his critique of what he terms "bourgeois cinema," he consistently downplays all individual expression on the part of the filmmaker, emphasizing instead the horizontal structure of the filmmaking collective, which is only led by the filmmaker in the sense that he or she has certain technical abilities necessary for realizing the collective's shared goals. A good place to begin in analyzing the role of the filmmaker in Sanjinés's cinema is his definition of a revolutionary cinema, which, in laying out the basic goals, also serves to define the filmmaker's responsibilities.

> Podemos ensayar una definición del *cine revolucionario* como aquel cine al servicio de los intereses del pueblo, que se constituye en instrumento de denunicia y clarificación, que evoluciona integrando la participación del pueblo y que se propone llegar a él.
>
> (We could attempt to define *revolutionary cinema* as that cinema which is in the service of the people, which constitutes an instrument of denunciation and clarification, which develops through integrating the people's participation, and which proposes to reach them.)[66]

If the films are to be instruments of denunciation and clarification, then the filmmaker is in turn the instrument through whom this is achieved. And in order to do so the filmmaker must pursue three main objectives: placing his or her self in service of the people, developing a cinematic practice with the intended audience, and finally, attempting to reach that audience with the films.

The first of these goals has both political-ideological and more practical aspects. Politically, the filmmaker must exchange his or her class ideology with that shared by the people he or she wishes to serve. Filmmakers and other intellectuals, Sanjinés admits, "mainly come from the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie, and, therefore, we have to consciously be on our guard against the enemy that to a greater or lesser extent has infiltrated our brains if we don't want to serve it, even when our intention is to destroy it."[67] Although he never hesitates to describe the encounters with his collaborators and spectators that altered the trajectory of his filmmaking practice and provided the basis for his theory, Sanjinés is deliberately vague about those experiences that led him to adopt a revolutionary stance, abandoning his original class ideology. The focus instead is on how the revolutionary intellectual can maintain and make more profound his or her avowed solidarity. This requires constant vigilance. "Nothing can be as difficult to distinguish for the revolutionary intellectual as knowing where precisely the enemy is influencing his behavior and thinking," since "it is a fact that this conditioning process begins long before we become conscious of it."[68] In this schema the people are defined as ideologically fixed and reflexively anti-imperialist in their ideology. Sanjinés further assumes that any intellectual who successfully rejects his or her class interests will by default become anti-imperialist. The intellectual, raised in a cultural environment which assumes any ideas that do not emanate from Europe or the United States are suspect, if not plain wrong, must go through a self-administered process of ideological purification, which has its parallel in the purification of cinematic technique that becomes the filmmaker-intellectual's principal formal task. Hence the prohibition against self-expression in the cinema. As individualism is the very essence of the bourgeois ideology, it is through individual expression that the revolutionary filmmaker will end up serving that ideology, even if his or her stated aims are to destroy it. "If he has a vital need to perpetuate himself as an individual, if he has the desire to create a work that is 'very much his own', if he lives and works with this ambition, he cannot call himself a

revolutionary artist, even if he uses the theme of revolution."[69] The filmmaker functions much as beauty does in the films, as a means, and not as an end in itself.[70]

On a practical level, this idea of service requires the filmmaker to use his knowledge of cinema to make a series of mostly formal choices governed foremost by ideology. These choices determine both the filmmaker's interaction with the subjects during filming and the final product. Given the chance to perform before the camera, "the people act and create with incredible intensity. These experiences are not unknown. Many filmmakers who have worked with the people have felt their spontaneity, but when these experiences begin to be systematically organized, they allow cinema to be another expressive instrument of the people."[71] As an organizer, the filmmaker is responsible both for creating the situation in which the people can spontaneously express themselves and for capturing this expression in such a way that is visually beautiful and able to be assembled into a narrative with the requisite emotional appeal. To achieve this Sanjinés worked with progressively more skeletal scripts that indicated only the central idea of each scene, leaving the subjects free to improvise. "Como director, cuido que la escena tenga unidad con las demás y que la cámara la capte eficazamente y también con belleza y secillez (As director I take care that the scene has unity with the rest and that the camera captures it with beauty and simplicity)."[72] Simplicity of form, besides enhancing the communicability of the film to its ideal spectator, helps the filmmaker avoid the trap of individual expression. Referring to *¡Fuera de aquí!* Sanjinés notes that with this film Ukamau intended to reveal the links between American missionary groups and multinational corporations "con toda sencillez y claridad, sin intentar constituirse en gran cine, sin buscar mostrar las cualidades intelectuales y plásticas de un determinado creador. (with complete simplicity and clarity and without attempting to make of it great cinema, without looking for ways to demonstrate the intellectual and plastic qualities of a certain creator.)"[73] This search for simplicity and clarity, for all their political utility,

constantly runs the risk of lapsing into a minimalist aesthetic, a simplicity for simplicity's sake, that would be individualistic and bourgeois. Sanjinés warns that:

> Esa actitud no puede ser fruto de una autorrepresión o de una renuncia al placer de la creación no controlada, sino de una verdadera consubstanciación con los objectivos clasistas enmarcados en el proyecto histórico de las clases desposeídas.
>
> (This attitude cannot be the result of an uncontrolled self-repression or renunciation of the pleasure of creation, but rather of a true consubstantiation with the class objectives contained in the historical project of the dispossessed classes.)[74]

This consubstantiation only takes place when the filmmaker puts himself at the service of the people, thus producing " una película hecha por el pueblo por intermedio de un autor (a film made by the people through the intermediary of a filmmaker)."[75]

If the film evolves in collaboration with the people, then the filmmaker will arrive at what Sanjinés terms a horizontal division of labor, "that is, a production characterized by widespread participation in the creative process on the part of individuals and groups, producing a work that is in the process of producing itself."[76] In Sanjinés's case, he arrived at this horizontal method only after a series of confrontations with the people for whom he assumed he had made his earliest films, particularly *Yawar Mallku*. During the making of that film, they failed to understand the indigenous social organization of the Kaata *ayllu*, as described in Chapter 1. "Thanks to the confrontations of our films with the people, thanks to their criticisms, suggestions, advice, protests and confusions due to our misunderstanding of the ideological relationship between form and content, we were slowly distilling a language and incorporating the creativity of the people themselves."[77] In another context, Sanjinés would refer to this popular creativity as an "otra forma de *leer* de realidad (another way of *reading* reality)."[78] This form of creativity or alternative method of reading reality can only be learned in conjunction with the people, as it is the product of a collective subjectivity. Sanjinés refers to the process whereby this creativity is translated into cinematic creativity as an "operación de mutua integration (operation of mutual integration)."[79] This formulation has several advantages over

"consubstantiation," as he uses it in the quote above. Consubstantiation refers to the Protestant theological doctrine that the body and blood of Christ coexist with bread and wine during the Eucharist, and it is opposed to the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, which insists that the bread and wine are wholly converted into the body and blood of Christ. As such, consubstantiation, in its historical sense, connotes a coexistence of the divine and the base material, albeit not necessarily a hierarchical one. Because of this history, using the term to describe the product of the collaboration between a filmmaker and the people, at the very least, suggests a vertical Cartesian division of labor between the intellect (the divine filmmaker) and the corporeal (the peasants acting before the camera), even if, in a Catholic country like Bolivia, the word may have faintly heretical connotations. "Mutual integration" on the other hand suggests a more horizontal and democratic relationship between the filmmaker and his subjects. Most importantly, it implies that the subjects of the film are capable of acquiring an understanding of cinema and its techniques that is a prerequisite for effect expression in the medium. Sanjinés notes, "Esta operación de mutua integración que, de la práctica de la relación humana con el destinatario, produce la teoría de la elaboración del lenguaje, es indispensable a nuestro juicio (This operation of mutual integration which, through the practice of human relations with the addressee, produces the theory of the elaboration of language, is indispensable in our judgment)."[80] It is neither coincidence nor digression that accounts for this argument being made in a speech on the distribution of revolutionary cinema; the process of mutual integration is a necessary prerequisite for the formulation of a cinematic language consonant with the addressee's way of reading the world. And this language in turn is essential in order for the content of the film to be communicated—in other words, for it to reach the addressee.

When Sanjinés writes of making sure the films reach their addressee (literally, arrive at the addressee), the third main role of the filmmaker, he intends this in three very distinct senses. The first, as described above, has to do with communicability and is

dependent upon cinematic form. The second is the very practical matter of creating exhibition opportunities for the intended addressees, i.e. physically getting the films out to the people. Between 1966 and 1970 Sanjinés's films were shown in Bolivia's commercial cinemas. According to Sanjinés, *Yawar Mallku* played three months in Cochabamba, Bolivia's third largest city. By comparison, he notes, new films with the Mexican superstar Cantinflas, normally thought to be the box office champions there, last only two weeks.[81] The success of his early films in large Bolivian theaters led Sanjinés to originally adopt a more accommodating or optimistic stance toward the possibilities of commercial film distribution that was not shared by other New Latin American Cinema filmmakers. In his "Call for Distribution" he counsels other filmmakers not to make Olympian renunciations of commercial channels.[82] And yet, because of where these theaters are located in Bolivia (in the cities) and who attends them (almost exclusively the middle class), as remunerative as these screenings may have been, they more often than not failed to reach *campesino* and worker audiences. With censorship and exile, too, these commercial screenings in Bolivia became impossible. Europe then became the focus of Sanjinés's efforts at commercial distribution.

The final sense in which Sanjinés means the filmmaker is responsible for seeing that the films reach their addressees means that the filmmaker is responsible for assuring that there be sufficient funds available to produce new work and subsidize alternative, non-commercial screenings. After going into exile in 1971, Sanjinés developed a three-pronged approach to distributing his films that would rely on commercial screenings in Latin America (when possible) as well as in Europe and North America, non-commercial screenings for worker and *campesino* groups, and screenings in institutional settings (festivals and universities). Each met a different objective. The first earned money to support the second, and the third, as noted above, were used for promotion and diffusion of particular denunciations. This situation continued into the 1980s, but as we shall see in the Afterword, the loss of alternative commercial distribution opportunities due to

multinational consolidation, especially in Europe, but in Latin America as well, provoked Sanjinés to seek new sources of funding and once again adopt new filmmaking techniques.

When he returned to Bolivia in 1979, Sanjinés lamented that despite the political opening for the commercial distribution of his work, theater owners were reluctant to show them for a mixture of political and economic reasons.[83] The way out of this impasse for Sanjinés was self-distribution. In 1980 he and Beatriz Palacios began distributing Ukamau's films in rural areas and marginal parts of Bolivia's cities. At the same time they founded a small theater in La Paz, *Sala Ukamau*, in which, for the next twenty years, the films were given daily repertory screenings.

By 1974, the year in which Sanjinés made *El enemigo principal*, many of Latin America's revolutionary filmmakers were living in exile, and their films were not being seen outside of clandestine circuits in their home countries, if at all. Despite censorship and persecution of filmmakers, Sanjinés argues in the section on distribution in "Problems of Form and Content in Revolutionary Cinema," that, because the political situation in many Latin American countries is so fluid, the filmmaker must continue to make films, ready at all times for political openings that would allow their exhibition. Using a military analogy, he writes, "you must know when and where to shoot, and when to keep your head down in the trenches."[84] Above all, once committed to the anti-imperialist cause, despite persecution and exile, the revolutionary filmmaker must resist what Sanjinés disparagingly refers to as "remaining in Paris, comfortably vegetating."[85]

This last comment refers to filmmakers who are living in exile in Europe, but in no way suggests that the filmmaker should avoid Europe altogether. Sanjinés writes that European festivals are not the primary objective of the revolutionary filmmaker, although they are useful for spreading denunciations and making connections with other filmmakers that would be otherwise impossible.[86] For the same reason he writes approvingly of screenings on college campuses in the United States, "the very bowels of

the imperialist enemy," a paraphrase of "Che" Guevara.[87] Success in Europe enabled independent filmmakers like Sanjinés to continue working, but it could also guarantee a filmmaker a certain degree of protection in Latin America as well. As Rocha notes, the success of *Cinema Novo* in Europe "endow[ed] it with a prestige that enabl[ed] it to confront pressure from all sides."[88] Such pressure from Europe and the United States was partially responsible for Antonio Eguino's release from detention in 1975, after he was arrested for possession of a print of *El coraje del pueblo*.

However essential European distribution may have been for Sanjinés in economic terms, it also placed him in a double bind as a filmmaker-theorist. On the one hand, his theory advocates the elimination of the individual auteur, and yet the expense of international travel and the critical discourse surrounding festivals demand that there be one individual representing the films. To a certain extent this contradiction is resolved through conceptualizing two very different groups of spectators, one indigenous and the other Europeanized or European.

In a piece written for a 1974 special issue of *Screen* on Brecht and revolutionary cinema, Colin MacCabe writes that "the main problem facing anyone attempting to articulate a theory of film within a Marxist theory of ideology is that by and large no such Marxist theory exists."[89] He goes on to note that the starting point for any such investigation must be Louis Althusser's essay "Ideology and the Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes Toward an Investigation)." Thus during the 1970s much of the film theory produced in Europe and the United States was heavily influenced by Althusser's conception of ideology. Highly influential essays like Jean-Louis Baudry's "Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematic Apparatus" use Althusser's theories to argue that cinema interpellates capitalist subjects by the very ordering of its material basis.[90] Other, more semiotically inclined theorists like Kaja Silverman emphasized textual operations such as "suture" in an attempt to explain the ideological relationship between the subject and cinematic discourse.[91] The conclusions of these theorists as well as the language they

deploy remained foreign to the filmmaker-theorists of New Latin American Cinema, and this despite the fact that the films they were producing were often regarded by their European counterparts as exemplary correctives to the ideology of the dominant cinema. In "Marginal Cinemas and Mainstream Critical Theory," Julianne Burton-Carvajal argues that the division between First and Third World film theory stems from the fact that in the former, theory is a profession practiced within educational institutions, while in the latter it is produced by filmmakers as a result of practice.[92] This is no doubt true and a partial explanation. But another reason for the historic disconnect between western and Latin American film theory during this period is the Latin American filmmaker-theorists's radically different conception of the spectator, as exemplified by the two theorists who gave the most attention to this issue, Jorge Sanjinés and Tomás Gutiérrez Alea.

While Baudry and others theorized a spectator who was falsely made to believe that he or she was a unified subject, Sanjinés's theory, at least as far as it pertains to *campesino* spectators, assumes that this spectator is indeed a unified subject, unified both with the collective social group to which he or she belongs and with nature. MacCabe quotes Brecht on the "sharp opposition between work and leisure which is peculiar to the capitalist mode of production," with leisure serving the reproduction of the labor force. "Naturally it is not thus," writes Brecht, "that one can create a style of life which forms a unique and coherent whole."[93] As the numerous scenes of collective labor combined with play in Sanjinés's cinema serve to indicate, Andean *campesinos* have maintained a precapitalist wholeness in their lives and social relations. The threat from cinema, then, is not that they will be duped into an imaginary wholeness, but rather that the wholeness in which they already participate will be fragmented, the central theme of *¡Fuera de aquí!* Hence the need to purify cinematic form of its more fragmenting tropes, the closeup, montage, and the individual protagonist, in favor of the long shot, the sequence shot, and the collective protagonist. Underlying this theory is an essentializing view of the indigenous spectator that has its roots in a certain tendency within South American

Marxist thought. But before addressing these caveats we will proceed with a basic outline of Sanjinés theory of spectatorship.

Like most Third Cinema theorists Sanjinés assumes that a revolutionary cinema should be a didactic catalyst for political action by its spectators and that these spectators come to that cinema with a desire to acquire knowledge and participate in political action, of which viewing the film is part. It is the spectator's participatory attitude (*actitud participante*) which first of all distinguishes him or her from the spectator merely seeking diversion in the cinema. In an essay dedicated to describing the spectator, he writes that the participatory spectator:

> asiste al cine empujada por la urgencia de conocer, por la inquietud política de informarse, por la curiosidad sociológica de comprender, por la ansiedad revolucionaria de descubrir…Ese es nuestro principal destinitario
>
> (attends the cinema compelled by a need to know, by a political unease that seeks to inform itself, by a sociological curiosity to understand, by a revolutionary anxiousness to discover…That is our principal addressee).[94]

This particular description of the participatory attitude limits itself to the spectator's motivation and thus constitutes a point of convergence between the indigenous Bolivian spectator and the European spectator. It is this attitude which brings the spectator to the film and is conceived as universal. Participation in the film, on the other hand, necessitates a grasp of the cultural specificity of the Andean campesino.

Except for certain situations, such as a school fieldtrip to a movie or a screening before a group of trade unionists, audiences are aggregates of individuals made into a temporary collectivity by proximity and shared experience, especially the identification with the individual protagonist. Sanjinés assumes that the audience's existence as a collectivity precedes the film; therefore, the problem for the filmmaker is how to keep them from individuating while viewing the film. The bourgeois cinema encourages this process of individuation; the revolutionary cinema builds upon the collective social organization of its audience. The main means at the filmmaker's disposal for doing so

are formal devices that present an onscreen collectivity that reflects its audience. This can be done, according to Sanjinés, through the use of sequence shots filmed with a handheld camera that are framed so as to encompass groups in their totality, not cutting them off at the knees as in the standard *plan américain*. Such shots replicate the gaze of the collective actor and encourage participation in the center of the scene.[95] Sanjinés argues that the sequence shot "because of its breadth…offers the viewpoint of the participating audience who can move inside the scene, attracted by the most interesting points."[96] This moving within the scene he terms a "spontaneous and democratic participation within the frame."[97] This form of participation allows for a certain spontaneity on the part of the spectator that mirrors the spontaneity of the actions being performed before the camera.

Just as his thoughts on the efficacy of beauty distinguishes Sanjinés's theory from most European writings on political cinema in the 1970s, so too does his insistence on the utility of emotion to solicit audience participation. Like beauty and the filmmaker, emotion is a means to an end, and that end is the participatory spectator.

> We have reached the conclusion that we should not refuse the power to excite that the cinema may exercise upon a viewer, but use it to awaken in him a concern which, beginning with the emotional shock induced by the film, will extend to the period of reflection, bringing him to the point of analysis and self-criticism. This is in opposition to that cinema which seeks to impose a distance between the spectator and the text, so as not to prejudice his rational reflection on it. We believe that the human capacity to be moved can be used to promote a deeper reflection rather than act as a barrier to it.[98]

Here Sanjinés is calling for a Third Cinema that seeks a third way in addressing its spectators. Clearly it cannot be a cinema that encourages identification with the individual protagonist, nor is it the cinema of, for instance, Godard during the same period, a cinema dedicated to disrupting the pleasures of narrative cinema.[99] That Sanjinés feels no urgency to disrupt the habitual pleasures of cinematic spectatorship is owing in part to his desired spectator's lack of familiarity with these pleasures. Even if

they did have access to theaters, though, Sanjinés assumes that indigenous audiences would reject most commercial films as they did *Yawar Mallku*. In Bolivia, he argues, ideology irradiates from the center to the periphery, as it does in the larger world system. Therefore, those most susceptible to it are residents of the urban centers, especially middle class ones.[100] The indigenous population is insulated from this ideology by their distance from the center, but also, and more importantly, by their tradition of resistance to it. According to Sanjinés, workers, especially Bolivia's miners, are able to resist that ideology because of their capacity to self-organize. And peasants are shielded from it by the indigenous culture they maintain.[101]

If for Sanjinés the filmmaker, being an urban middle class intellectual, must go through a process of ideological purification in order to enter into true solidarity with the oppressed indigenous majorities, he also assumes that the latter need not change, for they already embody the revolutionary ideal of a collective, anti-imperial ideology. Sanjinés inherits this essentializing view of the indigenous people of the Andes from José Carlos Mariátegui, the Peruvian Marxist literary critic and social thinker whose *Seven Interpretive Essays on Peruvian Reality* has exerted a strong influence on leftist intellectuals in Latin America since its publication in 1928. In this work Mariátegui conflates socialist revolution and indigenous culture, arguing that the indigenous people of the Andes are a dormant revolutionary socialist bloc.

> The soul of the indian is not raised by the white man's civilization or alphabet but by the myth, the idea, of Socialist revolution. The hope of the Indian is absolutely revolutionary….Why should the Inca people, who constructed the most highly-developed and harmonious communistic system, be the only ones unmoved by this worldwide emotion? The consanguinity of the Indian movement with the world revolutionary currents is too evident to need documentation. I have said already that I reached an understanding and appreciation of the Indian through socialism.[102]

Sanjinés sounds much like Mariátegui when he writes:

> Not only did the search for an ideological coherence help convince us of the need to do away with the individual protagonist—the hero and focus of every story in our culture—but also our

> observation of the primordial and essential characteristics of indigenous American culture. Indians, through their social traditions, tend to conceive of themselves first as integral members of the group, and then as isolated individuals.[103]

In the same paragraph he paraphrases Mariátegui. "The great Peruvian political thinker, Mariátegui, referring to concepts of freedom, said that the indian is never less free than when he is alone."[104] As does Mariátegui, Sanjinés conceives of the indigenous peasant as an autochthonic socialist whose cultural values and forms of social organization are already identical with that of the revolution.

> Cuando hablabamos de concepciones propias entre los campesinos que han podido conservarlas mediante la práctica y integración a las mismas, queremos destacar valores culturales de inmensa significación que no solamente sirven hoy como pararrayos frente al enemigo sino que representan, definitivamente, las ideas de conducta y de relación social que persigue la revolución.
>
> (When we speak of concepts among the peasants that they have been able to preserve through their practice and integration, we would like to especially point out cultural values of immense importance which today not only serve as lightning rods in front of the enemy but also, most definitely, represent the ideas of conduct and social relations that the revolution pursues).[105]

Sanjinés's film theory, as it pertains to indigenous subjects, is in some ways an attempt to revive the idea of the consaguinity of indigenous culture and socialist revolution by moving it to another field, the cultural rather than directly political one, although the ultimate goal is always political. And although he adapts Mariátegui's essentializing view of the Indian, it is important that, like his films, these ideas were tested in the field, so to speak, even if he comes back from his observations with a renewed understanding of the Indian's "primordial and essential characteristics."[106] The later essays written in the late 1980s while *La nación clandestina* was in production demonstrate a greater sophistication in their analysis of Aymara culture. The very fact that he begins to speak of a specifically Aymaran cosmovision and not simply a generalized Andean one indicates this change. The thematic shift in the films from confrontational politics to issues of identity permitted this profound understanding of culture. Or, alternately, it was Sanjinés's more profound understanding of Aymara culture, the result of his years of

work with them, that caused him to turn his attention to identity. As with his initial radicalization as a middle class intellectual, Sanjinés is silent on this change.

Before closing this discussion of the spectator, we need to consider another type of spectator, who, although not the professed principal addressee of the films, is equally important—the European spectator. Sanjinés justifies distribution of the films in Europe on political grounds, while at the same time acknowledging Europe's crucial financial support for his project. He contrasts the passive consumer of culture with another kind of viewer,

> whose attitude toward this cinema is consistent with his advanced thinking and who extracts information to be used in the formation of new concepts. We believe this last type of viewer is each day becoming more numerous in Europe, and, therefore, the distribution of our films in Europe is justified (one could also justify this distribution on the basis of the economic support it provided, which meant selling copies to television networks and movie theaters…)[107]

This spectator may share motivations with the indigenous Bolivian spectator but, owing to cultural differences, will not participate in the film in the same way.

> Y creemos que a este cine no le es ajena de la universalidad, porque es, de hecho, comprendido por otros públicos, aceptado y gustado. Porque no se trata de subsestimar a nadie, lo mismo pasaba con los campesinos que ven y comprenden otras obras pero sienten y saben que esas obras les están hablando desde otra frontera cultural, desde las playas de otra visión sobre la vida.
>
> (And we believe that universality is not foreign to this cinema, because it is understood, accepted and enjoyed by other publics. Because it is not about underestimating anybody, the same happens when peasants see and understand other works but sense and know that these works speak to them from across other cultural borders, from the shores of other visions of life.)[108]

The awareness on the part of the European spectator that the film speaks to him or her of and from another culture is part of its appeal. Although the films do not permit the spectator to participate in the same way, they do offer the familiar spectacle of what Deborah Poole, in her study of European consumption of photography from Peru in the 19th century, calls "the Andean image world."[109] In addition to political information and

the fascination of gazing at the other, the films of Sanjinés offer aesthetic pleasures as well for both their local and international audiences. This is a result of Sanjinés's preoccupation with visual beauty and the pleasure it affords, but also because of his refusal to underestimate his audience's ability to interpret the film, even when that audience is unfamiliar with cinema. In a speech given at the Second Meeting of Latin American Filmmakers in Merida, Venezuela, in 1968, Sanjinés notes that some have argued the need to find a simplified language capable of communicating with popular audiences. He then goes on to say that he does not wish to underestimate the people's understanding; what is needed, he adds, is to get away from European models.[110]

Sanjinés's twin desire to create a cinema that credits the intelligence of its audience while distancing it from European models authorizes him to adapt techniques from the European art cinema. On their return to Europe, these techniques appear strangely familiar to the European spectator. Their consonance with that spectator's schema for European art cinema creates the impression of access to another culture, which, in keeping with western cultural norms, is more individual than the participatory attitude the films solicit from indigenous audiences.

In the end, the distribution and production of the films, as well as the published theory underlying them, share the common purpose of bringing together the intellectuals and the people, something which Sanjinés felt had not been achieved by other means. Sanjinés argues that the ultimate importance of Bolivian cinema is that it has "abierto un camino hacia los sectores populares, de haber desarrollado una integración, una interrelación entre los intelectuales y el pueblo (opened a path toward the popular sectors, it has developed an integration, an interrelationship, between the intellectuals and the people)."[111] Rather than adopting the unidirectional process of *mestizaje*, which Javier Sanjinés argues had become the usual method by which Bolivian elites responded to the confrontation between coloniality and modernity, Jorge Sanjinés, through his films and writings, generates a dialogue that creates relations among Bolivia's various cultures. At

the same time, his work engages in a dialogue with European makers, theorists, and spectators of political cinema. In the context of European debates on political cinema, he intervenes with a powerful defense of the political efficacy of beauty and emotion, and a prescient argument about the need for cinema to contribute to cultural decolonization through the approximation of non-western subjectivities.

Notes

[1] In this way Sanjinés is very similar to Jean Rouch, subject of Chapter 5, who, like Sanjinés, explored non-western temporalities and subjectivities through film.

[2] Javier Sanjnés, *Mestizaje Upside-Down* (Pittsburgh: Univ. of Pittsburgh Press, 2004), 23.

[3] Ibid., 23.

[4] Sanjinés, Jorge, "Un cine militante," *Cine Cubano* 68 (1971): 46.

[5] That being said, from a contemporary perspective, there is much of the merely rhetorical in his writings, passages and phrases that today will tend to either evoke nostalgia in older readers or provoke confusion in younger ones. One of the larger projects of this work, and this chapter in particular, however, is to look beyond that rhetoric, whether it be in the films (the final shot of *Yawar Mallku*) or the texts, to uncover what is unique about this body of work and the specific contribution it makes to our understanding of film theory and practice.

[6] Jean-Luc Godard, *Godard on Godard*, trans. and ed. Tom Milne (New York: Da Capo Press, 1972), 243.

[7] Pick, Zuzana M., *The New Latin American Cinema: A Continental Project* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1993), 1-13.

[8] López, Ana M., "An 'Other' History: The New Latin American Cinema," in *New Latin American Cinema*, ed. Michael T. Martin (Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1997), 1:138.

[9] Octavio Getino and Susana Velleggia, *El cine de las historias de la revolución: Aproximación a las teorías y prácticas del cine político en América Latina (1967-1977)*, (Buenos Aires: Grupo Editor Altamira, 2002), 189.

[10] Fernando E. Solanas and Octavio Getino. *Cine, cultura y descolonización* (Buenos Aires: Siglo Ventiuno, 1973), 122 (translation mine).

[11] Ibid., 123.

[12] Alfonso Gumcio Dagron's book about his experiences establishing Super-8 workshops in post-revolutionary Nicaragua shows the influence of Sanjinés's ideas, especially in the section on sequence shots. See Alfonso Gumucio Dagron, *El cine de los trabajadores* (Managua: Central Sandinista de Trabajadores, 1981), 71-3.

[13] "Encuesta a cineastas latinoamericanos sobre influencía del cine silente sovietico," *Cine cubano* 93 (1979): 45.

[14] Jorge Sanjinés, "Vlijanie na s'vetskoto njamo kino v'rhu reolucionnoto kino v Bolivija," *Kinoizkustvo* 32.9 (1977): 7 (unpublished translation by Mariana Ivanova).

[15] Ibid., 7.

[16] Ibid., 7.

[17] Edward Said, "Traveling Theory," *Raritan* 1.3 (1982): 58.

[18] Jorge Sanjinés, "Para ser verdederamente bolivianos tenemos que estar integrados a la vida de las mayorias: una entrevista al cineasta boliviano Jorge Sanjinés," interview by Romulado Santos. *Cine cubano* 98 (1981): 61. Although it has been out of print for years, Sanjinés still sells reprints of his book from the box office of the *Sala Ukamau* in La Paz.

[19] This phenomenon is not limited to the developing world. How many filmmakers in the United States have set out to make experimental films after reading texts by Stan Brakhage and studying some stills, having never had the opportunity to see actual prints? As a source from which filmmakers learn their craft—sometimes *the* source, depending on where the filmmaker lives—the circulation of texts about cinema and how filmmakers around the world have adapted the ideas they contain to their own evolving practice merits further research and theoretization.

[20] Mette Hjort, "Danish Cinema and the Politics of Recognition," in David Bordwell and Noël Carroll, eds. *Post-Theory: Reconstructing Film Studies* (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1996), 525.

[21] Mette Hjort, *Small Nation, Global Cinema: The New Danish Cinema* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005), 46.

[22] Alfonso Gumucio Dagron, *Historia del cine en bolivia* (La Paz: Editorial Amigos del Libro, 1982), 218.

[23] "Encuesta a cineastas", 45.

[24] Viggo Holm Jensen and Vibeke Pedersen, "Bolivia" in *1972 International Film Guide*, ed. Peter Cowie (New York: A.S. Barnes & Co., 1971), 62.

[25] Jorge Sanjinés, "Ein neues Konzept," *Film und Fernsehen* 15.9 (1987): 24.

[26] Mette Hjort and Scott MacKenzie, *Purity and Provocation: Dogma 95* (London: BFI, 2003), 199.

[27] Hjort, *Small Nations, Global Cinema*, 46.

[28] Greg Urban, *Metaculture: How Culture Moves Through the World*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001), 69.

[29] Ibid., 189.

[30] Jorge Sanjinés, "Conversacion con un cineasta revolucionario: Jorge Sanjinés," interview, *Cine cubano* 73-5 (1972): 6.

[31] Qtd. in Randal Johnson and Robert Stam, eds., *Brazilian Cinema* (New York: Columbia UP, 1995), 57.

[32] Jorge Sanjinés, "The Search for a Popular Cinema" in *Latin American Filmmakers and the Third Cinema*, trans. and ed. Zuzana M. Pick (Ottawa: Carleton University, 1978), 90.

[33] Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino, "Towards a Third Cinema," in *New Latin American Cinema*, Michael T. Martin, ed. (Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1997), 1:46.

[34] Ibid., 1:56.

[35] Julio García Espinosa, "For an Imperfect Cinema", in *New Latin American Cinema*, Michael T. Martin, ed. (Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1997), 1:78.

[36] Julio García Espinosa, "Cine y revolución" in *Problemas del nuevo cine*, ed. Manuel Pérez Estremera (Madrid: Allianza Editorial, 1971), 193-5.

[37] For Sanjinés on Costa-Gavras and how his form imposes limits on his content, see Jorge Sanjinés y Grupo Ukamau, *Teoría y práctica de un cine junto al pueblo* (Mexico: Siglo Ventiuno, 1979), 78.

[38] Tomás Gutiérrez Alea, *Dialéctica del espectador* (Mexico D.F.: Federación Editorial Mexicana, 1983), 54ff.

[39] Jorge Sanjinés, "Problems of Form and Content in Revolutionary Cinema," in *New Latin American Cinema*, ed. Michael T. Martin (Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1997), 1:62.

[40] Solanas and Getino, "Towards a Third Cinema," 47.

[41] Glauber Rocha, "An Aesthetic of Hunger," in *New Latin American Cinema*, ed. Michael T. Martin (Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1997), 1:70.

[42] Glauber Rocha, "The Tricontinental Filmmaker: That is Called the Dawn," in Randal Johnson and Robert Stam, eds., *Brazilian Cinema* (New York: Columbia UP, 1995), 77.

[43] Sanjinés, "Un cine militante," 11.

[44] Jorge Sanjinés, "Revolutionary Cinema: The Bolivian Experience," in *Latin American Filmmakers and the Third Cinema*, ed. and trans. Zuzana M. Pick (Ottawa: Carleton University, 1978), 85.

[45] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 46.

[46] Ibid., 46.

[47] Jorge Sanjinés, "Bolivia Sanjines," trans. John King, *Framework* 10 (1979): 32. For the original Spanish see Jorge Sanjinés, "Sobre ¡Fuera de aquí!" *Cine cubano* 93 (1979): 129.

[48] Jorge Sanjinés, "El perfil imborrable," *Cine cubano* 122 (1988): 33.

[49] Jorge Sanjinés and the Ukamau Group, *Theory and Practice of a Cinema with the People*, (Willimantic: Curbstone Press, 1989), 93-4. For the original Spanish see, Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 156.

[50] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 80.

[51] Nestor García Canclini, "Así es y no de otra manera," in *El cine de Jorge Sanjinés* (Santa Cruz: FEDAM, 1999), 88.

[52] Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino, "Towards a Third Cinema," 42.

[53] Ibid., 34.

[54] Julio García Espinosa, *Un largo camino hacia la luz*, (Havana: Fondo Editorial Casa de las Americas, 2002), 116, (translation mine).

[55] Godard's Dziga Vertov Collective, along with Chris Marker's Medvedkine Group, are the two filmmaking initiatives most closely approximating third cinema to have come out of European art cinema. In the case of Marker, his involvement with Latin American radical film dates back to just after the Cuban revolution and before the emergence of New Latin American Cinema. Solanas and Getino mention Marker's experiments with giving French factory workers Super-8 cameras in "Towards a Third Cinema." See Solanas and Getino, "Towards a Third Cinema," 45.

[56] Glauber Rocha, "The Tricontinental Filmmaker," 80.

[57] Tomás Gutiérrez Alea, *Dialéctica del espectador*, 28.

[58] Ibid., 27.

[59] Jorge Sanjinés, "El plano sequencia integral," *Cine Cubano* no. 125 (1989), 66.

[60] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 74.

[61] Solanas and Getino, "Towards a Third Cinema," 42.

[62] Jorge Sanjinés, "El perfil imborable," 33.

[63] Rocha begins his "History of Cinema Novo" with the following: "There is nobody in this world dominated by technology who has not been influenced by cinema." See Glauber Rocha, "History of Cinema Novo," in *New Latin American Cinema Volume Two: Studies of National Cinemas*, ed. Michael T. Martin (Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1997), 2:275.

[64] Sanjinés, "The Search for a Popular Cinema," 94-5.

[65] Sanjinés, "Revolutionary Cinema," 82.

[66] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 38.

[67] Sanjinés, *Theory and Practice*, 61-62.

[68] Ibid, 62.

[69] Sanjinés, “The Search for a Popular Cinema,” 92.

[70] Sanjinés, *Theory and Practice*, 93.

[71] Sanjinés, “The Search for a Popular Cinema,” 95.

[72] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 126.

[73] Ibid, 145.

[74] Jorge Sanjinés, “Nuestro principal destinatario,” *Cine cubano* no. 105 (1983), 42.

[75] Ibid, 42.

[76] Sanjinés, “Revolutionary Cinema,” 83.

[77] Sanjinés, *Theory and Practice*, 41-2.

[78] Sanjinés, “El perfil imborrable,” 33.

[79] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 88.

[80] Ibid, 88-9.

[81] Isaac Leon Frias, *Los años de la conmoción: 1967-1973 entrevistas con realizadores sudamericanos* (México D.F.: UNAM, 1979), 83.

[82] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica, 83.*

[83] Santos, “Para ser verdaderamente bolivianos,” 58.

[84] Sanjinés, *Theory and Practice*, 47.

[85] Ibid, 47-48.

[86] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 127.

[87] Sanjinés, *Theory and Practice*, 48.

[88] Rocha, “History of Cinema Novo,” 283

[89] Colin MacCabe, “Realism and the Cinema: Notes on some Brechtian Theses,” *Screen* 15.2 (1974), 22-23.

[90] Jean-Louis Baudry, “The Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematic Apparatus,” *Film Quarterly* 28.2 (1974-75): 39-47.

[91] Kaja Silverman, *The Subject of Semiotics*, (New York: Oxford UP), 1983.

[92] Julianne Burton-Carvajal, "Marginal Cinemas and Mainstream Critical Theory," *Screen* 26.3-4 (1985): 3.

[93] MacCabe, "Realism and the Cinema," 21.

[94] Sanjinés, "Nuestro principal destinitario," 44.

[95] Jorge Sanjinés, "El plano sequencia integral," 66.

[96] Sanjinés, "Bolivia Sanjines," 32.

[97] Ibid, 33.

[98] Sanjinés, "Revolutionary Cinema," 84-85.

[99] This contrast between Sanjinés's films and commercial radical political cinema in Europe will be pursued in greater detail in the following chapter.

[100] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 84.

[101] Ibid, 85.

[102] José Carlos Mariátegui, *Seven Interpretive Essays on Peruvian Reality*, trans. Marjory Urquidi (Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1971), 29.

[103] Sanjinés, *Theory and Practice*, 45.

[104] Ibid, 45. For the original quote see Mariátegui, *Seven Interpretive Essay*, 58.

[105] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 86.

[106] See the section on Rouch in Chapter 5 for an analysis of Sanjinés's films and theory as ethnography.

[107] Sanjinés, *Theory and Practice*, 48.

[108] Sanjinés, "Nuestro principal destinitario," 40.

[109] Deborah Poole, *Vision, Race and Modernity: A Visual Economy of the Andean Image World* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1997).

[110] Jorge Sanjinés, "Testimonio en Mérida (Venezuela)," in *Hojas de cine: testimonios and documentos del nuevo cine latinoamericano* (México D.F.: UNAM, 1988), 1:97.

[111] Ibid, 61.

CHAPTER 3: NEW LATIN AMERICAN CINEMA AND TWO TRANSNATIONAL IDIOMS, ITALIAN NEO-REALISM AND THE EPIC THEATER OF BERTOLT BRECHT

Introduction

Among the more than 120 Latin Americans who studied filmmaking in either France or Italy during the 1950s were three key figures in the earliest development of New Latin American Cinema: the Argentine Fernando Birri, founder of the *Escuela Documental de Santa Fe* in Argentina, and two Cubans, Julio García Espinosa and Tomás Gutiérrez Alea.[1] These three all studied at Rome's *Centro Sperimentale di Cinematografia*, where they were imbued with the teachings of Cesare Zavattini, one of the primary theorists of Italian neo-realism and the screenwriter of such neo-realist classics as *Roma città libera* (*Rome, Open City*, Roberto Rossellini, 1946) and *Ladri di biciclette* (*Bicycle Thieves*, Vittorio De Sica, 1949).[2] Like filmmakers all over the world, Birri, García Espinosa, and Gutiérrez Alea were profoundly impressed with the way neo-realist methods broke with studio-bound production, thus granting more freedom to directors, and with its aesthetic, which, especially in its earliest manifestations, offered a template for how cinematically to represent social reality in countries which, like their own, were gripped by political and economic crises.[3] As Laura E. Ruberto and Kristi M. Wilson note in the introduction to their recent anthology, *Italian Neorrealism and Global Cinema*, "neorrealism—undogmatic and malleable—offered a pattern for constructing a unique culture of a nation. A similar pattern was put to work…in such diverse places and spaces as postindependence India, cold war Czechoslovakia, and 1950s English immigrant filmmaking."[4] García Espinosa's enthusiasm was so great that when he was arrested by Cuban dictator Fulgencio Batista's secret police for the crime of exhibiting *El mégano* (1955), the first film he made in Cuba after returning from Italy, all he could

think about was what a shame it was he could not get through to the officer arresting him how important neo-realism was.[5]

These anecdotes and well-documented historical intersections have given rise to an enduring myth, according to which New Latin American Cinema was heavily influenced by, and thus became a sort of offshoot of, Italian neo-realism. For instance, the quote above from Ruberto and Wilson follows an extended discussion of Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino's "Towards a Third Cinema," parts of which they quote not from the original text but from Roy Armes's *Third World Filmmaking in the West* (1987). They quite understandably recruit Third Cinema and New Latin American Cinema to bolster their argument that Italian neo-realism had a lasting influence and became a global style, and they do so by relying on Armes, rehearsing the myth of neo-realism's impact in Latin America and thus bypassing the issue of whether or not Solanas and Getino's text can be reconciled with a neo-realist aesthetics or practices. All historical inaccuracies aside, this myth has the unfortunate effect of isolating New Latin American Cinema from other movements dedicated to the renewal of cinema that emerged during the 1960s and 1970s. It suggests that neo-realism lived on in an adapted form in Latin America long after it had disappeared from screens elsewhere, including in Italy. In terms of the origins of New Latin American Cinema, a too singular focus on neo-realism additionally obscures the variety of sources upon which the movement drew; these included Russian cinema of the 1920s, the Griersonian social documentary, and the globetrotting militant documentary films of Joris Ivens and Roman Karmen. By seizing upon the moment of neo-realism's supposed first arrival in Latin America and ignoring the subsequent, ongoing and intense cinematic cross-pollination between Latin America and the West, New Latin American Cinema is given a myth of origin in common with European art cinema, only to then assume that the two definitively parted ways.[6]

This chapter examines the adaptation or transculturation of two transnational idioms, Italian neo-realism and the epic theater of Bertolt Brecht, by New Latin

American Cinema filmmaker-theorists, and Jorge Sanjinés in particular.[7] After briefly reviewing the history of neo-realism in Latin America and how and why the term has been used by scholars and critics to describe Bolivian films, especially the films of Ukamau, I describe Sanjinés's own thoughts on neo-realism and New Latin American Cinema and argue that it is not a particularly useful interpretive framework for New Latin American Cinema. Much more useful are Brecht and Walter Benjamin's theoretical writings on epic theater, for two reasons: first, because the theory and practice of New Latin American Cinema as it developed during the 1960s-1970s is much more explicitly Brechtian than neo-realist; second, and more importantly, because the effort to elaborate upon and practice a Brechtian aesthetic is a common denominator, perhaps *the* common denominator, between radical political cinema in Latin America and Europe during the period. By examining the different ways in which filmmakers and scholars on both sides of the Atlantic attempted to reconcile Brecht's theory with film, I will demonstrate the extent to which New Latin American Cinema filmmakers like Sanjinés participated in European debates about Brecht's relevance to cinema and the proper path radical political filmmaking practice should follow.

From Italian Neo-Realism to Bolivian Neo-Realism

The title of Paulo Antonio Paranaguá's *Tradición y modernidad en el cine de América Latina* (*Tradition and Modernity in Latin American Cinema*) is somewhat deceptive in that it does not announce his real ambition, which is nothing less than pointing the way for a complete overhaul of Latin American film historiography. He argues that a proper understanding of Latin American cinema requires conceiving it as supported by a tripod comprised of production, exhibition, and distribution. Latin American film histories to date, he argues, have privileged the first of these three legs, production, almost exclusively.[8] The two histories of Bolivian cinema by Carlos Mesa G. and Alfonso Gumucio Dagron clearly fit this description, as we saw in Chapter 1.

Paranaguá uses the term "triangulation" to refer to the relationships between Latin American cinema and the two dominant cinemas, North American and European. For Paranaguá, Latin American cinema, because of the limited output of its industries and its historically small share of domestic markets, has always been, and will continue to be, in a subordinate position vis-à-vis the other two "poles." That being said, he argues that, "In the case of Latin America, even its most nationalist or reformist expressions, there exists a dialogue, implicit or explicit, respectful or combative, with the dominant models."[9] From this perspective, New Latin American Cinema, for all of its anti-Hollywood rhetoric, is really just another stage in a dialogue that has existed from the start. In an essay on the triangulation effect, he further notes that the widespread description of Hollywood as the enemy, which began with New Latin American Cinema and continues in the rhetoric of contemporary Latin American commercial filmmakers, ignores Hollywood's past positive impact in the region. He reminds us that during the 1920s Latin Americans desiring to overcome the academicism of productions in the lineage of European *Film D'Art*, turned to Hollywood directors like King Vidor and Henry King for inspiration. As a result they produced films that were more authentic and dynamic.[10]

In a chapter from *Tradición y modernidad en el cine de América Latina* devoted to neo-realism, Paranaguá writes:

> The canonical version of the history, the golden legend of the New Latin American Cinema, reprises the contribution neo-realism made to two pioneers, the Brazilian Nelson Pereira dos Santos and the Argentine Fernando Birri, to which can be added a Cuban short, *El mégano* (Julio García Espinosa and Tomás Gutiérrez Alea, Cuba, 1955). This venerable trinity supposes a chemically pure and unquestionably militant neo-realism capable of setting in motion the renewal of the 1960s. But the original in Italy does not conform to such a homogenous schema, nor was its impact in Latin America limited to the intellectual sectors and leftist artists.[11]

Antonio Traverso's piece on Italian neo-realism and Brazilian cinema in Ruberto and Wilson's anthology is a good example of the sort of "legendary" or mythical history

Paranaguá describes. Traverso notes that Italian neo-realism had been a source of inspiration for Cuban and Brazilian filmmakers during the early to mid 1950s. The only Brazilian filmmaker from this period he mentions is Nelson Pereira dos Santos, whose first two features, *Rio 40 Graus* (*Rio 40 Degrees*, 1955) and *Rio Zona Norte* (*Rio, Northern Zone*, 1957) are considered to be both neo-realist in inspiration and important precursors to *Cinema Novo*. According to Traverso, Pereira dos Santos was exposed to neo-realism during a two month stay in Paris in 1949 during which he frequented screenings at the *Cinémathèque*.[12] To his credit, Traverso also notes that Pereira dos Santos was impressed by the films of Grierson and Ivens during this visit. On the downside, he also argues that during the 1960s *Cinema Novo* and Italian neo-realism were discovered by Latin American filmmakers inside and outside Brazil who had not been previously aware of either movement. "*Cinema Novo's* adaptation of neo-realism," he goes on to argue, "became the model in Latin America."[13] Since it hinges upon one filmmaker's two month long visit to Paris, this is perhaps the most reductively "heroic" account of how Italian neo-realism came to influence New Latin American Cinema. It goes well beyond other accounts in positing Brazil as the source for neo-realism for the rest of the continent, and by arguing that other filmmakers simultaneously discovered Italian neo-realism and its Brazilian adaptation.

Paranaguá objects to such accounts because they not only obscure a history of neo-realism in Latin America that predates 1955 but also tend to suggest that Latin American filmmaking did not begin in earnest until New Latin American Cinema arrived on the scene. The "golden legend," he argues, presupposes that cinema began in the 1960s and that everything before then constitutes a prehistory made up of the work of isolated pioneers, an argument he traces to what he considers Glauber Rocha and Alfredo Guevara's self-serving revisionist histories of Latin American cinema.[14] To counter this legend he documents several commercial productions made in Brazil, Argentina and Venezuela, some as early as 1948, which could be considered neo-realist in style. All

told, according to Paranaguá, somewhere in the range of 30-40 commercial neo-realist features were made in Latin America between 1948-1960. This represents a substantial percentage of output during that period, leading Paranaguá to conclude that neo-realism was more vibrant a movement in Latin America than it was in India, Egypt, or Spain, where it tended to be associated with the work of one director.[15] In order to establish the presence of neo-realism in Latin America as early as the late 1940s, evidence from the other two legs of the tripod, exhibition and distribution, must be added to this account of production. Paranaguá analyzes statistics on the number of films opening each year in Latin America and their country of origin and concludes that there was a general trend throughout Latin America in the years directly after World War II toward a dramatic loss of market share for Hollywood which was mostly to the advantage of Europe. The main factor accounting for this change was the presence of refugees from the Spanish Civil War and World War II in Latin American cities.[16]

Paranaguá points to the growth in the postwar period of cine clubs and film magazines throughout Latin America as further evidence of a general Europeanization of film culture in Latin America during the 1950s.[17] Bolivia, which had what Paranaguá terms a "vegetative" cinema industry, lagged considerably behind other Latin American countries in the formation of film magazines and cine clubs, but there is some evidence that Bolivian film enthusiasts were aware of neo-realism and the estimation in which it was held by foreign critics, if not audiences. In 1954, the *Instituto Cinematográfico Boliviano* (ICB) published the first and only issue of its official journal, titled *Warawara* after the 1929 feature by Bolivian film pioneer José María Velasco Maidana. The issue is entirely devoted to Bolivian film production, with articles on the founding and operations of the ICB, detailed descriptions of all the ICB productions to date, and a historical section devoted to its namesake film. Curiously, though, an article covering a two-page spread titled "Compaginación Tiempo y Tiempo (Combining Time and Time)", which outlines the basics of continuity editing for would-be filmmakers, is illustrated with

pictures of Vittorio De Sica and Anna Magnani. Beneath the picture of De Sica is the caption "Victorio De Sicca" (sic), and beneath the other, "La Magnani. Naturalidad y Realismo en el Cine Italiano (The Magnani. Naturalness and Realism in the Italian Cinema)".[18] This appearance is curious because the author of the article makes no mention of any particular films in the piece, neo-realist or otherwise. Even more oddly revealing of the status of Italian neo-realism among Bolivia's small band of cinéastes is a caption that appears in a box on one of the pages in the section on *Warawara*, "Estilo Victorio De Sicca: Artistas escogidas o encontradas en la calle (Victorio De Sicca style: Performers taken from or encountered in the street)."[19] These casual references indicate that the editors of the journal, including Waldo Cerruto, who, before returning to Bolivia to take charge of the ICB had been in exile in Buenos Aires, were familiar with some of the major figures (Magnani and De Sica) and characteristics (realism, non-professional actors, location shooting) of Italian neo-realism. Further, in attempting to link a foundational text from Bolivian cinema to the Italian movement, they reveal their knowledge of the international prestige accorded it. *Warawara* does not provide any evidence that the films of Italian neo-realism showed in Bolivia, but it does unquestionably indicate that these films were part of Bolivian discourse about quality cinema. Sanjinés, in an essay on neo-realism, remembers seeing *Miracolo en milano* (*Miracle in Milan*, Vittorio De Sica, 1951) as a youth, and that between the years 1955-1965, in both Lima, Peru, and La Paz, you could see "las grandes películas de cine europeo (the great films of European cinema)." [20] Sanjinés's periodization and his use of *Miracolo en milano* as an example suggest a substantial lag time between a European film's distribution in Europe or North America and in the Andean countries; nevertheless, it does indicate that even in such peripheral cities as La Paz an avid filmgoer could have been exposed to neo-realism in its original form, possibly alongside the Latin American neo-realist films Paranaguá recovers from obscurity. In any case, it is reasonably certain

that Italian neo-realism was familiar throughout Latin America at least by the mid-1950s, and that it was not "discovered" along with *Cinema Novo* in the 1960s.

For all of its aesthetic merits, Paranaguá describes neo-realism's impact on Latin American cinema mostly in terms of the production process. If filmmakers in Latin America adapted neo-realist techniques in the late 1940s, he argues, it was not because of an affinity for the films's aesthetic, but rather because of economically determined tendencies within the studio systems themselves, especially in Argentina and Brazil.[21] The need to keep down production costs was leading these cinemas to move away from the large-scale studio productions to an independent *auteur* cinema based on the joint efforts of a producer, a screenwriter, and a director.[22] Paranaguá quotes Mário Audrá Jr., founder of an independent production company in São Paulo in 1950, as saying that, to a Latin American producer, the appeal of Italian neo-realism as a model lay in its low production costs and success in external markets.[23]

Italian neo-realism had much the same appeal for New Latin American Cinema filmmakers as it did for their commercial counterparts. According to Nelson Pereira dos Santos:

> The influence of neorrealism was not that of a school or ideology, but rather a production system. Neorrealism taught us, in sum, that it was possible to make films in the streets; that we did not need studios; that we could film using average people rather than known actors; that the technique could be imperfect, as long as the film was truly linked to its national culture and expressed that culture.[24]

Fernando Birri notes that for him neo-realism was important not so much for its style as for the "example it offered of making independent, highly artistic, nationalist, sociological films."[25] Antonio Eguino notes that " for us the term means filmmaking with a certain commitment towards the society we are involved in, with little money, shooting with non-actors, mostly outdoors."[26]

As useful as the neo-realist production methods were to commercial and non-commercial Latin American filmmakers alike for the creation of an independent, low-cost

cinema, it did not provide a model for the kind of political commitment aspired to by the filmmakers of the New Latin American Cinema. In the words of Eguino, neo-realism connotes a "certain" commitment to society, but not militancy. As David Overby remarks in the introduction to his collection of Italian writings on neo-realism, the social criticism in neo-realist films was always mild.[27] One reason for this was institutional. The so-called Andreotti law passed in 1949 allowed the Italian government to ban the export of any film it deemed as having potential to damage Italy's reputation abroad. Much as was to happen later in Latin America, the influx of American films in the immediate post-war years destroyed the financial basis for cinema production in Italy, making producers dependent on foreign revenues, especially from the United States. Thus during the period during which neo-realist productions were at their height, the Andreotti law made certain that, were they so inclined, filmmakers would avoid explicitly political themes.[28] Overby notes that attacks on neo-realist films by the Vatican and right-wing politicians "might have added to the prestige of neo-realism as being more anti-establishment than it actually was."[29] These attacks led to a sense of crisis around neo-realist production which in turn led to a series of defensive congresses, such as the 1953 Congress of Parma, during which Cesare Zavattini presented his "A Thesis on Neo-Realism," a widely-anthologized essay on the movement by one of its key theorists. Neo-realism was certainly subject to the restrictions of the commercial marketplace, and it did not benefit from state support to the same extent as later, export-oriented national film movements in Europe such as New German Cinema. Whether the Andreotti law or the need to appeal to American audiences stifled neo-realism's political impulses must remain an open question. It is just as likely that this political inexplicitness was a characteristic of the movement from the start, explaining its appeal abroad. As André Bazin, one of neo-realism's most perceptive critics and ardent defenders wrote, "neorealim by definition rejects analysis."[30] Writing of *Ladri di Biciclette* Bazin argues that it is "certainly the only valid Communist film of the whole past decade precisely

because it still has meaning when you have abstracted its social significance. Its social message is not detached, it remains immanent in the event, but it is so clear that no one can overlook it, still less take exception to it, since it is never made explicitly a message."[31] Bazin's stance towards politics and cinema is difficult to sort out here at first. On the one hand, the political in *Ladri di Biciclette* is immanent in the story; on the other hand, despite this immanence, it is susceptible to being "abstracted" from the film, leaving that part which is of interest to Bazin. He concludes by noting that the political is "never made explicitly a message," a much stronger prescription than his previous equivocations would suggest.

Like all militant political cinema movements, New Latin American Cinema filmmakers had little interest in rendering the political content of their films in an oblique or indirect way. Militant cinema has little use for vague concepts such as the "revolutionary humanism" advocated by Bazin.[32] Bazin retroactively reads 1920s Russian cinema as an important precursor to neo-realism's approach to realism, minimizing its political significance much in the way his theories on neo-realism would be used by some critics in the 1970s to emphasize the broad, humanistic appeal of New Latin American Cinema and deemphasize or make less specific its politics. Comparing it to German Expressionism and Hollywood's star system, he writes, "Was it not from the outset their search for realism that characterized the Russian films of Eisenstein, Pudovkin, and Dovjenko as revolutionary both in art and politics?"[33] The obvious riposte to this rhetorical question, from the perspective of political filmmakers working in Europe or Latin America during the 1960s, would be that the politically and aesthetically revolutionary in those films was their revolutionary politics, and the filmmakers's conscious creation of a revolutionary political aesthetic. Or, to paraphrase Benjamin's well-known formulation from "The Author as Producer," a key text for theorists of political cinema in the 1960s-1970s, films that are politically correct are cinematically correct and vice versa. Bazin's rejection of explicitly political filmmaking was a factor in

his waning influence at *Cahiers du cinéma* during the 1960s, especially after the political turn of 1968.[34] In the 1970s Bazin's "revolutionary humanism" became a counter-force to the revived Eisensteinian tradition of political cinema, and a critical divide emerged in film studies between a Bazinian camp that favored long takes, deep focus, and a "phenomenological" approach to realism that eschewed explicit political commitment, and an Eisenstein camp occupied with montage and political ideology.[35]

To a limited but nevertheless instructive extent, New Latin American Cinema, and Bolivian cinema in particular, was sometimes championed by adherents to the Bazinian tradition, thereby keeping alive the association of the movement with neo-realism. Two such pieces will be considered here, before moving on to John Hess's important contribution to the neo-realism/New Latin American Cinema debate and Sanjinés's own thoughts on the matter.

The first is Erich Keel's "From Militant Cinema to Neo-Realism: The Example of *Pueblo Chico*."[36] According to the biographical data at the end of the article, Keel taught in La Paz for a year, presumably during 1975 when *Pueblo Chico* was released. He reveals himself to be unaware of Sanjinés's *El enemigo principal* and the existence of a *Grupo Ukamau* in exile. He thus attributes a greater degree of continuity between Ukamau Ltda. and the pre-1971 group than most critics would, but this is understandable in part because of the presence of both Antonio Eguino, cinematographer turned director, and scriptwriter Oscar Soria, from the original group. Before proceeding with Keel's piece, some background on the film and the attitude of its makers is necessary. *Pueblo Chico* was the first feature film made in Bolivia after *El coraje del pueblo*, and it was made under the repressive dictatorship of Hugo Banzer. During this period Soria commonly referred to two kinds of cinema, "the cinema that is needed…and the cinema that is possible."[37] *Pueblo Chico*, along with Eguino's subsequent feature, *Chuquiago* (1977), was part of the latter group. *Pueblo Chico*, set in the 1960s, is the story of an idealistic youth, the son of a large landholder, who returns to his town after studying in

Buenos Aires. Aware that the situation there has changed little despite the 1952 revolution and its promise of reform and determined to do something about it, he proposes schemes for more equitable distribution of land among the peasants and educating them in their native Quechua, only to have his efforts frustrated by the town's racist elite, to which his own family belongs. He is forced to confront the enduring inequities produced by Bolivia's discriminatory social structures. Soria expresses some longing for the more militant period of *Yawar Mallku* and *El coraje del pueblo*, but Eguino, by contrast, was content to move away from revolutionary commitment and make films that would not only avoid government censorship but would also attract middle-class audiences, the only audiences in Bolivia who could afford to pay for, and thus had access to, commercial cinema. In "Neo-realism in Bolivia: An Interview with Antonio Eguino," published subsequent to *Chuquiago*, Eguino says,

> When we make a film we have to take into consideration what kind of audience we are trying to reach. We have to aim for the groups that regularly go to the cinema, which is only 5% of Bolivia's population. And to reach these people we have to use established channels of communication and distribution…We don't have the means or the organization to create an alternative distribution system, and we do not think that showing a film with a portable projector to a limited number of people is effective. It is unrealistic to think that we are going to make a film exclusively for the peasants who do not have access to cinema at all—although the Quechuas and Aymaras are the majority of the population—or for the workers who make up 3% of the population.[38]

Eguino is making a thinly veiled critique of Sanjinés's "cinema with the people" and advocating a more professional, middle class-oriented film production for Bolivia. While dismissive of the political content of Sanjinés's films and their militant form, this is still far from being a reactionary rejection of New Latin American Cinema, especially in regards to countering the influence of American cinema on viewers and national production. Eguino describes one of the new group's goals as "replacing, little by little, the alienating commercial cinema, basically backed by American distribution monopolies, that invade us."[39] In this sense he and Soria achieved great success;

Chuquiago famously beat *Jaws* (Steven Spielberg, 1975) at the Bolivian box office. When asked what kinds of films he is permitted to make, Eguino sounds almost militant when he responds, "They are not *permitting* us to make films, we have won that right. I was put into jail for my participation in *Courage of the People*, and even the bourgeois press protested my arrest."[40] If the content of the films was no longer explicitly political, Eguino is careful to portray the very act of continuing to film in Bolivia under a dictatorship as an act of resistance.

Just as it would be impossible to determine whether the Andreotti law, the preferences of much-needed American audiences, or some combination of the two resulted in the mild social criticism of Italian neo-realism, so too it is difficult to determine which factor was most responsible for the low-key politics of Eguino and Soria's 1970s cinema of the possible, fears of political censorship or the tastes of middle-class Bolivians, who, except for certain intellectual sectors, almost universally rejected the revolutionary politics of the period. Eguino, as part of his defiant posture towards the dictatorship, emphasizes the latter. Keel, in his piece on *Pueblo Chico*, attributes the shift in tone from *El coraje del pueblo* to necessary accommodations made to the political reality of dictatorship, and despite the objectionable nature of these pressures, concludes that they have had a salutary impact on the development of Ukamau's filmmaking. He ignores how the story, by positing the white, educated elite as a potential catalyst for transforming the political and economic fortunes of Bolivia's indigenous majority, is calculated to appeal to a middle class audience.[41]

Keel holds the "phenomenological narrative" style of neo-realism, as described by Bazin, as an ideal that previous Ukamau films fell far short of. He criticizes the use of music to create suspense in *Ukamau* and the caricatured portrayal of Peace Corps workers in *Yawar Mallku*, noting that "such contrivance and distortion are altogether alien to *Pueblo Chico*."[42] He argues that the film distinguishes itself from its predecessors and joins the lineage of such classics of neo-realism as *Sciuscià* (*Shoeshine*,

Vittorio De Sica, 1946) because of its makers's "reluctance to set forth a political program or thesis, or to assume even a precise ideological point of view."[43] He notes that the political ambiguity of the film was necessary in order save the project, then adds that "in relying on the phenomenological narrative developed by Italian directors, it succeeded in giving its political maneuver stylistic coherence."[44] "In sum," Keel argues, "working with the neorealist conventions involved a retreat from the radical sociology of Fanon and Friere which had so strongly influenced Ukamau's previous position toward *cine popular*."[45] Here retreat does not suggest failure or retrogression, but progress. Keel concludes by naming *Pueblo Chico* "unquestionably…Ukamau's most Bolivian film," and bolsters this assertion by noting that festivals and distributors have failed to see its particular qualities, enamored as they presumably are with politically tendentious, rather than authentic and "realistic", films.

José Sánchez-H's *Neo-realism in Contemporary Bolivian Cinema: A Case Study of Jorge Sanjines's* <u>*Blood of the Condor*</u> *and Antonio Eguino's* <u>*Chuquiago*</u>, a doctoral thesis completed at the University of Michigan in 1985, is similar to Keel's piece in that it privileges neo-realist films as inherently more humanist, and thus artistic, than militant cinema. The twist here is that Sánchez-H sets out to prove, despite widespread assumption to the contrary, that *Yawar Mallku* is not militant cinema. "Comparative cinematic analysis will make clear the social reasons why the films described as militant by the Bolivian authorities, the critics, and even by Sanjinés himself, are not really militant, but rather, neo-realistic. The analysis further questions how neo-realistic Antonio Eguino's films really are."[46]

Using writings on neo-realism and *Roma, città aperta* as a representative film, he constructs a number of Italian neo-realism's definitive characteristics. Then, using "Towards a Third Cinema" and *La hora de los hornos* (*The Hour of the Furnaces*, Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino, 1968), he comes up with another set of characteristics to help define militant cinema. Sánchez-H stacks the deck in favor of his

argument by using a documentary to represent militant cinema, something which he never acknowledges. His antipathy for militant cinema and *La hora de los hornos* is apparent in his description.

> Technically and stylistically the film is crudely done and lacks unity. It is a collage of many disparate parts—newsreels, interviews, testimonials, current happenings—all glued together by the ideological argument. Throughout the film there are many shots that are out of focus or jerky. The lighting is usually poor. There are no dominant characters, so there is no avenue for human involvement in the film.[47]

He concludes that the film has little value except as a rare audiovisual document of Argentine history and as an "example of its genre, militant cinema."[48] *Yawar Mallku*, by contrast is "artistic, dramatic, and emotional in the presentation of its story. It is not discursive, journalistic, or ideological."[49] Sánchez-H's most startling move is to accuse those, including Sanjinés, who consider *Yawar Mallku* militant cinema of being complicit with the authorities who banned the film. He argues that "it is actually the government's labeling of *Blood of the Condor* that took this work of art into the political arena."[50]

Keel and Sánchez-H use the Bazinian version of neo-realism in different ways: Keel to valorize a less overtly political style of Latin American filmmaking, and Sánchez-H to attempt to rescue the films of Sanjinés from an assignation as militant propaganda. Both run counter to the broadly favorable critical reception of Sanjinés's films, militant tendencies and all, and both do so by referencing Bazin's injunction that the politics never be in the form of an explicit message. Their choice of Bazin's reading of neo-realism is validated to some extent by the mythical origins of New Latin American Cinema in Italian neo-realism and also indicates that the Bazinian humanist approach to politics and cinema had not died away completely during the 1970s but remained as a critical undercurrent. They also indicate that, to critics of the period, the value of neo-realism was sometimes even more hotly contested than that of New Latin American Cinema. The interview with Eguino quoted above was published in *Cinéaste*, an American film journal specializing in politics and cinema. The title they gave the piece

was "Neo-Realism in Bolivia: An Interview with Antonio Eguino." Eguino at no point confesses that his films are neo-realist; the subject is raised by the interviewer. To the editors of *Cinéaste* neo-realism, in this context, means apolitical, and it implies a negative appraisal of Eguino's work, exactly the opposite of Keel's intentions in using the term. In these texts the appellation "neo-realism" has become unmoored from its original historical association with New Latin American Cinema and is used as a shorthand critique of the way the politics in individual films are expressed.

By far the best scholarly piece to date on the relationship between neo-realism and New Latin American Cinema is by John Hess, and once again, *Yawar Mallku* is at the center of the argument. Hess argues that the film reflects both the influence of Italian neo-realism and the changes filmmakers had to make to neo-realism as a form in order to accommodate political reality in Latin America and the possibilities open to them.[51] The most informative part of the piece is his analysis of why Italian neo-realism was inadequate to New Latin American Cinema's purposes. Hess notes that Italian neo-realism put greater demand on the spectator than the average Hollywood production, but unlike New Latin American Cinema, "there is none of either the Eisensteinian or Brechtian sense of wanting to catapult the audience out of present reality in order to make their own history. There is only the vague hope that the film experience will provide an opportunity to rethink or re-see one's own reality."[52] He notes that neo-realism as a form "did not readily admit history, and many of the formal innovations of Latin American film, attributed alternately to Brecht, Eisenstein, Vertov and Godard are just as likely innovations necessitated by the need to express history," which, along with memory, he sees as one of the primary themes of New Latin American Cinema.[53]

History, for Hess, is collective memory, and Italian neo-realism does not offer models for representing this. Hess does not mention collective protagonists, but we might add that Italian neo-realism (as opposed to Eisenstein) does not offer models of collective protagonists, either, another reason why it was inadequate to the needs of many

New Latin American filmmakers who, like Sanjinés, were interested in representing and giving expression to collectivities. Italian neo-realism was as resolutely oriented toward the individual as any other commercial cinema, whether that individual be the protagonist or the film's supposed author. As Roberto Rossellini defines it, "neo-realism is the greatest possible curiosity about individuals."[54] Bazin notes that only one Italian neo-realist director, Giussepe De Santis, attempted to make a film with a collective protagonist.[55] He argues that such protagonists are contrary to the spirit of neo-realism, since "this revolutionary humanism has its source…in a certain consideration for the individual; the masses are but rarely considered to be a positive social force. When they are mentioned it is usually in order to demonstrate their destructive and negative character vis-à-vis the heroes."[56] As for the filmmaker, Bazin cites one of the defining characteristics of Italian neo-realism as being "reality as it is visible through an artist, refracted by his consciousness."[57] Bazin accepts, with Rossellini, that the proper subject of a neo-realist film is an individual, and he adds that that individual may be contrasted with the masses, who are not agents of history, again, making neo-realism a poor choice for filmmakers wishing to portray history or historical processes. Interestingly, of the three films Paranaguá cites as the "holy trinity" of early, neo-realist inspired New Latin American Cinema, only one, *El mégano*, has a true individual protagonist. Fernando Birri's *Tire dié* (*Throw a Dime*, Argentina, 1957) follows a group of children who run along a train as it crosses an elevated track above a swamp, begging the passengers to throw coins. The film also includes interviews with some of the childrens's parents, but no individual is given any more prominence than another. Likewise, Pereira Dos Santos's *Rio 40 Graus* follows a group of street urchins without isolating an individual protagonist. In García Espinosa and Gutiérrez Alea's *El mégano*, a film about a group of workers who pull mineral-soaked tree stumps from a swamp in order to make charcoal for the landowner to sell, the individual protagonist only appears about two thirds of the way into the film, when the workers are given their meager pay, along with receipts for

deductions made by their boss. One man unsuccessfully attempts to rouse the others in a revolt against the boss and his thugs. In the last shot of the film, we see him staring angrily ahead at the children of the boss as they drift by on a punt. The camera tracks down to his hand at his side, and he crushes the receipts he was just given in his fist. The film ends with this image of individual resolution, but it has already dramatized the collective failure to take action to better their lot.

Hess uses Italian critic Mario Cannella's piece on the ideology of Italian neo-realism, translated and published in *Screen* in 1974, to elucidate the political origins of neo-realism as a movement and contrast that with the situation in Latin America in the 1960s. According to Cannella's analysis, neo-realism was a product of Italy's particular version of Popular Front culture. The continued adherence to a Popular Front cultural politics that marks neo-realist filmmakers and the critics who supported their work (such as Bazin) and the elision of class antagonisms such consensus-based political movements require, effectively blocked the filmmakers in their efforts to make a break with the past and create a new political cinema.[58] Turning to Latin America, Hess locates the first emergence of neo-realism there during a similar period of Popular Front politics, in pre-revolutionary Cuba of the 1950s. Using Paranaguá we can date this emergence much earlier, but the point Hess makes is confirmed by Paranaguá, who notes that neo-realism had particular appeal in parts of Latin America in the immediate post-war years because of a historically unprecedented convergence of Roman Catholics and communists in countries like Argentina.[59] Hess's argument that neo-realism, because of its historical legacy as part of a Popular Front culture, had to be adapted to a different situation in Latin America hinges on a quote taken from García Espinosa, who, as we have seen, was an ardent supporter of neo-realism in the early 1950s. The quote comes from Michael Chanan's paraphrase of an interview García Espinosa gave to an unnamed Peruvian film journal, probably *Hablamos de cine*, and it is worth including at length here.

> Even those who had made *El mégano*, he said, who had been imprisoned and gone to work clandestinely for the overthrow of the Batista government, had believed that they were preparing only for a multi-class government with the participation of leftists alongside the bourgeoisie, and with a national programme. Nobody thought at first the outcome would actually be a socialist government—even if that is what they dedicated themselves to work for. Neorrealism they saw as a model for an appropriate cinema—a humanist and progressive aesthetic that offered a real alternative to the dominant modes of Hollywood and Latin American commercial production. An anti-dictatorial nationalist bourgeoisie could not have objected to it, it was a style that placed the people on the screen as historical actors, but without being too explicit about it. But the rapid realisation of the Revolution demonstrated that there was both room and need for a cinema to go further than this: straightforward neorrealist ideas could not really catch the speed and depth of revolutionary change. Though what kind of cinema could do this was not yet obvious, and would not emerge for some years.[60]

While in Cuba there was a socialist revolution, in Bolivia, beginning in 1964, as was the case in much of Latin America, there was a series of right-wing dictatorships. Both political situations rendered neo-realism, with its broad, humanist appeal, inadequate as a model for political filmmakers. We can take Hess's argument a bit further. Although certain key figures in New Latin American Cinema's earliest development (García Espinosa, Birri, and others) came of age as filmmakers when neo-realism commanded critical attention worldwide and were clearly influenced by it in their first works, others (Sanjinés, for instance) began making films after neo-realism had run its course in Latin America and elsewhere. As correct as Hess is to acknowledge Brecht, Eisenstein, Vertov, and Godard as sources New Latin American Cinema filmmakers drew upon for inspiration in their formal experimentation, need we assume, as Hess does, that these innovations were applied to a base of neo-realism? Or, to anticipate Sanjinés's thoughts on neo-realism's legacy, need we assume that neo-realism was any greater part of Latin American filmmakers's inheritance than it was for Godard, Rainer Werner Fassbinder, or any other filmmaker from any other of the various "new waves" descended from that first postwar new wave in European cinema, Italian neo-realism?

We can conclude from this that neo-realism already existed as an option in the industrialized commercial cinemas of Latin America by the late 1940s and was widely seen in the region, in both its original and Latin American versions, by at least the mid-1950s. Its appeal to Latin American filmmakers, whether they were commercial producers in the 1940s or New Latin American Cinema independents in the 1960s, resided mostly in its production methods and its success in penetrating foreign markets, not in its attempt at a realist aesthetic. For a burgeoning political cinema movement like New Latin American Cinema, it did not offer a model for radical political filmmaking practice, since it was a commercial cinema, the politics of which were formed during a period of Popular Front consensus and circumscribed by state censorship.[61] As Sanjinés has remarked, Italian neo-realism survived because commercial circuits were open to it that were denied New Latin American Cinema. These circuits accounted for its success, but may also have accounted for its lack of militancy, one of the primary characteristics of New Latin American Cinema. Given all this, despite its tentative applicability to some of the earliest films made by New Latin American Cinema filmmakers like Birri, Pereira dos Santos, and García Espinosa, it is best to regard Italian neo-realism as one of a number of early sources for New Latin American Cinema, but hardly a determinative one, and certainly not a model that would be pursued much longer in Latin America than it was in Europe. Rather, we should see Italian neo-realism as an influential model that was temporarily adapted and then superceded, in Latin America just as it was in Europe. It was succeeded by another intellectual current with an explicitly Marxist pedigree fostering new politicized ways of conceiving cinematic form, production, and exhibition, and spectatorship, a current that was simultaneously flowing through the political cinemas worldwide, Brecht's theory of the epic theater. Before turning to Brecht, though, we will review Sanjinés's own thoughts on neo-realism.

Sanjinés on Neo-Realism

In June 2002, the Brazilian film journal *Cinemais* organized a seminar on the influence of Italian neo-realism on New Latin American Cinema as part of the *Festival Cinesur de Cine Latinoamericano*, held in Rio de Janeiro. Sanjinés presented a talk as part of the seminar titled, "Neorrealismo y nuevo cine latinoamericano: La herencia, las coincidencias y las diferencias (Neo-realism and the New Latin American Cinema: The Inheritance, the Coincidences, and the Differences)", which was later published in a Mexican online film journal.[62] Throughout this talk, his most developed statement on the relationship between European and Latin American cinemas to date, Sanjinés puts greater emphasis on the differences than the similarities, and although he mentions his own *Yawar Mallku*, he does so in order to highlight its militancy and the political effect it had as a point of contrast with Italian neo-realism, not to comment on or condemn it for its "European" qualities, as he had done in the past.

Sanjinés begins the talk by making the obvious but often overlooked point that the "*Nuevo*" in *Nuevo Cine Latinoamericano* is also present in other movements aimed at revitalizing cinema, such as New German Cinema and the French New Wave. All of these movements trace their origins, he notes, to the first postwar wave of cinematic renewal, Italian neo-realism. In doing so he suggests that New Latin American Cinema was one of these waves and that it shared with them a common predecessor in Italian neo-realism. According to Sanjinés, the "revolutionary" period of Italian neo-realism lasted for only a few years, although he dates the movement's definitive demise at 1965, which would be considered very late by most historians and practitioners of Italian neo-realism. His choice of this date may have more to do with it being the year before his first feature, *Ukamau*, appeared than developments in Italian cinema, creating a break of continuity between Italian neo-realism and New Latin American Cinema, which, by 1967, was a recognizable movement. Sanjinés segregates Italian neo-realism from subsequent new waves while simultaneously crediting it with turning its back on

Hollywood practices to pursue a path these later waves would also take. All of these waves were motivated by

> nuevos ánimos de devolverle al cine su sentido constituyente y las posibilidades de volver a ser espejo de las sociedades y lugar de reflexión de ellas sobre sí mismas, como en su momento lo había sido el cine del Neorrealismo en Italia.
>
> (new impulses to return to cinema its constituent meaning and the possibility to return to being a mirror of the societies and a place where these societies could reflect on themselves, as Italian neo-realism had been in its moment.)[63]

This "constituent meaning" neo-realism returned to cinema was the ability for a society to represent itself "en términos de tiempo, espacio y carácter (in terms of time, space and character)," which made Italian neo-realism, according to Sanjinés, "el fenómeno cultural más destacado, profundo e importante de la Europa Occidental de su época (the most distinguished, profound, and important cultural phenomenon of its epoch in western Europe)."[64] His reading of Italian neo-realism makes no reference to realism in the Bazinian ontological sense; as a matter of fact, he does not mention realism at all. Sanjinés maintains an anti-humanist view of Italian neo-realism's significance in that he does not see it as a universal template for the realistic representation of a society. Rather, it pointed the way for future new waves by finding a culturally and historically specific way of representing a particular society's (Italy's) sense of time, space, and its own character, the central impulse behind Sanjinés's own theory. In doing so, it created the spaces of reflection Sanjinés continuously attempted to achieve in his own work. Italian neo-realism, he is careful to note, is a product of its own time and place.

That being said, Sanjinés acknowledges the impetus Italian neo-realism lent to New Latin American Cinema in its earliest years, an influence he attributes to certain similarities in the socio-historical context out of which both arose:

> Es indudable que el Neuvo Cine Latinoamericano recibió una fuerte herencia del Neorrealismo. Esa herencia, a nuestro entender prendió con fuerza en los cineastas latinoamericanos no solamente por su magnitud intrinseca, por su propria fuerza y mágica, sino también porque algunas coincidencias históricas y sociales habían

> creado el caldo de cultivo adecuado. Ambas cinematografías nacieron como producto de una grave crisis social-histórica. El Neorrealismo como un nuevo cine de denuncia de la situación social en la Italia de la postguerra y el Nuevo Cine Latinoamericano como un nuevo cine de denuncia de la situación social, económica, política y cultural en una Latinoamérica dominada y castigada por las oligarquías y militarismos dependientes del Imperio. Surge, puede decirse, como un movimiento generado muy poco tiempo después del triunfo de la Revolución Cubana y eclosiona inmediamente después de la muerte del Ché.
>
> (It is incontrovertible that New Latin American Cinema received a powerful inheritance from neo-realism. This inheritance, to our understanding, captured by force Latin American filmmakers not only because of its intrinsic greatness, its power and magic, but also because of some historical and social coincidences that had created the proper culture medium. Both movements were born as products of a grave socio-historical crisis. Neo-realism as a new cinema of denunciation of the social situation in postwar Italy and New Latin American Cinema as a denunciation of the social, economic, political, and cultural situation in a Latin America dominated and punished by oligarchs and militarists dependent on the empire. It first surged forth and was generated as a movement, we could say, a very short time after the triumph of the Cuban Revolution and arose immediately following the death of Che.)[65]

Sanjinés barely sketches out the similarities between the socio-historical context of postwar Italy and 1960s Latin America before moving on to the differences. Still, he does praise *Paisà* (Rossellini, 1946) for its critical stance towards the American occupation, and, although this theme would not characterize Italian neo-realism as a whole, it does suggest, given his belief that Latin American societies are virtually occupied by American interests, one powerful reason these films were so appealing to Latin American filmmakers.

Before moving on to what he considers the two major differences between the movements, Sanjinés digresses to consider the respective place of each in world cinema distribution. Unlike Italian neo-realism, he argues, New Latin American Cinema failed to achieve a major commercial presence worldwide. He speculates that this may be the result of Italy's better-organized and supported system for foreign distribution and the fact that during the immediate postwar years the American monopoly on global distribution was nowhere near as total. Being blocked from global networks of

commercial distribution quantitatively limited the production of New Latin American Cinema, but it also forced the filmmakers to experiment with new forms and new methods of production and distribution, which in turn kept the movement vital and positioned it at the forefront of political cinemas. He notes that besides being virtually locked out of international distribution, New Latin American Cinema faced other obstacles that Italian neo-realism did not, including direct political censorship, indifference tantamount to an outright boycott on the part of domestic exhibitors, direct interference in domestic production and exhibition by the American Embassy, as was thought to have been the case with *Yawar Mallku*, and the thoroughgoing conditioning of the filmgoing public by American films. A historian of Italian cinema would no doubt take issue with some of these assertions, such as, for instance, that Italian neo-realism did not suffer from the indifference of domestic exhibitors, but Sanjinés's larger point is to draw attention to the politically repressive circumstances that gave rise to and in which much New Latin American Cinema was produced. He remarks that there were no equivalents in Italian cinema to the political assassination of filmmaker Raymundo Gleyzer of Argentina.

Despite having been products of a similar "culture medium," Sanjinés argues that "las diferencias son también palpables y pienso que podrían sintetizarse en las palabras IDENTIDAD y MILITANCIA (the differences are noticeable as well, and I think they could be summed up in the words IDENTITY and MILITANCY)."[66] Sanjinés has a distinctly uncomplicated notion of Italian identity, and he tends to assume that conflicts over identity so very much in the forefront in Latin American struggles for liberation have long been settled there, a view that would have stunned and offended his Italian contemporaries such as Pier Paolo Pasolini: "En Italia la noción de identidad cultural y nacional estaba sostenida por la memoria orgullosa de un inmenso y prodigioso pasado histórico y cultural (In Italy, the idea of identity is sustained by the proud memory of a prodigious historical and cultural past)."[67] Sanjinés assumes that the absence of conflict

over identity in Italian neo-realism is genuinely reflective of a similar absence in the culture at large. As Hess argued, using Cannella, Italian neo-realism was a cinema that arose from a Popular Front ideology of national consensus, which accounts for its generally homogenizing approach to Italian identity. For this same reason, as the editors of the recent book on global neo-realism note in their introduction, "these films seemed to show filmmakers how a national identity could be shaped and/or redefined by cinema."[68] Their use of the singular to define national identity is in this case correct, and it points to one of the limits of neo-realism as a form for political filmmaking practice. In the case of Italian neo-realism, Sanjinés is correct to point out that in it the notion of cultural identity is conflated with the national, and that a dominant discourse on Italian culture is favorably represented as constitutive and uncontested by marginalized voices. For all of their social critique, the films of Italian neo-realism did not advocate the founding of a new society so much as the rehabilitation of the old. In New Latin American Cinema, by contrast, culture is nearly always defined as in opposition to the state, the ruling elite, and the forces of imperialism, both cultural and political, that animate each. Speaking of Glauber Rocha, Sanjinés says, "toda su gran obra es un enorme canto a la fuerza de la identidad cultural como el principal bastión para construir la resistencia a la penetración cultural propugnado por el capital foráneo y el imperialismo (all of his great work is a an enormous song to the power of cultural identity as the primary bastion from which it is possible to construct resistance to the cultural penetration proposed by foreign capital and imperialism)."[69] In Bolivia, the culture of resistance is that of the indigenous majority, and Sanjinés retroactively reads the indigenous as being historically the primary occupation of Bolivian cinema,

> su trayectoria es una constante pregunta sobre las posibilidades de construir una nueva sociedad impregnada de la sabiduría nativa para mirar la vida con ojos más profundos. Desde *Wara Wara* de Velasco Maidana, filmade en 1929 a películas muy recientes, el tema de la identidad cultural ha estado presente.

> (its trajectory is a constant questioning of the possibilities of constructing a new society impregnated with the native wisdom in order to be able to look upon life with more profound eyes. From *Wara Wara* by Velasco Maidana, filmed in 1929, to more recent movies, the theme of cultural identity has been present.)[70]

Like Mesa and Gumucio Dagron in their histories of Bolivian cinema, Sanjinés reads back into the Bolivian cinematic tradition a continuous preoccupation with the indigenous, in an effort to locate a local source for New Latin American Cinema's engagement with issues of cultural identity, since he does not find one in Italian neo-realism. In the same way, though, one could construct a revisionist history of Italian neo-realism as being concerned with marginalized Italian identities by focusing on a *sui generis* film like *La terra trema* (*The Earth Trembles*, Luchino Visconti, 1948), which was performed by Sicilian fishermen and their families speaking a dialect incomprehensible to most Italians.

As Hess points out, filmmakers turned to issues of cultural identity in response to the unique political situation in Latin America, a situation in which they found the existing models, such as Italian neo-realism, insufficiently militant, Sanjinés's other main distinguishing characteristic. The militancy that distinguishes New Latin American Cinema from Italian neo-realism, according to Sanjinés,

> surge de una cinematografía contestaria, que se hace para subvertir un realidad social intolerable, que se enfrente, en muchos casos con el aparato poderoso del estado, que denuncia las atrocidades dictoriales, que registra la memoria de sucesos que se pretende esconder u olvidar, que se juega la vida a veces para proyectar sus imágenes y que está muy lejos de buscar dinero, fama y glamor.
>
> (arises from a contestatory film practice which exists to subvert an intolerable social reality, which in many cases confronts the powerful state apparatus, which denounces the atrocities of dictators, which registers the memory of events hidden or forgotten, which sometimes puts its life on the line to project its images and is very far removed from the search for money, fame, or glamour.)[71]

Sanjinés speculates that many, if not most, of the filmmakers of Italian neo-realism shared this sort of militant commitment to the causes of the common people in Italy, but

it did not find expression in the films themselves because during the first postwar years Italy

> ya estaba libre del fascismo, de la ocupación y el horror nazi y las anchas avenidas quedaban libres para construir otra sociedad, habían conquistado espacios seguros para exhibir sus obras, eran vistos y comprendidos en el mundo entero, hacían un cine que circulaba, que se demandaba porque tenían acceso a los circuitos.
>
> (was already free of fascism, of the Nazi occupation and horror, and the wide avenues remained open for constructing another society, they [neo-realist filmmakers] had conquered secure spaces for exhibiting their work, were seen and understood all over the world, made a cinema which circulated, which made demands because it had access to the circuits.)[72]

Italian neo-realism lacked militancy in part because it was made in a country recently freed from fascism. By contrast, New Latin American Cinema was mostly made in what Sanjinés and others would regard as the gathering shadow of fascism. Thus the very different social and political circumstances account for this difference. But in the same sentence Sanjinés suggests that it was the circulation of the films along conventional commercial circuits that accounted for their lack of militancy as well. Thanks to its having been denied access to these commercial circuits, the very production and exhibition of New Latin American Cinema becomes a political act. As Sanjinés remarks, attending a festival of New Latin American Cinema "significaba, de muchas maneras, militar en una causa social y política (meant, in many ways, to militate in a social and political cause)."[73] When it came to international festivals, he argues, New Latin American Cinema filmmakers did not seek prizes, but a forum from which to deliver their denunciations. He notes that 800 members of the international press attended the European premiere of *Yawar Mallku* in Venice. And although an occasional work of New Latin American Cinema succeeded in the commercial circuits, "su campo de acción estaba más bien en la sombra, en la clandestinidad, circulando en las fábricas, en las universidades, en las distantes comunidades campesinas (its field of action is better found in the shadows, in clandestinity, circulating in the factories, in the universities, in isolated

peasant communities)."[74] Documenting the effect of New Latin American Cinema in the festival and other non-commercial circuits in which it moved is difficult; even more so is documenting its effect in the shadows, but it is there, Sanjinés insists, that it achieved its most significant political impact.

Two key events mark the timeline of Sanjinés comparison of New Latin American Cinema and Italian neo-realism: the Cuban Revolution and the death of "Che". The original appeal of Italian neo-realism to New Latin American Cinema filmmakers lay in their perception of it as a cinema that likewise arose in a period of political upheaval. In the case of Italy, it was the end of World War II and fascist rule and occupation. In Latin America there was a similar sense of euphoria and possibility following the Cuban Revolution, but this all ended with the death of Ché and increasingly repressive dictatorial regimes throughout the region. Italian neo-realism continued to inspire Latin American filmmakers because it was the first of a series of postwar new waves dedicated to representing a society in its own sense of time, space, and character, and this impulse could be used to create a contestatory sense of cultural identity. As political cinema, though, it was not an influence, because it was denunciatory at times but never integrated with social and political movements for liberation. Part of this could be explained by its success in commercial circuits, a success denied New Latin American Cinema. For all the hardships this lack of commercial access posed to filmmakers like Sanjinés, hardships he bemoaned in earlier writings, in retrospect he acknowledges that it forced filmmakers to construct new languages and new modes of production and exhibition that ultimately proved more politically efficacious. No mere play of light and shadows, New Latin American Cinema was a cinema *of* the shadows, a marginalized and sometime violently repressed movement that, owing to its lack of commercial success, was free to reinvent the cinema and its relationship to the people and to political practice. Here New Latin American Cinema definitively parted ways with Italian neo-realism. If there was still something like neo-realism in Bolivian cinema by the mid-1970s, it is, as we have seen,

Eguino's effort to bring Latin American cinema out of the shadows and into the theaters, an effort that entailed dropping militancy in favor of a politics of middle class consensus. The functional transformation of the cinema advocated by Sanjinés, García Espinosa, and Rocha, ultimately found less inspiration in neo-realism than it did in the Brechtian theories of Epic Theater then prevalent among political filmmakers and theorists in Europe as well as the practitioners of *Nuevo Teatro Popular* (New People's Theater) in Latin America.

The Epic Theater in Latin America and Europe

Near the middle of Godard's *Groupe Dziga Vertov* production *Le Vent d'est* (*Wind from the East*, 1970), we see Glauber Rocha standing at a fork in the road, hands outstretched in a Christ-like pose. A pregnant woman carrying a motion picture camera approaches him and says, "Excuse me for interrupting your class struggle, but could you please tell me the way toward political cinema?" Rocha points first in front of himself, then behind and to the road on his left, saying, "That way is the cinema of aesthetic adventure and philosophical inquiry, while this [pointing to the road behind and to his right] is the Third World cinema—a dangerous cinema, divine and marvelous, where the questions are practical ones like production, distribution, training three hundred filmmakers to make six hundred films a year for Brazil alone, to supply one of the world's largest markets." One possible reading of this scene would be that it reinforces a conventional division between Third World political cinema, dominated by practice, and First World political filmmaking, given to aesthetic and philosophical enquiry. In this reading both cinemas have failed to properly integrate theory and practice, privileging one while sacrificing the other. This reading is reinforced by an anecdote concerning the scene's origin. Once while in Rome, "Rocha encounters Godard, who, as Rocha tells it, suggested that the two of them should coordinate their efforts 'to destroy cinema'—to which Rocha replied that he was on a very different trip, that his business was to build

cinema in Brazil and the rest of the Third World, to handle very practical problems of production, distribution, etc."[75] This anecdote implies a strong divergence between European and Latin American political cinemas. And yet the presence of Rocha in this allegorical tableaux suggests other readings as well. James Roy MacBean, writing only a few years after the film's release, interprets the scene thus: "At a very pregnant stage of creative development, the cinema turns to the Third World for direction regarding the proper relation between cinema and politics."[76] For him, the scene does not emphasize separation and disjuncture but confluence. "In the crossroads sequence in *Vent d'est*, there is even a strong visual suggestion that the three-way intersection is simply the point where two paths—that of the Third World and that of European cinema—converge and join together in what is really one big ongoing path of 'aesthetic adventure and philosophical enquiry,' which, by necessity, combines both theory and practice."[77] Rocha, despite the fact that he symbolizes Latin American cinema in the scene, and despite the fact that he identifies one of the roads as that of Third World cinema, by his very placement at the fork in the road is nevertheless positioned as a figure mediating the two. Of course there are other plausible readings as well. When first asked which is the way to political cinema, he points directly ahead, down the single road. On the one hand, this single road represents the convergence of the others. On the other, it is the road of the three that we know Godard to be on, by virtue of the camera's placement. This reading interests me in that it emphasizes the confrontation between the European and the Latin American filmmaker, placing them both squarely on the same axis that unites theory and practice. Furthermore, it suggests that Godard, and by extension his European and North American audiences, are looking to Latin America for solutions to problems of political aesthetics.

This is also, of course, a Brechtian moment in a film from Godard's most Brechtian period. It is an isolated tableaux marked by a mix of allegorical and concrete language, performed by actors who "quote themselves" and their social *gestuses*,

presented to the audience for judgment. We can take the allegory further. The road both filmmakers are standing on was created some time ago. It is the political aesthetic developed by Bertolt Brecht during the 1930's, which each holds to be a model of politically engaged artistic production. That both filmmakers are facing different directions, that they are approaching from different points along that road, is appropriate. For they do not share the same history, nor have they necessarily received their Brecht by the same route. The remainder of this chapter explores what happens when you place Godard (or Miklos Jancsó, or Theo Angelopoulous) and Rocha (or Sanjinés, or García Espinosa) on this road which they claim as an inheritance, an inheritance stronger and more relevant after 1968 than neo-realism ever was. It explores the differences and points of convergence between European and Latin American applications of Brechtian theory to cinema, always assuming that the differences generated dialogue.

In discussing Latin American cinema and Brecht, I will be focusing mostly on Sanjinés while also drawing on other theorists in order to present a general picture of the Brechtian aspects of New Latin American Cinema. As for Europe, I will maintain a rather narrow focus on Godard, and especially *Vent d'Est*. I do so because this film, perhaps more than any other European production of the period, generated theory and commentary on revolutionary political cinema, and also because this self-consciously Brechtian film, along with other Godard films from the late 1960s and early 1970s, were often used as a point of entry for examining the applicability of Brechtian theory to film. Furthermore, since Godard made it known that his Brechtian cinematic practice was a product of his reading of "The Modern Theatre is the Epic Theatre (Notes to the Opera *Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny*)", this text was frequently used, even imitated, as a tool for analyzing Godard's work. Julia Lesage, in a piece on *Vent d'Est*, writes, "Godard and Gorin's intent in making *Wind from the East* was specifically Brechtian. One can paraphrase Brecht's famous table in the Preface to *Mahagonny* comparing epic and dramatic theater to apply it to *Wind from the East*."[78] Perhaps Lesage is referring to

a Peter Wollen piece on the film, or perhaps she was unaware, but two years earlier Wollen had published an essay on *Vent d'Est* in which he indeed paraphrases Brecht's table, creating his own table of elements of conventional and revolutionary film.[79] Brecht's "The Modern Theatre is the Epic Theatre (Notes to the Opera *Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny*)", in which he makes his call for a radical separation of the elements of theater, quickly became the Brechtian *Urtext* of 1960s-1970s European radical political film theory, for reasons having to do with the material base of European art cinema and the intellectual tendencies of the period, while Latin American readings of Brecht were more wide-ranging and more likely to be derived directly from theater practice.

European interest in Brecht's cinematic work and the applicability of his theories of theater and literature to film began in France, with the publication of an issue of *Cahiers du cinéma* (no. 114) devoted to him appearing in 1960.[80] By the mid-1960s, according to George Lellis, "there is evidence in some of *Cahiers'* articles that many of its writers have started to look for new, alternative critical methods and conceptual frameworks."[81] He notes that in this period there was a marked shift of interest "away from the American cinema and towards the *jeune cinéma* movements in Europe, Asia, and Latin America: implicit in it is the assertion that the film medium's major revelations are no longer to be found in the American cinema but elsewhere."[82] After 1968, the *Cahiers* critics radicalized their political stance, and, according to Lellis, "Bertolt Brecht is the pivotal figure for these changes."[83] The turn toward Brecht by the highly influential *Cahiers* critics thus coincides with, and is reinforced by, an increasing preoccupation with Third World cinemas, including New Latin American Cinema. By 1970, two volumes of Brecht's theoretical writings were published in France, *Sur le cinéma* (*On Cinema*) and *Sur le Réalisme* (*On Realism*). For English readers, John Willett's anthology *Brecht on Theatre: The Development of an Aesthetic*, had been available since 1964. The new French translations supplemented that book and sparked a

renewed interest in Brecht among Anglophone critics associated with the film journal *Screen*, who were inspired by French theory as well as the changes taking place at *Cahiers*. *Screen* published two special issues on Brecht; the first, Volume 15, no. 2 (1974), had translations from the French of short pieces by Brecht on cinema, two articles on the only film Brecht ever co-directed, *Kuhle Wampe: oder wem gehört die Welt?* (*Kuhle Wampe, or Who Owns the World?*, Brecht and Slatan Dudow, Germany, 1931), an essay by Walter Benjamin, and Roland Barthes's essay, "Diderot, Brecht, Eisenstein," among other pieces. The second special issue, Vol. 16, no. 4. (1975), gathered together papers and roundtable presentations given in conjunction with that year's "Brecht and Cinema" program at the Edinburgh Film Festival. Around the same time the *New Left Review* published Brecht's "Against Georg Lukács" in no. 84 (1974), a piece from the Brecht and Lukács debates over realism in the pages of the literary journal Brecht edited during the 1930s, *Das Wort*. In 1972 Godard declared that Brecht's "The Modern Theatre is the Epic Theatre (Notes to the Opera *Aufstieg und Fall der Stadt Mahagonny*)" provided the basis for his and Jean-Pierre Gorin's film *Tout va bien* (*All's Well*, 1972).[84] In France and England, by the early-1970s Brecht had replaced Eisenstein as the theorist of choice for politically radical filmmakers and the critics who championed their work.

The New Latin American Cinema filmmakers were as inspired by Brecht as their European counterparts. Although there were no Latin American equivalents of *Screen*, journals devoted to the production of film theory by professional intellectuals, the filmmakers themselves published theory in which they explicitly announced their Brechtian intentions. Typical of this would be Glauber Rocha's "The Tricontinental Filmmaker: That is Called Dawn," an essay first published in *Cahiers du cinéma* in 1967, in which he declares his "goal of epic-didactic cinema."[85] García Espinosa mentions Brecht in his writings and interviews more than any other New Latin American Cinema theorist, and his work, as we shall see below, has much more in common with European Brechtianism like that of Godard than his Latin American colleagues's. In an essay

recounting his influences as a filmmaker, he writes how he has always turned for inspiration to "Renoir, Rossellini, Godard, Brecht, above all Brecht, and all those who have wanted to make cinema something more than a fairground spectacle."[86] García Espinosa's fellow Cuban filmmaker-theorist Tomás Gutiérrez Alea, in his *Dialéctica del espectador* (*Dialectic of the Spectator*, first published 1982) attempts to reconcile Brecht with Eisenstein, creating a dialectical relationship between these two theorists in an effort to theorize the proper dialectic between the spectator and the film in a people's cinema.[87] Sanjinés, by contrast, does not mention Brecht in his major theoretical pieces, although in a late essay published in 1988 he several times uses "aristotélico (Aristotelian)," an adjective with distinctively Brechtian overtones in this context, where he would previously have used "burgués (bourgeois)."[88] Despite the lack of explicit references to Brecht, Sanjinés's writings are pervaded by a Brechtian spirit and in no manner contradict Brecht's central positions. One might say of Sanjinés what Lellis does of his French contemporaries, "Much of the criticism in *Cahiers* after 1968 represents an elaboration of Brechtian theory to treat specifically cinematic issues. Often the conclusions drawn make no reference to Brecht, but the standards employed are comparable to the German dramatist."[89] Still, there is some evidence in the writings that Sanjinés was aware of Brechtian debates around aesthetics. In a very early piece, he indirectly mentions Brecht when reporting a conversation he has had with García Espinosa. Since it not only gives evidence that Brecht was part of the theoretical dialogue maintained among the New Latin American Filmmakers, but also touches upon the role of pleasure in cinema, perhaps the single greatest fault-line dividing European and Latin American filmmakers and theorists in their use of Brecht during this time, I will quote Sanjinés at length.

> Parece justo lo que decía Julio García Espinosa, mencionando a Brecht, con relación al cine revolucionario que en su mayoría no ha conseguido todavía producir placer. Y al margen de que los objectivos de un cine revolucionario no sean los de divertir, sino los de preocupar, movilizar y crear consciencia, por lo mismo que

> su tendencia y su objectivo final no el de constituirse en espectáculo sino en testimonio, este cine debe contener un poderoso atractivo y un interés capaz de cautivar y ganar al pueblo para convertirlo en su interlocutor y lograr su participación.
>
> (It seems correct what Julio García Espinosa always says, mentioning Brecht, with relation to revolutionary cinema, which, for the most part, still has not succeeded in producing pleasure. Since the objectives of revolutionary cinema are not to divert, but rather to trouble, to mobilize, and to raise consciousness, just as its tendency and final objective is not to make itself into a spectacle but a testimony, this cinema must have a powerful attraction and an interest able to captivate and win over a public in order to convert that public into its interlocutor and achieve that public's participation.)[90]

It is unclear in this passage whether Sanjinés refers to Latin American revolutionary cinema, European revolutionary cinema, or both, but if we assume that he means European, this critique becomes fairly representative of a widely held position on European political cinema as practiced by Godard among the New Latin American filmmakers.

As we have seen in Chapter 2, cinematic pleasure, often expressed as beauty, is central to Sanjinés's theoretical writings. And among the New Latin American Theorists he is not unique in this respect. Gutiérrez Alea's writings are equally insistent on the need for pleasure in popular cinema. Pleasure and attraction, for Gutiérrez Alea, draw the spectator out of him or herself, which in turn permits him or her to experience everyday reality in unfamiliar ways and from unhabitual perspectives. This re-alignment of the self with surrounding reality, produced through a dialectical process of attraction (Eisenstein) and distanciation (Brecht), constitutes the core of Gutiérrez Alea's theory.[91] Through this process the spectator is able to see how reality can be changed, a process that, in the Brechtian tradition, the spectator learns in the theater and then practices in the street. The radical European filmmakers and theorists and the filmmaker-theorists of the New Latin American Cinema shared a common goal which drew them both to the theories of Brecht; both wanted to create a more active spectator. How they went about this depended on selective, rather than disputed, readings of Brecht, readings determined

by their different conceptions of the spectator and how cinema performs its ideological work. To simplify things we might return to the image of the fork in the road from *Vent d'est*. Beginning with the Brechtian road in the foreground, we encounter the split in the road; on the one side the path of aesthetic and philosophical enquiry, which we will call European; on the other, what Rocha refers to as the path of Third World cinema. In this scenario the forking of the road exists not in order to reach two destinations but as the result of a deviation, or, perhaps better put, a *dérive* en route to the same destination, the linguistic turn in European theory. As a result of this turn, it very soon became a given among many European and U.S. theorists of political cinema that the path for creating a revolutionary cinema and creating a more active spectator lay almost exclusively in creating "new relations between sound and images."[92]

According to Thomas Elsaesser, in a useful survey of European uses of Brecht in film, English and French film theory in the 1970s

> borrowed from Sausserian semiology and Russian formalism. It argued that cinema, because intrinsically based on the discontinuity of its elementary units and materials, was a signifying system rather than a representational art. Consequently, any critical theory of the cinema needs to clarify the relations between the heterogeneous material supports of the filmic process (optics, chemistry, mechanics) but also the relation between image and image, and between sound and image. Hence the significance for theory of Brecht's concept of 'separating the elements'.[93]

As Peter Wollen argues in "The Two Avant-Gardes," exploration and revelation of what Elsaesser calls the material supports of the filmic process became the reserve of English "materialist" filmmakers like Peter Gidal and Malcolm LeGrice, and, in the United States, the "structuralist" filmmakers like Michael Snow and Hollis Frampton.[94] Although some, especially the Americans, were motivated primarily by notions of medium specificity, others, especially the English "materialists" shared with radical filmmakers like Godard a desire to disrupt passive cinema spectatorship. Because they "performed" their films in gallery or small, unconventional spaces, the "structuralist" and "materialist" filmmakers were free to create new exhibition environments and disrupt the

normal functioning of cinema's material apparatus by, for example, projecting film onto objects other than a screen or altering the speed at which the projector advanced the film. The same was not true of filmmakers like Godard, or Jean-Marie Straub and Danielle Huillet. Since their films circulated in commercial theaters (or university screening rooms that tried to approximate the commercial theater experience using 16mm film), they could not reveal the essential difference between individual photograms effaced by the apparatus to produce the illusion of motion; they were forced to work upon the cinematic text, and not the entire apparatus. "Separation of the elements" in Wollen's second avant-garde, the European political cinema of Godard, Jancsó and others, became largely a matter of exploring the relationship between sound and image and amongst the images and sounds. Unable to counter the ideological work of cinema at the level of its physical apparatus, they concentrated their efforts on textual operations that would result in, to use Laura Mulvey's familiar formulation, "a total negation of the ease and plenitude of the narrative fiction film."[95]

Theorists took the separation of the elements, now limited to Christian Metz's five matters of cinematic expression, to be in itself a political act, and one capable of creating the new, more active spectator that political filmmaking demanded. Writing in the second special issue of *Screen* devoted to Brecht and cinema, Colin MacCabe argues, "what is important, therefore, is that in the separation of the elements the spectator gets separated out of this unity and homogeneity—this passivity—in order to enter into an active appropriation of the scenes presented to him."[96] MacCabe assumes that the textual fissures created by the separation of the elements as performed by Godard in *2 ou 3 choses que je sais d'elle* (*Two or Three Things I Know About Her*, 1967) and *Tout va bien*, his two main examples, are the principal subversive technique available to filmmakers. His is the sort of reading of Brecht that would be criticized by Dana B. Polan and others for their overly narrow focus on one strategy or technique, such as distanciation, an orthodoxy foreign to Brecht's practical and eclectic approach.

According to Polan, "Many current readings of Brecht employ a formalizing interpretation whereby one perspective—for example, his emphasis on a separation of elements—of Brecht's theory is extracted from the whole and peremptorily declared to be the whole of what Brecht is saying."[97] Polan argues that much film theory claiming to be inspired by Brecht is distorted by the totalizing, deterministic tendencies of poststructuralist thinkers like Louis Althusser, whose 1962 essay "The 'Piccolo Teatro': Bertalozzi and Brecht" greatly influenced the *Screen* theorists's understanding of ideology and cinema and the nature of spectatorship. I will return to this essay below in order to argue that it is not as deterministic as critics such as Murray Smith argue, and that Sanjinés's cinema presents a startling example of Althusser's basic assertions in action.[98] But first I will use MacCabe's "The Politics of Separation" to describe why poststructuralist film theory and its method of using Brecht was less compelling in Latin America.

In considering film to be primarily a signifying system, theorists like MacCabe and Wollen downplayed its status as a commodity. And because they were not theorizing film as a commodity, this authorized them to valorize the new and the innovative in the modernist tradition without the risk of appearing to endorse newness and innovation in the manner commonly associated with the marketing of commodities. The irrelevance of film's commodity status stemmed in part from their entirely abstract conception of film and the filmgoing experience, but it was also no doubt encouraged by the relative success of radical films like those of Godard or Straub and Huillet. Of course, they were not box office champions, but at the same time films like *2 ou 3 choses que je sais d'elle*, or even *Vent d'est* were seen widely enough that they could be meaningful points of reference for critics and theorists. In Latin America, New Latin American Cinema filmmakers struggled to acquire the basic materials of cinema and to insert their films into commercial circuits that were mostly closed to them. They were, therefore, acutely conscious of the commodity relations within which films are produced and the status of

the individual film as a commodity, even if only in the negative sense of being a commodity banned from circulation by very tangible political or economic forces.

As for newness, Sanjinés and other New Latin American Cinema filmmakers constantly emphasized the need for new cinematic languages and forms that would create active, participating spectators. To accomplish this, they would turn to their own cultural resources that were either ignored or threatened with extinction by what they considered cultural imperialism. To the extent they could or needed to, these filmmakers turned their back on western filmmaking practices, ignoring them, rather than simply reacting to them. At the same time, they were open to using what they found useful in the European cinematic tradition. By contrast, much of what poststructuralist film theory advocates is determined by conventional practices, as reflected in the English term from the period used to describe works by Godard and others, "counter-cinema". MacCabe, arguing that *2 ou 3 choses que je sais d'elle* does not go far enough in its separation of the cinematic elements, writes, "The film, like Juliette Janson [the main character], is on the point of splitting, of separating, but hesitates endlessly…This hesitation is what enables the film to lag behind its own practice in a nostalgia for exactly the right relationship between sound and image."[99] MacCabe goes well beyond arguing that the film should disappoint the spectator's expectations and disrupt his or her usual viewing practices; unless the textual fissures are so great that they render the film almost unrecognizable as conventional cinema, they run the risk of only nostalgically invoking the memory of the desires the spectator has been conditioned to have and will not unseat or even challenge these desires in any meaningful way. Peter Wollen, in his 1972 piece on *Vent d'Est*, argues that a revolutionary cinema cannot be autonomous from "Hollywood-Mosfilm", that "it can only exist in relation to the rest of cinema. Its function is to struggle against those fantasies, ideologies and aesthetic devices of one cinema with its own antagonistic fantasies, ideologies and aesthetic devices."[100] The negative dialectic behind such arguments always cedes the determinant power to conventional, Hollywood-style cinema,

by virtue of its ubiquity and proximity to the prevailing ideology. The filmmaker can do little more than attempt to subvert each new innovation from Hollywood with innovations of his or her own, in a constant defensive counterstrategy, eventually succumbing to a bunker mentality. As Solanas and Getino said of Godard, filmmakers pursuing this strategy within second cinema run the risk of remaining "trapped in the fortress." This approach assumes a spectator intimately familiar with the codes of narrative cinema, an assumption that Sanjinés simply cannot make during the same period. But even for filmmakers like Rocha, whose domestic audience was mostly made up of middle class urban cinemagoers, it was more important to draw upon their own cultural tradition (in the case of Rocha, the *sertão* and the folklore of banditry) than to allow their works to be determined by opposition to Hollywood. The filmmakers of New Latin American Cinema were true revolutionaries in the sense that they acted under the conviction that despite their extremely limited resources and the overwhelming power of the enemy, in the end they would triumph, and that the decolonization of Latin American, if not world, film culture would be complete. The filmmakers of New Latin American Cinema did not share the *Screen* and *Cahiers* critics's formation in poststructural thought; subsequently they did not share their ambivalence about the political value of cinema, which resulted from poststructuralism's monolithic and totalizing accounts of ideological apparati like the cinema. Nor was their interpretation and application of Brecht conditioned by a poststructuralist intellectual environment. They were not exposed to Brecht via Barthes or Althusser, but through the writings of Brecht himself and through theater, especially the New Popular Theater.

Bertolt Brecht's plays were well known in Latin America during and after World War II and were often performed by professional theater groups in the major cities. According to Ricardo Blanco, Jewish and German immigrants interested in revealing fascism were the first to regularly perform Brecht in Latin America, often in German or Yiddish.[101] Members of these Yiddish and German groups later assisted local

companies in translating the plays into Spanish. Other groups in areas without large German-speaking immigrant populations made translations of readily available French or Italian versions.[102] Blanco goes so far as to say that there was a "Brecht fever" throughout Latin America during the 1940s and 1950s, but he is careful to point out that it was a Brechtian theater hollowed out of its politics, in part because of the class of its audience and in part because the performers and directors were working only from the texts of the plays and did not have access to Brecht's theoretical writings. As for this last point, other historians of Latin American theater disagree. According to another source, "By the late fifties, productions of Brecht's plays were being staged in the main Latin American cities, and his writings on the theater were available in translation (in Spanish, English, or French)."[103] In the early 1960s, performers and technicians from East Germany were training theater companies in Cuba as part of a program of cultural assistance to the revolution that also included a Cuban-East German film co-production, *Preludio 11* (*Prelude 11*, Kurt Maetzig, 1964).[104] Blanco quotes a Guatemalan theater critic who notes that productions of Brecht, even productions that emulated those of Brecht's own Berliner Ensemble, were popular among the Latin American theatergoing bourgeoisie. What was not acceptable to this same bourgeoisie, and what almost always led to censorship, was when Latin American theater groups "joined together the Brechtian aesthetic with the basic elements of our society, which was so dramatically fruitful, in other words, when they applied the universal principles of the Brechtian aesthetic to our concrete reality."[105]

The main efforts to apply the Brechtian aesthetic to Latin American social reality took place not so much in the major cities as in small towns and marginal neighborhoods, and they were the product of New Popular Theater, a theater movement that slightly predates New Latin American Cinema and shares many of its political and aesthetic goals and strategies. Like New Latin American Cinema, New Popular Theater emerged in different places at different times without any real coordination, and it only identified

itself as a movement after a series of crucial festivals that brought together its practitioners. "The history of the New Popular Theater can be traced by the one phenomenon that enables us to look at it as a movement, a network of movements…It was at the Festival of Nations, in France, that many Latin American theater artists discovered Brecht and one another in the late fifties, and at the Nancy Festival (First Festival of University Theater, 1964), Latin American groups participated and began their dialogue."[106] The New Popular Theater, then, set a precedent by using European festivals as a forum for coordinating their efforts which would later be followed by New Latin American Cinema.

Brecht was the common denominator unifying the various New People's Theater groups and these groups with their European counterparts, much in the same way that Brecht's theory, as applied to film, provided a platform for dialogue between European radical political film practice and theory and New Latin American Cinema. In her history of popular theater in Latin America, Judith Weiss notes of the New Popular Theater that "of all the possible unifying influences, one name invariably recurs: Bertolt Brecht."[107]

Filmmakers in Latin American countries without large-scale industrial cinema tended to draw upon theater groups for performers. This was even the case in Bolivia, where professional theater was much less developed than in neighboring countries like Peru and Chile. There was an experimental theater workshop at UMSA in La Paz which maintained relations, although no formal connections, with the ICB after 1952.[108] If this relationship remained in force when Sanjinés took over the ICB in 1964, it could be a source of the Brechtian elements of his own theory. But there were other practitioners of a radical Brechtian people's theater with whom he no doubt would have been familiar, as well.

Preeminent among these figures would be Brazil's Augusto Boal, who studied theater at Columbia University in New York during the mid-1950s, then returned to São Paulo where he founded *Teatro de Arena*, for which he wrote plays one critic describes as

"sociograms of the power struggle between classes."[109] Forced into exile by the Brazilian military, Boal traveled to Peru where he spent 1973 heading the theater section of the Peruvian government's literacy campaign, the *Operación Alfabetización Integral* (ALFIN), the same year Sanjinés was in Peru filming *El enemigo principal*. Combining Brechtian theater with the basic tenets of Paolo Friere's influential *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Boal attempted to abolish once and for all the separation between performer and spectator by making the spectators themselves the performers. He wrote a book about this experience which, like Sanjinés's book, combines theory with practical advice on how to create what he called Theater of the Oppressed.[110] Like many New Latin American Cinema filmmakers, Boal fled dictatorship to Europe in 1976, where he founded the Center for Investigation and Popularization of Boal Method of Active Techniques, in Paris, which he used as a base for disseminating his theory of theater in Europe and in Latin America.[111]

According to historian of Latin American Theater Adam Vesény, "Friere and Brecht have been the twin pillars upon which the work of other Latin American theater practitioners such as the Colombian Enrique Buenaventura and the Nicaraguan Alan Bolt have rested as well."[112] One group he describes that is of particular relevance to a study of Sanjinés is Cuba's Teatro Escambray, directed by Sergio Corrieri, better known to film scholars as the lead in Gutiérrez Alea's *Memorias del subdesarrollo* (*Memories of Underdevelopment*, 1968). According to Vesény, one of the major themes in the works of this rural, community-based theater was the effect of Jehovah's Witnesses on Cuban politics.[113] In the 1950s Batista had encouraged Jehovah's Witnesses proselytization in the Escambray region of the Cuban countryside because of their doctrine of obedience to authority and abstention from all political and military activity. He had hoped that their spread would serve as a brake on the growing popularity of the guerillas. The title of one of the plays Corrieri produced about the Jehovah's Witnesses, *Y si fuera así…*(*And if*

That Were So…), is remarkably similar to that of Sanjinés's own film on the politics of Christian missionaries, *¡Fuera de aquí!*

Of the many groups comprising New People's Theater two more merit notice in the context of Sanjinés's cinema. The first is Grupo de Teatro Ollantay, which was founded in 1971 at the Polytechnic Institute of Quito. One of their first productions was of Brecht's *Der Jasager/Der Neinsager* (*He Who Says Yes/He Who Says No*). Their best-known play, *Cuánto nos cuesta el petróleo* (*How Dear our Petroleum Has Become*) was written in 1976, the year before Sanjinés made *¡Fuera de aquí!* in Ecuador.[114] Like Sanjinés's film, *Grupo de Teatro Ollantay*'s play deals with resource extraction by foreign multinationals. The other group of significance is the *Teatro Experimental de Cali*, in Colombia, which was founded by the above-mentioned Enrique Buenaventura. Víctor Fuentes describes their work as "having followed the concept of 'functional transformation' elaborated by Brecht, which exhorts intellectuals not to give anything to the system of production without, insofar as is possible, changing that apparatus in the direction of socialism."[115]

Walter Benjamin outlines Brecht's theory of *Umfunktionierung* (functional transformation) in his essay "The Author as Producer," which was widely cited by 1970s theorists of political cinema. In this piece Benjamin famously rephrases the basic formula governing political art's relationship with capitalist production. "Rather than asking, 'What is the attitude of a work *to* the relations of production of its time?' I would like to ask, 'What is its position *in* them?'"[116] The radical political cinema of Godard and other European filmmakers, because their techniques and strategies were almost exclusively textual and predicated on the negation of conventional practices in the manner advocated by Wollen, can be fairly characterized as having an attitude to the relations of production and not interceding in those relations themselves. Since they were funded more or less conventionally (*Vent d'Est* had an Italian producer hoping to capitalize on the notoriety of Daniel Cohn-Bendit, one of Godard's collaborators on the

film) and were destined to show in the same exhibition spaces as art cinema, they were limited to textual operations in their efforts to create new, more participatory film spectators.[117] As Sanjinés noted in his talk on neo-realism, a key difference between New Latin American Cinema and Italian Neo-Realism, as well as the European new waves that followed it, was its inability, except on rare occasions, to gain access to commercial distribution and exhibition circuits. This exclusion forced filmmakers like Sanjinés to insert their films "into living social contexts" and functionally transform not just cinema's system of signification but its material institutions as well.[118] By creating collaborative, horizontal methods of production, giving prints to peasant organizations to use as organizing tools as they saw fit, and by taking their films into rural and marginal urban communities not served by the commercial film industry, *Grupo Ukamau* and other Latin American producers attempted to functionally transform the cinema in the same way that *Teatro Experimental de Cali* and other New Popular Theater groups did theater. By appearing with the films and participating in discussions and analysis afterward, and by changing the films in response to the audience's reaction, as *Grupo Ukamau* did with *Yawar Mallku*, New Latin American Cinema was able to address Brecht's "fundamental reproach" of cinema, which was that "the audience no longer have any opportunity to change 'the artists'' performance. they [sic] are assisting at a production, but at the result of a prod. That took place in their absence."[119] Brecht saw the necessarily collective nature of film production as one of its revolutionary potentials. In a note on *Kuhle Wampe, oder wem gehört die Welt*, a production of the communist Prometheus collective, he wrote, "we gradually came to see the organization as an essential part of the artistic work. This was possible only because the work as a whole was political."[120] Being the product of a collective, cinema could not be considered art, in the sense of the individual's creative act. Ideally, he wrote, "a film should do nothing a collective cannot do. This limitation alone would be a fruitful law, 'art' would be excluded."[121]

In the same essay in which Brecht lays out the differences between dramatic and epic theater and calls for a radical separation of elements, the essay so admired by Godard and poststructuralist critics, he also writes,

> the *avant-garde* don't think of changing the apparatus, because they fancy that they have at their disposal an apparatus which will serve up whatever they freely invent. But they are not in fact free inventors; the apparatus goes on fulfilling its function with or without them; the theaters play every night; the papers come out so many times a day; and they absorb what they need; and all they need is a given amount of stuff.[122]

For Sanjinés, Rocha, Gutiérrez Alea and other New Latin American Cinema filmmakers, the films of Godard or Straub and Huillet, for all of their aesthetic merits, were failures in that they did not have popular audiences and did not substantially change the cinematic apparatus. When they were seen, it was by middle class intellectuals, students, and academics who were familiar with and sympathetic to the idea that a poststructural poetics of textual fissures constituted a revolutionary politics. From a Latin American perspective, this politics had little chance of changing society in the way popular cinema, as defined by Gutiérrez Alea, demanded. Sanjinés and Gutiérrez Alea were by no means anti-intellectual, but they did frequently criticize a tendency toward what they saw as over-intellectualizing filmmaking in a way that failed to attract popular audiences. Typical of this line of reasoning is the following statement by Sanjinés on the search for popular audiences from his talk on neo-realism:

> Yo creo que en no pocos casos, el exceso de intelectualismo, el propio desenfado creativo, conspiraron contra este proyecto. Cineastas fervorosos que no midieron, adecuadamente, el equilibrio de la fascinación, indispensable recurso, para ganar la atenención capturada del espectador.
>
> (I believe that in no few cases the excess of intellectualism, uninhibited creativity, conspired against this project. Fervent filmmakers who did not adequately fear the equilibrium of fascination, indispensable resource for attracting the captive attention of the spectator.)[123]

Sanjinés and other New Latin American Cinema filmmakers, in order to maintain this equilibrium of fascination while simultaneously producing a political cinema, relied on a

far less exclusive reading of Brecht that emphasized the flexibility of his theory and, above all, his consistent emphasis on pleasure. While Europe's radical political filmmakers and theorists pursued the separation of the elements, New Latin American Cinema filmmakers assembled a variety of strategies for exploring their societies. Following Brecht, their approach to filmmaking changed repeatedly in tandem with historical circumstances. As Brecht notes in his "Threepenny Lawsuit," for the "refunctioning of art into a pedagogical discipline, the means of representation must be multiplied and frequently changed."[124] This is so "because the simple 'reproduction of reality' says less than ever about that reality. A photograph of the Krupp works or the AEG reveals almost nothing about these institutions…the reification of human relations, the factory, for example, no longer discloses those relations."[125] Both Gutiérrez Alea and Sanjinés argue that cinema, by virtue of its ability to construct new, dialectical relationships through the juxtaposition of images and sounds, could reveal the forces operating beneath the visible that are inaccessible to a purely phenomenological approach to reality. But, and this is a crucial difference from filmmakers like Godard, they were not seeking new relationships of image to image and sound to image to expose and subvert capitalist ideology as it is reified in a signifying system. For one thing, they did not share the poststructuralist belief that everything was discourse. But more importantly, they saw such an approach as a displacement of the political into a secondary, intellectual realm, which, however important in theory, in practice entailed a fundamentally abstract approach that would fail to reach popular audiences. Both Sanjinés and Gutiérrez Alea emphasize cinema's ability to create dialectical relationships between images that reveal a reality hidden from non-dialectical, phenomenological approaches to reality like that advocated by Bazin in his writings on Italian neo-realism.[126] But their work needed to be "concrete so as to encourage abstraction."[127] It would be made up of experiences the audience could, in Brecht's terms, validate themselves, and in order for the spectator to be able to do this, the film would have to at

least begin with the familiar. Among audiences habituated to dominant cinema, this would mean also beginning with something like conventional cinema's pleasures and attractions, the absence of which would keep them away from the theater. According to Julia Lesage, during the 1970s the critics at *Cahiers* and *Cinéthique* rejected films, "even if effective for organizing the proletariat, that depend on identification and elicit a simple emotional response."[128] Such criticism, in its emphasis on doctrinal or theoretical purity, contravened the advice of Brecht himself, who wrote, "our conception of *realism* needs to be broad and political, free from aesthetic restrictions and independent convention. *Realist* means: laying bare society's causal network/ showing up the dominant viewpoint as the viewpoint of the dominators/ writing from the standpoint of the class that has prepared the broadest solutions for the most pressing problems afflicting human society."[129] Separating the elements of cinema was one way of showing up the dominant discourse, but it could not be done from the standpoint of the class offering the broadest solutions to humanity's problems, if that class was understood to be the workers, the poor, and the oppressed indigenous, and not the educated middle classes. The New Latin American Cinema filmmakers, and Sanjinés in particular, were committed to speaking with the people from their standpoint and in a language both comprehensible and culturally coherent with their intended addressees, the oppressed masses of Latin America. For this reason they emphasized lucidity, rather than difficulty and novelty, in their writings and films. Europe's radical filmmakers and theorists of the 1970s were haunted by an essential ambivalence about the political value of cinema, owing to the failure of 1968 to spark a revolution and the pessimistic determinism at the heart of poststructuralist theory. Sanjinés and his fellow New Latin American Cinema theorists, whose outlook was formed by the successful Cuban Revolution, did not share these doubts. As Sanjinés, speaking of New Latin American Cinema, remarked in his talk on Italian neo-realism,

> Se tenía absoluta certeza del peso político cultural del cine como instrumento liberador, concientizador y participante del proceso revolucionario que ha había liberado a Cuba y que, sin más demora, debía liberar al resto de nuestros países latinoamericanos.
>
> (It was absolutely convinced of the power of cinema as a liberating, consciousness-raising and participating force in the revolutionary process that had already liberated Cuba and which, without further delay, needed to liberate the rest of our Latin American countries.)[130]

This certitude, this absolute conviction in the power of cinema as an instrument of revolution, combined with the material scarcity and difficult conditions under which they worked, made the New Latin American Cinema filmmakers more open to questions of identification and pleasure than their European counterparts. Rather than reject such categories outright, they pursued new, collective means of identification, and pleasures unknown in the commercial cinema. Amongst these pleasures was the utilization of knowledge derived from the cinema, knowledge presented in a poetic, even beautiful way. As Brecht wrote, "Whatever knowledge is embodied in a piece of poetic writing has to be wholly transmuted into poetry. Its utilization fulfills the very pleasure that the poetic element evokes."[131] In taking the film into the streets and utilizing the knowledge acquired through pleasurable means, the spectator fulfills the purpose of that pleasure and reinforces his or her own actions as the initial pleasurable response to the poetic is reinvoked.

Sanjinés consistently and eloquently insisted that beauty was a quality not only desirable but necessary in revolutionary film. His categorical insistence on this places him at odds with much radical European criticism and theory of the period and suggests a line of dialogue between New Latin American Cinema and European radical film. Here, again, Godard's *Vent d'Est* is a useful counterpoint to the cinema of Sanjinés. According to MacBean, the film set off debates about whether or not the film could be considered visually beautiful, and, if so, "whether or not visual beauty was an attribute or a liability given Godard's revolutionary aims."[132] He quotes Godard as saying, "If the film succeeds at all, it's because it isn't beautifully made at all."[133] In a review of *Vent d'Est*

Rocha would praise its "desperate beauty," but take Godard to task for trying to destroy aesthetics and being so pessimistic about the usefulness of art.[134] Here in a nutshell is the debate between New Latin American Cinema and European radical political film over the political value of beauty, a debate that returns us to the image from the film at the beginning of this section.

The theorists extolling *Vent d'Est* and other films for the displeasure they provoked, were, however, less categorical in their rejection of beauty than Sanjinés was on its necessity. One of the pairs at the beginning of Wollen's chart at the beginning of his piece on *Vent d'Est* is pleasure/unpleasure.[135] Despite the rigid binarism of his chart, when he discusses this pair later, he invokes Brecht's commitment to entertainment and goes on to argue that it is really not a question of whether or not the film should be pleasurable as it is what kind of pleasure it affords. Here Wollen resorts to Freudian psychoanalysis to argue that pleasure in cinema is a product of fantasy's appeal to the pleasure-principal. He goes on to argue that in advanced capitalist countries where physical survival is not at stake, the reality-principal and the pleasure-principal remain antagonistic.[136] From this he concludes that since the reality-principal is essentially adaptive, change can come only from the other, and he ends by criticizing Godard for failing to align the fantasy content of his film with the ideology it professes, owing to his "suspicion of the need for fantasy at all."[137] In the same manner MacCabe, in his "The Politics of Separation," retreats a bit from the full implications of his position when confronted with the issue of spectatorial pleasure. He cautions against a too rigorous adherence to the separation of elements that conceives of cinema as separate from other sites of class struggle, leading to the aesthetic exercises of the materialist and structuralist filmmakers.[138] He further voices doubts about the political efficacy of Straub and Huillet's *Geschichtsunterricht* (*History Lessons*, 1972), wondering, given the extreme demands the film makes on the spectator due to the obscurity of the texts on which it is based, whether there could even be an intended audience for it. He raises these doubts,

though, only to conclude by criticizing Godard, as quoted above, for not going far enough in separating the elements in *2 ou 3 choses que je sai d'elle*, for invoking nostalgia for conventional sound-image relations rather than establishing new ones. Julia Lesage's lengthy analysis of *Vent d'Est* is more nuanced than Wollen and MacCabe's writings on Godard in that she displays appreciation for his artistry while ultimately arguing that the film fails as political cinema. She generally finds the film a witty and correct take on the politics of the period, but she repeatedly emphasizes that it required multiple viewings and an in depth knowledge of French and Italian trade union politics in order to be understood at all. She seems to at least partially confirm the theories of the *Cahiers* and *Screen* critics on the ability of such cinema to create new spectators when she writes, "after seeing this sequence and understanding it (and that takes several viewings, I feel), I found I cannot ever have the same kind of empathic response to a Hollywood image as I had before."[139] And yet she acknowledges that this response stems from her understanding of the film, her openness to its arguments, and, above all, her willingness to critically view it several times. Ultimately, though, she feels it is too complex to reach popular audiences, and that it is a product of the filmmakers's privileged position within world cinema. "I compared Godard and Gorin, with their command of production and distribution resources, compared them to radical U.S. filmmakers such Newsreel and feminist groups, and concluded that *Wind from the East* was self-indulgent to the point of being masturbatory and politically jejune."[140] She attributes much of this to the failure of Godard and Gorin's original project, which was to make a film in a non-hierarchical, collective manner. For whatever reason, this arrangement fell apart, and, she suggests, it is for this reason that the film received its final form during the editing of the sound and images, which was imposed upon the footage by Godard and Gorin, working together and apart from the collective. Significantly, Lesage's piece appeared in the U.S. film journal *Jump Cut* in 1974, which was, at that time, regularly publishing pieces by and about New Latin American Cinema filmmakers. By invidiously comparing *Vent d'Est*

with the work of Newsreel and other radical filmmaking collectives more directly inspired by New Latin American Cinema than the films of Godard, her piece reveals the dialogue the coexistence of these two very different political cinemas generated.

Of the New Latin American Cinema filmmakers, Julio García Espinosa's films most closely resemble Godard's, and of the major theorists, he gives the most positive appraisal of his work. García Espinosa made the debates about pleasure, beauty, and the popular surrounding Godard's work the subject of his 1978 film, *Son o no son*, and thus it can be seen as a text that mediates between Latin American and European political cinema.[141] The film has only a skeletal plot, interspersed with dance numbers, short comic sketches, lectures in the style of television documentaries, and clips from other films, including *El coraje del pueblo*. A repeated motif is the sequence shot through the windshield of a car driving around Havana. On the soundtrack during these sections, we hear the voices of a man and a woman dryly debating the merits of popular culture and its pleasures and whether or not they will still be needed when the separation of work (productive) time from leisure (reproductive) time has been overcome. Chanan refers to these shots as a parody of Godard, but since the film as a whole is a film essay in the style of Godard or Alexander Kluge, rather than a narrative feature, they seem to function more like homage.[142] Chanan also notes that the extreme economy bordering on austerity with which the dance sequences are filmed is reminiscent of Straub and Huillet.[143] García Espinosa's announced intentions in making the film sound closer to the European skepticism about pleasure in the cinema than many of his Latin American contemporaries.

> I made *Son o no son* with the intention of making the most ugly movie in the world, and I proposed to myself removing from it all that is habitually an object of seduction, from brilliant mise-en-scène, to tremendous photography or extraordinary actions: in other words, to attempt to eliminate all that which can seduce the public and keep only a dramaturgical operation, therefore, to negate the factor of beauty, as it is usually used, as an element of attraction.[144]

In a sequence dedicated to Sanjinés, García Espinosa reads a letter to the Bolivian over an extended clip from *El coraje del pueblo*. "Isn't it possible," he asks, "that we have spent too much time watching good films that no one sees and too little time watching bad films that people like?" This question sums up the predicament at the heart of the film, which is how to make a popular and radical cinema. It was a question García Espinosa had been forced to confront upon assuming the directorship of ICAIC. Cuban cinema, hailed worldwide in the late 1960s for its formal innovations, had been steadily losing its audience at home. It had to regain a popular audience, but *Son o no son* was not intended to be the answer; it was not distributed in Cuba. Addressed primarily to Latin American filmmakers like Sanjinés, it used the language of European Brechtian political cinema, a language it casually assumes these filmmakers to be conversant in, to explore the contemporary crisis of popular revolutionary cinema in Latin America. Although addressed to Sanjinés and other Latin American filmmakers, *Son on no son*'s form explores, and ultimately rejects, the applicability of a European Brechtian cinema to Latin American filmmaking.

During the 1960s and 1970s, European radical filmmakers like Godard, Angelopoulos, Kluge and others pursued Brecht's separation of the elements as a strategy for subverting the ideology of dominant cinema. This lead to a style of filmmaking that was austere and abstract, intentionally denying the spectator dominant cinema's familiar pleasures. Despite their professed adherence to a Brechtian aesthetic, European filmmakers and theorists applied Brecht in a formalist manner, rigidly privileging individual techniques such as distanciation and the separation of the elements in a way that was foreign to Brecht's general opposition to aesthetic restrictions of any kind, his openness to experimenting and combining with a variety of techniques. This formalizing approach to Brecht was the result of the linguistic turn in European theory, which profoundly affected the practice and theoretization of political cinema. This theory, combined with commercial and industrial systems within which the films were produced

and distributed, led to an emphasis in Europe on the creation of textual fissures as a way of creating new, more participatory spectators. In Latin America, where the filmmakers of the New Latin American Cinema were equally inspired by Brecht, the Brechtian aesthetic they practiced was derived from popular theater as much as it was from theory. Barred from producing and distributing their films within commercial circuits, they found themselves compelled to functionally transform the cinema in order to continue to produce and reach an audience. Assuming the standpoint of the continent's oppressed, as per Brecht, they adapted elements and forms of popular culture to cinema. While equally opposed to the seductions of commercial cinema as their European counterparts, they did not hesitate to use culturally specific notions of beauty or the beauty of their landscapes to attract popular audiences for their work, nor did they hesitate to make their work pleasurable when necessary. Unlike their European counterparts, they had no doubts about the political efficacy of their work, and this certainty made them disposed to a Brechtian pursuit of lucidity at the expense of aesthetic prescriptions.

In the screening halls of festivals, in the pages of film journals, and in the films themselves, in both Europe and Latin America, New Latin American Cinema and European radical filmmaking conducted a dialogue with each other on the necessary features of a revolutionary cinema capable of transforming the spectator from passivity to revolutionary action. Much of this debate concerned the role of pleasure in a revolutionary cinema, the film text's ability to subvert the dominant ideology by textual means, and whether or not and if so how to pursue a popular audience. The debates and possible points of intersection were not restricted to these themes, though. One of Sanjinés most significant contributions to film theory and practice is his exploration of the dialectical, rather than unitary time in cinema, a subject that will be explored in greater length in Chapter 4. To conclude this section I will use this element of Sanjinés's theory as a means to reconciling his work with one of poststructural thought's most

influential reinterpretations of Brecht from the 1960s, Louis Althusser's "The 'Piccolo Teatro': Bertalozzi and Brecht."

Althusser begins his essay by asking "How can there coexist two forms of temporality, apparently foreign to one another and yet united by a living relationship?" and he goes on to describe his experience seeing a production of *El Nost Milan* by Italian playwright Carlo Bertalozzi.[145] In this play, each of the three acts seem to be made up of dead time, with various people milling about randomly, interrupted by the sudden arrival of characters who take up and rapidly advance the drama. Althusser describes the two temporalities in each act as "chronical (empty)" time and "tragedy (full)" time. He notes that this "latent asymmetrical—critical structure, the dialectics-in-the-wings structure found in Bertalozzi's play, is in essentials also the structure of plays such as *Mother Courage* and (above all) *Galileo*."[146] He characterizes Brecht's principal aim as producing a critique of the spontaneous ideology in which we live, and argues "the dynamic of this latent structure, and in particular, the coexistence without any explicit relation of a dialectical temporality and a non-dialectical temporality, is the basis for a true critique of illusions of consciousness."[147] The asymetrical time of Brechtian theater prohibits the spectator from occupying the hero's time, tragic time, as in conventional theatrical experiences. This temporal disjunction, according to Althusser, is the real source of distanciation in Brecht's drama. It forces the spectator to critically confront the illusory nature of the tragic mode in which he or she lives. Rather than be a mirror held up to reality, Brechtian drama breaks the mirror into which society looks for self-recognition through shared ideology, but in which it cannot truly know itself. He concludes,

> If…the theater's object is to destroy this intangible image, to set in motion the immobile, the eternal sphere of the illusory consciousness's mythical world, then the play is really the development, the production of a new consciousness in the spectator—incomplete, like any other consciousness, but moved by this incompletion itself, this distance achieved, this inexhaustible work of criticism in action; the play is really the production of a

> new spectator, an actor who starts where the performance ends,
> who only starts so as to complete it, but in life.[148]

The description of the new spectator is pure Brecht. The means of achieving it are not, for Althusser, in his typically totalizing manner, posits that the structure of contradictory temporalities is "essential to any theatrical effort of a materialist nature" and later, that it is a necessary starting point from which to pose the problem of the relationship of the spectator to the play.[149] He reduces the political work of Brecht's dramaturgy to one element, and he neither describes how this structure works in Brecht or to what extent it can be found in his plays. Yet let us assume for the moment that this structure is *a*, rather than *the*, way in which the spectator can be brought to a new consciousness of the ideology he or she spontaneously lives. If so, then the films of Sanjinés are profoundly Brechtian without resorting to, in fact, while scrupulously abstaining from, separating the elements of cinema.

Central to Sanjinés's theory, as we have seen, is the idea that a film must be in harmony with the particular temporality in which its addressee lives. Thus his experiments with the sequence shot, culminating in *La nación clandestina* with the shots in which two temporalities coexist. But even before that film, a dialectic of conflicting temporalities articulated through alternating cinematic chronotopes pervaded his work: ritual vs. commercial time, rural vs. urban time, Quechua-Aymara vs. western time, individual vs. collective time, and linear vs. circular time. For Bolivian audiences, these temporal conflicts and contrasts dramatized the problematic at the heart of their Bolivian identities. For indigenous viewers, experiencing cinema of the temporality they usually occupied was intended to reinforce their cultural values by underscoring the extent to which their temporality, and hence their very way of being in the world, was being encroached on and negated by western norms.

But what of the European viewer? Could it be, as Althusser says of the audience at the Bertalozzi play, that they were "bowled over" by "their unconscious perception of this structure and its profound meaning"?[150] Could it be that for European spectators

watching a Sanjinés film, experiencing Quechua-Aymara time in the cinema, “this silent confrontation of a consciousness (living its own situation in the dialectical-tragic mode, and believing the world to be moved by this impulse) with a reality which is indifferent and strange to this so-called dialectic—an apparently undialectical reality, makes possible an immanent critique of the illusions of consciousness”?[151]

Notes

[1] Paulo Antonio Paranagua, *Tradición y modernidad en el cine de América Latina* (Madrid: Fondo de Cultura Económica de España, 2003), 20. Paranaguá admits that the count of 120 is probably an underestimation, since it does not include people who studied in eastern Europe.

[2] The relationship between Zavattini and the Cubans would continue after the revolution. In the early 1960s, during a visit to Cuba, Zavattinni helped García Espinosa rewrite the script for *Cuba baila* (*Cuba Dances*, 1963), which would become the first feature-length production of the fledgling state studio, the *Instituto Cubano de Arte e Industria Cinematográfico* (ICAIC). See Michael Chanan, *Cuban Cinema* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), 153. Gabriel García Márquez also studied film in Rome during the same period.

[3] Increasingly scholars describe neo-realism, sometimes minus the Italian modifier, as a global phenomenon. For one such recent attempt see Laura E. Ruberto and Kristi M. Wilson, eds., *Italian Neorrealism and Global Cinema* (Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2007).

[4] Ibid., 5.

[5] Michael Chanan, *New Cinema of Latin America El nuevo cine latinoamericano*. Eleventh hour. (New York: Cinema Guild, 1989).

[6] Even such a perceptive scholar as Paul Willemen makes this claim. "What the Latin Americans appear to have picked up on was the potential for different cinematic practices offered by European examples rather than their actual trajectory. Consequently, they did not follow the evolution of neo-realism into European art-house cinema." Paul Willemen, "The Third Cinema: Notes and Reflections," in Jim Pines and Paul Willemen, eds., *Questions of Third Cinema* (London: BFI, 1989), 5. That Latin Americans working in Latin America would not follow the *same* trajectory is to be assumed, given the socio-cultural, industrial, and political differences. This does not mean that European art cinema and New Latin American Cinema did not at times follow *parallel* or *intersecting* trajectories. Willemen's reference to "art-house" rather than art cinema may indicate an effort to differentiate between the more politically oriented and more commercially oriented groupings within the larger category, with "art-house" referring to the latter. In this case we would be broadly in agreement, since I argue that New Latin American Cinema was in dialogue with the more explicitly political European art cinema of the 1960s and 1970s.

[7] I am indebted to David Desser for his useful description of epic theater as a "transnational idiom" in the context of Indian cinema. See Frances Gatewood and David Desser, "Introduction: Indian Cinema and Film Studies," *Postscript* 25.3 (2006): 5.

[8] Paranaguá, *Tradción y modernidad*, 17.

[9] Ibid., 29 (translation mine).

[10] Paulo Antonio Paranaguá, "América Latina, Europa y Estados Unidos: Relaciones triangulares en la historia del cine," *Journal of Film Preservation* no. 62 (2001): 9-15.

[11] Paranaguá, *Tradición y modernidad*, 170 (tanslation mine).

[12] Antonio Traverso, "Migrations of Cinema: Italian Neorrealism and Brazilian Cinema," in Laura E. Ruberto and Kristi M. Wilson, eds., *Italian Neorrealism and Global Cinema* (Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2007): 172-3.

[13] Ibid., 173.

[14] Paranaguá, *Tradición y modernidad*, 170. Again, we can note how Mesa G. and Gumucio Dagron's histories conform to this characterization. Alfredo Guevara was for many years the director of ICAIC in Cuba and collaborated with García Espinosa and Gutiérrez Alea on *El mégano*.

[15] Ibid., 174. Paranaguá does not name these directors, but we can assume he is talking about Satyajit Ray in India and Youssef Chahine in Egypt. I suspect, though, that if Indian and Egyptian productions from the period were scrutinized the way Paranaguá does Latin American production, films that could be considered neo-realist not made by these *auteurs* would emerge. In other words, Paranaguá is treating Indian and Egyptian cinemas in the manner he finds so objectionable in writings on Latin American cinema.

[16] Paranaguá, "América latina, Europa y Estados Unidos," 10-11.

[17] Ibid., 13.

[18] *Warawara* no. 1 (1954): n.p.

[19] Ibid., n.p.

[20] Jorge Sanjinés, "Neorrealismo y nuevo cine latinoamericano: La herencia, las coincidencias y las diferencias," *El ojo que piensa: Revista virtual de cine latinoamericano* no. 0 (Aug 2003) http://www.elojoquepiensa.udg.mx/espanol/numero00/veryana/07_neorrealismo.html (accessed 18 Feb 2009).

[21] Paranaguá, *Tradición y modernidad*, 171.

[22] The same can be seen in the United States, with the appearance of "semidocumentary" films made by small production companies after the 1948 Supreme Court-mandated breakup of the big five Hollywood studios's vertically integrated monopoly on production and distribution. The films of *Grupo Ukamau's* first phase (*Yawar Mallku*, *El coraje del pueblo*) fit the organizational pattern Paranaguá describes as well, with Ricardo Rada as producer, Oscar Soria, scriptwriter, and Jorge Sanjinés, director.

[23] Paranaguá, *Tradición y modernidad*, 173.

[24] Qtd. in Randal Johnson and Robert Stam, eds., *Brazilian Cinema* (New York: Columbia UP, 1995), 122.

[25] John Hess, "Neo-Realism and the New Latin American Cinema: *Bicycle Thieves* and *Blood of the Condor*," in John King, Ana López and Manuel Alvarado, eds.,

Mediating Two Worlds: Cinematic Encounters in the Americas (London: BFI, 1993), 110.

[26] Antonio Eguino, "Neo-realism in Bolivia: An Interview with Antonio Eguino," by Udayan Gupta, *Cinéaste* 9.2 (1978-9): 29.

[27] David Overby, ed. and trans., *Springtime in Italy: A Reader on Neo-realism* (Hamden: Archon Books, 1979), 26.

[28] Ibid., 28.

[29] Ibid., 27.

[30] André Bazin, *What is Cinema?* ed. and trans. Hugh Gray (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971), 2.97.

[31] Ibid., 2.51.

[32] Ibid., 2.22.

[33] Ibid., 2.16.

[34] See section 3.3 below.

[35] For more on this division see the section on Brian Henderson's articles on the long take from the late 1960s in Chapter 4 below.

[36] Erich Keel, "From Militant Cinema to Neo-Realism: The Example of *Pueblo Chico*," *Film Quarterly* 29.4 (1976) 17-24.

[37] Ibid., 20.

[38] Eguino, "Neo-realism in Bolivia," 28.

[39] Ibid., 29.

[40] Ibid., 59.

[41] I have unfortunately not been able to see *Pueblo Chico*. The negatives for this film and *Chuquiago* were lost when the New York lab in which they were stored went out of business. New Yorker Films, the distributor of *Chuqiago* in the US sent Eguino their print, which he was able to digitalize. So far, if there are any extant prints of *Pueblo Chico*, Eguino has not digitalized them. Antonio Eguino, interview by the author, 5 June 2007, La Paz.

[42] Keel, "From Militant Cinema to Neo-Realism," 21.

[43] Ibid., 22.

[44] Ibid., 22.

[45] Ibid., 23.

[46] *Chuqiago* is made up of four unrelated stories from spanning the classes and geography of La Paz, the indigenous name for which provides the film's title. An obvious corrollary to this approach from the neo-realist canon is *Paisà*, which he ignores. José Sánchez-H, *Neo-realism in Contemporary Bolivian Cinema: A Case Study of Jorge Sanjines's* Blood of the Condor *and Antonio Eguino's* Chuquiago, PhD Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1985, 6.

[47] Ibid., 69.

[48] Ibid., 69.

[49] Ibid., 156.

[50] Ibid., 291.

[51] Hess, "Neo-Realism and New Latin American Cinema," 106.

[52] Ibid., 107.

[53] Ibid., 116.

[54] Roberto Rossellini, "A Few Words About Neo-realism," in Overby, *Springtime in Italy*, 89.

[55] *What is Cinema?* ed. and trans. Hugh Gray (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971), 2.22.

[56] Ibid., 22.

[57] Ibid., 98.

[58] Ibid., 107. See also Mario Cannella, "Ideology and Aesthetic Hypotheses in the Criticism of Neo-Realism," *Screen* 14.4 (1973-4): 5-60.

[59] Paranaguá, *Tradición y modernidad*, 174.

[60] Michael Chanan, *The Cuban Image: Cinema and Politics in Cuba* (London: BFI, 1985), 128.

[61] Julio García Espinosa recalls a special screening of *El Mégano* for Ernesto Ché Guevara, after which the Commandante remarked half in earnest, half in jest, "Batista was so afraid of that picture." See Julio García Espinosa, *Un largo camino hacia la luz* (Havana: Editorial Casa de las Américas, 2004), 141.

[62] Sanjinés, Jorge, "Neorrealismo y nuevo cine latinoamericano: La herencia, las coincidencias y las diferencias," *El Ojo Que Piensa: Revista Virtual de Cine Iberoamericano* no. 0 (2003): [journal online]; available from http://www.elojoquepiensa.udg.mx/espanol/numero00/veryana/07_neorrealismo.html; Internet. Accessed 18 February 2009.

[63] Ibid.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Ibid.

[66] Ibid.

[67] Ibid.

[68] Ruberto and Wilson, *Italian Neorrealism and Global Cinema*, 3.

[69] Ibid. See Chapter 5 below for a discussion of Pier Paolo Pasolini's revision of neo-realism as the kind of resistance to cultural penetration Sanjinés describes.

[70] Ibid.

[71] Ibid.

[72] Ibid.

[73] Ibid.

[74] Ibid.

[75] James Roy MacBean. *Film and Revolution* (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1975), 118.

[76] Ibid., 120.

[77] Ibid., 138.

[78] Julia Lesage, "Godard-Gorin's *Wind from the East*: Looking at a Film Politically," *Jump Cut*, no. 4 (1974): 18.

[79] Peter Wollen, "Godard and Counter Cinema: *Vent d'Est*," in *Film Theory and Criticism*, 6th Ed., edited by Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2004), 525.

[80] George Lellis. *Bertolt Brecht, Cahiers du cinéma and Contemporary Film Theory*. Studies in Cinema, no. 2 (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1982), 41.

[81] Ibid., 68.

[82] Ibid., 68.

[83] Ibid., 164.

[84] Ibid., 160.

[85] Glauber Rocha, "The Tricontinental Filmmaker: That is Called Dawn," in Randal Johnson and Robert Stam, eds. *Brazilian Cinema* (New York: Colubia Univ. Press, 1995),

[86] Julio García Espinosa, *Un largo camino hacia la luz* (Havana: Editorial Case de las Americas, 2004), 160 (translation mine).

[87] Tomás Gutiérrez Alea, *Dialéctica del espectador* (Mexico: Federación Editorial Mexicana, 1983), 74-9.

[88] Jorge Sanjinés, "El perfil imborrable," *Cine cubano* no. 122 (1988): 32.

[89] Lellis, *Bertolt Brecht, Cahiers du Cinéma and Contemporary Film Theory*, 161.

[90] Jorge Sanjinés, "Cine revolucionario: La experiencia boliviana," *Cine cubano* nos. 76-7 (1972): 15.

[91] Gutiérrez Alea, *Dialéctica del espectador*, 70-80.

[92] MacBean, *Film and Revolution*, 130.

[93] Elsaesser, Thomas, "From Anti-illusionism to Hyper-realism: Bertolt Brecht ad Contemporary Film," in Pia Kleber and Colin Visser, eds. *Re-interpreting Brecht: His Influence on Contemporary Drama and Film* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1990):172-3.

[94] Wollen, Peter. *Readings and Writings: Semiotic Counter-Strategies* (London: Verso, 1982), 92-104.

[95] Laura Mulvey, "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," *Screen* 16.3 (1975): 8.

[96] MacCabe, Colin, "The Politics of Separation," *Screen* 16.4 (1975-6): 48.

[97] Polan, Dana B. *The Political Language of Film and the Avant-Garde* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1985), 80.

[98] For a cognitivist critique of Althusser's essay, see Murray Smith, "The Logic and Legacy of Brechtianism," in David Bordwell and Noël Carrol, eds. *Post-Theory: Reconstructing Film Studies* (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1996): 130-48.

[99] MacCabe, "The Politics of Separation," 54.

[100] Peter Wollen, "Godard and Counter Cinema," 533.

[101] Blanco, Ricardo, *Von Apu Ollantay bis Brecht: Theater als Waffe im Klassenkampf Lateinamerikas* (East Berlin: Henschelverlag, 1983), 41. At least one key figure in New Latin American Cinema came directly out of the Yiddish theater tradition, the Argentine Reymundo Gleyzer.

[102] Ibid., 41.

[103] Judith A. Weiss et al., *Latin American Popular Theater: The First Five Centuries* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 1993), 152

[104] Ibid., 151.

[105] Ibid., 41 (translation mine)

[106] Weiss and others, *Latin American Popular Theater*, 177.

[107] Ibid., 151.

[108] Armando de Urioste, Interview by author, La Paz, Bolivia, 25 April 2008.

[109] Charles B. Driskell, "Teatro de Arena of São Paulo: An Innovative Professional Theater of the People," in *Popular Theater for Social Change in Latin America: Essays in Spanish and English*, Gerardo Luzuriaga, ed., 270-80. UCLA Latin American Studies, Vol. 41, Johannes Wilbert, ed. (Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publications, 1978), 278.

[110] Augusto Boal, *Theater of the Oppressed* (New York: Urizen Books, 1973). We might also note the similarity, in structure and argument, between Boal's 1971 essay "Categories of Popular Theater" and Sanjinés's "Sobre un cine contra el pueblo y por un cine junto al pueblo." For Boal see Augusto Boal, *Legislative Theater* (New York: Routledge, 1998), 211-46. For Sanjinés see Jorge Sanjinés y Grupo Ukamau, *Teoría y práctica de un cine junto al pueblo* (Mexico: Siglo Ventiuno, 1979), 74-81.

[111] Adam Vesény, *Theater in Latin America: Religion, Politics, and Culture from Cortés to the 1980s* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993), 162.

[112] Ibid., 163.

[113] Ibid., 169.

[114] Grupo de Teatro Ollantay, "Cuánto nos cuestra el petróleo" in *Popular Theater for Social Change in Latin America: Essays in Spanish and English*, Gerardo Luzuriaga, ed., 325-337, UCLA Latin American Studies, Vol. 41, Johannes Wilbert, ed. (Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publications, 1978), 325-330.

[115] Víctor Fuentes, " La Creación Colectiva del Teatro Experimental de Cali," in *Popular Theater for Social Change in Latin America: Essays in Spanish and English*, Gerardo Luzuriaga, ed., 338-48, UCLA Latin American Studies, Vol. 41, Johannes Wilbert, ed. (Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publications, 1978), 339 (translation mine).

[116] Walter Benjamin, "The Author as Producer," in In *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings*. Edited by Michael W. Jennings, 768-82, Vol. 2, *1927-1934*, Translated by Rodney Livingston and others Edited by Michael W. Jennings, Howard Eiland, and Gary Smith (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press, 1999), 770.

[117] I am aware that there was also a European tradition of militant cinema, largely centered around radical trade unions, that existed outside the commercial circuits, was often inspired by Third World cinema, and was much more similar in its practices to New Latin American Cinema filmmakers than Godard. However, I am maintaining a focus on radical political cinema at the margins of European art cinema (that the Godard of the *Groupe Dziga Vertov* years was marginal could be debated) for two reasons: first,

this body of films was the object of considerable theory, while the more ephemeral works of various militant cinema groups was not; and second, because the films of Sanjinés, Solanas and other New Latin American Cinema Filmmakers were shown at the same festivals and theaters as those of Godard, Angelopoulos and others. In Europe they were not limited to the small circuits of portable 16mm projectors, as they often were in Latin America. For a comprehensive survey of militant cinema production in France see Martin Even and others, "Le Cinema Militant, en France, Aujourd'hui" *Cinema D'Aujourd'hui*, New Series, nos. 5-6 (March-April 1975): 33-159. For Italy see Dan Georgakas, "Revolutionary Cinema—Italian Style," *Cinéaste* 4, no. 3 (1970-1): 33-4.

[118] Benjamin, "The Author as Producer," 769.

[119] Quoted in Ben Brewster, "The Fundamental Reproach (Brecht), *Cine-Tracts* 2, no. 1 (1977): 45.

[120] Bertolt Brecht, *Brecht on Film and Radio*, edited and translated by Marc Silberman (London: Methuen, 2000), 204.

[121] Ibid., 172.

[122] Bertolt Brecht, *Brecht on Theatre: The Development of an Aesthetic*, edited and translated by John Willet (New York: Hill and Wang, 1964), 34.

[123] Sanjinés, "Neorrealismo y nuevo cine latinoamericano."

[124] Brecht, *Brecht on Film and Radio*, 162.

[125] Ibid., 164.

[126] See Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 92, and Gutiérrez Alea, *Dialéctica del espectador*, 40ff.

[127] Brecht, *Brecht on Theater*, 109.

[128] Julia Lesage, "Godard-Gorin's *Wind From the East*," 23, note 7.

[129] Brecht, *Brecht on Theatre, 109.*

[130] Sanjinés, "Neorrealismo y nuevo cine latinoamericano."

[131] Brecth, *Brecht on Theatre*, 74.

[132] MacBean, *Film and Revolution*, 119.

[133] Ibid., 120.

[134] Ibid., 120.

[135] Wollen, "Godard and Counter Cinema: *Vent d'Est*," 525.

[136] Ibid., 531.

[137] Ibid., 531.

[138] MacCabe, "The Politics of Separation," 51.

[139] Lesage, "Godard-Gorin's *Wind from the East*," 20

[140] Ibid., 18.

[141] The title is left untranslated because it is a play on words. It means "They are or they are not," in Spanish, a distortion of the famous line from Hamlet's soliloquy, which is parodied in the first scene. Son is also a popular form of dance music in Cuba, so the title can also mean, "son or no son," in other words, whether or not to incorporate the popular.

[142] Michael Chanan, *Cuban Cinema* (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 2004), 397.

[143] Ibid., 397.

[144] Julio García Espinosa, *Conversaciones con un cineasta incómodo: Julio García Espinosa*, interviews by Victor Fowler Calzada (La Habana: Ediciones ICAIC, 2004), 60.

[145] Louis Althusser, *For Marx* (New York: Verso, 2005), 135.

[146] Ibid., 142.

[147] Ibid., 142.

[148] Ibid., 151.

[149] Ibid., 143, 147.

[150] Ibid., 141.

[151] Ibid., 143.

CHAPTER 4: THE SEQUENCE SHOT

> Materialist aesthetics means, in the first place, a way of organizing collective social experience. This collective social experience exists with films or without them. It has existed for about three-hundred-thousand years, and been 'actualised' for only about three hundred of them because social development grew faster. The invention of film, of the cinema, is only an industrial answer to the film which has its basis in the film in people's minds. The stream of associations which is the basis of thinking and feeling—logic or geometry or whatever are not the basis—the stream of associations has all the qualities of cinema. And everything you can do with your mind and your senses, you can do with cinema.
>
> Alexander Kluge, "But Why Are the Questions So Abstract?"

Introduction

Yawar Mallku begins with a close-up of a drunk Ignacio, who says, "Shit…Now we are going to see." The shot is canted and out of focus, as if to suggest his subjective state or comment ironically on his line. The master shot for this first sequence is a two shot from behind Ignacio. There are occasional cuts to him, or to his wife Paulina, who is calmly spinning yarn and begging him to go to bed. Ignacio becomes increasingly agitated, talking about their two dead children and blaming Paulina for trusting the doctors at the medical clinic. After a brief cutaway to two clay effigies of the dead children on a mantel top, the two shot switches to behind Paulina. Ignacio attempts to grab her and falls backward onto the floor. We then have a close-up of Ignacio from Paulina's point of view, followed by a close up of Paulina, another close-up of Ignacio, taking another swing, and a brief close up of Paulina's reaction. Before the strike makes impact, there is a cut to the exterior of a small house over which appear the title and opening credits. The first sequence after the titles follows the same pattern of a two shot followed by alternating close-ups, as does much of the rest of the film.

The close up of Ignacio on the floor that follows the two shot from behind Paulina does not match. But this probably has more to do with the exigencies of shooting quickly on location in very tight quarters than any attempt on Sanjinés's part to disrupt the

continuity, drawing attention to the constructedness of the film. It is the type of mismatch one might see in a William Wellman Warner Bros. film from the early 1930s, the kind audiences receptive to low-budget films lacking technical polish have trained themselves to look past. On the whole, the film conforms to the standards of continuity editing; the spectator is inserted into a scene through an exchange of gazes among characters, and we are asked to identify with certain characters at certain times, and to recognize their subjective point of view, by reaction shots and eyeline matches between shots, or by a camera placed just above and behind a character's shoulder.

Exactly halfway through the film, though, this system momentarily breaks down during a twenty-one shot sequence lasting one minute and ten seconds that combines continuity editing with dialectical documentary montage reminiscent of *Revolución*. In this sequence Paulina is waiting for her brother-in-law Sixto to return with the money for Ignacio's blood transfusion. She is seated on a bench next to a door along the inside wall of an exterior walkway that appears to be on the second or third floor of the hospital. There is no diegetic sound during this sequence, only a march played on brass instruments, perhaps tubas, that quickens near the end with the pace of the editing.

> (1) Long shot of a man on crutches moving from left to right, the walkway railing visible behind him. He is dressed in western apparel, but the woman behind him is wearing the traditional *polleras* and derby.
>
> (2) Two shot of Paulina and a young man on a bench. The young man is dressed in western apparel and has a bandage on one cheek. At the beginning of the shot Paulina is looking to screen right, then she turns to screen left.
>
> (3) A shot of the doorway at the end of a walkway with various people milling about; the rail is visible on the far right.
>
> (4) Exterior long shot of medics carrying a stretcher from left to right across a plaza in front of a church.
>
> (5) Same as Shot 2, Paulina looking to the right.
>
> (6) Two men walk from left to right, looking toward the Paulina or the camera as they pass. The rail is visible behind them.

(7) Long shot from behind and above of two white-clad figures helping a man dressed in black walk.

(8) Five people, two children and three adults, all dressed in western apparel, leaning against the rail, regarding Paulina.

(9) Close up of Paulina. She looks down, then screen left, which would be away from the people in shot 8.

(10) A man with his arm in a sling walks from left to right along the railing. The camera pans right to follow him, and he looks at Paulina as he passes.

(11) Close up of Paulina turning her head to screen left to follow the man with a sling.

(12) A man with dark lenses in light frames leaning against the rail, looking downward and towards screen left.

(13) A shot from behind of a woman walking away from the camera. The shot begins on her feet, then the camera tilts up to reveal her as a woman in *polleras* and a derby carrying a large burden slung on her back.

(14) Another long shot of two medics carrying a stretcher across a parking lot from screen right to left.

(15) A doctor in white scrubs wearing glasses walks by the camera from right to left, looking down and smiling briefly at Paulina.

(16) A man in a wheelchair is pushed from right to left into a room off the walkway. This would be taking place to Paulina's right.

(17) Close up of feet in sandals walking right to left, followed by feet in western shoes.

(18) Close up of a woman in a derby covering her mouth with a kerchief as she walks left to right. She looks at Paulina as she passes, the camera tracking with her.

(19) Close up of a woman in a white lab coat walking right to left, looking straight ahead.

(20) Same plaza as in shot 4, a bit closer in. Two women with long braids, one in *polleras* and one with a white lab jacket on, carry a stretcher from left to right.

(21) Lingering close up of Paulina, her eyes moving in several directions.

Shots 1 and 2 appear to establish this as a sequence from Paulina's perspective, but this becomes less clear with shot 3. At the end of shot 2 Paulina turns to look screen left, in

other words to her right. According to the eyeline, shot 3 would be the opposite end of the walkway from shot 1, yet it is clearly from the same angle as shot 1, making it more likely a shot taken further down the same walkway in the same direction. It could be that this is simply a mismatch the filmmakers are counting on the audience to override, as in the opening sequence discussed above. But the ambiguity as to exactly whose perspective is being represented is heightened, not clarified, by the next shot. Shot 4 introduces the thrice-repeated motif of medics carrying a stretcher. This may be taking place in front of Paulina, just past the rail, but there is no clear indication that it is seen from her perspective. Shots 5 & 6 reestablish Paulina's subjective point of view, as her eyelines match the placement and movement of the two men. Shot 7 is more clearly an impossible perspective for Paulina than shot 4, but this interruption is followed by shots 8 through 11, which maintain approximate eyeline matches, making them appear as Paulina's subjective vision. The man in shot 12 could be looking at Paulina, but shot 13 suggests he is watching another woman walk away from him. Paulina does not appear again until shot 21, the shot that closes the sequence, so shots 12-20 are only ambiguously assigned to her based on screen direction and proximity to the camera. Over the course of the sequence Sanjinés abandons the tentatively established spatial relationship between Paulina and the people in the various shots in favor of dialectical editing based on the screen direction of the movements (shots 4 and 14, shots 18 and 19) but more importantly on the contrast between images of rural, indigenous and urban, westernized people, which is established in the first shot of the man on crutches with the woman behind him. This contrast continues in shot 2, the two shot of Paulina and the young man, and alternates in shots 8 and 9, 10 and 11, and 12 and 13. Shot 17 contrasts the sandaled feet of an indigenous person with feet wearing shoes, and shots 18 and 19 use screen direction for emphasis. Shot 20, the last of the four shots of pairs of white-clad figures carrying stretchers or assisting a patient is the reverse of the first, shot 4, in that the figures carry the stretcher in the opposite direction and are now clearly

indigenous women, even though one of the two has a lab jacket on over her *polleras*. The dialectic rural/urban, indigenous/western, is gendered in this sequence, the women being much marked more unambiguously as indigenous or not, like Paulina, by their hats and *polleras*, or the absence of both. The men in shot six wear sport coats over sweaters and fedoras, but the earflaps of their *lluchus* (knit caps with earflaps) hanging beneath their hats, as well as their faces, suggest rural indigenous origins. The insertion of this shot near the beginning of the sequence complicates the exchange of gazes between Paulina and others, which would otherwise indicate only that she is an object of interest to urbanized passers-by (e.g. shots 8-12), gendering the gaze and suggesting that, as an indigenous woman alone, she is subject to multiple scopic regimes. As in *Revolución*, this sequence uses a dialectical form of associative montage in the "poetic" avant-garde tradition to represent Bolivian reality. It was the last time such a passage appears in Sanjinés's cinema.

Sanjinés's post-*Yawar Mallku* move toward an aesthetic founded in the sequence shot, or, perhaps more accurately, the long take, did not entail the abandoning of dialectics or subjectivity. The subsequent films, especially *¡Fuera de aquí!*, *La nación clandestina*, *Para recibir el canto de los pájaros*, and *Los hijos del último jardín* continue to explore the indigenous/western and rural/urban dialectics at the center of *Yawar Mallku* without using montage as in the sequence described above. And beginning with *La nación clandestina*, for a number of technical and theoretical reasons, Sanjinés turned renewed attention to the question of subjectivity in cinema. Ultimately he devised a shooting style marked by long takes and a constantly moving camera capable of shifting between representations of collective and individual subjectivities within a single shot. How Sanjinés arrived at this style is the subject of this chapter. That Sanjinés moved away from montage and toward a long take style might suggest that he was further aligning his work with neo-realism. And yet the sequence shots in his later films sometimes depend for their effect on the intentional violation of the spatial and temporal

relations neo-realist filmmakers sought to preserve by means of the long take. To fully understand how Sanjinés arrived at this style requires placing his work in dialogue with that of certain European political filmmakers of the 1960s and 1970s who were also experimenting with such "unrealistic" uses of the sequence shot.[1] Using a process of what I will be calling "dialectical transculturation," Sanjinés adapted techniques from the films of Jean-Luc Godard, Miklos Jancsó, and Theo Angelopoulos to develope his theory and practice of the sequence shot.[2] The result was what Sanjinés sometimes refers to as "the Andean sequence shot," which he saw as consonant with what he refers to as the "Andean cosmovision," the collective subjectivity of a people with a radically non-western perception of space and time.

"El plano secuencia integral"

In essays written in the 1970s such as "Sobre *¡Fuera de aquí!*," Sanjinés repeatedly states that the first effect of the uninterrupted take is to encourage the spectator to participate "in the interior of the scene," and that, when combined with strategies for anticipating the story and minimizing the distraction of suspense, the long take creates spaces of reflection. He had arrived at these conclusions through, on the one hand, an analysis of "bourgeois" cinema, and, on the other, the practice of producing and exhibiting cinema in rural, indigenous communities, mines, and marginal urban neighborhoods. The various essays tend to be either analysis or reportage of the group's practice. In "El plano secuencia integral," published in 1989 but written before the production of *La nación clandestina* began (probably 1986-7), Sanjinés unites these two tendencies found in his earlier writing. The result is his most comprehensive statement on his aesthetic and why he believes it is culturally consonant with his principal addressees, thus fulfilling the primary responsibility of the revolutionary filmmaker. In the same way that Sanjinés sees *La nación clandestina* as the culmination of his previous filmmaking efforts, this essay is the summation of his theoretical writings. In it he

reflects upon the experiences of *Yawar Mallku* and the films made in exile, while simultaneously detailing what he will be attempting with the current production. It begins with an extended analysis of what he has removed from his cinema and why, expanding upon arguments he first made in "Problemas de la forma y del contenido en el cine revolucionario." Having laid the theoretical groundwork, he devotes the second half to a detailed, sometimes technical, description of the type of sequence shot he will be attempting in the new film.

In the very first sentence Sanjinés defines who the addressees of his cinema are; as before, they are not Europeans, North Americans, or even residents of Buenos Aires, but the people of the Andes.[3] He then makes a move that is new in his writing, expanding the definition of the addressees in a way that reflects both the pan-Andean, less nationalist, perspective he acquired in exile and his larger goal of opening lines of communication between urban intellectuals and the people. He writes that the addressees are also certain urban Bolivians who respond to the films consciously or unconsciously.

> Porque, curiosamente, un sofisticado intelectual boliviano que se vangloria de dominar la obra de Proust, que ha rimado en griego como Franz Tamayo o escrito sólo en francés, expresa, casi siempre, en su conducta, en sus maneras, en sus actitudes y pensiamiento, esa acumulación que los siglos del pensamiento aymara y quechua han infiltrado en su ser a pesar del propio racismo, desprecio y hasta enconado odio que su clase genera en relación a esas masas de opremidos, directos herederos de la tradición andina.
>
> (Because, curiously, a sophisticated Bolivian intellectual who prides himself on mastering the works of Proust, who has rhymed in Greek like Franz Tamayo or written only in French, expresses, almost always, in his conduct, manners, in his attitudes and thoughts, that accumulation which the centuries of Aymara and Quechua thought have infiltrated into his being, despite the racism, contempt, and even fierce hatred which his class generates in relation to the oppressed masses, the direct heirs of the Andean tradition.)[4]

He then compares a *doctor paceño* (doctor from La Paz) with an *intelectual cruceño* (an intellectual from the Santa Cruz department in Bolivia's tropical lowlands) and argues that the *paceño*, unlike his lowland counterpart, has been "infiltrated" by indigenous

thought. The *paceño*, then, despite his racism that may be every bit as virulent as that of a *cruceño*, shares a common inheritance with intellectuals in Quito, Ecuador, Cuzco, Peru, and other Andean urban areas, that he does not share with all of his fellow Bolivians. Thus the search for a cinematic language consonant with Aymara and Quechua thinking has two revolutionary potentials in the Andean context, depending upon the class of the spectator. For the oppressed, the indigenous people, the films allow them to analyze the reality in which they live, by presenting that reality in the form of their habitual, culturally learned, modes of perception. Penetrating this reality and perceiving the relations sustaining it that are hidden behind appearances set the stage for collective strategies of intervening in and changing that reality. To the urban Andean whose western orientation entails the suppression of indigenous modes of thinking and perception, the film awakens a response, initially perhaps only unconscious, that begins the work of cultural decolonization, which is, for Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino, the goal of Third Cinema.

As a westernized intellectual, this *doctor paceño* feels himself to be an individual first and foremost, which is for Sanjinés the core value of the Occidental tradition. In cinema, Sanjinés argues, as he did in earlier essays, the most perfect expression of individualism is the close up. "[E]l primer plano en el cine tiene la lectura icónica de los contenidos ideológicos históricos que corresponden a la cultura europea occidental y su hermeneútica contradice las concepciónes comunales, colectivas de otras culturas. (In the cinema the close up is the iconic reading of the ideological and historical contents that correspond to western European culture, and its hermeneutic contradicts the communal and collective conceptions of other cultures.)"[5] Sanjinés acknowledges that the close up has been used with great expressive force by D. W. Griffith, Sergei Eisenstein, and the German Expressionists, and he adds that they did so with complete propriety, since they were creating within a western individualist tradition. But to use the close up as they did would be to contradict the collective ethos of the Andean indigenous people and further

the destruction of their culture. This much is not new in Sanjinés's writings, but there are two claims he makes starting from this assumption that are.

The first is the idea that the logical extension of individualism is fragmentation, which manifests itself in various ways.

> La fragmentatión interpretaba también una manera de entender la realidad coherente con una visión individualista de la sociedad y la vida. Sociedad no integrada, resuelta en permanentes repturas tanto en relaciones humanos como en su composición orgánica. Al romper de espacio, frecuentamente estaremos pintando un universo social de fragmentaciones, de saltos, de violencia psicológica. Sociedad de espacios individuales, de territorios demarcados, de lugares 'propios'; sociedad de rangos, de diferencias sociales, de privilegios, de clases finalmente.
>
> (Fragmentation also always interprets a way of understanding reality coherent with an individualistic vision of society and life. An unintegrated society results in permanent ruptures in both human relations and organic composition. By breaking up space, we are frequently painting a social universe of fragmentations, of leaps, of psychological violence. A society of individual spaces, of marked off territories, of private places; a society of ranks, of social differences, of privileges, finally, of class.)[6]

Despite the close up playing the "papel protagónico (role of the protagonist)" in western cinema, Sanjinés argues that it would be absurd to abandon this resource. The fault does not necessarily lie in the close up itself, but in the manner in which the close up is achieved. In western cinema the direct cut to the close up is typical. In Sanjinés's cinema there may be close ups, indicating the collective interest in a particular person or object, but that person or object must be approached in a traveling shot. The camera, as the instrument of the collective interest, can move in on a person or object in order to interpret the collectivity's attempt to approximate itself to the object of interest. The direct cut, by contrast, introduces fragmentation. It leads to a "lenguaje de mutilación (language of mutilation)", which,

> Era y es coherente con la cosmovisión de una sociedad que ha perturbado y desnaturalizado la relación integral entre los hombres, que ha violentado la relación del hombre con la naturaleza destruyendo la continuidad, complementaridad vital entre ambos.

> (Has been and is coherent with the cosmovision of a society which has disturbed and denaturalized the integrated relationship between men, which has violated the relationship between man and nature, destroying the vital continuity and complementarity between both.)[7]

Montage, even in, or perhaps especially in, its "invisible" form, i.e. continuity editing, is expressive of the separations inherent in western culture, which manifest themselves as class society and as a separation from nature. Sanjinés's theory of the long take does not rest in, nor is it derived from, European notions of realism. For Sanjinés, a cinema that innocently deploys the "language of mutilation" would be the most realistic form a European cinema could take, since this language is founded upon individualism and reflective of class society.

The second new claim Sanjinés makes in this piece is that the fragmentation of a scene into various shots has its origin in the rules governing composition derived from the western painterly tradition. "La pintura clásica, naturalista y figurativa, seleciona un instante gráfico, una escena, un personaje, un paisaje y compone el cuadro guiándose por ciertas normas y leyes, llamadas de 'oro', que sitúan y descubrieron los puntos claves donde se concentra inconcientemente la atención humana. (Classical painting, naturalist and figurative, selects a graphic instant, a scene, a person, a landscape and composes the picture guided by certain norms and law, referred to as 'golden', which locate and reveal the key points where human attention is unconsciously concentrated.)"[8] The rules of composition direct the attention to one place within the frame, from which that attention can be relayed in sequence to other key points as the beholder "reads" the painting. Cinema uses montage, combined with static compositions, to replicate this highly controlled relaying of the gaze within a painting, a technique which separates the elements of which a particular *mise-en-scène* are composed, much in the way pictorial composition is used to divide, or fragment, the frame.[9] To avoid this fragmentation a filmmaker must reject the standard rules of composition. For Sanjinés, who believes that revolutionary cinema must be beautiful to be effective, the rejection of standard western

practices of pictorial composition necessitates a search for alternative ways of composing beautiful shots. There are two ways Sanjinés accomplishes this, the second of which will be dealt with in more detail later in the chapter.

Sanjinés's films, beginning with *Ukamau*, contain many extended sequences of people traversing the landscape of the Andean altiplano. Many of these sequences are shot with long lenses that heighten the verticality of the mountainous background while collapsing the distance between people or objects in the foreground and the background. The terraced mountainsides beneath or behind the figures often appear as an almost two-dimensional field that they pass before. And though sometimes the camera pans to follow them, especially in the films of the mid 1970s, it usually remains stationary, the figures entering and exiting the frame. The human figure is not there, as in the Romantic paintings of Caspar David Friedrich or Albert Bierstadt, to lend scale to nature or to emphasize its sublimity, which is another way of marking the separation between the human and the natural. They are there as integral parts of the landscape, and as they travel from place to place, hoe a field, or perform some other everyday activity, the way they are shot, with long lenses collapsing the spatial planes and a camera that refuses to single them out through movement, emphasizes their integration into the landscape, and thus nature. These shots are patterned on Andean weavings and intended to appeal to Andean, rather than western, aesthetic norms.

The second alternative to western compositional rules, which Sanjinés deploys with great consistency first in *La nación clandestina*, is the camera in nearly continuous motion that never halts to frame a shot, substituting what I will be calling "composition in motion" for the compositional rules derived from the western painterly tradition. This technique often involves moving the camera around characters in circles or semi-circles. Such movements have a centrifugal rather than centripetal force in Sanjinés's cinema; rather than isolating an individual or group and positing them at the center of a drama,

and thus a fictional world, they tend to suggest the encompassing spatial totality, or nature, into which the figures are integrated.

In *Theory of Film: The Redemption of Physical Reality*, Siegfried Kracauer argues against the subordination of physical reality to abstract concepts. He writes, "Art in film is reactionary because it symbolizes wholeness and thus pretends to the continued existence of beliefs which 'cover' physical reality in both senses of the word. The result is films which sustain the prevailing structure."[10] For Kracauer the only way to combat the illusion of wholeness created by western ideology, which he uses interchangeably with "abstraction," is with fragmentation and separation within the shot, the basic unit of cinema. Kracauer does not, like Bazin, correlate the length of a shot with its capacity for indeterminacy and thus realism. What is most important for him is the extent to which the objects within the shot are left untouched by the necessity of the narrative intrigue. According to Kracauer, the narrative filmmaker must live up to two objectives that are difficult to reconcile: "On the one hand, he will have to advance the action by assigning to each shot a meaning relative to the plot…On the other hand, the film-maker will wish to exhibit and penetrate physical reality for its own sake. And this calls for shots not yet stripped of their multiple meanings."[11] Kracauer's call for a narrative with only a weak hold over the action and objects in a scene is a call for a separation between those elements within the frame rendered determinate by the narrative and all else, which, in its excess, provides a countervailing force against the abstraction of ideology that seeks to render all as an illusory whole.

I raise Kracauer at this point to illustrate the difficulty of completely reconciling Sanjinés's theory with western film theory. Committed as he is to representing collectivities and the nature into which they are integrated as whole, Sanjinés could be seen as guilty of creating a reactionary cinema, according to Kracauer. And yet, it is the "prevailing structure," emanating from the West, that Sanjinés is determined to dismantle, not leave in place. Kracauer's theory, precisely because it is written from

within the western aesthetic tradition, cannot accommodate the use of a non-western conceptualization of wholeness and integration as a means for revealing the illusory wholeness at the center of western aesthetics, a wholeness paradoxically created, according to Sanjinés, through fragmentation. Kracauer advocates the redemption of reality through a deeper separation within the shot, not just between them, a separation of those elements subordinated to narrative and those that are not. The "free-hovering images of material reality" that appear within shots determined only partly by the necessity of implementing an intrigue lend the images an indeterminacy that combats abstraction.[12] For Sanjinés, though, the preponderance of landscape and other elements of "camera reality" are subordinated to a liberatory abstraction, which he refers to as the Andean cosmovision. Thus despite the fact that he has minimized the intrigue to the extent possible while still maintaining a narrative, there is little indeterminacy in his cinema. As we shall see below, this lack of indeterminacy is heightened by the use of dialectical editing to assemble the shots. And yet the kind of highly tendentious editing practiced by Sanjinés would not alone disqualify him as a realist, according to Kracauer, who, after all, considered the Eisenstein of *Battleship Potemkin* a great realist. The cultural coherence underlying the choices of form and content in Sanjinés's cinema is what render the images, in certain contexts and among certain audiences, relatively devoid of indeterminacy. In other words, what might appear to western eyes as an excess of reality is not there in the service of any western notion of ontological realism.

None of this should be seen as discrediting Kracauer; Sanjinés himself would no doubt argue that his theory is as appropriate as the close ups in Griffith and Eisenstein. I do so rather to point out how the films are structured so as to be difficult to reconcile with western film theory, although this by no means prevents their being interpreted through that particular set of lenses. To a European (or even to a *cruceño*) viewer interested in theories of cinematic realism, the films might appear to have an abundance of indeterminate camera reality, and as such, to have a particular value, as "realistic"

documents or even spectacle. In much the same way, a European spectator in the 1970s familiar with European art cinema might be convinced that Sanjinés is making art cinema in the European auteurist mold. This is entirely plausible at least in part because Sanjinés adapts techniques from the European art cinema, using them "under different coordinates" to create a new film language. This renders his films strangely familiar to western audiences and is no doubt part of their appeal to those same audiences. Paul Willemen notes, "In Europe, most Third Cinema products have definitely been consumed in a Second Cinema way, bracketing the politics in favour of an appreciation of the authorial artistry."[13] I suspect Willemen overstates the extent to which the politics of the films were bracketed; certainly festivals such as Pesaro were as much about the politics in the films and the politics of film as they were artistry. And yet Sanjinés always wanted his films to serve in the West as denunciations that drew attention to the politics of imperialism and western-backed military dictatorships. To gain an audience in Europe he also willingly exploited, or at least passively accepted the benefits of, the discourse of authorship, through his presence at screenings and various festivals. He also adapted techniques associated with other film authors in his own work, which, in the European context, encouraged the consumption of his films in, as Willemen puts it, a "Second Cinema way." But this is not to suggest that European auteurs "influenced" Sanjinés in the conventional sense, or that he merely imitated their work. Before moving on to consider Sanjinés's films in comparison with the work of three European filmmakers who, like him, were experimenting with the use of sequence shots in politically committed cinema, it is necessary to outline a theory of adaptation that applies to his cinema.

Dialectical Transculturation

As we have seen in Chapter 2, Sanjinés believed the revolutionary Bolivian filmmaker's task was to screen the available techniques for their aesthetic coherence with

Aymara and Quechua culture as well as their utility for revealing "the hidden logic of historical phenomena."[14] The failures of *Yawar Mallku* demanded a move from what literary scholar Javier Sanjinés has described as "transculturation from above" of Jorge Sanjinés's first films to a "transculturation from below" in his second phase.[15] As Javier Sanjinés notes, the term "transculturation" has a long history in Latin American literary studies, from its invention by ethnographer Fernando Ortiz in 1940 to its later use by literary critic Ángel Rama in the 1970s and 1980s to describe the work "lettered" Latin American intellectuals and artists attempting to represent subaltern classes and groups.[16] Reviewing this history, Javier Sanjinés uses John Beverly's essay "Transculturation and Subalternity: The 'Lettered City' and the Túpac Amaru Rebellion," which begins with a critical history of the term.[17] According to Beverly, "Whereas in processes of acculturation a subordinate culture has to adjust to a dominant one, in transculturation elements of both cultures come into a dynamic relationship of contradiction and combination."[18] Using the 18th Century Quechua language play *Ollantay* as an example, he distinguishes between transculturation from above and below:

> But it is important to see this as a transculturation *from below*, based not on the ways in which an emerging creole 'lettered city' (and then creole-dominated nation-state) becomes progressively more adequate to the task of representing the interests of the indigenous population, but rather on how that population appropriates aspects of the European and Creole literary and philosophical culture to serve its interests.[19]

Although Beverly concludes that the term is of dubious value, Javier Sanjinés believes that it is still useful for analyzing Jorge Sanjinés's aesthetic, and he deploys two modified versions of the term, "transculturation from above" and "transculturation from below," to describe the the two major phases of Jorge Sanjinés's career. The first phase begins with the short *Revolución* and ends with *Yawar Mallku*. In their photography, music, montage, metaphor, and at times elliptical plot structures, these films, according to Javier Sanjinés, show the profound influence of European art cinema. The experience of taking

the latter film into the countryside and screening it to peasants provoked Sanjinés to fundamentally rethink his filmmaking.

According to Javier Sanjinés, beginning with his next film, *El coraje del pueblo*, Jorge Sanjinés's films were characterized by transculturation from below. It was with this film that Jorge Sanjinés and his collaborators began their experiments in collaboration with their nonprofessional, mostly peasant, performers. In the subsequent two films, *El enemigo principal* and *¡Fuera de aquí!*, Sanjinés began experimenting with long takes, or sequence shots, techniques that became increasingly central to his theories of filmmaking "with the people."

Javier Sanjinés goes on to coin the term "double transculturation" to describe the "permanent confrontation between the world above and the world below" in *La nación clandestina*.[20] In place of "double transculturation," I prefer the term dialectical transculturation, which is more in keeping with the idea of reciprocal exchange between Bolivia and Europe at the heart of this work and which, in the case of *La nación clandestina*, neatly expresses the various dialectics at play in the film: colonizer and oppressed; the urban and the rural; Eisenteinian ecstasy and Brechtian distanciation; European film technique and local conceptions of time. The paradox at the heart of *La nación clandestina* is that despite the return to such previously abandoned elements as the individual protagonist and complex, non-linear narrative, the film succeeds in expressing the Andean cosmovision and, more importantly, was and remains well received by the filmmaker's desired audience.

In "El plano secuencia integral" Sanjinés describes *Yawar Mallku* as a film "que basó su lenguaje en los elementos aprendidos del cine europeo-norteamericano (which based its language on elements acquired from European-North American cinema)."[21] The film failed to communicate with the desired addressees because it was a product of the lettered city, a top-down application of western techniques familiar to and appropriate for western audiences but incomprehensible and culturally irrelevant to the indigenous

workers and peasants in Bolivia. Sanjinés's search to remove the influence of European cinema on his films did not entail so much a wholesale rejection as a change in stance toward it. While removing the characteristics of "bourgeois cinema" from his own, he remained engaged with European cinema both personally, through his attendance at festivals, and formally, through the selective appropriation of techniques developed by European filmmakers producing radical political cinema. These appropriations were no mere imitations, as Sanjinés would argue they were in *Yawar Mallku*. Though their source was "from above" in European art cinema, these techniques were "indigenized" through the horizontal process Sanjinés had developed, transformed "from below", and then returned to their source in Europe, familiar and yet transculturated. To adequately chart the process of dialectical transculturation, we need to superimpose two maps of different scales, one on top of the other. At the local level, there is Sanjinés, a member of the intellectual elite, creating spaces and means of dialogue with the oppressed and excluded indigenous masses. One such space is the improvised screening in a village, mining camp, or marginal urban *barrio*, where the filmmaker both explains his work and listens to critiques of it. Mapped on top of this local network would be the transnational circuit of art cinema, centered in Europe. By the 1970s Sanjinés was not just a resident of the Bolivian or Latin American lettered city, but a presence on the European intellectual scene as well, at least that portion of it devoted to cinema. From this position he functioned as a relay in the network of relations between Europe and Latin America much in the way he did more locally between Andean urban intellectuals and the indigenous masses. Ultimately what Sanjinés's cinema offered Europe in this system of exchange was a challenge to universalizing notions of subjectivity and an example of how to represent alternative, non-western subjectivities. This arrived in its most articulated form with *La nación clandestina*, the film that put into practice the theoretical stands taken in "El plano secuencia integral." By coincidence this film arrived in 1989, a year when the division of Europe into competing monolithic blocs ended, leading to

growing recognition of the cultural diversity within Europe's borders, a long-ignored postcolonial phenomenon. At this point New Latin American Cinema was a waning movement. The end of military dictatorships in much of Latin America and the end of the Cold War had changed the political context in which it thrived both locally and internationally. In Europe, films from Latin America and Third Cinema from other parts of the Third World were supplanted by a growing number of domestic productions by former colonial subjects and immigrants from the developing world. This work is devoted to exchanges of films, theories, personnel, and cinematic style in the period preceding the pivotal year of 1989. But implied in the notion of dialectical transculturation is the idea that the films of Sanjinés and others had an afterlife in Europe, much in the way it has been argued that that Italian neo-realism had an afterlife in Latin America. It may be too early to definitively tell, but if the patterns of exchange established in the 1960s continued to have repercussions in the post-1989 European context, we might reasonably suspect that the presence of Latin American films and filmmakers in the preceding years inspired Europe's own marginalized peoples to make cinema and, because of the prestige accorded Latin American cinema during the 1960s-1970s, predisposed state funding institutions to take seriously the idea that these marginalized communities can and should represent themselves cinematically. It may well be that European filmmakers now adapt techniques from European art cinema in a form that has already been transculturated once in Latin America or elsewhere.

The remainder of this chapter explores Sanjinés's process of dialectical transculturation by examining his films and theory in light of the work of three European filmmakers from the 1960s-1970s who were experimenting with long takes in creating radical political cinema: Jean-Luc Godard, Miklos Jancsó and Theo Angelopoulos. The works of these filmmakers resonate with Sanjinés's in complex ways, but with each I will be singling out one element characteristic of their work during the period that Sanjinés adapted: from Godard, it will be the use of dialectics within and among long takes; from

Jancsó, the collective protagonist and what I will be calling "composition in motion"; and from Angelopoulos, the representation of multiple simultaneous temporalities.

Godard's Dialectics

Of the major New Latin American Cinema theorists Jorge Sanjinés is anomalous in that he never once mentions Godard in his writings. For Glauber Rocha, Julio García Espinosa, Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino, Godard served as a sort of touchstone that they used to critique the European cinema of auteurs. This silence on Sanjinés's part is probably more indicative of his attempt to keep his distance from European auteurs then in the spotlight than a lack of knowledge; in the chapter of *Teoría y práctica de un cine junto al pueblo* devoted to the precursors of New Latin American Cinema, of the European filmmakers, he tends to privilege historical figures like Eisenstein or Alexander Medvedkine or less well-known documentarians like Joris Ivens (who collaborated with Godard in 1968 on *Loin du Vietnam* [*Far From Vietnam*]) over contemporary directors of fiction films. If the films of Godard were not generally available in Latin America, discussions of his work were certainly ubiquitous in circles dedicated to political cinema, as references to him in the works of other New Latin American Cinema filmmakers indicates. Of the European directors experimenting with the use of sequence shots in the late 1960s, Godard was without a doubt the most written about, if not the most widely seen, especially in Latin America. In addition, there are points at which the biographies of Godard and Sanjinés nearly intersect or seem to parallel each other as well. 1966, the year of Sanjinés's triumph at Cannes, marked the beginning of a period during which Godard's work became increasingly radically political. This period culminated in his 1970 attempt to create a filmmaking collective, *Groupe Dziga Vertov*, which coincided with Sanjinés's bringing *Grupo Ukamau* back together to make *El coraje del pueblo* for Italy's RAI Television, a company which had previously hired Godard.[22] It is safe to

assume that Sanjinés's knowledge of Godard's work was at least as direct as his knowledge of Bertolt Brecht's.

With *Weekend* and *La Chinoise* (both 1967) Godard consistently deployed what Brian Henderson, in a well-known essay, has called his "non-bourgeois camera style." The hallmarks of this style are camera movements that advance at a fixed rate and maintain a strict perpendicularity to the action, either tracking directly in or away from it or to the left or right (sometimes both). These movements can also take the form of the 360° pan, as in the "musical interlude" section of *Weekend*, when the camera, placed in the center of a barnyard, rotates on its axis several times while a pianist plays classical music. The effect, according to Henderson, is to reduce the image to a single plane, the very antithesis of the deep focus photography which André Bazin had argued granted the spectator freedom, in that he or she was encouraged to explore the various receding planes within the image, thus participating in the construction of its meaning. According to Henderson:

> Godard's later style does require the active participation of the viewer, but not in Bazin's sense of choosing what to see within a multi-layered image and, presumably, making his own moral connections within it also. Godard presents instead an admittedly synthetic, single-layered construct which the viewer must examine critically, accept or reject. The viewer is not drawn *into* the image, nor does he make choices within it; he stands outside the image and judges it *as a whole*.[23]

This style, in other words, distances the spectator from the screen while demanding of him or her the stance of Brecht's relaxed and attentive observer, ready to pass judgment on the scene, which is presented as a discreet unit of meaning. Sanjinés, like Godard, combines wide angle lenses and narrow apertures to reduce depth of field, and his propensity to use the vertical backdrops of the Andes, much in the way Godard uses walls, similarly tends to flatten the image and give it a certain wholeness, fusing figure within landscape to express their unity. A key difference between Godard and Sanjinés, though, is how the camera moves.

For Henderson, the slow, seemingly mechanized tracking shots in Godard's films are "non-bourgeois" not only because they create a single-layered image but also because of their refusal to privilege an individual protagonist. "Godard, like Eisenstein repudiates 'the individualistic conception of the bourgeois hero' and his tracking shots reflect this. His camera serves no individual and prefers none to another. It never initiates movement to follow a character and if it picks one up as it moves it leaves him behind haphazardly."[24] For instance, in the "musical interlude" sequence from *Weekend*, the camera, in its rotations, catches up with pairs of characters walking around the yard and talking. We expect that the camera will slow down to follow them, but each time it either leaves them behind or they suddenly exit the frame in another direction, and the camera refuses to follow. Godard's camera seems to capture characters by accident, like an oscillating security camera in a hotel lobby. As an intervention against cinematic conventions, this strategy only works if the spectator has been conditioned by those conventions. It does so by thwarting the spectator's habitual desire for a richly detailed image full of color and depth and a mobile camera that seems to correspond, through its movements, to his or her interest in following the characters. We might add that this mechanically moving camera, at least initially, is anti-bourgeois in that it also minimizes the authorial presence of the filmmaker, at least until it becomes a recognizable trait susceptible to analysis by film scholars.

The same movements would not have the same effect on Sanjinés's local audiences. Although opposed to bourgeois cinema and its forms, like Godard, his intended audience is not necessarily aware of these forms, and therefore would not be liable to experience the frustration Godard's cinema relies upon for its political effect. Their absolute mechanical regularity might even make them seem westernized to a *campesino* audience. In addition, Sanjinés wants the spectator to feel as if he or she is participating in the interior of the scene, although not sutured in through continuity editing, granting an illusion of omnipresence. With each film, from *Coraje del pueblo*, to

El enemigo principal, to *¡Fuera de aquí!*, the movements are increasingly the product of a hand-held camera, not dollies. There are of course practical reasons for this: it is in part a concession to the ruggedness of the terrain and lack of equipment; and it also permits the cinematographer to respond quickly to the performers's improvisations. More important, though, is the effect created by a camera held at approximate eye level whose motions correspond with a human gait. Sanjinés encourages the spectator to participate in the scene principally through the effect such movements create.[25]

Henderson points out another feature of Godard's "non-bourgeois" camera style that has clear analogues in Sanjinés's films from the 1970s. He describes a shot from *La chinoise* that begins with a cluster of hovels. The camera pans left, leaving the hovels behind and revealing several modern multistory buildings under construction. The shot ends static, with a modern building in the right half of the frame and a small hovel on the left. This shot is of the university buildings in the Parisian suburb Nanterre and the shacks in which the Algerian workers employed making these buildings live. Henderson writes, "Eisenstein would have cut from a shot of one to a shot of the other, making the juxtaposition for the viewer, obliterating time and space relations to make a clear-cut social relation. Godard observes the time and space relations and lets the viewer make the social relation."[26] Henderson exaggerates the freedom Godard grants the spectator because this essay, like his earlier essay "The Long Take," is an effort to confound what he sees as a too clear-cut distinction among film scholars between Eisenteinian montage and Bazinian long take aesthetics. For Henderson this shot, which absolutely preserves spatial and temporal relations, as advocated by Bazin, is also dialectical in the Eisensteinian sense, in that it creates a montage within the shot through camera movement and, at the end, through framing of a static shot. He suggests that such shots grant the spectator a certain freedom in that the spectator, not the *monteur*, makes the relation. However, the only possible relation is the one Godard wants you to make all along. And Henderson neglects to mention the highly directive soundtrack. As we watch

the shot we hear Veronique narrate how her experience of walking to the university through the surrounding slums made her realize that there were two separate and highly unequal Frances.

There is a very similar shot in *¡Fuera de aquí!*, Sanjinés's film about missionaries who divide a rural community along religious lines so that they can be better exploited by their own government, working on behalf of multinational mining concerns. The shot begins with a group of *campesinos* in the right half of the frame hoeing a field and singing, as they move slowly to screen left. Another song, which resolves into a Christian hymn, becomes gradually more distinct as a second group of *campesinos* rounds the top of the hill in the background, marching toward the camera in the left half of the frame. As they pass, the first group stops singing and pauses to watch. The second group eventually passes out of the frame screen left, and the first group resumes their work. The division of the frame, the movement of the groups perpendicular to each other, and the clashing songs on the soundtrack all dialectically represent the growing division in the community. Unlike Godard's shot, there is no narration directing the viewer how to interpret the shot. This does not mean, though, that the shot grants the spectator any more interpretive freedom than Godard's. The songs we hear function as "Dixie" and differing versions of "The Battle Cry of Freedom" do in so many westerns, in which they are used to reveal conflicts among groups of Civil War veterans, or like the songs sung by communists and fascists occupying opposing sides of a *taverna* in *O thiasos* (*The Travelling Players*, Theo Angelopoulos, 1974). Militant political cinema does not thrive on ambiguity and indeterminacy, something Henderson, in his description of *La chinoise*, seems reluctant to concede.

This hesitancy before the full implications of a "non-bourgeois" cinema (perhaps this is why he avoids using "anti-bourgeois," which would have been equally apt), this refusal to completely abandon Bazin's moral discourse on spectatorial freedom, is a holdover from Henderson's earlier essay, in which he assumes, like Bazin, that long takes

are inherently more indeterminate than shorter ones.[27] In "The Long Take" Henderson writes that the cut between two long takes, which he calls the "intra-sequence" or "*mise-en-scène*" cut

> must be carefully differentiated from montage. Montage is the connection or relation of two or more shots (usually far more than two)—of entire film pieces—in some overall format. Montage treats or arranges the whole piece, not just the end of one piece and the beginning of another. The intra-sequence cut does not relate, arrange, or govern the whole of the pieces it joins; it merely has a local relationship to the beginnings and ends of the connecting shots, at the place they are joined.[28]

When he argues in the later piece that Godard constructs long takes so that they must be accepted or rejected as whole pieces, he misses the opportunity to revise his argument about editing and the inherent tendency of the long take to resist being treated as a whole unit with a single meaning, the way Eisensteinian montage does. He notes, "the odd quality of the intra-sequence cut is that it *reflects back* on the scene (and on *mise-en-scène*) and defines it or qualifies it in retrospect."[29] What if this retroactive qualification were capable of creating more than a "local relationship," collapsing the meaning of the previous shot into a single unit through the dialectical force created by a juxtaposition of images, despite the fact that both shots are long? In other words, is it possible that montage can be used in such a way as to overcome the long take's tendency to disperse its rhetorical power? Henderson does not consider these questions, but the films of Godard and Sanjinés suggests the possibility.

This chapter began with the description of a sequence from *Yawar Mallku*, one of the last appearances of montage in Sanjinés cinema, a sequence that, in its inconsistency, already revealed his discomfort with or flagging confidence in montage as a form. In abandoning montage Sanjinés did not abandon dialectics; he merely transposed it to a dialectic within the shot or the dialectical editing of long takes. Herein lies Sanjinés's deepest affinity with Godard's work of the late sixties. *¡Fuera de aquí!* is particularly full of strong dialectical editing of long takes. Sometimes it serves as ironic or amused

commentary, playing on traditional iconography, as when he cuts from missionaries building a church to a flock of grazing sheep. Other times he uses a cut to underline the basic conflict in the film, as when a long shot of *campesinos* hoeing is joined to a shot of American mining engineers attacking a cliff face with pickaxes. In its strongest form, this type of editing produces a denunciation. Sanjinés cuts from a shot of a table laden with cans of food labeled "USAID" to a child's funeral.

Like Godard, Sanjinés is uninterested in the question of the spectator's freedom to interpret a shot, a freedom which, in the context of militant cinema, is little more than a concession to bourgeois morality. Unlike Godard, he has more to offer than the systematic negation of bourgeois style. And in place of a Bazinian freedom to revel in indeterminacy Sanjinés offers his *campesino* spectators the opportunity to see onscreen their world and the hidden relations of power transforming it, represented in their language and using narrative structures consonant with their culture and their non-western subjectivity. Rather than a negation of the individual, as in Godard, they can see a collective in action. For the European spectator Sanjinés's films present a radical alternative to western critiques of individualism, a critique that begins with the collective, as opposed to the masses, something rarely seen in western cinema since the revolutionary fervent of Russia in the 1920s.

Jancsó, the Collective Protagonist, and "Composition in Motion"

Miklos Jancsó first earned international attention when his *Szegénylegények* (*The Round Up*, 1966) was nominated for a Golden Palm at Cannes, the same year Sanjinés won best new director for *Ukamau*. *Szegénylegények* was Jancsó's fifth feature and the first in which he systematically used sequence shots, which soon became his stylistic trademark. Beginning in 1969 Jancsó divided his time between his native Hungary and Italy, where he worked for RAI, so he was working there in 1971, the same year in which

Sanjinés completed post-production of *El coraje del pueblo*, although it is possible they were not there at the same time.[30] In 1972 Jancsó won his first Golden Palm for *Még kér a nép* (*Red Psalm*), which, along with the Hungarian-Russian co-production *Csillagosok, katonák* (*The Red and the White*, 1967), is among his most widely seen and written about films. *Még kér a nép* was the first Hungarian film ever to show in commercial cinemas in Paris, and according to Graham Petrie in his monograph on the film, "One country that showed particular enthusiasm for the film was Chile, then undergoing its brief experiment with Socialism under the Allende government. The film was welcomed there for its challenge to the aesthetic and commercial hegemony of Hollywood, and received the Film Critic's Prize for the Best Film from Abroad Shown in 1972."[31] After having left Bolivia in 1971, Sanjinés resided in Chile for the remainder of the Allende period, after which he left for Peru. His next film, *El enemigo principal*, has stylistic similarities with Jancsó's work generally and thematic similarities with *Még kér a nép* in particular that suggest he used the film as a reference when developing his new, long take style.

Like *El coraje del pueblo*, most of Jancsó's films from the 1960s are about place and collective memory, and their stories are inspired by historical events. *Szegénylegények* is set in the aftermath of the failed 1848 rebellion against Austrian rule. The Austrian secret police bring the captured rebels to a remote fort on the Hungarian plain and apply various forms of physical and psychological pressure to them until they reveal the identity of their leaders, whom the Austrians assume are among them. Individual rebels become passing protagonists in the film as they are separated from the others and subjected to individual coercion, which undermines the men's cohesion. There is no real protagonist in the film, though, and apart from the scenes in which individuals are interrogated, Jancsó tends to use wide framing and long takes to emphasize their collectivity. Division, lack of discipline, and a misplaced trust in their oppressors lead to their eventual downfall. The lessons of this film would not have been lost on anyone following Che Guevara and his guerilla army in Bolivia at the time.

The setting, along with the sequence shots in near continuous motion, is another immediately recognizable element of Jancsó's better-known films. All are shot on the vast Hungarian plain and use the open expanses and distant horizon line to great effect. He shares with Sanjinés, whose films are similarly recognizable for their consistent use of the Andean *altiplano* landscape, a desire to ground his cinema in a specific, historically resonant place of which his characters are integrally part. The Hungarian plain for Jancsó and the *altiplano* for Sanjinés are not abstracted mythical fields upon which history is reenacted, as Monument Valley was for John Ford. In the words of one of Jancsó's collaborators, these are spaces "embodying real situations."[32]

The narratives of Jancsó's films are episodic and sketchy, intrigue is minimized, and key information is sometimes withheld from the spectator. All of this encourages the spectator "to look beyond the question of individual destinies that forms the subject matter of most films."[33] As with Sanjinés, Jancsó uses the sequence shot to deny the spectator an omniscient perspective, thereby encouraging identification with and within the collective. David Bordwell notes, "Whereas Miklos Jancsos' long takes create spatial patterns that refuse omnipresence and thus drastically restrict the spectator's knowledge of story information, classical omnipresence makes the cognitive schema we call 'the camera' into an *ideal* invisible observer, freed from the contingencies of space and time."[34] The "ideal" observer is always singular, and in the schema Bordwell uses, it admits the spectator into the scene, but, because it is freed from spatial and temporal continuity to which the scene is assumed to be bound, permits the spectator to be simultaneously within the scene and without it, from where he or she passes judgment. Jancsó's drastic restriction of the spectator's knowledge, through narrative and photographic means, holds him or her within the scene. The spectator is not privy to any more knowledge than that which the collective learns over the course of the narrative. His or her participation thus mirrors that of the collective, and his or her judgments, whether in agreement with those represented on screen or not, are arrived at in tandem

with them. The usefulness of Jancsó's technique for his film about a community's collective decision whether or not to support a guerilla insurgency, for all the differences in their eventual execution, must have been immediately obvious to Sanjinés. And certain scenes from *El enemigo principal* resonate strongly with *Még kér a nép*. Jancsó establishes a collective protagonist in the opening shot of *Még kér a nép*, when a bailiff approaches a woman he perceives to be the leader of the revolutionary group and proceeds to attempt negotiating with her. She refuses, shouting, "Only together!", and the rebels drown out the bailiff's protests with chants of "Rights for the people!" This moment is similar to a scene near the beginning of *El enemigo principal* when the people of the community capture Carillo and bring him before a judge, only to be told that there must be an individual plaintiff.[35] Both films dramatize the irreconcilability of a revolutionary collective mindset and bourgeois law founded upon the idea of the individual. Both are also concerned with the revolutionary potential residing in folk or popular culture. Again, to take the first shot of *Még kér a nép* as an example, we hear the revolutionaries singing a folk song to a hurdy gurdy accompaniment, the first of many times in the film when folk music and folk dancing are used to express solidarity and opposition to official culture.

One comes away from a Jancsó film of this period struck by the beauty of the compositions, which, in the case of *Csillagosok, katonák*, are composed of large numbers of figures arranged so as to exploit the proportions of the widescreen format he favored. Although the camera is in near constant motion, it pauses frequently, lingering on perfectly framed compositions. The movements, which sometimes track individuals or groups and other times overtake or lag behind them, as in Godard's shots, seem more motivated by the desire to move from one static composition to another than narrative considerations. Jancsó's earlier *Csend és kiáltás* (*Silence and* Cry, 1967), like *Még kér a nép* about state repression following a failed rebellion, is typical in this respect. It is about a member of the Lenin Battalion from Hungary's short-lived post World War I

communist government who is hiding from the police in a house that has been taken over by two women slowly poisoning its elderly owners. In one of the longest shots in the film, lasting nearly five minutes, we see the man sit down to dinner with the women, one of the women poison the old lady, and the arrival of the police, looking for fugitives. The camera tracks left and right inside the house, sometimes tracking forward and out into the yard through a door as well. Jancsó uses the door, windows, and an open porch to frame the action outside. Meanwhile, the lines made by the door and windows are used to break up the space and compose images of the inside of the house. Jancsó uses these framing devices even when the camera is in motion; as the policemen walk by outside, the camera tracks in unison, capturing them in a series of frames created by the windows and doors. In this shot the camera moves almost continuously, but it pauses to compose frames within frames or static compositions formed by vertical and horizontal lines. The tension between the formal compositions of the static moments and the more haphazard framing of the moving camera create the impression that Jancsó's style, despite the restlessness of his camera, is really dominated by the moments of stasis that punctuate the shots, and it is these moments, rather than the sinuously meandering tracking shots, that are easiest to remember, conforming as they do to the "golden" rules of the western painterly tradition.

Sanjinés's shots in *El enemigo principal* and *¡Fuera de aquí!* resemble Jancsó's; he keeps the camera in nearly continuous motion, tending to circle the figures from outside rather than photograph them from within their grouping, and he occasionally moves in for a close up, singling out one figure. But there are significant differences as well, indicating Sanjinés's process of adaptation, or "dialectical transculturation," of the Jancsó style to the needs of his cinema. Jancsó often begins a shot with a close up, part of his overall strategy discussed by Bordwell of circumscribing the viewer's knowledge, not as an invitation to identification with an individual.[36] Sanjinés moves toward a close up if the collective interest seems to dictate a "closer look," but after *Yawar Mallku* he never begins a shot or sequence with a close up. Petrie notes of Jancsó's plots, "The lack

of interest in following specific characters throughout the film and the avoidance of anything resembling a conventionally structured plot thus result in an episodic structure in which attention switches without much warning from one series of actions to another."[37] The camera movements that make up these episodes similarly switch attention in a frequently aleatory fashion. The seemingly arbitrary movement of the camera forces the spectator to look for non-narrative motivations (e.g. a certain desired composition), but more importantly, they draw attention to the controlling presence of the film's director. This latter effect is anathema for Sanjinés, so, unlike Jancsó, he is careful to design a scene so that the camera movement is motivated by the internal dramatic logic of the scene and the series of likely foci of collective attention.

The camera movements and zooms in Jancsó's films are invariably smooth and unobtrusive. In Sanjinés's films from the 1970s movement is very often shaky and uneven. Here the difference is less one of intentions than a marker of underdevelopment. Jancsó was working in Hungary, a country with a long tradition of cinema, and, although his films were quickly made and inexpensive, he still had access to the basic technology of industrial film production, especially 35mm cameras and tracks for dollies. Sanjinés abandoned using 35mm cameras after *El enemigo principal* because they proved unwieldy in situations where laying tracks, even if they had them, would have been impossible, and he remains considerably embarrassed by what he considers the obtrusive instability of the camera.[38] As he notes several times in his writings, including in "*El plano secuencia integral*," the shots were to have been longer and smoother, and certainly more were planned as sequence shots than were finally realized. Lack of adequate equipment, including long enough pieces of film stock, impeded his efforts.[39] While Sanjinés may have been disappointed by the results, this difference between his and Jancsó's cinematography mark another form of transculturation, one that happens without the intervention of the artist as a result of the disparity between the technology he or she has access to and the technology taken for granted in more developed countries.

Sanjinés's cinematography appears to be modeled upon direct cinema as practiced by D.A. Pennebaker and others in the United States. But this is not the case at all, first and foremost because he has little interest in realism. He does not emulate direct cinema camerawork as Pier Paolo Pasolini did in *Il vangelo secondo Matteo* (*The Gospel According to Matthew*, 1964) in an effort to document underdevelopment in the Italian South. With certain reservations and adaptations he is emulating Jancsó, if anybody, and the gap between aspiration and accomplishment is mediated by technology. That Sanjinés is able to wrest images of extraordinary beauty—and *El enemigo principal* and *¡Fuera de aquí!* contain many images of extraordinary beauty—remains one of the principle testimonies to the essential wisdom of Julio García Espinosa's "For an Imperfect Cinema."

The single greatest distinction between the cinematography in Sanjinés's and Jancsó's films has to do with the compositions they create with the static camera. As we have seen, Sanjinés considers the rules guiding composition derived from the western painterly tradition an importation or imposition grounded in notions of individuality and private property. When Sanjinés pauses in the midst of a series of camera movements, the compositions he creates are far less formal than Jancsó's. With Jancsó the movements seem haphazard and the resulting compositions refined, and with Sanjinés the nearly opposite prevails. His primary concern is with motivating and executing camera movements. The moments of stasis appear the result of a direct, uncomposed gaze. Sanjinés replaces the privileging of the moments of stasis through composition with what I will call, for lack of a standard term, "composition in motion." In this his work is similar to that of the direct cinema filmmaker, albeit lacking any claims to documentary objectivity. Composition in motion, which he would greatly refine in *La nación clandestina* thanks to video preview and slightly less crude working conditions, becomes a strategy for undermining the compositional rules that largely define beauty in the bourgeois cinema. It is worth pointing out here that *Még kér a nép*, for all of the extreme

stylization of its narrative, is not shot in a widescreen format like Jancsó's earlier films and the compositions are much less formal.

For Jancsó, the barren Hungarian plain provides an empty expanse into which he selectively reintroduces elements of his minimal *mise-en-scène*. The objects he does include, because they appear so isolated, take on an elementary symbolic value. According to Yvette Biro, who collaborated with Jancsó on six features in the 1960s, although his films are about historical events, they are clearly set in the present.[40] She writes that Jancsó strives to give his narratives a timeless appearance. "This is why uniforms, nudity, and folklore play such a large part in the spectacle…Here, if the decors, landscape, human faces and clothing bear the marks of time, it is not in their outward form; they are not tied down to the single represented moment."[41] Through a mix of historical detail and anachronism "two temporal planes are projected one onto another, mingling past and present."[42] What Biro describes here is a different approach than Godard's to countering the multiple visual plains of deep focus photography and its ideological implications, an image with restricted visual planes that represents overlapping temporal planes. "Thus in the degree to which Jancsó reduces the distance between the historical and the actual, in the national and the universal, the time dimension itself assumes a more general meaning, not only in the sense that two temporal planes are projected one on another, but also on the philosophical plane."[43]

El coraje del pueblo begins with a recreation of the Catavi massacre in 1942, in which more than 150 protesting miners demanding larger food rations were machine gunned down by the Bolivian army. Among the victims was María Barzola, who bravely and eloquently defied the army and the mining barons who used it. The plain upon which the massacre took place is referred to by her name in popular memory to this day, and it was on this very plain that Sanjinés mounted his recreation. The participants in the recreation were survivors of the 1967 *La noche de San Juan* massacre.[44] Thus he links these two historical periods, and, by invoking María Barzola, further links her to Domitila

Chungara, director of the *Comité de Amas de Casa* in the Siglo XX mine, whom we see in one of the next scenes arguing with the managers of the company store that the rations must be increased. The overlapping of temporal planes in *El coraje del pueblo* are embodied in both the landscapes and the figures that populate it. As in so many Jancsó films of the 1960s, this present is referred to the past through the simple use of historical military uniforms and weaponry.

Conflicting or overlapping temporalities had been a characteristic of Sanjinés's cinema from the start. *Revolución* evoked 1952 while documenting the miserable present of the early 1960s, starkly illustrating the historical revolution's failed promise. *Ukamau* contrasts the ritualized, season-based time of the Andrés Mayta and the other indigenous inhabitants of the *Isla del sol* with the more westernized commercial time of Copacabana, represented in the figure of the *mestizo* trader, Rosendo Ramos. *Yawar Mallku*, besides mixing past and present with flashbacks, literally dramatizes the incommensurability of indigenous and western time through Sixto's quest for blood, especially when he is kept waiting at a reception for the foreign medical advisors.

When Sanjinés returned to fiction filmmaking in 1987, after having written "El plano secuencia integral," he was becoming increasingly preoccupied with the question of how to represent the Aymara sense of time in cinema than the collective. In key ways his subsequent film, *La nación clandestina*, seems to be a retreat from his positions of the 1970s, but it is more accurate to see these more formally and politically radical films from the mid-1970s as necessary forerunners to this later work in that through them Sanjinés was able to deepen his contact with and understanding of his audience while simultaneously stripping down his practice, enabling him to reconstruct from the bottom up a form that would be of maximum utility and communicative power to his audience. His rejection of the individual protagonist had never been absolute, after all, as evidenced by this passage from "Problems of Form and Content in Revolutionary Cinema": "Popular cinema, in which the fundamental protagonist will be the people, will develop

individual histories when these have meaning for the collective, when these serve the people's understanding, rather than that of one individual, and when they are integrated into the history of the collective as a whole."[45]

Sebastian is an Aymara Everyman, as indicated by his common surname, Mamani. He represents all of the rootless transplants in the city who have sacrificed the fundamental values of their people in exchange for survival, or at best, the allures of consumer society. At several moments in the film the camera moves away from action set in the past to Sebastian in the present looking on at these events. The dialectical tension within a single shot created by having Sebastian regard his previously integrated self is resolved at the end with his death and reappearance as, once again, part of the community. The last shot of the film, a tracking shot along Sebastian's funeral procession, begins with his coffin and ends with a close up of Sebastian himself taking up the rear of the line. The sequence shots in *La nación clandestina* are smoother, more complicated, and obviously rehearsed. They appear to be choreographed according to predetermined movements of the characters. But what distinguishes them most from the long takes of the previous two feature films is the way they encompass, at key moments beginning one hour into the film, two temporalities within the same shot. Sanjinés accomplished this by adapting a technique from Theo Angelopoulos's *O thiasos*.

Angelopoulos and Multiple Temporalities

In *O thiasos* there is a remarkable traveling shot in which we see the itinerant players of the title walk through a 1952 election rally and down a train track past some warehouses. They leave the frame and the camera lingers a while before moving back to its starting place. It is no longer 1952 but 1939, and the election banners and flyers are gone, replaced by German flags. Instead of a truck with a loudspeaker playing a candidate's speech we see black motorcycles with sidecars carrying SS officers. There are a few other similar shots in the film, some going backward and some going forward

in time, shots upon which Sanjinés modeled the ones described above from *La nación clandestina*.

Given the positions Sanjinés staked out on individualism and auteurism in cinema, his recourse to Angelopoulos might seem even more surprising than his use of techniques form Godard and Jancsó. Few European *auteurs* are so consistently described as having a "personal" style as Angelopoulos. Dan Fainaru gives a fairly typical appraisal of the filmmaker in the introduction to a recent collection of interviews with Angelopoulos. "There are few if any filmmakers in the history of cinema who qualify better for the classic definition of *film auteur*. Every shot in every sequence in every film he has made bears his indelible artistic personality."[46] But Angelopoulos' vaunted reputation as an auteur with a rigorously idiosyncratic style obscures certain basic similarities between him and Sanjinés. First we should note that Sanjinés himself has acknowledged Angelopoulos's influence, something he rarely does.[47] In a roundtable presentation given in 1979, Beatriz Palacios approvingly cites the Portuguese film critic Julio Diamante, who, writing in the French journal *Ecran*, chose *O thiasos*, *El coraje del pueblo*, and Luis Buñuel's *La fantôme de la liberté* (*The Phantom of Liberty*, 1974) as the three most important post-1968 films.[48] So both filmmakers were linked in the minds of at least some critics and their publics. In addition, both Sanjinés and Angelopoulos profess to having been profoundly influenced by Francesco Rosi's *Salvatore Giuliano* (1962), an early European example of politically committed cinema that successfully deploys art cinema's fragmented, modernist narrative strategies and, as such, is a forerunner to both *O thiasos* and *La nación clandestina*.[49]

Like Sanjinés and other New Latin American Cinema filmmakers, Angelopoulos was heavily influenced by Brecht through much of the 1970s. Of *O thiasos* he comments, "What I was trying to achieve is a kind of Brechtian epic."[50] Angelopoulos fled Greece to escape political repression between the location scouting and shooting of the film, and as with Sanjinés's *El coraje del pueblo*, he was only able to make the film

because he concealed the real script from the authorities.[51] Finally, Angelopoulos began making *O thiasos* uncertain as to whether it could ever be shown in Greece; Sanjinés completed *El coraje del pueblo* a matter of days before a 1971 coup, and it was not openly shown in Bolivia until 1979.[52]

There are thematic similarities between Angelopoulos's film and Sanjinés's *La nación clandestina* as well. Both films look back upon traumatic periods of dictatorship and attempt to rescue and reconstruct a national history and identity. In *O thiasos* Angelopoulos presents a history of the left in Greece between 1939 and 1952 that had been erased from the record by a succession of rightwing governments. Sanjinés gives visibility to the indigenous majority of Bolivia whose presence is effaced by the dominant discourse of *meztizaje*.

Having established the similarities between these two filmmakers and their films, I wish to focus on Sanjinés's act of dialectical transculturation, whereby he adapts, rather than imitates, techniques from Angelopoulos. One more remark from Angelopoulos is revealing in this respect: "once you change the frame, it is as if you are telling the audience to look elsewhere."[53] For Angelopoulos the camera movement within the sequence shots performs like analytical montage, directing the spectator's attention and revealing authorial control. The proper motivation of camera movements is something that preoccupies Sanjinés in his writings from the mid-1970s on. He writes, "If within a scene the camera approaches the proximity of a closeup, it is guided by the collective interest which selects that person we look at, and in any case from a distance that would be the maximum proximity a real spectator of the event would take."[54] Movements of the camera, even moving the camera in on a figure until something like a closeup is achieved, must be justified by the "collective interest," a sort of collective version of Pudovkin's "interested observer." With the spontaneous, documentary style cinematography of films like *¡Fuera de aquí!,* following that collective interest only requires a director who is attentive to the cast and able to communicate that interest to the

cinematographer on the fly. With the more elaborately choreographed and rehearsed sequence shots found in *La nación clandestina* this further complicates the filming:

> Otra limitación se presentaba cuando en el desarrollo interno de una escena, después de llegar a detener la cámara en un encuadre adecuado había que desplazarla sin motivación para un acercamiento u otro movimiento, descubriendo ante el espectador la presencia de la misma. Esto violentaba el principio de participación que se apoyaba en la resolución de movimientos casi imperceptibles que interpretan la ansiedad del espectador y su deso de moverse en el interior del cuadro.
>
> (Another limitation presents itself when, in the development of a scene, once the camera has arrived at an adequate framing it must displace itself without motivation in order to make an approach or other movement, discovering before the spectator does the motivation itself. This violates the principle of participation which assists in the resolution of nearly imperceptible movements that interpret the anxiety of the spectator and his or her desire to move within the interior of the frame.)[55]

In order not to violate the principle of participation by getting ahead of the spectator, so to speak, the camera movements in *La nación clandestina* are designed to minimize the appearance of authorial control.[56] The sequence shots in *O thiasos*, by contrast, often seem to drift away from the action, only to rejoin it later at some previously plotted point. This goes well beyond directing the spectator where to look through reframing; more than any other technique in Angelopoulos's film it reveals the controlling hand of the director, a wholly intentional effect. García Espinosa writes of Jancsó that his camera movements deny freedom to the characters, which could be said of Angelopoulos's as well.[57] Along with other techniques like violating classical continuity in matching shots, Angelopoulos, like his contemporary Godard, pursued a reflexive cinema that revealed its own constructedness. Such reflexivity did not lessen the beauty of Angelopoulos's film for its contemporary audience—in fact if anything it heightened it—but for Sanjinés's indigenous Bolivian audience that same reflexivity, predicated as it is on revealing the controlling presence of an individual auteur, would lack aesthetic coherence and therefore detract from the film's oft commented upon beauty.

Near the end of "El plano secuencia integral," Sanjinés discusses how a sequence shot can be used to violate ordinary spatial and temporal relations. The example he gives describes the majority of such sequences in *La nación clandestina*. A shot begins with the subjective point of view of a person who remembers something; through a change in the camera's position, the shot becomes a description of that memory. Then he adds another possibility. A group of people arrive who have nothing to do with the memory, and the camera adopts their point of view, erasing all trace of the remembered scene. What began as a shot representing an individual's subjective point of view now encompasses a collective one. To Angelopoulos's multiple temporalities Sanjinés has added another vector, multiple subjectivities. He achieves this using a new form of the "impossible perspective" I described in my analysis of *Yawar Mallku* in the introduction to this chapter. In *Yawar Mallku* Sanjinés inserted shots of ambiguous perspective in sequences constructed around characters's points of view in order to inhibit identification with an individual. In the later films he breaks the spectator's identification of a shot with one or more characters's subjective point of view using camera movement and without montage. For *La nación clandestina* Sanjinés uses a crane to shift from one subjective vision to another; the camera rises up above the group or individual, keeping horizontal to the ground. It pauses in the air above the characters, assuming an impossible perspective, just long enough for the first identification to fade. Afterwards it drops back down just behind an individual or group whose subjective point of view it subsequently adopts.

Before concluding I wish to consider two specific dialectical relationships running throughout his films and writings that Sanjinés works to resolve in *La nación clandestina* and how they might prove a resource for contemporary European art cinema. The first is the dialectic form/content, especially, as we have seen above, where Sanjinés equates form with aesthetic coherency, i.e. beauty, and content with analysis. Gutiérrez Alea poses a similar problem in the chapter of *La dialéctica del espectador* in which he

attempts to reconcile Eisenstein and Brecht. He quotes the essay "The Structure of the Film," in which Eisenstein argues that pathos in art forces the spectator to go "out of himself."[58] How, Gutiérrez Alea asks, can this passionate detachment from the self be reconciled with the prerequisite for contemplation as defined by Brecht, distanciation? He goes on to argue that distanciation is better described as a dealienation in that its purpose is to reorient the spectators, ultimately bringing them closer to their reality.[59] Thus he sublimates the moving away from the self proper in pathos and the counterintuitive movement toward the true self that comes with distanciation by considering them as two moments of the same dialectical process, one of simultaneous alienation (pathos) and dealienation (distanciation). In *La nación clandestina* this dialectic described by Gutiérrez Alea plays out thematically in a very literal manner, with Sebastian literally going outside of himself at times so that he can approach the true reality from which he is estranged. To communicate the content, the internal decolonization of an indigenous subject and his reclaiming of his culture, the form of the film had to be consonant with the specifically Andean aesthetics and cosmovision. The flashbacks are legible to his audience in *La nación clandestina*, while they failed to communicate in *Yawar Mallku*, because they are carefully structured in accordance with the Aymara's cyclical, circular conception of time.[60] The sequence shots with multiple temporalities adapted from Angelopoulos's film function similarly, in that they give narrative form to the Aymara belief in the layered, or overlapping and interpenetrating, nature of past, present, and future time. According to Sanjinés, the Aymara believe that the past remains permanently and that the future, rather than being ahead of one, can be behind. Sanjinés writes, "The Aymara believe that to go forward one must look behind, one must contemplate and reflect on the past, but at the moment it is incorporated into the present it is converted into the future."[61] Like Benjamin's Angel of History in "On the Concept of History," Sebastian advances while looking behind himself at the onrushing catastrophe that threatens his annihilation, the deracinating force of colonialism.

Conclusion

The motion picture camera unites two key technologies that facilitated the standardization of western perception of vision and time, the lens ground according to the principles of Renaissance perspective and the clockwork mechanism. Since the apparatus could not be altered, Sanjinés turned to film language as a way of forcing the medium to be capable of representing the indigenous Andean non-western collective subjectivity and its unique sense of time, its cosmovision. The sequence shot paradoxically became his primary means for doing this. Sequence shots are conventionally assumed to preserve temporal and spatial relations. In particular, they unite cinematic time with "real" time. But that real time is a time already determined by the very clockwork mechanism adapted to the motion picture camera, and if these times correspond, it is because the western notion of time is already embodied in the apparatus. Making cinematic time correspond with a non-western conception of time required creating a flexible cinematic language, one that, responding to the needs of Sanjinés's cinema, could represent multiple temporalities and move seamlessly between collective and individual perspectives. Key to Sanjinés's development of his sequence shot aesthetic was his dialectical transculturation of techniques developed by European filmmakers who were similarly engaged in experimenting with sequence shots and making radical political cinema. From Godard he adapted the non-bourgeois camera style, humanizing its more mechanistic aspects, dialectics within the sequence shot and the dialectical editing of long takes. Jancsó's films of the 1960s provided new methods for representing collectivities, still grounded in the western painterly tradition. Sanjinés took Jancsó's technique to its logical conclusion, creating what I have referred to as "composition in motion" to create a photographic style that turned its back on western composition. From Jancsó, and especially from Angelopoulos, he adapted techniques for representing overlapping planes of time, the persistence of the past in the present.

Notes

[1] From this point on I will follow Sanjinés's lead and use sequence shot to refer to both true sequence shots and long takes. On the confusion between the two terms, see Raymond Durgnat, "The Long Take in *Voyage to Cythera*: Brecht and Marx vs. Bazin and God." *Film Comment* 26. 6 (1990): 43-6.

[2] Although it is impossible to place Sanjinés in specific rooms watching specific films, the works of all three of these filmmakers were widely discussed if not seen in Europe and Latin America during the 1970s. I will do my best to ground my comparisons in analyses of films and written texts. More important than any "direct" influences, however, is my more general assertion that Sanjinés and other New Latin American filmmakers were full participants in contemporary debates about the political aesthetics of film, a debate scholars of the period wrongly center in Europe. By focusing on Godard, Jancsó, and Angelopoulos, I am omitting other European filmmakers of the period doing important work with sequence shots. Among the most conspicuous omissions is Jean Rouch, who will be considered in depth in the next chapter.

[3] Jorge Sanjinés, "El plano sequencia integral," *Cine cubano* no. 125 (1989): 65.

[4] Sanjinés, "El plano secuencia integral," 65. Franz Tamayo is a renowned Bolivian poet and politician from the first half of the twentieth century.

[5] Ibid., 66.

[6] Ibid., 68.

[7] Ibid., 68.

[8] Ibid., 68.

[9] Sanjinés's criticisms of the western pictorial tradition are reminiscent of those of the American experimental filmmaker Stan Brakhage: "Somewhere along the line I realised that something was constricting my sight in this pursuit: which was my training in in this society in renaissance perspective—in that form of seeing we could call 'westward-hoing man's,' which is to try to clutch a landscape or the heavans or whatever. That is a form of sight which is aggressive & which seeks to make of any landscape a piece of real estate." Stan Brakhage, *The Brakhage Scrapbook: Collected Writings* (New Palz: Documentext, 1982), 205-6.

[10] Siegfried Kracauer, *Theory of Film: The Redemption of Physical Reality* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1997), 301.

[11] Ibid., 69.

[12] Ibid., 71.

[13] Paul Willemen, "The Third Cinema Question: Notes and Reflections" in Jim Pines and Paul Willemen, eds. *Questions of Third Cinema* (London: BFI, 1989), 9.

[14] Jorge Sanjinés, "Revolutionary Cinema: The Bolivian Experience," in *Latin American Filmmakers and the Third Cinema*, ed. Zuzana Pick (Ottawa: Carleton University, 1978), 82.

[15] Javier Sanjinés, "Transculturación y subalternidad en el cine boliviano," *Objeto Visual* 10 2004), 14ff.

[16] Fernando Ortiz, *Contrapunteo cubano del tabaco y del azúcar* (Havana: Jesús Montero, 1940). Published in English as Fernando Ortiz, *Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar*, trans. Harriet de Onís (New York: Knopf, 1947). Ángel Rama, *Transculturación narrativa en América Latina* (Mexico: Siglo XXI, 1982). Ángel Rama, *La ciudad letrada* (Hanover: Ediciones del Norte, 1984). Published in English as Ángel Rama, *The Lettered City*, trans. John Charles Chasteen (Durham: Duke UP, 1996).

[17] John Beverly, *Subalternity and Representation* (Durham: Duke UP, 1999), 41-64.

[18] Ibid., 43.

[19] Ibid., 54.

[20] Javier Sanjinés, "Transculturación y subalternidad," 26, (translation mine).

[21] Sanjinés, "El plano secuencia integral," 66.

[22] Michael Shedlin, "Case Study vs. Process Study: Two Films Made For Italian Television," *Film Quarterly* 27.3 (1974): 27. A Spanish monograph devoted to the *Groupe Dziga Vertov* appeared in 1976. See Ramón Font, ed. *Jean-Luc Godard y el Grupo Dziga Vertov: Un nuevo cine politico* (Barcelona: Editorial Anagrama, 1976).

[23] Brian Henderson, "Toward a Non-Bourgeois Camera Style," in Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen, eds. *Film Theory and Criticism* 6th ed. (New York: Oxford UP, 2004), 54-64.

[24] Ibid., 55.

[25] Beginning with *La nación clandestina* Sanjinés begins to use cranes extensively. These shots include moments of impossible perspective, like the inserts of the figures carrying stretchers in the sequence from *Yawar Mallku* described above. As we shall see, these moments of impossible perspective break the identification of the camera with one person or one group's subjective view, allowing it to take up another within a single shot.

[26] Henderson, "Toward a Non-Bourgeois Camera Style," 57.

[27] Ethnographic filmmaker David MacDougall shares this view. "Longer takes, which create sequential chains and cloisterings of meanings, also undermine these very meanings by leaving the viewer more time to ignore or challenge them." David MacDougall, "When Less is Less: The Long Take in Documentary" in Brian Henderson and Ann Martin, eds. *Film Quarterly: Forty Years—A Selection* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 292.

[28] Brian Henderson, "The Long Take," in Bill Nichols, ed. *Movies and Methods* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), 1.318.

[29] Ibid., 1.319.

[30] John O'Hara, "Miklos Jancso=Circles and Plains," *Cinema Papers* (Jun-Jul 1976): 26.

[31] Graham Petrie, *Red Psalm o Még kér a nép* (Wiltshire: Flick Books, 1998), 46.

[32] Yvette Biro, "Landscape During Battle," *Millenium Film Journal* nos. 4/5 (1979): 118.

[33] Petrie, *Red Psalm o Még kér a nép*, 21.

[34] David Bordwell, "Classical Hollywood Cinema: Narrational Principals and Procedures," in Philip Rosen, ed. *Narrative, Apparatus, Ideology* (New York: Columbia UP, 1986), 24.

[35] This incident is in Sanjinés's source for the film. See Héctor Béhar, *Peru 1965: Notes on a Guerilla Experience* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1970), 93-5.

[36] In *Még kér a nép* a significant number of the shots end with one figure framed and looking directly at the camera. In *El enemigo principal* the onscreen narrator occaisionally appears in a space recently vacated by the characters to address the camera directly, a similar strategy for ending a scene.

[37] Petrie, *Red Psalm Még kér a nép*, 30.

[38] Jorge Sanjinés, interview by the author, La Paz, Bolivia, 21 April 2008.

[39] Sanjinés, "El plano sequencia integral," 66.

[40] Birro, "Landscape During Battle," 119.

[41] Ibid., 120.

[42] Ibid., 120.

[43] Ibid., 120.

[44] On the opening of the film see Alfonso Gumucio Dagron, *Historia del cine en Bolivia* (La Paz: Editorial los Amigos del Libro, 1982), 234. On María Barzola and the 1942 Catavi massacre see June C. Nash, *We Eat the Mines and They Eat Us: Dependency and Exploitation in Bolivian Tin Mines* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 41-2.

[45] Sanjinés, "Problems of Form," 63.

[46] Dan Fainaru, *Theo Angelopoulos: Interviews* (Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2001), vii.

[47] José Sánchez-H., *The Art and Politics of Bolivian Cinema* (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 1999), 77.

[48] Beatriz Palacios, "A proposito de una ponencia sobre el cine boliviano," in Carlos D. Mesa G., *Cine boliviano: Del realizador al critico* (La Paz: Editorial Gisbert, 1979), 134.

[49] Ibid., 77 and Raymond Durgnat, "The Long Take in *Voyage to Cythera*: Brecht and Marx vs. Bazin and God," *Film Comment* 26.6 (1990), 44.

[50] Fainaru, *Theo Angelopoulos*, 18. Compare this comment with Rocha's "goal of epic-didactic cinema," in Rocha, "The Tricontinental Filmmaker," 80.

[51] Andrew Horton, *The Films of Theo Angelopoulos: A Cinema of Contemplation* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1997), 121.

[52] Fainaru, *Theo Angelopoulos*, 16.

[53] Ibid., 22.

[54] Sanjinés, "Sobre ¡Fuera de aquí!," *Cine Cubano* 93 (1979): 129, (translation mine).

[55] Sanjinés, "El plano secuencia integral," 68-9, (translation mine).

[56] See Sanjinés detailed diagrams of camera movements from the film in *El cine de Jorge Sanjinés*, ed. El Festival Interamericano de Cine de Santa Cruz (Santa Cruz: FEDAM, 1999), 55-62.

[57] Julio García Espinosa, *Una imagen recorre el mundo*, Documentos de la Filmoteca no. 4 (Mexico: Filmoteca de la UNAM, 1982), 153.

[58] Sergei Eisenstein, *Film Form* (San Diego: Harvest, 1977), 166.

[59] Gutiérrez-Alea, *Dialéctica del espectador*, 70.

[60] Jorge Sanjinés, *La nación clandestina* (Grupo Ukamau, La Paz, 1990, photocopy) n.p.

[61] Ibid., (translation mine)

CHAPTER 5: SANJINÉS, PASOLINI, ROUCH

> Between 1961 and 1975 something essential has changed: we have experienced a genocide. A population has been culturally destroyed […T]he young—deprived of their values and models—as of their blood—have become larval casts of another way and conception of being: the petit-bourgeois one.
>
> Pier Paolo Pasolini, "*Accattone* Today"

> I gave them [Sorko fishermen in Niger] my PhD thesis and the books I had written about their culture, but they had no use for them. If only you can go back to a people with a screen, a projector and an electric generator, you have your passport to them.
>
> Jean Rouch, "Our Totemic Ancestors and Crazed Masters"

Introduction

Pasolini and Rouch took opposing stands on the sequence shot. The former, in his essay "Observations on the Sequence Shot," condemns it as bourgeois because of the naturalistic manner in which it is commonly used and because it appears to privilege an individual subjectivity. Rouch, on the other hand, believing his filming of a ten-minute sequence shot precipitated a trance in the subject of one of his ethnographic films, used them almost exclusively from 1971 onward. In keeping with his roots in Surrealism, Rouch advocated the use of spontaneous sequence shots for their aleatory nature and their ability to provoke a *ciné-transe* in the filmmaker which in turn would catalyze events in the profilmic. Although I will be looking at both filmmakers's theorizing about the sequence shot in relation to Sanjinés's, it is not my principal concern in this chapter. Neither is the more obvious similarity between Pasolini and Rouch, their both having made films in the Third World, although this too will inform my argument. Instead I intend to explore the reciprocal nature of European and Latin American film theory and practice during the 1960s-1970s by reading Pasolini using Sanjinés and Sanjinés using Rouch. I argued earlier that the disjuncture between film theory in Europe and Latin America during the period, to the extent it really existed, resulted from Latin American

theorists's rejection of theory based in semiotics and poststructuralism. Pasolini, by contrast, labored with only modest success to have his theorizing taken seriously by the proponents of a scientific semiotics of film. As a result, neither its most innovative qualities nor its points of convergence with New Latin American Cinema theory were immediately apparent. After reviewing the original reception and recent reevaluations of Pasolini's theoretical writings on cinema, I focus on his efforts to theorize a non-bourgeois, collective cinematic language. His theoretical writings arrived at a dead end in this regard, but it continued to be a concern of his, and it was only with his much-maligned *Trilogy of Life* in the early to mid-1970s that Pasolini achieved a non-bourgeois form of "free indirect subjectivity" in his own work. He did so in much the same way, and for many of the same reasons, Sanjinés did at the same time. Sanjinés was the apotheosis of the scandalous, heretical ideas that, in retrospect, appear to be Pasolini's most enduring contribution to film theory.

Pasolini engaged in sectarian battles on the left during the 1960s-1970s with relish, a fact that partially accounts for his marginal status until recently in Anglophone film studies. Rouch did not, and thus escaped detection as a political filmmaker, at least until recently. The idea that Rouch was not making political films was abetted by his primary, though far from exclusive, association with ethnographic film. In the period under consideration, anthropologists denied the political intentions and ramifications of ethnographic films in order to defend the discipline's claims to scientific objectivity, and film critics too willingly bought these claims, refusing to read ethnographic films politically. The ensuing feedback loop effectively kept Rouch from being associated with New Latin American Cinema, despite the remarkable similarities between his politics and film practice, and those of Third Cinema generally. A corollary to the question, "Why does Rouch not figure in the histories of Third Cinema?" is, "Why do Third Cinema films not figure in the histories of ethnographic film?" Many are, after all, every bit as much what Jay Ruby calls "anthropologically-intended films" as others in the

canon. Recent challenges to the notion of the anthropologist as transcendental observer have exposed the enduring inheritance of colonialism manifested in the discipline's pretensions to scientific objectivity. This inheritance had led anthropologists to deny the political in their work and made anthropological readings of Third Cinema objectionable to its theorists and practitioners. Rouch, with his dialectical cinema of provocation, is a key figure in these challenges. Given that using cinema to communicate with non-western subjects, and, even more so, using cinema to communicate the non-western subjectivity of these same subjects, are inherently political acts, I argue that anthropological knowledge is useful in understanding these processes. Sanjinés's theory is, after all, founded upon a certain set of anthropological hypotheses concerning the Andean cosmovision.

Pasolini

Near the beginning of Pier Paolo Pasolini's *Il Decameron* (*The Decameron*, 1971), there is a scene of a busy market in Naples. An old man, squatting on his haunches, is reading from a large ornate book that turns out to be Giovanni Boccaccio's *Decameron*. A large crowd is assembled around him, listening. After struggling a few moments with the author's highly Latinate language, the old man slams the book shut and announces to the crowd that he is going to tell the story "*alla napolitano*," i.e. in Neapolitan dialect. Gesticulating vigorously, he precedes to relate Boccaccio's tale of the abbess who, when called from her quarters early in the morning, places the pants belonging to the priest with whom she has spent the night on her head, mistaking it for her wimple. As the storytelling continues, we see Ser Ciappelletto, the homosexual thief whose story provides the frame for the first part of the film, pick some mens's pockets and then use his gains to attempt to seduce young men. Recent readings of this film consider this sequence essential for understanding the politics of Pasolini's *Trilogy of Life*.[1] In this brief sequence we find in distilled form many of the concerns that

motivated Pasolini's theoretical and polemical writings: economic, linguistic, and representational homogenization, the dangers of passive consumption and spectatorship, the revolutionary potential of "precapitalist" peoples's storytelling, and, above all, how to incorporate the voices of the marginalized in a work of art.

At the time of the *Trilogy's* release, though, such readings would have been ridiculed in Anglophone film studies, as were Pasolini's assertions that the films were neither escapist fantasies nor opportunistic pornography, but rather a return to politically engaged cinema. *Il Decameron* appeared after Pasolini had produced a series of what he referred to as "unpopular" or even "aristocratic" films, including *Edipo Re* (*Oedipus Rex*, 1967) *Medea* (1969) and *Porcile* (*Pigpen*, 1969), films which, to varying degrees, were quasi-anthropological reconstructions of the ancient or medieval past. Having denounced the student radicals of 1968 as spoiled children of the bourgeoisie in a widely read poem and in a series of newspaper articles, Pasolini's relations with the New Left in Italy were strained at best. The left denounced the "unpopular" films as abandoning political reality at a crucial moment by retreating into an archaic past. *Il Decameron* seemed like more of the same, but with a populist twist. This time the stories were amusing and briskly paced, and the unprecedented nudity guaranteed the kind of public controversy that would attract a potentially large audience. By 1975, the year of his death, Pasolini had become one of Italy's top-grossing filmmakers, thanks to the *Trilogy*, which only served to confirm his critics's belief that he had sold out.

By the time of his death, Pasolini's films and writings had come to have great resonance in western Europe, especially in West Germany, where his critiques of consumer culture gave new impetus to a left that found itself temporarily disoriented.[2] But this had not always been the case. As a film theorist and political thinker, Pasolini continued to be a marginal figure in Britain and the U.S. until the late 1980s, when his writings on cinema were finally translated into English. If there was some debate in western film studies during the 1960s and 1970s as to the political merit of his films,

there was universal agreement that his efforts at constructing film theory were amateurish and suffused with a naïve realism. He first read many of his essays on cinema at Pesaro festivals during the first half of the 1960s, while the festival was still devoted to semiotic debates and before it became dominated by Latin American cinema. From the start his essays were dismissed as lacking scientific rigor and tending dangerously towards a naïvely ontological realism. As he read one paper on the "semiology of reality" at the 1966 Pesaro festival, theorists A. J. Greimas and Christian Metz attempted to portray Pasolini as being hopelessly behind the times in his analysis by circulating among the listeners a list of past efforts to examine visual and gestural codes.[3] In an essay titled "The Semiological Heresy of Pier Paolo Pasolini," Antonio Costa flatly states, "Pasolini's theoretical writings are of little or no use for the development of a scientific semiology of the cinema, nor for film theory and/or criticism."[4] Costa's dismissal was translated and reprinted in the first English-language collection of essays on Pasolini, in which it is the only piece dedicated to his body of theoretical work. Elsewhere, in the preface to this volume, editor Paul Willemen writes, "Pasolini had lapsed into an ultra-reactionary form of right-wing anarchism." His "wish to find solace in a myth of pre-historic, silent, innocent state of grace, as manifested through the films and writings of Pasolini, are themselves well known ideological phenomena: it is a widespread and well documented panic reaction of some factions of the petty bourgeoisie in the face of the class struggle."[5] G. Nowell-Smith, in a more generous appraisal, still describes Pasolini as making "a firm positive insistence on the single shot as the unit of reality with which cinema operates," essentially an accusation that he has succumbed to the "ontological fallacy," a claim that persists to this day among Pasolini's less perceptive readers.[6] In his introduction to a book-length collection of interviews first published in Britain in 1969, interviewer and editor Oswald Stack notes, "If there is one constant, one invariant, it is Pasolini's uncritical attachment to the peasantry, an attachment which can be presented in

the light of marxism, but more consistently in the light of a backward-looking romantic."[7]

Given that, in English-language publications of the 1970s, Pasolini was characterized as an undisciplined theorist, an advocate of naïve, ontological realism in cinema, and a romanticizer of the peasantry, it is little wonder that he remained for some years a marginal figure in Anglophone film studies.[8] I point out these criticisms not merely to refute them as the misunderstandings and willful distortions of Pasolini's thought I take them to be—to a large extent this work has already been done by the scholars whose work I reference below. More important to this study is the effect that the 1970s reception of Pasolini's films and theory among leftist film critics had; namely, that it excluded him from the ranks of Europe's militant political filmmakers and obscured the affinities between his work and that of Third World practitioners of revolutionary cinema. The three charges against Pasolini listed above could have been leveled against Jorge Sanjinés as well. That they were not has more to do with the European and American politics of Third World liberation than anything else. Although they both came from middle class backgrounds, as a Bolivian, Sanjinés enjoyed an inherited prestige among European radicals that Pasolini lacked. In the same way that the end of the debates about a "scientific semiology" of the cinema allowed for what was innovative in Pasolini's film theory to be correctly apprehended for the first time, so too has the end of the Cold War and the accompanying politics of Third World liberation made possible a reevaluation of the theories of Sanjinés. These reevaluations follow parallel courses. Put simply, while Pasolini was purportedly discussing semiotics, he was in reality reconceptualizing cinematic subjectivity. Likewise, while theorizing cinema's role in revolutionary struggles, Sanjinés was also engaged, often below the surface of the text, in similar questions of subjectivity, areas of his thought that he foregrounded in the late-1980s essays such as "El plano secuencia integral." In the remainder of this section, I will briefly review the reappraisal of Pasolini's work as well as certain stylistic traits he

shared with Sanjinés. Then, I will examine Pasolini's theory for its relevance to Sanjinés's own, arguing that Sanjinés's films are the apotheosis of Pasolini's once maligned conceptualization of cinematic free indirect subjectivity.

The rehabilitation of Pasolini the film theorist received much of its impetus from the authority accorded to Gilles Deleuze, who had the audacity to take his writings on cinema seriously in his *L'image-mouvement* (1983) and *L'image-temps* (1985). But before Deleuze there was a significant reappraisal by an American film scholar, Teresa DeLauretis, in 1980. Much of her piece is devoted to reviewing the criticisms of Pasolini in an effort to account for his lack of centrality to film studies, but near the end she makes an incisive case for Pasolini's newfound relevance, sidestepping the semiotic debates to argue that "Pasolini imagines *cinema as the conscious representation of social practice*," which is essentially, she notes, what most independent filmmakers strive to do.[9] Examining Pasolini's statements on the spectator, she finds them to be consonant with then current reconceptualizations of subjectivity:

> The emphasis on the subjective in three of the four terms, 'feelings, affects, passions, ideas,' cannot be construed as an emphasis on the merely 'personal,' that is to say, an individual's existential or idiosyncratic response to the film; on the contrary, it points to the current notion of spectatorship as a site of productive relations, of the engagement of subjectivity in meaning, values and imaging, and therefore suggests that the subjective processes which cinema instigates are 'culturally conscious,' that cinema's binding of fantasy to images institutes, for the spectator, forms of subjectivity which are themselves, unequivocally social.[10]

From DeLauretis's notion of social forms of subjectivity to that of a collective subjectivity is a short move, one that Giuliana Bruno makes some ten years later in 1991, commenting on the same statement by Pasolini, translated a bit differently. "His emphasis on the nexus of 'affects, passions, feelings, and ideas' is not unrelated to a notion of subjectivity, as conceived and practiced by Italian feminism, a notion that acknowledges a collective dimension of subjectivity as shared psychic formation as well as social function."[11] It is hardly surprising that feminist film scholars in the U.S. were

the first to recognize Pasolini's understanding of the role of the affective in active spectatorship and the social, even collective, nature of cinema's subjective processes. Feminist film theory had, after all, with its insistent attention to the suppression of difference, succeeded in demolishing the very idea of the unified subject.

Recent scholarship has recognized the centrality of sexual difference to the understanding of Pasolini's films and theory. In his study of the *Trilogy*, Patrick Rumble notes, "Homosexuality was not an alternative, but an alterity that throughout his life he hesitated to describe—not simply out of some form of denial or self-loathing, as some have suggested (with only partial validity), but out of a refusal to render his diversity as an object of representation or figuration."[12] Similarly, Angelo Restivo has remarked that it was vitally important for Pasolini "to conceive of homosexuality as primarily an *alterity*, not an identity."[13] These arguments serve two purposes. First, they account for Pasolini's refusal to participate in the politics of gay liberation, a stance for which he was criticized by the left during his lifetime. More importantly, though, this reappraisal of Pasolini's attitude toward his homosexuality forces us to rethink his relationship with the Italian peasantry and, in his later films, Third World peoples, which, during the 1970s, were characterized at best as backward-looking romanticism, and, at worst, as exploitative. It places Pasolini in much the same position Latin American filmmakers committed to a popular, revolutionary cinema found themselves. Intellectually and politically, they identified with the oppressed, and yet, being from the educated middle class, they were not of them. At the same time, by virtue of a shared Latin American heritage, they too were the Other to the developed West. Similarly, Pasolini's homosexuality made him Other to the West. Like his Latin American counterparts, he could not claim to be of the people, but his alterity granted him a speaking position alongside them, a position which his class and national origins would otherwise have denied him. Speaking of his love for the peasantry in his mother's native region, where he lived during most of World War II, Pasolini said, "When I realized that Friulan

braccianti [peasants] existed, that their psychology, their education, their mentality, their soul, their sexuality were all different, my world broke down; I could no longer love the bourgeois élite and hate the bourgeoisie; a new feeling emerged, the feeling of taking part from the outside."[14] He includes sexuality in his list of areas in which the Friulan peasant differed from the bourgeois Italian, a comment that seems especially revelatory in retrospect, since Pasolini's letters from the period have been published, revealing the extent to which his attraction to the peasant world and recognition of his own sexual difference were intertwined. Clearly sexual desire subtended Pasolini's love of the peasantry, and one need only watch his films half attentively to confirm this. And yet, rather than use this knowledge to portray Pasolini's political stances as essentially a pose, we might question the extent to which an erotics of the other informs the work of other politically committed filmmakers who, like Pasolini, took part from the outside. Could not something of the same process have been at work in Sanjinés, who, during the height of his engagement in political cinema during the mid-1970s, formed a relationship with Beatriz Palacios, an Aymara Indian, who became his lover, collaborator, and spokesperson for *Ukamau*? In a 1981 special issue of *Cahiers du cinéma* devoted to Pasolini, Glauber Rocha viciously condemns him, writing that his favorite Pasolini film was *Salò, o la 120 giornate di Sodoma* (*Salò, or the 120 Days of Sodom*, 1975), because in that film "he tells the truth; he says, 'There you are, I am perverted, perversion is fascism, I love fascistic rituals.'"[15] He continues, "Pasolini, a communist intellectual, a revolutionary, a moralist, abetted prostitution, that is, he paid poor boys, the 'ragazzi di vita,' for sex. He sought the poor, the ignorant, the illiterate, and he tried to seduce them as if perversion is a virtue."[16] It would be easy to dismiss Rocha's obsession with Pasolini's "perversion"—which he seems unable to name—as merely symptomatic of Latin American *machismo*. This attack may also reveal Rocha's anxieties about his relationship to the marginalized he championed, both politically and sexually; his first film, *Barravento* (1962) contains heroic shots of Afro-Brazilian fishermen, which, like

the shots of peasants in Eisenstein's *¡Que viva Mexico!* that inspired them, are almost eroticized.

For Pasolini, the "bourgeois are those who cannot cope with the presence of scandalous otherness."[17] He noted how in his childhood, images of other social worlds seemed "extraneous, anomalous, disquieting and devoid of truth."[18] It was the discovery of the difference of the Friulan peasantry as well as his own homosexuality, conceived of as a similarly radical alterity, that liberated Pasolini from the determinism of his class origins. Thus his championing of the marginalized defined him as outside bourgeois culture, which, beyond simply denying the scandalous presence of the other, also, he argued, attempted to eradicate it completely. These arguments resonate with statements by Sanjinés and other Latin American revolutionary filmmakers on the need to put oneself through a "cultural decolonization" in order to be of service to the people and their political aspirations. And, as we shall see, Pasolini's theory of free indirect subjectivity resonates in the cinema of Sanjinés as well, but before taking up this topic we should briefly review some of the other affinities uniting these two filmmakers.

As with Jean-Luc Godard, Pasolini does not appear in Sanjinés's theoretical writings from the 1970s. In fact, I have found only one reference to Pasolini in all of Sanjinés's writings and interviews. In a 2003 interview published in the Mexican online film journal *El ojo que piensa*, he includes Pasolini, along with Ingmar Bergman, Satyajit Ray, Francois Truffaut, and Godard, in a list of directors that today's young filmmakers have unfortunately not been formed and nourished by.[19] We can take this list to be a rare statement by Sanjinés on at least some of the filmmakers who inspired him. That Pasolini appears on it is hardly surprising. There is a certain, easily detectable stylistic similarity between Sanjinés's films and Pasolini's, especially his earlier films like *Il vangelo secondo Matteo* (*The Gospel According to St. Matthew*, 1964). Certain handheld shots taken from behind of Ignacio walking on mountainside trails in *Yawar Mallku* recall similar images of Joseph near the beginning of *Il vangelo secondo Matteo*. At the

end of Pasolini's film, during the two trials, the camera bobs and weaves, straining to get a glimpse of the action over the shoulders and between heads from the periphery of a crowd. The same style of shot appears during the *auto da fé* scene in *I riconti di Canterbury*. In each case, Pasolini grounds the restlessly mobile camera in the subjectivity of one character, through the use of reverse shots. Sanjinés uses similar shots in *El enemigo principal*, *¡Fuera de aquí!*, and *La nación clandestina*, but without the reverse shots. Not identified with the subjectivity of a given character, despite their necessarily single optical perspective, they create the impression of a generic, or even collective onlooker, generating, as Sanjinés would describe it, a sense of participation in the interior of the scene. In *Il Decameron* Pasolini does much the same thing during the funeral for Ser Ciappelletto the thief, who is taken to be a saint based on his outlandishly untruthful dying confession. The camera hovers behind, and slightly above the crowd gathered around the dais on which his body is laid. The shot is not assigned to anyone in the room, and even though it is taken from a slightly high angle, that angle seems less intended to create an objective, disembodied perspective than to encompass as many of the people as possible whose collective, worshipful gaze it represents.

There are other clear affinities between the films of these two filmmaker-theorists as well. The rural-urban dialectic found in much of Sanjinés's work is strongly present in Pasolini's as well, especially in *Mamma Roma* (1962), *La ricotta* (1963), and *Uccellachi e Uccellini* (*The Hawks and Sparrows*, 1966). In keeping with his theories of cinema as the written language of gesture, Pasolini considered his primary concern the human body, not the landscapes and spaces in which these bodies moved. He once noted that he never begins a shot with an empty field, that there is always a figure, however small, which he soon approaches, "and behind it, the background—the background, not the landscape."[20] And yet, despite his disparagement of landscape as mere background, some of the most beautiful sequences in his cinema, as with Sanjinés, contain little more than figures in motion across landscapes.

The question of beauty also aligns Sanjinés with Pasolini. According to Naomi Greene, Pasolini found political validation for his commitment to beauty in the thinking of Antonio Gramsci. "Not only did the great political thinker underscore the importance of the peasantry but he also ascribed a revolutionary role to culture and intellectuals. Moreover, he did so without denying—and this must have been crucial for Pasolini—the value of 'beauty' and art."[21] Pasolini's and Sanjinés's insistence on the necessity of beauty in cinema join them together and separate both from their radical political filmmaking contemporaries. As Greene notes of the *Trilogy*, "In the political climate of the early 1970s, Pasolini's repeated insistence on the pleasure of art […] was almost as scandalous—if less spectacular—as the sexual explicitness of the films."[22] As we have seen, Sanjinés aspired to being, like Pasolini, a Gramscian organic intellectual "who stood ready to renounce his traditional 'ivory' tower in favor of 'organic' links with the working class."[23] If Sanjinés had not read Gramsci, he had no doubt imbibed his thought through the works of the Gramscian Bolivian political thinker Rene Zaveleta Mercado, whose work, as we saw in Chapter 2, so profoundly affected his thinking on questions regarding the political role of the peasantry.

Like Sanjinés and most other New Latin American Cinema filmmakers, Pasolini resisted the prevalent "Brechtian" tendency in radical European political cinema towards textual operations completely disrupting the audience's habitual pleasures. If Pasolini claimed to "try to create a language that would place the average person, the average spectator, into crisis in relation to the language of the mass-media," he did not do so without offering new pleasures in place of what he abandoned.[24] Even his most demanding and "aristocratic" films, such as *Porcile*, offer moments of intense visual beauty as well as horror. In the previous chapter, I discussed Colin MacCabe's essay on the "Brechtian" separation of the elements in cinema, in which he argues that by not going far enough in violating cinematic codes in *2 ou 3 choses que je sais d'elle*, Godard was merely creating a nostalgia for them, not a rejection, in the mind of the spectator. On

this point Pasolini held a diametrically opposed view more in line with that of Sanjinés or Tomás Gutiérrez Alea. In "The Unpopular Cinema" Pasolini writes, "Through the subversion of contiguity and similarity of discourse, the author obtains the infraction of the code which makes his message—in the eyes of the addressee—a 'frustrated expectation' […] A filmmaker working today not only knows how to, but wants at all costs to frustrate this expectation," and he locates editing as the place where this is most likely to be achieved.[25] At the same time he cautions, in the beginning of the essay, that "*excessive transgression against the code finishes by creating a sort of nostalgia for it*," a claim he had made earlier in an essay on avant-garde poetry ("What is Neo-Zhdanovism and What Isn't") using all capital letters in that instance, rather than italics, to underscore his point.[26]

Pasolini wrote "The Unpopular Cinema" in 1970, after *Medea*, the last of his "unpopular" films, and before *Il Decameron*. That same year he made *Appunti per un'Oriestiade Africana* (*Notes for an African Orestia*), a notebook of sorts on possible locations for an adaptation of the *Orestia* of Aeschylus he was planning to shoot in Africa that, along with *Edipo Re* and *Medea*, would have completed a trilogy of anthropological adaptations of Greek tragedy. Pasolini wanted to use Aeschylus's plays to explore the birth of modern democracy in postcolonial Africa. In two scenes reminiscent of the ending of Jean Rouch and Edgar Morin's *Chronique d'un été* (*Chronicle of a Summer*, 1960), he screens his rushes to a group of African exchange students at a university in Rome and asks their thoughts on the value of his project. For the most part the students fail to see the relevance of Aeschylus's dramas to the contemporary situation in Africa, noting that they might be more applicable to the 1950s and 1960s, when most of the continent made the transition out of direct colonial rule. In the second encounter with the students, he asks them if they feel their experience as students in Italy, their travel from an archaic, tribal society to a modern democracy, parallels Orestes's journey. Here the students agree, if only politely and tentatively, and Pasolini immediately follows up by

asking them if they can really be so sure, as they seem to be, that everything they are learning in a western university is positive, and what they have left behind in Africa is negative. In his subsequent, highly directive questioning of the students, Pasolini reveals what seems to be the real purpose of his experiment: to determine whether or not there is something in African cultures that allows Africans to oppose their very being to consumerism and resist its corruption.[27]

This is a key and seldom remarked upon moment in Pasolini's cinema that permits insight into the radical shift his filmmaking practice would take later that year, with the *Trilogy of Life*. On the one hand, Pasolini is for the first time giving voice to Third World subjects in one of his films—for a filmmaker so driven to control every aspect of his films, his inclusion of the criticisms of his proposed project are remarkable, in some ways more astonishing and daring than Rouch and Morin's. On the other, they clearly delineate the limits of Pasolini's idea of creating a pastiche of the ancient and the modern by adapting classical texts in contemporary settings. In one section of the film Pasolini edits together newsreel footage from the Biafra war. His narration insists that these "seemingly up to date images" could represent the burning of Troy in his proposed *Orestia*. The problem is that the images are not just seemingly up to date; they are vividly actual and immediately recognizable as such. Despite their having, as Pasolini insists all documentary images do, "style without style," or perhaps because of this very quality, these images resist being transposed into allegory. Pasolini fails to reveal the ancient world subtending these images; in Benjaminian terms, he fails to reveal them as the dialectical images they may or may not be. Similarly, based on the response of the students, the project as a whole seems destined to fail to achieve the "profoundly popular, folk epic" qualities Pasolini insists from the start must characterize the film.

The experience of *Appunti per un'Oriestiade Africana* seems to have provoked Pasolini to retreat from any attempt to take as his subject the contemporary world; his remaining four films would all be set in historical periods. To his contemporary critics

on the left, this marked the fulfillment of the reactionary tendencies they had perceived in his earlier films and the end of Pasolini's relevance to political cinema. In a statement included in the press packet for *Il fiore delle mille e una notte*, Pasolini writes, "The next film will be more frankly and explicitly ideological. But perhaps it will never be so frankly and radically ideological as my last three films…especially *The Thousand and One Nights*."[28] This sort of statement was scarcely taken seriously at the time. Critics like Paul Willemen interpreted it as a desperate provocation on Pasolini's part, an expression of his deep-seated animosity toward the left. It is exactly the kind of scandalous, or heretical statement that, in more recent years, has attracted the attention of scholars like Bruno. With this renewed attention to Pasolini came a reevaluation of the *Trilogy*, most notably in Patrick Rumble's monograph, *Allegories of Contamination: Pier Paolo Pasolini's* *Trilogy of Life*. Like Rumble, I agree with Pasolini that the *Trilogy* is a highly ideological set of texts, and I will demonstrate that these films are essential for understanding how Pasolini used free indirect discourse, the aspect of his theory that, thanks to Deleuze, has received significant attention, and the one most useful in understanding the workings of Sanjinés's own theory and practice.

Key to more recent reevaluations of the later films has been the recognition that Pasolini's move toward explicitly Third World subject matter and locations, beginning in the late 1960s, was more a continuous development than the sudden departure it was seen as at the time. Sam Rohdie, writing in 1995, argues that "the subject of all Pasolini's films was the Third World whether it was the slums and ghettoes of the First World, or the slums and ghettoes of the Third World at the borders of the First World."[29] Angelo Restivo, writing in 2001, notes that the Italian South in which Pasolini set his *Il vangelo secondo Matteo* "needs to be conceived of as a postcolonial space within the nation."[30] Pasolini makes Restivo's point with humor in his *cinéma verité* documentary, *Comizi d'amore* (*Love Meetings*, 1965), when, at the conclusion of an interview with journalist Oriana Fallaci, he asks her opinion of the South. She responds that it is a different world,

and as we hear her speak, Pasolini cuts to a long shot of a man dwarfed by an enormous horse plowing a lunar looking field, practically the only image of rural Italy in the film. If, as Restivo suggests, Pasolini was acutely aware of the Italian South as a modern postcolonial space, it becomes difficult to believe that he really thought, as some critics have argued, that he had found a premodern world in the more unambiguously postcolonial spaces of India and Africa.

Although generally dismissive of Pasolini's Third World films and the *Trilogy*, Rohdie counters the notion that Pasolini retreated into the past. "He was not opposing the old to the new, but rather opposing the contemporary with the new; this new took the form of borrowed and invented or mythical languages."[31] Rohdie is close to truth here, but by characterizing what was "new" in this work as "borrowed" or "mythical," he remains somewhat equivocal on the status of the old or archaic in Pasolini's work. If we substitute "contemporary" and "new" with "dominant" and "residual," in the sense in which Raymond Williams uses these terms, then Rohdie's statement makes the perfect sense it seems to be reaching for. Like Pasolini, Williams argues that contemporary capitalism has extended its reach further into culture than in previous eras. As a result, the creation of oppositional cultural practices has become much more difficult, since emerging oppositional practices can be easily incorporated into the dominant ideology. In such a situation, Williams argues, residual cultural practices are the sole remaining counterforce within a capitalist culture continually reinventing by incorporating, and thus neutralizing, the opposition it generates.[32]

When Pasolini says, "I prefer to move in the past now because I believe the past to be the only force that can contest the present," he is speaking of the contestatory power of the residual described by Williams.[33] For Pasolini had a dialectical understanding of the relationship between the past and present. Using words remarkably similar to Sanjinés's descriptions of the Andean cosmovision, Rohdie notes that, "A central figuration of all Pasolini's films is the insinuation of the past into present and the present

into past."[34] Just as images of the Biafra war cannot be made to shed their actuality so as to becoming free-floating signifiers attachable to a given historical or mythical war, cinematic images attempting to recreate the past resist divesting themselves of their actuality as well. Though set in the past, the films of the *Trilogy* are also very much about the present, and more specifically, about the residual as the sole remaining counterforce in the present. This manifests itself in two ways: first, in the style of the films, which evoke the past; second, in the largely non-professional performers, who anchor the films in the present through their spontaneous, historically conditioned gestures. The paintings and literary texts Pasolini adapts are key to understanding his revisionist take on the past. Like Brecht and Benjamin, Pasolini uses citation to restore to the past its revolutionary potential in the present, which has been systematically effaced by bourgeois historical accounts. Rohdie comes close to making this argument in an essay on Pasolini and Italian neo-realism, when he writes that "the quotations were all designed to emphasize the primitive reality which for him, by definition, lay outside history and culture, certainly bourgeois history and culture. For Pasolini, the function of that history and culture as he manipulated them was to make one conscious of the real, that is, conscious of what history and culture were not."[35] Again, if we substitute Williams's "residual" for Rohdie's "primitive," we have a fair approximation of Pasolini's method in the *Trilogy*. Rohdie correctly describes reality for Pasolini (as for Brecht and Sanjinés) as that which cannot be represented by bourgeois culture, because it insists that individual subjectivity and experience are a means—even the only means—of accessing it. To get at this reality, Pasolini uses a cinematic form of free indirect discourse, but before describing how it functions in these particular films, it is worth reviewing the figure's place in Pasolini's literary and cinematic theory.

In 1950, Pasolini moved to Rome from the Friulan countryside, where he had spent the duration of World War II in his mother's home village. Economic circumstances forced him to take up residence in the city's slums, and he soon became

fascinated with the people of a neighborhood called the *Borgate*, and especially with their way of speaking. His first two novels, *Ragazzi di vita* (*The Ragazzi*, 1955) and *Una vita violenta* (*A Violent Life*, 1959) were the product of his sociolinguistic researches into the street argot of the *Borgate*. Filled with authentic slang of the Roman lumpenproletariat, the novels became a sensation, and they proved to be Pasolini's ticket into the film industry. He was hired by Federico Fellini and other directors from the waning neo-realist movement to write convincing dialogue for the lower class characters populating their films. Pasolini saw these novels and his early film scripts as a continuation of changes wrought in Italian literature as a result of Resistance. Reflecting the Popular Front politics of the period, writers on the left created a blend of voices in their works, mixing the speech of the bourgeoisie with workers and dialect with standard Italian. As Rohdie explains it, "Before the Resistance, the imitation of the other in literature was purely literary and, in the end, nothing changed. In the Resistance on the other hand—Pasolini claimed—, the blend and shift of voices represented a political intention, and, in part (or so it seemed at first) a political reality."[36] As critics like Leonardo García Pabón have noted, the shift in Sanjinés's work from *Yawar Mallku* to *El enemigo principal*, from a vertical to a horizontal method of production, cannot be fully understood independently from a similar shift in Latin American literature from the liberal works of *indigenista* literature of most of the twentieth century to late twentieth century literature that narrates in the language and from the perspective of its indigenous subjects.[37] This similarity between the literary developments that influenced both Sanjinés and Pasolini is further evidence to support the former's claim that socially, politically, and culturally, the environments from which both Italian neo-realism and New Latin American Cinema emerged were very similar.

Pasolini often professed an ardent disdain for all naturalism, and he claimed that his use of language in the novels went well beyond that of the Italian school of naturalism associated with Giovanni Verga. In his essay "Comments on Free Indirect Discourse,"

he describes Verga's writing as "a naturalist illusion not yet separated from romantic regressions in the speakers, from the romantic myth of the people," which is especially noteworthy in that it anticipates criticisms that would later be made against Pasolini himself.[38] The language of Pasolini's novels would not be an illusion created by the author, but the actual speech of another, different in its content and class origins from that of the author. According to Louis-Georges Schwartz, "For Pasolini, the recognition of difference makes possible an author's freedom with respect to his socioeconomic conditions and the norms of his social type by permitting a radical critique of the author's speaking position."[39] Here Pasolini is addressing a problem familiar to New Latin American Filmmakers, and politically committed filmmakers more generally. Failure on the part of the author to properly acknowledge difference, especially socioeconomic ones, in his or her characters eliminates the possibility of critiquing reality as a construction of the author's own bourgeois class. Worse yet, the mere imitation of difference, rather than the frank recognition and incorporation of it into the text, facilitates the destruction of that difference as it is collapsed into the ever-expanding, powerfully homogenizing forces unleashed by, according to Pasolini, the twin forces of "neocapitalism," his shorthand for American style consumerism, and "Neoitalian," the communicative but inexpressive language of "modernization." In typically polemical fashion, Pasolini writes in "Comments on Free Indirect Discourse":

> Even a noble, elevated bourgeois writer, who doesn't know how to recognize extreme characteristics of psychological diversity of a man whose life experience differs from his, and who, on the contrary, believes that he can make them his by seeking substantial analogies—almost as if experiences other than his own weren't conceivable—performs an act that is the first step toward certain manifestations of the defense of his privileges and even toward racism. In this sense, he is no longer free but belongs to his class deterministically; there is no discontinuity between him and a police chief or an executioner in a concentration camp.[40]

Once the author recognizes difference from bourgeois norms, he or she is also free to conceive of speakers within the text or its auditors as collectivities, defying the bourgeois

individualism that determines the enunciation and reception of most literary texts. Pasolini begins his essay on free indirect discourse with a brief analysis of the infinitival category of the figure, which he illustrates with some lines from the opera *Don Giovanni*: "*To labor* night and day/for someone who doesn't know how to appreciate;/*To bear* rain or wind/*To eat* badly and *to sleep* badly."[41] As Pasolini explains it, in this passage, the infinitives, which he renders in italics, do not "presuppose an addressee but a chorus of addressees—in short, a chorus listening to and recognizing the experiences from which the deduction of the norm is born."[42]

At this point the similarities between Pasolini's concerns in his writings on free indirect discourse and those of the New Latin American Cinema theorists, particularly Sanjinés, should be obvious. Both seek ways to step outside of and critique their class position, address collectivities with their art, and represent alternative subjectivities, and some form of the free indirect discourse seems to fit the bill all around. It is worth pausing here, though, to emphasize that Pasolini's essay on free indirect discourse is specifically about literature, not about film. The problem then becomes, how to create free indirect discourse, or its equivalent, in cinema. Deleuze, in his reading of Pasolini, evades this question entirely.

It would be easy to assume that this question was settled by Pasolini's subsequent and most widely-read essay, at least in Anglophone film studies, "The Cinema of Poetry," in which he again invokes the figure of free indirect discourse to describe a certain tendency he sees emerging in European art cinema of the early 1960s. In this essay Pasolini seeks to answer the question, Is a cinema of poetry possible? Most cinema, Pasolini argues, is cinema of prose. That is, it is the product of channeling cinema's oneiric and irrational qualities into narrow narrative forms. Cinema's inherent expressiveness is sacrificed in order to make it a merely communicative medium, the audiovisual equivalent of Neoitalian. Poetry, as opposed to prose, Pasolini argues, is expressive and requires an active auditor, similar in many ways to the type of spectator

filmmakers inspired by Brecht were trying to create. In "The Written Language of Reality" Pasolini writes, "every poem is translinguistic. It is an *action* 'placed' in a system of symbols, as in a vehicle, which becomes *action* once again in the addressee, while the symbols are nothing more than Pavlovian bells."[43] That Pasolini should rely on free indirect discourse to define a possible cinema of poetry is hardly surprising, given the role he assigns the figure in "Comments on Free Indirect Discourse." "Poetry, as lyricism or expressiveness, is born of the blending in the collision of two, sometimes profoundly different, spirits."[44] Schwartz notes that Deleuze radicalizes Pasolini's theory "until free indirect discourse becomes the motor for the development of language, the wellspring of cinematic subjectivity and a fundamental resource for ethical and political consideration."[45] If we assume, as does Pasolini, that the true development of language is in the direction of greater expressiveness, then Deleuze's interpretation hardly goes beyond Pasolini's own. But again, the question of how free indirect discourse can generate cinematic subjectivity and exactly what kind of political and ethical resource it is, and how can be used, is conspicuously elided.

"The Cinema of Poetry" is one of Pasolini's interventions into debates about scientific semiotics and cinema. He uses the question of whether free indirect discourse is possible in the cinema to approach the question of whether or not a cinema of poetry is possible, and he does this for two reasons: first, because it transposes the question in such a way as to allow him to utilize the vocabularies of semiotics and linguistics to make his point; second, and more importantly, because he had already located the generation of poetic expressiveness in the blending and collision of voices that result from the proper use of the figure. While deploying the trope of free indirect discourse, he simultaneously acknowledges its strict inapplicability to cinema. He argues that the difference generated by the figure is always linguistic, that free indirect discourse is always marked as linguistically different from the language of the author, and he goes on to argue that there

can be no linguistic difference within cinematic language. This argument reprises one he makes more clearly in an earlier essay, "The End of the Avant-Garde":

> The structures of the language of cinema therefore present themselves as transnational and transclassist rather than international or interclassist. *They prefigure a possible sociolinguistic situation of a world made tendentially unitary by complete industrialization and by the consequent leveling which implies the disappearance of particular and national traditions*.[46]

Since there is only one cinematic language, these productive collisions must take place at the level of cinematic style. "Thus, if he immerses himself in his character and tells the story or depicts the world through him, he cannot make use of that formidable instrument of differentiation that is language. *His activity cannot be linguistic; it must instead, be stylistic*." [47] And here Pasolini gives his central examples of the free indirect discourse in cinema, or, as he calls it, free indirect subjectivity, which he draws from Michelangelo Antonioni's *Il deserto rosso* (*Red Desert*, 1964), Bernardo Bertolucci's *Prima della rivoluzione* (*Before the Revolution*, 1964), and from unspecified films by Jean-Luc Godard. In each case the filmmaker is freed to engage in expressive experimentation by his immersion in the perception of a neurotic character. These characters are all, as Pasolini notes of Godard's, "exquisite flowers of the bourgeoisie." To the extent that this tendency within European art cinema restores to cinema some of the poetic expressivity that it has lost, Pasolini sees it as a positive development, but he harbors no illusions about what forces are compelling this shift. "In short, in general terms, the formation of a tradition of a 'language of poetry of film' may be posited as revealing a strong general renewal of formalism as the average, typical production of the cultural development of neocapitalism."[48] In a later piece, "Quips on Cinema," he notes, "Now the 'cinema of poetry' is on the rise once again, a sign that the industry can find a 'second channel' of distribution for the elite."[49] Pasolini's writings on the cinema of poetry are more descriptive than prescriptive; nowhere does he suggest that free indirect subjectivity is susceptible to political applications other than those which logically follow from

"neocapitalism's" structuring of markets. Here Pasolini sounds remarkably like Tomás Gutiérrez Alea, or Sanjinés, who, for all their admiration of European art cinema's aesthetic achievements, remained deeply skeptical of its political value and its ability to become a true popular cinema, i.e. one that expressed the political ambitions of the broad masses rather than the bourgeois elite.

Another thing Pasolini fails or refuses to mention in his writings on the cinema of poetry is how, or even if, he uses free indirect subjectivity in his own films. Given the centrality of free indirect discourse and subjectivity to Pasolini's literary and film theory, it is surprising the limited extent to which Mauricio Viano engages with the figure in his book subtitled *Making Use of Pasolini's Film Theory and Practice*. In the chapter on *Accattone* he describes several shots, such as the first in the film, in which we see a close-up of the cadaverous, nearly toothless, face of a poor man framed by a bouquet of flowers. Viano names these shots, which I, in Chapter 4, referring to Sanjinés's films, referred to as dialectics within the shot, as "dual visions," and he argues that they announce free indirect subjectivity.[50] He immediately qualifies this, though, adding that the use of free indirect subjectivity in the film is ultimately less about seeing the world through the eyes of a character than it is about creating a stamp of authorship and making metacinema.[51] Twenty pages later, in his discussion of *Mamma Roma*, Viano remarks that at this point Pasolini had definitively abandoned the attempt to use free indirect subjectivity.[52]

Christopher Orr's essay on Pasolini's film theory, while highly perceptive regarding his essay "Observations on the Sequence Shot," is less enlightening when it comes to "The Cinema of Poetry." Orr correctly observes that the sequence shot essay sketches out the possibility of a non-bourgeois cinematic style, but he ignores Pasolini's frank admission that the cinema of poetry is a bourgeois form. Borrowing from Gerard Genette, he identifies free indirect subjectivity in Pasolini's cinema as the product of "multiple focalization."[53] By this Orr means a sequence of subjective shots not unified

by more objective establishing shots. He asserts that this tendency of Pasolini's reached its highpoint in *Il vangelo secondo Matteo*, noting that Pasolini's theory and practice makes no allowance for a "focalized" proletarian narrative being recuperated through the very process of identification that multiple focalization can, at least for a time, disrupt.[54]

Pasolini does explore the possibilities of free indirect subjectivity, and indeed, cinematic variants on its collective, "infinitival" form, with the goal of producing a non-bourgeois cinema, but he does not do it in the films made around the time he wrote "A Cinema of Poetry" (1965). These explorations come to fruition in his much-maligned *Trilogy*, although *Porcile* must be seen as an important trial along the way. *Porcile* intercuts two stories, one set in the middle ages, one in the present. In the former, a cannibal (Pierre Clémenti) wanders around the desolate surface of Mount Aetna in an ultimately unsuccessful effort to evade capture by the political and religious authorities, who condemn him to be torn apart by wild animals. In the modern tale, Julius (Jean-Pierre Léaud), the son of a West German industrialist, resists the advances of Ida (Anne Wiazemsky) and her efforts to get him to participate in student protests. Unknown to all but the local peasants and his father's major competitor, Julius can only love the pigs in a nearby sty, and during one of his nocturnal visits, the pigs kill and consume him. Adding to the contrast in temporal settings are the styles of the two stories. The medieval tale, like Pasolini's "unpopular" films, is almost silent. In the modern tale, the self-consciously literary dialogue is nearly constant. The cannibal's tale is shot with the handheld camera preferred by Pasolini after *Il vangelo secondo Matteo*, and the combination of expansive landscape and long lenses create a paradoxical intimacy. The modern section is shot with a stationary camera, and the characters are rigidly blocked to either face the camera or be at a ninety-degree angle. The camera movements are steady and maintain a perfect perpendicularity to the figures. In short, this is Godard's non-bourgeois camera style, as discussed in the previous chapter. This allusion is made obvious by Pasolini's use of Léaud and Wiazemsky, both associated with Godard, the

latter his wife at the time. Pasolini's use of Godard's style is anything but non-bourgeois, though, largely because of the collision created with the film's other style. The tale of the cannibal, who has killed and eaten his father, filmed in a loose, long take (for Pasolini) style, is the more aggressively non-bourgeois part in both content and style. As free indirect discourse, the story of the cannibal sets off the other story, which is told, in an almost parodic fashion, in the language of the author. This language is parodied both in the ornate verbiage of the spoken text as well as in the "cinema of poetry" shooting style, which adopts Godard's method of "immersing" himself in the lives of the "decaying flower of the bourgeoisie." Pasolini reveals what Brian Henderson calls Godard's non-bourgeois camera style to be quintessentially bourgeois, in that it is the perfect stylistic mechanism for dissecting and revealing bourgeois neuroses. But this is not so much a criticism of Godard as it is self-criticism; Pasolini uses the style of the tale of the cannibal as a mark of difference by which he can critique his own speaking position as a bourgeois artist.

Here we return to the scene from *Il Decameron* described at the beginning of this chapter to explore how Pasolini uses spoken language and visual style to explore the possibilities of non-bourgeois (or, more precisely, pre-bourgeois) cinematic free indirect subjectivity. When the old man closes the book on Boccaccio and tells the story of the nun in his native dialect, he returns the story to its origins in an oral culture that predates the standardization of the Italian language, the roots of which can be traced, not coincidentally, to Boccaccio's Tuscan dialect. As Millicent Marcus notes, "By translating Boccaccio's normative latinizing prose into Neopolitan street talk, Pasolini is challenging the Tuscan-centricity of the Italian language and thereby criticizing Tuscany's dominance over the entire culture since the time of Boccaccio."[55] As we have seen, Pasolini made little distinction between linguistic homogenization and capitalist domination, two processes he saw as working in tandem, and whose beginnings, in the

Italian context, can both be traced to the same time and place, 14th century Florence. Therefore, to critique one is to critique the other.

By wresting these stories from the bourgeois tradition, Pasolini attempts to restore, or at least recreate, their origins in acts of collective storytelling. As Patrick Rumble writes of the same scene in *Il Decameron*:

> Pasolini attempts to re-create the collective reception of stories (a form of reception analogous to that presumed by the very texts he adapts), and to constitute a community of spectators and bring them, through the narrative experience, to an understanding of the process involved in the building and maintenance of hegemony—be it the current one, or, to recall Giorgio Agamben's utopian concept, a "coming community."[56]

Rumble's invocation of Agamben's "coming community" is reminiscent of Deleuze's assertion, in his discussion of Pasolini and free indirect subjectivity, that, "because the people are missing, the author is in a situation of producing utterances which are already collective, which are like the seeds of people to come."[57] The people are missing from Pasolini's film, in the sense that they do not exist as a constituted and identifiable political collectivity. And yet, they are not wholly absent. Pasolini's "retreat into the past" is peopled with subjects from the present, whose voices and gestures he uses to retell the tales retold by Boccaccio. This is not an act of collective storytelling—Pasolini maintains too much control for this to happen—but it does, as Rumble suggests, demonstrate the process of building hegemony, which is intricately involved with storytelling. Deleuze calls storytelling a speech-act that produces collective utterances, which is in accord with Pasolini's insistence on the gestural, or active nature of speech. By locating his film in the past, though, Pasolini expresses the revolutionary potential of the speech-act, while simultaneously distancing the spectator from it. In *Il Decameron*, storytelling as a speech act is recreated, not created, by the performers in the film. As Deleuze writes, "The speech act must create itself as a foreign language in a dominant language, precisely in order to express an impossibility of living under domination."[58] The performers in the film are limited to speaking a foreign language within a dominant

one (Neopolitan, both in its linguistic and gestural forms), but Pasolini reserves for himself the creation of a cinematic language within the dominant one, which, as we have seen, he insists can only be done at the level of style. But we need to look at another of Pasolini's efforts to depict collective creation in the film before moving on to an analysis of the visual style, the film's most radical and ideological component.

The frame story for the second half of *Il Decameron* is a relatively minor tale from the book about the painter Giotto. In the film, the character becomes one of Giotto's acolytes and is played by Pasolini himself. Several elements besides Pasolini's presence make these sequences self-reflexive metacinema: the painter and his assistants are hired to paint a fresco on a church wall in a whitewashed space with roughly the same aspect ratio as a motion picture screen; and in one sequence we see Pasolini "scouting" for faces in a busy market, framing between his fingers individuals who appear in the next tale. Significant screen time is devoted to the creation of the fresco, emphasizing the collective, only semi-hierarchical nature of the work. Although the painter eats with the priests apart from his assistants, he slurps his food quickly so as to return to work, and during the dream sequence, we see that they all sleep in the same room. According to Marcus, the fresco painting sequences represent a "Pasolinian utopia," in that they demonstrate a "collective, working-class ethos, untainted by notions of property, family prestige, or personal honor."[59] It is a utopian depiction, but we need not assume, simply because Pasolini himself is the protagonist, that it represents a personal utopia. This image of collective production, after all, flies in the face of Pasolini's own accounts of his working method, which have often been criticized as almost pathologically insistent on individual authorship. For instance, Pasolini once said, "As for my own films, I never conceived of making a film which would be the work of a group. I've always thought of a film as the work of an author, not only the choice of sets and locations, the characters, even the clothes, I choose everything—not to mention the music."[60] From the mid-1960s on, Pasolini even insisted on operating the camera himself. Again, the subject

matter of *Il Decameron* is collective storytelling and creation, but it is not an act of collective storytelling. Pasolini locates this collective potential in the precapitalist past and uses it to implicitly critique his speaking position, but as much as he holds it up as an ideal, he does not pretend to deny his own status as and affinity towards being a profoundly bourgeois and individualistic artist.

The story of Giotto's pupil, besides giving Pasolini the opportunity to comment upon collective creation, hints at the visual strategies of the film as well, which challenge dominant cinematic language in the same way the use of Neopolitan does standard Italian. Giotto's pupil's dream, as well as the fresco he paints, allow Pasolini to return to a theme he had first explored in *La ricotta* and *Il vangelo secondo Matteo*, the use of *tableaus vivants* based on early Renaissance paintings. As Rumble notes, for Pontormo and Rosso Fiorentino, the two painters whose work Pasolini recreates in *La ricotta*, linear perspective was only one system among many that they used for representing spatial relations in their paintings. He goes on, "It is indeed remarkable that during the same period that experienced the growing hegemony of Tuscan as the peninsula's standard language, there was an analogous attempt to hegemonize what we could call the Tuscan conventions of spatial organization."[61] We can add a third element to the hegemonizing force of the capitalism-language dyad extending from 14th century Tuscany, Renaissance perspective, which, six centuries later, the apparatus theorists would argue made cinema complicit in the formation of capitalist subjects. According to Rumble, Roberto Longhi, the Italian art historian who was Pasolini's teacher when he attended the university in Bologna, theorized that Giotto, like Pontormo, saw rectilinear perspective as only one system available for representing space. For this reason, Giotto's paintings, which were the product of a period of transition to normative perspective, often have multiple vanishing points with no clear privileging of one over the others.[62] In *Il Decameron*, the dream of the painter, a living recreation of a Giotto painting, attempts to recreate in a cinema an image with multiple perspectives within the single frame. This is not an

homage to German Expressionism, but, like the language of the film, an attempt to restore the image to its precapitalist, preuniperspectival state. Among the resources Giotto took advantage of were oriental miniatures from the Muslim world, which were widely available along the trade routes passing through Tuscany. These miniatures, Rumble convincingly argues, do the same work in *Il fiore delle mille e una notte* as Giotto's paintings do in *Il Decameron*, recreating a way of looking at the world that has been overwhelmed and destroyed as a resource by inexorable modernization. Rumble writes:

> The presence of these 'alien' figural models within the film, whose lens-system was developed out of post-Renaissance experiments in perspective and optics, is part of Pasolini's attack upon the hegemonic forms of representation of the West, and ultimately an attack upon the cultural hegemony of the West as it spreads throughout the 'periphery' (in this case, particularly the Third World).[63]

There is, then, a sort of free indirect subjectivity at work in these films that manifests itself in, to return to Deleuze, a foreign language within the dominant language. Those parts of the film made in the dominant style are the voice of Pasolini, the bourgeois artist, while the intrusions of alternative systems of representation are the stylistic equivalent of an other's way of seeing the world. But it is not that of the marginal or Third World subjects of the films, and here Pasolini remains open to the charge of exploiting his performers. The various attempts to recreate pre-Renaissance ways of representing spatial organization approximate the perception of historical subjects, not the contemporary ones who appear in the film. They immerse themselves in past subjects, although one must not forget that these ways of seeing the world may exist in a faintly residual form that the very act of recreation might help revive.

Free indirect discourse, according to Pasolini, depends upon the linguistic contrast between the author's and the character's speech. In cinema, this contrast exists in style, with formalist deviations from stylistic conventions expressing a character's subjectivity. In *Il Decameron* Pasolini succeeds in creating a non-bourgeois style, marked as such by

its associations with painterly techniques that preceded the simultaneous consolidation of Renaissance perspective and the Italian language. This contrast bridges time, setting against each other the contemporary and the archaic or residual. The same operation takes place with the spoken language of the film. We hear contemporary subjects speak contemporary Neopolitan slang, which collides with the antiquated narrative style of the author, whom we might refer to as Boccaccio-Pasolini, for, despite his critique of the bourgeois literary and pictorial traditions, Pasolini refuses to deny himself the rights to expression of a bourgeois artist. In this way he maintains the recognition of difference upon which the critique of his own subject positioning depends.

Ultimately, it is a pity that Pasolini positioned his theoretical writings on cinema as interventions into the scientific semiotics of film. As Bruno notes, it is not the semiotic arguments but the heretical and scandalous assertions regarding cinematic subjectivity buried within them that would later be seen as Pasolini's most enduring contribution to film theory. These assertions are confused and limited by Pasolini's consistent drive to find linguistic analogues for what he describes, most notably in his essay "The Written Language of Reality." At the same time, to his critics like Umberto Eco, Pasolini's explorations of subjectivity and reality in cinema seemed like undisciplined flights of fancy barely concealed by a thin veneer of semiotics. That Pasolini would desire to participate in these debates is understandable, though, especially considering the venue in which they took place, the Pesaro festival. The format of this independent alternative to Venice—roundtables and conference style panels—gave Pasolini the opportunity to assume the role of public intellectual within the film community, a role he increasingly came to relish with his polemical newspaper essays. By 1968, the programming of the festival became increasingly devoted to Third World cinema, especially New Latin American Cinema, and debates on film and politics had replaced the semiotic debates of the festival's early years, when Pasolini was most active in it. If we look for continuity, rather than ruptures, between these two periods of the

festival, then Pasolini emerges as a lynchpin figure; the framing of his arguments in the language of semiotics grounds him in the former phase, while his thoughts on realism and subjectivity, and particularly free indirect subjectivity, anticipate the later theoretical interventions of New Latin American Cinema theorists, especially Sanjinés.

In "The Cinema of Poetry" Pasolini writes,

> Because, in fact, the "gaze" of a peasant, perhaps even an entire town or region in prehistoric conditions of underdevelopment, embraces another type of reality than the gaze given to that same reality by an educated bourgeois. Not only do the two actually see different sets of things, but even a single thing in itself appears different through the two different "gazes". However, all this cannot be institutionalized; it is purely inductive. In practice, therefore, on a possible common linguistic level predicated on "gazes" at things, the difference that a director can perceive between himself and a character is only psychological and social. *But not linguistic.* He therefore finds himself in the complete impossibility of effecting any naturalistic *mimesis* of this language, of this hypothetical "gaze" at reality by others.[64]

Pasolini at first takes as a given the possibility of different subjective gazes, and this possibility only becomes hypothetical later on after he has argued its irreproducibility in cinema, which, having only one language, can only have a normative gaze. Pasolini notes the "impossibility of effecting any naturalistic *mimesis*" of the other's gaze, emphasizing its imitative function through the use of italics. Pasolini vehemently opposed naturalism in both literature and cinema, and his notion of the free indirect discourse was founded upon true difference, not imitation, so we cannot take this to be a remark about an unattainable ideal. What Pasolini appears to be saying here is that only linguistic difference can mark social and psychological difference, and, since cinema has only one language at its disposal, and since he entirely equated the cinematic gaze with cinematic language, even the imitation of another gaze is impossible. This imitation would at least point to another way of seeing the world, essentially, of expressing it, and for Pasolini cinematic language was, like normatized Italian, resistant to expressiveness. It could be forced into expressiveness with formalistic deviations from the stylistic conventions, but only, if we are to take his examples seriously, in the most bourgeois of

cinemas, the European art film. But he makes it clear, a little later on in the essay, that these stylistic elements imitate a character's state of mind, not a perception of the world, i.e., a gaze. "It may be irregular and approximate—very free, in short, given that the filmmaker makes use of the 'dominant psychological state of mind in the film,' which is that of a sick, abnormal protagonist, in order to make it a continual *mimesis* which allows him great, anomalous, and provocative stylistic freedom."[65] In the *Trilogy*, as we have seen, Pasolini sought a way around the block presented by what he assumed to be the linguistic homogeneity of cinema, reviving ways of seeing that predated both the consolidation of Renaissance perspective and the Italian language, from which he derived his ideas on linguistic homogenization in the sort of technological and bureaucratic society that produced cinema.

Unburdened as he was with the tenets of scientific semiotics, for Sanjinés, the possibility of different cinematic gazes was never in doubt.[66] When he uses the phrase "language of cinema," as he often does, it is clear that he is speaking about one among possibly many, although he acknowledges that there is a single language so dominant as to, at least quantitatively, nearly constitute *the* language of cinema. Like Pasolini, Sanjinés was not interested in a naturalistic mimesis of Andean subjectivities within that language; he sought a cinematic language consonant with these subjectivities in its production and reception, not imitative of them. At the same time Pasolini's emphasis on style was too grounded in the individualism these subjectivities challenged. The filmmaking style Sanjinés developed, based on the long take or sequence shot, was therefore a legitimate attempt to create a new, non-bourgeois cinematic language, or a non-bourgeois gaze within cinema. Paradoxically, it was Sanjinés's failure to achieve his original objectives that, in Pasolinian terms, created the free indirect subjectivity in his films.

As he recounted in "Sobre *¡Fuera de aquí!*" and other essays, Sanjinés originally intended to make *El enemigo principal* entirely in sequence shots, but, because of

technical problems and film shortages, his group only accomplished a few true sequence shots. These shots, encompassing groups of people in their entirety without cutaways to closeups, are, as noted above, very similar to a type of shot used by Pasolini, especially in *Il vangelo secondo Matteo*. But, like the shot of the crowd mourning the dead Ser Ciappelletto in *Il Decameron*, they are not grounded in the subjectivity of a specific character. They are, then, representations of a collective gaze; in other words, they are a cinematic manifestation of the "infinitival category" of free indirect discourse Pasolini describes in "Comments on Free Indirect Discourse" but never takes up again in his writings on cinema. That they appear as free indirect subjectivity in Sanjinés's film is owing to their collision with the other sections of the film shot in a more conventional style. This collision throws into relief the gaze of the Other. Sanjinés's films give voice to their indigenous subjects, but they are not in the voice of those subjects. They are in fact a mixture of forms and styles, some invented, some adapted, that express the hybridity of the films's subjects and their culture. They do not pretend to be pure expressions of an Andean indigenous subjectivity; at every level, like the Andean subjects themselves, they are subjected to contamination. Had Sanjinés actually been able to make *El enemigo principal* entirely in sequence shots, it would have been less a film consonant with the Andean cosmovision and more a work of European formalism. It would have been pure Theo Angelopoulos or Miklós Jancsó, rather than a film which draws upon these makers as resources with which to explore non-western temporalities and subjectivities. It is the realization of this possibility which later leads Sanjinés to remark on occasion that he avoids the consistent use of sequence shots for fear of appearing mannerist. In order for Sanjinés to critique his own class origins in his films, his voice must be present in them as well, or the difference created by the moments of free indirect subjectivity would go unmarked and hence be subsumed into the act of individual creation. The problem for Sanjinés is what cinematic form to use to embody his voice. His solution is to adapt techniques from filmmakers who consistently

challenge the norms of western cinematic representation out of a humanist or revolutionary impulse: Vittorio De Sica, Pasolini, and Angelopoulos.

It may seem odd to suggest that Sanjinés, for whom the sequence shot is central to his aesthetic, fulfills some of the possibilities for collective subjectivity and the creation of alternative cinematic gazes only hinted at in Pasolini's writings. After all, Pasolini often stated his objection to the sequence shot. In the promotional materials for *Il fiore delle mille e una notte*, Pasolini writes, "As for stylistic rules, I have obeyed my usual ones: no sequence shots, no off-stage characters, no exits or entries into the field of the camera, etc."[67] Pasolini's objection to the sequence shot went beyond stylistics. In his essay "Observations on the Sequence Shot" he argues that any single take in cinema implies a subjectivity. Realism demands the combination, through editing, of various subjective shots. The use of sequence shots to achieve realism was in fact nothing more than naturalism. As Orr correctly notes, "Pasolini's objection to subjectivity in 'Observations' is really an objection to the subjectivity or individualism of the bourgeois artist."[68] In contrast to Godard or Angelopoulos, Pasolini saw abandoning the sequence shot as a necessary step toward a non-bourgeois cinema, and yet, his prohibition against its use was not absolute. In "Quips on the Cinema" he argues that his notion of cinema, as opposed to individual films, as an infinite and continuous sequence shot does not imply naturalism: "On the contrary! Instead, the concrete sequence shot, in individual films, is a naturalistic technique (of itself: certainly if not corrected by the opposition of other techniques)."[69] As we have seen in the previous chapter, sequentially representing several individual points of view within a sequence shot is one of the techniques Sanjinés opposes to it as normally constituted so as to render it realistic, that is to say expressive of multiple or collective subjectivities. These techniques were the result of experiments with what Sanjinés refers to as his "horizontal" production methods. It is important to keep in mind that the production of free indirect subjectivity, like every other revolutionary aspect of Sanjinés's cinema, was not the product of textual operations

controlled by the filmmaker alone, but were grounded in collaborative production methods. In order to place this path toward cinematic free indirect subjectivity in historical and theoretical perspective, we turn to the works of Jean Rouch.

Jean Rouch

In March of 1971, Jean Rouch was the honorary president at the first Brazilian Festival of Short Films in São Paolo, where a selection of his films was screened, including his most recent, *Petit á petit* (*Little by Little*, 1971), a work of "reverse anthropology" in which some of his African collaborators investigate that strange tribe known as Parisians. According to the account of the festival in *Hablemos de cine*, in his keynote speech, Rouch talked about how the hunters he filmed in *La chasse au lion à l'arc* (*Hunting the Lion with Bow and Arrow*, 1965) had "corrected" his work through collaboration during the shoot and their critique of the rushes.[70] By the time he made *La chasse au lion à l'arc*, Rouch had developed a highly participatory form of ethnographic filmmaking. He describes its origins as follows:

> Three years later I went back to the island of Sorko fishermen, showed them this new color film, and for the first time they understood what I was doing with this strange machine that was always in my hand. They saw their own image in film, they discovered film language, they looked at the film over and over again, and suddenly they started to offer criticisms, telling me what was wrong with it. This was the beginning of *anthropologie partagée*, a sharing anthropology: we suddenly shared a relationship.[71]

The film Rouch refers to in this passage is *Bataille sur le grand fleuve* (*Hippopotamus Hunt*, 1950), and the screening he mentions took place in 1954. The Sorko fishermen were most critical of Rouch's use of non-diegetic music to heighten the tension as the hunters approached their prey. No one would use music on a hunt, the fishermen argued, since it would only scare away the hippo. Rouch removed the music from subsequent prints of the film and would never again use non-diegetic music.[72]

Jean Rouch's "participatory cinema" and Jorge Sanjinés's "horizontal" practice of filmmaking with the people share a number of affinities. First of all, they allow the subjects of the films to speak in their own voices. With *Ukamau* and *Yawar Mallku*, Sanjinés introduced indigenous languages to Latin American fiction features. Rouch, commenting on *Moi, un noir* (*I, a Negro*, 1958), writes, "What was important for me was that, for the first time, an African spoke on film."[73] Both were encouraged to adopt more collaborative practices as a result of criticisms leveled by non-western, indigenous audiences; in the case of Sanjinés, it was the experience of showing *Yawar Mallku* in marginal urban neighborhoods, mining camps, and rural villages. For both filmmakers, improvised screenings before local audiences were as important as the collaborative production process, since they sometimes led to other projects. When Rouch showed *Bataille sur le grand fleuve* to a group of Nigerien prisoners in a Gold Coast jail, they invited him in turn to document a Hauka possession ritual, and the resulting film, *Les maîtres fous* (*The Mad Masters*, 1953), remains the work for which he is best known. Likewise, Sanjinés and Oscar Soria learned of the Night of San Juan massacre, the subject of *El coraje del pueblo*, from informants who attended a screening of *Yawar Mallku* at the Siglo XX mines, where the massacre had taken place a few years earlier.

Sanjinés and Rouch both made the sequence shot central to their aesthetic. For *Gare du nord*, his contribution to the omnibus film *Paris vu par…*(*Six in Paris*, 1965), Rouch hired Etienne Becker, a documentary cinematographer who had shot Chris Marker's *La joli mai* (1963), in order to experiment for the first time with storytelling using sequence shots.[74] Except for a brief shot at the beginning, and another at the end, most of *Gare du nord*'s twenty minutes appears to be one continuous take, although in reality the shoot was timed so that a change of reels could be hidden when an elevator darkens. Rouch did not use a sequence shot in his ethnographic work until six years later, when he made *Les tambours d'avant: Tourou et Bitti* (*Tourou et Bitti*, 1971), documenting a Songhay ritual performed before the rainy season in order to protect the

new crop from locusts and curses.[75] According to Rouch, musicians charged with catalyzing the trances necessary for completing the ritual had been playing continuously for several days without success. Tired of waiting, Rouch decided to enter the village and film the ceremony in one continuous ten minute take. He was not surprised that the musicians began to play with greater intensity as he approached, but he was stunned when the dancers entered a trance right as he trained his camera on them. Rouch was convinced that his filming of the ritual provoked the trance, and this experience became central to his theory of the "*ciné-transe*".[76] After this film Rouch used sequence shots almost exclusively. Early in his career he had abandoned the tripod, arguing that the handheld camera permitted him to "penetrate into the reality."[77] Later he speculated that the sequence shot was capable of provoking reality into revealing itself to the filmmaker, who could then penetrate it with his handheld camera, usually held at shoulder height and kept in near constant motion at a natural gait. Rouch's writings emphasize the participation of the filmmaker in the action before the camera, but the resulting style is nearly identical to that which Sanjinés developed to make the spectator feel as if he or she were participating in the center of the scene. At times Sanjinés uses long takes, much like Rouch, in order to provoke his performers into revealing themselves: the women complaining about the lack of groceries in the company store in *El coraje del pueblo*, the townspeople denouncing the landowner, Carillo, in *El enemigo principal*, and the political debates among the villagers in *¡Fuera de aquí!*, all depend for their authenticity and power on the protagonists's forgetting their lines, so to speak, and drawing upon their own experiences in order to keep talking. As Rouch would have it, since people are social beings, they are most themselves when performing for others.

Finally, both Rouch and Sanjinés were dedicated to training young filmmakers who would otherwise have no access to formal education or the technical means for making films. Some of Rouch's collaborators, such as Oumarou Ganda, the lead in *Moi, un noir*, went on to become directors, and Rouch is routinely credited with establishing

film culture and film production in sub-Saharan Africa.[78] In addition to his two efforts at creating a film school, the *Escuela Filmica Boliviana* of the early 1960s and the *Escuela Andina de Cine* of the early 2000s, Sanjinés also made a protégé of Reynaldo Yujra (Sebastian in *La nación clandestina*), who has since become an important actor and director in Bolivia's indigenous video movement.[79]

I have found no evidence that Rouch traveled to Latin America other than to attend the São Paolo short film festival in 1971, but this does not mean that he was not in direct contact with Latin American filmmakers. Alfonso Gumucio Dagron, author of one of the two histories of Bolivian cinema and Sanjinés's assistant during the production of *¡Fuera de aquí!*, regularly attended Rouch's Saturday morning screenings and lectures at *Le Museé de l'Homme* in Paris while a student at IDHEC between 1973 and 1976, and he also took courses taught by Rouch at the university in Nanterre. Later in the 1970s he happened to be in Mozambique when Rouch was there training people in Super-8 film production.[80] Gumucio Dagron replicated Rouch's Mozambiquan program in the early 1980s when the Sandinistas invited him to set up a Super-8 workshop in Nicaragua. The handbook he produced as a result of this work, *El cine de los trabajadores*, shows the clear influence of both Rouch and Sanjinés. The Colombian documentarian Marta Rodríguez first trained as an anthropologist in Bogotá, then went to Paris where she studied filmmaking under Rouch.[81] Her *Chircales* (*The Brickmakers*, 1972), made with photographer Jorge Silva, clearly shows the influence of Rouch in the occasional surrealism of its imagery and in its production method. Rodríguez and Silva lived with the family of brickmakers featured in the film for many months before filming began, a method inspired by Rouch's shared anthropology that they would continue to use in subsequent films. *Ateliers Varan*, a Parisian cinema institution founded by Rouch, established the *Cine Minero* (Miners's Cinema) program in Bolivia during the early 1980s, which trained residents of the mining communities in the use of Super-8.

Although this program was short-lived, it is widely seen as being instrumental in the later development of Bolivia's vibrant indigenous video movement.[82]

Given the extent of the exchange of personnel between Latin America and Paris throughout the 1960s-1980s, as well as the clear parallels between Rouch's participatory modes of film production and that of New Latin American Cinema filmmakers like Sanjinés, it is surprising that he is never mentioned in the movement's manifestoes. Although he refers to Chris Marker and Joris Ivens among other European filmmakers, Sanjinés makes no mention of Rouch in his major statement on his precursors and influences, the introductory section to his essay on the theory and practice of revolutionary cinema.[83] Paul Willemen argues that Rouch, because he invented a form of African Third Cinema with *Moi, un noir*, is a more intriguing father figure for the Latin Americans than Marker or Ivens, and certainly a more appropriate one than John Grierson, who saw documentary's political role as instructing citizens about the measures taken on their behalf by the state.[84] Rouch's absence from the classic Third Cinema manifestoes "speaks volumes," according to Willemen, and "operates as a marker of the marginalisation of African cinemas by Latin Americans at the time."[85] Leaving aside the question of whether one marginalized cinema can marginalize another, it remains to be proven that Latin American filmmakers ignored, or were unaware of, their African counterparts, as Willemen suggests. In the Sanjinés essay referred to earlier, he notes the contributions to revolutionary cinema made by Ousmane Sembène of Senegal and Youssef Chahine of Egypt and names several films produced in post-independence Algeria as well as a number of anti-apartheid documentaries from South Africa, all of which he had probably become familiar with at various film festivals, especially those in eastern Europe, where African filmmakers were heavily represented. Rouch's absence from this text appears to be more of a deliberate exclusion than an accidental omission. If so, we can only speculate as to the cause, although two possible explanations suggest themselves immediately: first, Rouch's nationality complicated his status as an African

filmmaker, and filmmakers like Sanjinés would naturally privilege films made by African postcolonial subjects; second, Rouch's African films were seen as ethnographies, not as political documentaries in the vein of *Chronique d'un été*. The second of these two is most productive in terms of explaining Rouch's absence from the histories of political cinema in both Europe and Latin America.

Willemen concludes his remarks on Rouch by noting that *Moi, un noir*, which he considers a work of Third Cinema, was made in Ghana the very year it became the first African state to win independence from a colonial power, but he stops short of declaring this is anything but coincidence.[86] Rouch remained unaligned with any political movements in Africa, earning him a reputation during the 1970s for being apolitical. More recent critical writings, though, have emphasized the extent of his commitment to the struggles against colonialism and especially European colonialism's legacy of racism. Steven Feld, in the introduction to the English edition of Rouch's collected writings, describes some of his films from the early 1960s as "merging filmic experimentalism with engaged antiracist politics."[87] Paul Stoller notes that even in the early 1950s Rouch was disturbed by accusations of racism leveled against *Les maîtres fous*, primarily because "his prior practices and commitments were clearly anti-racist, anti-colonialist, and anti-imperialist."[88] Rouch himself commented on the delayed recognition of the political nature of his work when he remarked in 1988 that this film, once denounced by his African colleagues as racist, was now considered by those same intellectuals to be one of the best depictions of African colonialism on film. He uses the term "colonialism from below" to describe it, an expression that resonates with the rhetoric of Third Cinema.[89] Anna Grimshaw, a scholar of C. L. R. James, is most explicit about the political context in which Rouch's films should be interpreted, when she argues that "Rouch's creativity was intimately linked to a revolutionary moment in modern society," which she locates in Africa and the Caribbean.[90] Unfortunately she does not extend this to the Latin American mainland. Grimshaw goes on to maintain that Rouch's work, "perhaps today

more than forty years ago, can be recognised as a powerful expression of a new and expanded vision of universal humanity which was embodied in the revolution of colonial peoples."[91] This is undoubtedly true. *Chronique d'un été*, for instance, is not a rare political film in the Rouch *oeuvre* owing to his collaboration with Morin, a Marxist sociologist. In retrospect, it is evident that the themes and techniques widely assumed to have been pioneered in this film had already been used by Rouch in African films like *La Pyramide humaine*, which precedes *Chronique* in the use of synchronized sound as well as scenes of Rouch screening the unfinished film to its performers and soliciting their comments.

The question of what kind of filmmaker Rouch was continues to vex scholars. Is he a French filmmaker, an African filmmaker, or both? Is he primarily a documentarian, an ethnographic filmmaker, or a fiction filmmaker? Is he a founding figure in sub-Saharan African cinema, the French New Wave, or both? His researches into the sequence shot described above are a case in point. They began with his short film *Gare du Nord*, part of the omnibus film *Paris vu par…*, which included films by Godard, Claude Chabrol, and Erich Rohmer, among others, a who's who of the French New Wave. He then used the techniques he developed on that shoot to make *Tourou et Bitti*, as unambiguously ethnographic a film as any he made. Compounding the general confusion about how to categorize his films is Rouch's disregard for the boundaries between fiction and nonfiction film. He referred to films like *Jaguar* (1954-1967), an improvised story of three Nigerien men undertaking a seasonal migration to the city in search of employment, as "ethnofictions" or "science fictions" because they mixed ethnographic observation with improvised narrative.[92] Further compounding the problem is the tendency among scholars to exclude all other modes of his filmmaking in the effort to valorize one.[93]

On the question of whether Rouch's work belongs primarily to European or African cinema, the most interesting recent argument has been made by Grimshaw, and I quote her at length because her project so closely resembles my own:

> I propose a juxtaposition of Rouch and his European counterparts as a way of bringing into new focus certain key concerns of post-war cinema. Despite their different geographical and cultural location, Rouch's films raise questions about subjectivity and society that resonate strongly with issues explored by key figures such as Rossellini, De Sica, Fellini, or Godard. The African site of Rouchian cinema, however, reconfigures these questions in a number of interesting ways. Looking more completely at what is shared and what is different in the work of Rouch and his Italian or French counterparts enables us to begin to construct a more expansive history of post-war cinema, one in which the conventional relationship between the centre (Europe) and periphery (Africa) is rendered unstable.[94]

In juxtaposing Sanjinés and Rouch, I intend to further destabilize the conventional boundaries between center and periphery, adding a third leg (Latin America) to the two described by Grimshaw in order to create a tripod, to borrow Paulo Antonio Paranaguá's terminology, connecting three continents[95]. Grimshaw argues that Rouch was working in Africa during a period of chaos and transition similar to the immediate postwar years in Italy that produced Italian neo-realism. We have already seen in Chapter 3 how a similarly unstable and transitional social, political, and cultural environment prevailed in Latin America during the late 1950s and into the 1960s, leading the earliest practitioners of New Latin American Cinema to originally look to Italian neo-realism as a highly pertinent resource which they could adapt to local needs. Grimshaw convincingly argues that Italian filmmakers like Federico Fellini shared with Rouch a preoccupation with the articulations between the social and the subjective, but that as Italian society reconsolidated around Christian Democracy, Fellini's films became more about personal and artistic rather than social or political liberation. Rouch's characters, on the other hand, continued to see themselves as agents of history resisting all checks placed on the expansion of their subjectivity. Although Grimshaw does not extend her argument in this direction, it places Rouch in the same relative position, *vis-à-vis* European cinema as

that occupied by Third Cinema filmmakers. The same shared preoccupation with the social and the subjective Grimshaw identifies in the films of Rouch and postwar Italians exists at a more profound level in the cinemas of Rouch and Sanjinés, since it exists well beyond or below the level of narrative thematics. Both Rouch and Sanjinés were dedicated to creating new, hybrid cinematic forms that would approximate, rather than merely describe or comment upon, non-western forms of subjectivity. To accomplish this each immersed himself in the culture of his subjects, incorporating aspects of those cultures into novel production methods and cinematic forms. After Marta Rodríguez, Sanjinés is the New Latin American Filmmaker whose practice shares the most in common with Rouch's. In bringing these two together, I am implicitly arguing for a greater place for Rouch in the history of Third Cinema.[96] More importantly, though, I will describe how Sanjinés's films and theory, like Rouch's, anticipate much contemporary criticism of ethnographic film within anthropology, criticism that reflects, without ever acknowledging it, the impact of Third Cinema within the field. Finally, I will use the ethnographic context introduced by the Rouch comparison to analyze several of Sanjinés's films as ethnographic films, or, more precisely, to read them ethnographically.

I am aware of the dangers of appearing to recruit Sanjinés as an ethnographic filmmaker, and I wish to state unequivocally that he has not made ethnographic films. That being said, many ethnographic films are not ethnographic films. As David MacDougall notes, until recently most ethnographic films were by-products of other endeavors, including, but not limited to, "the political or idealist visions of documentary filmmakers."[97] While it is true that a wide variety of films can and have been studied for their ethnographic value, there is a particular reason for avoiding doing so in the case of Sanjinés. In *Teoría y práctica de un cine junto al pueblo* Sanjinés describes anthropologists, ethnographers, and sociologists as shock troops for the penetrating forces of North American imperialism. The knowledge these researchers obtain in the field, he

writes, is used by the U.S. military and multinational corporations to effectively thwart resistance to their efforts to penetrate a society, mostly by sowing conflict between local groups in an academic and bureaucratic variant of the imperial technique of divide and conquer.[98] In *¡Fuera de aquí!*, the missionaries who divide the community and make it susceptible to exploitation build upon the work of linguists who arrived before them. Given that anthropology as a discipline is a direct product of 19th century European colonialism, Sanjinés's suspicion of anyone even remotely connected to it is perfectly understandable. His feelings about anthropologists notwithstanding, ethnographic readings of his films do not necessarily suggest that he was like an anthropologist, who is, almost by definition, an outsider to the culture being studied. If he was not strictly of the communities he worked with and portrayed, he maintained an interstitial relationship with these same communities by virtue of shared nationality and years of dedication to a common political struggle. No matter how much time they spend with their subjects of study, anthropologists maintain a distance from them that the empirical basis of their discipline demands. They may self-consciously reveal their outsider status through self-reflexive techniques, but they nevertheless maintain it. Anthropologists observe and document, implying a position some distance from the subject, even if they might no longer claim this position grants them objectivity. Rouch writes, "Film is the only means I have of showing someone else how I see him," and this is perhaps the strongest evidence for considering him primarily an ethnographic filmmaker, if, as I believe it is safe to assume, he means by this how he sees a person *as an ethnographer*.[99] Sanjinés, not having an equivalent institutional status to maintain, and furthermore, being opposed on political grounds to the assertion of an individual perspective, was less interested in how he saw his subjects than in how they preferred to see themselves represented. And yet, although he would not say of the indigenous people of the Andes, as Pasolini did of the residents of the *Borgate*, that he approached them like an anthropologist, notebook in hand, he clearly did, and for many of the same reasons as Pasolini. If we can regard

Sanjinés's films anthropologically, we should perhaps consider them what Catherine Russell calls experimental ethnographies, "discourse that circumvents the empiricism and objectivity conventionally linked to ethnography."[100] With these caveats in mind, I knowlingly proceed into dangerous terrain.

Eric Ross writes near the beginning of his review of *Yawar Mallku* in *American Anthropologist*, "Though rich in ethnographic detail (particularly coca fortune-telling rituals), it is not in such terms that it ought to be viewed."[101] His sympathies with the film's anti-imperialist themes so override his concern for its anthropological value that, instead of saying the film should not *primarily* or *solely* be viewed anthropologically, he dismisses such a reading altogether. Although Ross may well reject the comparison, he sounds very much like Jay Ruby, a conservative theorist of visual anthropology who is skeptical of any film's actual ability to have significant political impact and argues that politically engaged cinema is by definition disqualified as ethnographic film.[102] In other words, Ross maintains a separation between ethnographic film and Third Cinema that seems to exists across the political spectrum within the discipline of anthropology, leaving European art cinema for all practical purposes the exclusive alternative cinematic current from which visual anthropology can occasionally draw inspiration. For Ruby, "the purpose of anthropology is to allow people to see the native other through the eyes of an anthropologist," and he is critical of all forms of participatory anthropology.[103] Although Ruby believes ethnographic films should be made by trained anthropologists first for an audience of other anthropologists and second for audiences willing to learn how to properly view ethnographic films, he also argues that an ethnographic cinema worthy of the name will find a third way between fiction and documentary genres. To do so, ethnographic filmmakers must draw from a variety of filmic practices. "Given the eclectic and experimental nature of this proposed approach, ethnographic filmmakers will find themselves allied with the avant-garde, experimental, art-film world in a quest for a cinema alternative to the mainstream of fiction and documentary."[104] Curiously, despite

his impatience with political cinema, he cites Godard's *Vent d'est* as a paradigmatic example of the sort of radical break with past practices he advocates. David MacDougall, another theorist of ethnographic film, and one with a more expansive notion of what the category comprises, also advocates learning from other forms of cinema, especially when it comes to the representation of time, a particular concern of his. "Paradoxically, many of the other potentialities of the long take—for articulating space and time, relating people to their environment, exploring human personality—were being adventurously investigated in fiction, in the work of directors like Godard, Antonioni, Resnais, and Rossellini."[105] Likewise, in her introduction to the post-World War II section of *The Ethnographer's Eye*, Anna Grimshaw devotes considerable space to describing the impact of Italian neo-realism, *cinéma vérité*, and direct cinema on ethnographic film, but nowhere does she mention New Latin American Cinema.[106] The only Latin American filmmaker who occasionally receives some mention in works on ethnographic film is Argentine Jorge Prelorán, who attempted to create a genre of documentary called "ethnogbiography," which, according to MacDougall, although "ostensibly a way of depicting culture from the inside though an insider's perspective, it is framed by an outsider's concerns."[107] Why Prelorán and not Sanjinés? The Argentine was not aligned with New Latin American Cinema, but, even if he was not a militant, he still considered his work to be politically engaged. A comment Prelorán made regarding differing reception his work received at home and abroad is revelatory in this regard. He noted that inside Argentina his films were seen as demonstrating sociological problems, almost to the point of being political testaments, while abroad they were considered ethnographic, scientific documents.[108] It would seem that among anthropologists and even ethnographic filmmakers there is an anxiety regarding militantly political cinema that leads them to either brush aside their anthropological value (Ross) or dismiss it altogether (Ruby, MacDougall). Here we can return to MacDougall's observation that much of what constitutes ethnographic film from an earlier era was merely a by-product

from other endeavors, many of which were explicitly political. Since it is defined as what it is not, establishing a true ethnographic cinema requires a break with the traditions of political cinema that gave rise to it, in the same way that it must dispense with conventional fiction and documentary forms. The consolidation of ethnographic film as an academic and professional pursuit coincided with emergence of Third Cinema in the late 1960s and early 1970s, and the two pursued divergent paths, motivated by mutual suspicion. Yet these two movements shared similar concerns and, at times, similar methods. Below I briefly consider how Sanjinés and Rouch contribute to our understanding of time as polyvalent, free indirect discourse, and the necessarily dialectical nature of the encounter with the other before proceeding with viewing three of Sanjinés's films anthropologically.

Johannes Fabian identifies time as a primary concern for the critique of anthropology, which has historically tended to uncritically adopt European imperialism's epistemological assumptions about the temporality of the so-called primitive. He argues that "political-historical domination on a large scale, imperialism in short, seems to require ideological crutches in the form of theories of knowledge *that deny the confrontational, let us call it 'dialectical,' nature of human knowledge about other human beings*."[109] Anthropology's traditional observational, contemplative stance toward the other, as opposed to the "confrontational mode" he advocates, has been complicit in the discipline's denial of the coevalness of the primitive and the modern western subject. The primitive is first made "to belong to the past, to be not yet what We are," after which it can be made the object of empirical explanations and generalizations.[110] With the denial of coevalness comes the inability to establish what Fabian calls "radical contemporaneity, which would have as a consequence that we experience the primitive (or its permutations: non-literate, underdeveloped societies, peasants, etc.) as copresent, hence co-subjects, not objects of history."[111]

The collaborative methods by which both Sanjinés and Rouch created their representation of the "primitive" insistently asserts its contemporaneity with modernity by virtue of what Pasolini would call its scandalous presence.[112] For this reason both filmmakers often return to the theme of migration from the countryside to the urban center. But they go one step further than Fabian imagines, positing an even more radical cotemporaneity, one that has the primitive and modern held in a field of dialectical tension with the past, or with mythic time. In Rouch's *Funérailles à Bongo: Le vieil Anaï, 1848-1971* (*Funeral at Bongo: The Old Anaï (1848-1971)*, 1972), one of his studies of Dogon funeral rites, he shows a statue on the terrace of the dead man's home, which, he explains, "signifies that the dead man himself is presiding over his own funeral," an image that combines human and mythic time.[113] Stephen Felder refers to this film as displaying Rouch's "most developed sense of history, ritual and cinematic poetics."[114] Further complicating the temporality of Rouch's cinema is the representation of cyclical time, which Grimshaw describes as "cutting across the film's linear or historical development" in films like *Jaguar*, which is structured around seasonal migration patterns.[115] *Tourou et Bitti*, for example, uses patterns of cyclical time based on the rhythms of agriculture and the seasons, combined in this case with cyclical patterns of drumming. Rouch's most ambitious attempt to document alternative, mythical temporalities was the series of films he made of the Dogon *Sigui* rituals, which take place over seven consecutive years every sixty years. These rituals recount among other things how death came into the world, and they are held every sixty years because the Dogon believe that was lifespan of the first human being.[116] Sanjinés's films similarly document rituals based on cyclical natural or agricultural cycles to contrast with or disrupt their conventional linearity: examples include the ritual to ward off hailstorms in *Ukamau*, the planting of fields in *¡Fuera de aquí!* (the filming of which was interrupted by the planting and harvesting schedules itself), and the celebration of the return of the songbirds in *Para recibir el canto de los pájaros* (*To Hear the Birdsong*, 1995). The

final shot from *La nación clandestina* functions like the image of the statue in Rouch's funeral rite film, in that it combines mythic and human, or chronological, time, as does the scene in *Yawar Mallku* in which Ignacio and Benedicta bury the effigies of their two dead children on Mt. Kaata so that their spirits may rest in peace. The participatory nature of Rouch and Sanjinés's filmmaking practice challenges anthropology's "denial of coevalness" as described by Fabian. And in their search for a poetics of cinematic time that would similarly challenge the linearity built into the very apparatus itself, they turned to ritual or mythic times that indigenous people see as coexisting with the present, as well as cyclical time schema based on natural phenomena, agriculture, or human generations and lifespans. The result is a representation of time that is essentially destabilized in that it is both polyvalent and cyclical. But despite Rouch's inheritance from Surrealism and Sanjinés's indebtedness to cinematic high modernism, neither filmmaker experiments with time for the sake of aesthetic novelty; they use time as a means of exploring the mixing of non-western and western ways of knowing.

A central problem in Sanjinés's filmmaking, as we have seen, was how to make films that resonated authentically with what he calls the Andean cosmovision while simultaneously communicating this worldview to the European audiences on whom he depended financially. Daniel Morgan, in a recent essay on Rouch's films, describes a similar anxiety about bridging dissimilar worlds. According to Morgan, Rouch wanted his films to "serve as a bridge for the audience to enter a world with which it is unfamiliar."[117] Morgan assumes this audience to be European, but given the importance Rouch attached to the African reception of his work, it is safe to say, as with Sanjinés, that this effort to bridge two worlds is at least bidirectional (if not more, since we can also see the films as bridging the rural/urban and middle class/working or peasant class divides within the countries in which they are made). Morgan argues that this effort to bridge two worlds exists as more than just a thematic trope in Rouch, "Rather, it is within the basic formal construction of the films that Rouch negotiates and works through the

difficulty of bridging the gap between the audience for his films and the worlds his films show."[118] Rouch's main technique for accomplishing this, according to Morgan, is the insertion of shots that pause on an object, such as the shot of approaching the village underneath the titles in *Tourou et Bitti*, the shots of a dead tree, again underneath the titles, in *Jaguar*, or the shot of a clump of grass that follows a shot of the living Anaï in the film about his funeral. The result of these pauses is that "We are outside the narrative frame to which we had been accustomed, introduced to a new sense of time—the capacity to extend a moment outward and rest within it—that is articulated in the pause."[119] The pause, as analyzed by Morgan, both marks the transition to another temporal scheme and conditions the audience to experience it. As such it is related to the techniques deployed by Pasolini in the *Il Decameron* to announce transitions to other perspectival regimes, such as the shots of Giotto's disciple framing the people on the street with his fingers who will appear in both the film and the fresco, or the dream sequence in which the recreation of Giotto's painting appears. In *Il fiore delle mille e una notte* Pasolini uses the "Chinese box" narrative patterning of stories within stories in a more complex fashion to simultaneously move among various temporal and perspectival (in this case, the modeling of shots on Arabic miniatures) regimes. Sanjinés attempts to bridge dissimilar worlds by the adaptation of tropes from the European art cinema, which, for European audiences, are defamiliarized through being used "under different coordinates."

As we have seen, in the *Trilogy of Life* Pasolini revived ways of seeing that predated the consolidation of Renaissance perspective, and, by mixing them with conventional perspective, created an analogue in cinematic images to the collision of languages that constitute the literary figure of free indirect discourse. Rouch and Sanjinés similarly mixed cinematic temporalities and perspectives in order to create free indirect subjectivity, but unlike Pasolini, they did not ignore the audio track's ability to replicate free indirect discourse. *Jaguar* and *¡Fuera de aquí!* share a similar strategy of

mixing an omniscient narrator with the voices of the protagonists, and, in the case of the former, Rouch's collaborators approach something like the infinitival variety of free indirect discourse as described by Pasolini. In one sequence we are shown Illo, who has taken up work as a *kaya-kaya* or porter, in the port of Accra, a fact announced by Rouch. This is followed by Lam's voice saying, "You see all this? It is our people who do all this. Yes, we are in Accra, the Gold Coast." Rouch then explains, again in a matter of fact tone of voice, that a *kaya-kaya* can expect to make no more than two and a half shillings for an entire day's work. Then we hear the following exchange:

> Damouré: It's tough making money.
>
> Lam: You work hard here. We are men, and God says men must work to eat. It's tiring.

Although the two occasionally refer to their compatriot Illo, who is shown pushing loaded hand trucks and carrying boxes, most of their comments address a collective of their people, the Songhay of Niger, who migrate to Accra for a combination of reasons, including economic necessity, a curiosity about the world around them, and desire for the prestige that comes from distributing city-bought goods back home. In the case of "we are in Accra," the "we" can refer to either the Songhay or the film's audience, effectively bridging the two. Their comments reveal the nature of the work they engage in, but they also serve to explain to those of their community who do not make the trip the hardships they endure in order to return with the articles the community covets. In *¡Fuera de aquí!* Sanjinés's occasional voiceover narration, which he intersperses with the synchronized recordings of the film's protagonists, also addresses two communities, the one portrayed in the film and those outside of it. Much of the narration consists of exhortations to mistrust politicians or other outsiders, addressed to a collectivity, the indigenous peoples of the Andes. But these are not simply the advice of the filmmaker; rather, they are attempts at summarizing what the participants in the film have learned. At other times Sanjinés adopts a less self-consciously rhetorical tone to

impart information that would be known to the collectivity on the screen but not to outside viewers, as when he notes of one woman speaking at a meeting, "Maria Choquehuanca, you are the mother of eight dead children." This last statement singles out an individual from the collective (Sanjinés uses the informal second person singular address), but, because she is photographed as part of a group, rather than in a close-up, it does not make her the focus of individual identification. Her condition stands in for the conditions that prevail generally among the people in the film, as does Illo's labor in *Jaguar*. According to Steven Ungar, writing about *Moi, un noir*, Rouch's "efforts to balance fieldwork, narrative, and improvisation recast local informants as agents of a narrative over which—within limits imposed by technology and editing—they exercise an unprecedented control."[120] The same can be said of Sanjinés's films, especially those of the 1970s.

In mixing their voices in voiceover with those of their protagonists, Rouch and Sanjinés create on the audio track a version of ethnography in the confrontational mode as described by Fabian, one that mirrors the charged encounter between the filmmaker and the protagonist that generates the images and the narrative. Ultimately, the goal for both filmmakers is a similarly charged dialectical exchange at the moment of reception. As Rouch explains it, "the filmmaker-observer, while recording these phenomena, both unconsciously modifies them and is himself changed by them […] when he returns and plays back the images, a strange dialogue takes place in which the film's 'truth' rejoins its mythic representation."[121] With their emphasis on the dialectical nature of the encounter, both Sanjinés and Rouch can be seen as pioneering Steven Tyler's influential notion of a "postmodern ethnography," which he posits as a challenge to the presumed transcendental observer. Tyler's postmodern ethnography, like Fabian's confrontational mode of ethnography, "privileges 'discourse' over 'text,' it foregrounds dialogue as opposed to monologue, and emphasizes the cooperative and collaborative nature of the ethnographic situation."[122] This cooperatively developed discourse, according to Tyler,

is "intended to evoke in the minds of both reader and writer an emergent fantasy of a possible world of commonsense reality, and thus to provoke an aesthetic integration that will have a therapeutic effect. It is in a word, poetry," he argues, a poetry that will evoke the communal ethos and provoke the hearers to "act ethically."[123] Here Tyler is specifically describing written ethnographies, and it is surprising that he does not address visual ethnography, given that film and photography do not impose the same barriers to reception written texts do (see the epigram from Rouch above). And, as with the commentary on Deleuze quoted above, Tyler uses a vague language of ethics. But this has not stopped his ideas from being taken up by theorists of ethnographic film, such as Bill Nichols, who describes postmodern ethnography as "transformative" and "practiced with social use-value foremost in mind," words more reminiscent of the ambitions of Third Cinema than traditional ethnography.[124] Still, I do not believe Nichols's interpretation to be far off the mark; it merely brings to the fore what seems latent in Tyler's argument, which reads a bit like a manifesto of Third Cinema with all references to politics redacted. Even rather severe critics of ethnography's ideal of the transcendental observer, like Tyler or Fabian, hesitate before the notion that an ethnographer might be politically committed.[125] Sanjinés and Rouch, by contrast, follow a line established by Brecht at the beginning of his "sociological experiment," "The Threepenny Lawsuit," when he notes that, since the investigator of any social phenomenon is already a party in a force field of opposing interests, he or she must adopt a thoroughly subjective and partisan perspective.[126]

Still, Tyler's description of ethnography as a "provocation" is useful for linking up Third Cinema and ethnographic film. For Rouch, the basic method was provocation. He believed the *ciné-transe* of the filmmaker could provoke the subject into revealing himself or herself and could also serve as a catalyst for social phenomena, as in the case of the trance precipitated by his filming in *Tourou et Bitti*. In *La Pyramide humaine*, a film about racial prejudice among high school students in post-independence Ghana,

Rouch has a multiracial pair of participants pretend to be boyfriend and girlfriend in order to provoke the others into revealing attitudes that, absent such a breach of unspoken social decorum, they might keep concealed. Sanjinés also used long takes and staged situations to provoke revelatory actions on the part of his performers. There is no mistaking the terror on the face of the children in the crowd being machine gunned down in the opening sequence of *El coraje del pueblo*. Similarly, in *El enemigo principal* Sanjinés uses the peasants's confusion about whether or not they have just witnessed a real execution to great effect. As provocative acts, though, Sanjinés's films are distinguished from Rouch's in that the provocation caused by the reception of the film is intended to be greater than that of the production. And here, ultimately, is what separates Rouch and Sanjinés politically. They developed remarkably similar methods in response to the revolutionary and transitional moments in which they worked, but while Rouch's films, like *Les maîtres fous*, provoke then capture that moment, Sanjinés's are calculated to advance the revolutionary politics of the moment, which, as an artist, he accomplishes by the creation of a revolutionary, hence non-bourgeois, practice of art. Brecht argues that the artist should effect the political transformation of art, and of politics through art, "not simply by waiting but by provoking reality with experiments in order to formulate the process more visibly through accumulation and concentration."[127] Any ethnography that recognizes the radical contemporaneity of its subjects along with their agency in history and the collaborative, dialectical nature of the enterprise, must take into account its very specific political ramifications, reading forward into time the results of its provocations, however reluctant the ethnographer may be to recognize his or her own political commitments. This is not to say that ethnographic filmmakers must be politically committed, but I would argue that the political commitment in Third Cinema, because of its very explicitness, can be read almost as a self-reflexive gesture on the part of the maker, making films like *Yawar Mallku* valuable as ethnographies. Conversely, ethnographic knowledge, which is seldom used as a resource for interpreting Third

Cinema, can be useful for audiences who are not part of the social collectivity that is the subject and principal addressee of the film.

At the end of his essay "Revolutionary Film: The Bolivian Experience," Sanjinés recounts in detail the arrival of the Ukamau Group in Kaata to film *Yawar Mallku*.[128] This is, in the language of anthropology, an "arrival scene," and it is one that has experienced several iterations. Besides the essay, it is also alluded to in the film itself, when the community uses a coca leaf ceremony to judge the intentions of the Peace Corps volunteers. Furthermore, it is the subject of Sanjinés's 1995 film, *Para recibir el canto de los pájaros*, which compares the arrival of a film crew in a remote village to the Spanish Conquest. In what seems an instance of postmodern ethnography of a *mise en abîme* variety, the story also appears incorporated into the arrival scene in Joseph Bastien's 1978 ethnography about the *ayllu* of Kaata, *Mountain of the Condor: Metaphor and Ritual in an Andean Ayllu*. Bastien travels from La Paz to the closest town to Kaata in an open bed truck called the *Yawar Mallku*, perhaps the very one that we see taking the injured Ignacio to the city in the film. There he meets his informant, Marcelino Yanahuaya, who played Ignacio in the film (he is immediately recognizable in the photo on the book's cover). I will quote Bastien at some length here, as his account is revealing, both in the way it confirms and rehearses Sanjinés's version, as well as for the insight it gives into the level of collaboration between Ukamau and the film's subjects:

> On the trip there, Marcelino had told us that Carmen [his wife] was suspicious of visitors and that she would be the one to decide whether or not we stayed in Kaata. He had explained that Carmen's suspicions of foreigners increased in 1967 when Bolivian and French filmmakers had stayed twenty days in Kaata. In their film *Yawar Mallku*, Marcelino played the lead role of a rebellious Indian, who was married to a beautiful Chilean actress. This angered Carmen who, because she had never seen a movie, could not distinguish between actual romance and role playing. In addition to Carmen's anger, Kaatan leaders blamed the filmmakers for involving them in a political movie which advocated a socialist revolution to overthrow imperialist institutions. After the movie had become a success, Bolivian officials blamed Kaatans for their part in the movie and said they were communists, even though the Indians knew nothing about communism or the political overtones

> of the movie. The Indians had been exploited by the filmmakers, just as the filmmakers argued that imperialists exploited Bolivians. The leaders of Kaata attributed their community's loss of reputation, as well as some crop failures, to the 'bad luck' brought by the filmmakers. For this reason, then, when Carmen realized the intent of our visit, she walked away.
>
> Following Carmen into the cooking house, Marcelino argued with her for several hours. Carmen finally agreed we could stay with her family only if Sarito Quispe read the coca leaves and saw our visit as a good omen. The Yanahuayas had no doubt about Sarito's prophetic powers to predict the effects of our stay on the mountain. Several years before, Sarito had predicted the death of two Yanahuaya children.
>
> "My only two sons, Sabino and Roberto, died," Marcelino said, weeping. "When they were sick, Sarito divined from coca. The leaves revealed the time and place where they would die. I cursed him and said he was wrong. I doubted the leaves and took my sons to doctors in La Paz. I had to sell my cow to pay for their treatments, but they died as Sarito had prophesied."[129]

This is the only mention Bastien makes of Marcelino Yanahuaya's experience with cinema, and, for obvious reasons, Bastien does not connect Yanahuaya's experience acting in film with his desire to be a native informant for an ethnographer, which, if it is true that he argued with his wife about it for three hours, must have been intense. To do so would cast doubt on Marcelino's credibility as an uncorrupted representative of the Kaata *ayllu*. Bastien makes an implicit contrast between his unobtrusive presence and the exploitative interference in the community's life by the filmmakers, who are not just urban, intellectual Bolivians, but also French, positing himself as someone who will be more attuned to the community's own interests.[130] And he downplays any possible lingering effects from the experience on Marcelino and Carmen by emphasizing their utter incomprehension of the film and its politics. Exactly what romance between Marcelino and his co-star he refers to is unclear, and Carmen, as he describes her, is something of an ignorant harpy. Likewise, he claims the community knew nothing of "communism" or the film's political "overtones." The first seems an odd assertion to make, given the historical context in which he was writing. Bastien visited Kaata in 1978, near the end of the eight year rule of military dictator Hugo Banzer Suarez, and it

seems highly unlikely that fourteen years into an almost unbroken string of military dictators, they remained ignorant of leftist politics, even if only in the caricatured form purveyed by the ruling elite. Bastien's is not a self-reflexive ethnography; he questions neither his own motivations or those of his informers. By insulating his subject from the tumultuous politics then wracking Bolivia, he attempts to gain a transcendental perspective on the *ayllu's* belief system. But these beliefs are not immutable, and they are inflected by politics, something Sanjinés, despite his essentializing tendencies, seems to be aware of, as I will demonstrate with the discussion of the *kharisiri* below.

Bastien's second claim, that the community was unaware of the political "overtones" of the film is even more implausible, not least because the politics of the film are so manifest, rather than being mere overtones demanding some subtlety of interpretation. The last paragraph quoted above is interesting in this regard. It includes two details from Marcelino's life before the film that were clearly incorporated into the script: his loss of two children and his desperate attempt to save them by taking them to La Paz. In the film, Marcelino's character buries the effigies of his and his wife's two dead children, and of course it is Ignacio himself who is brought to La Paz in an effort to save his life. These details, which Sanjinés curiously does not mention in his account of the development of the film, strongly suggest that, as the group revised the script, they integrated Marcelino's life experiences into it. They are also omitted from Sanjinés fictional recreation of the making of *Yawar Mallku*, *Para recibir el canto de los pájaros*.

Arrival scenes in ethnographies, as Mary Louise Pratt notes, are "symbolically and ideologically rich," and "they often turn out to be the most memorable segments of ethnographic works."[131] She sees them as vestiges of the personal narrative ethnography claims to have "killed by science."[132] Pratt argues that ethnography defines itself negatively by contrast to adjacent and antecedent forms of discourse. The arrival scene, besides mitigating the boredom of ethnographic texts, serves to remind the ethnographer and the reader that the discursive practices of ethnography are all borrowed from other

discourses, such as travel writing.[133] The same is true of ethnographic film, which is largely defined in terms of its opposition to other cinematic practices from which it freely borrows, such as the documentary or feature fiction film. Sanjinés's *Para recibir el canto de los pájaros* is a markedly different film from the one that precedes it, *La nación clandestina*. There are few long takes in the film, and although it seems to move backward and forward in time, this illusion is often grounded in the present by the sudden intrusion into the frame of a camera on a crane. As a self–reflexive film in the tradition of *81/2* (Fellini, 1961), *Le mépris* (*Contempt*, Godard, 1963), or *La nuit américaine* (*Day for Night*, Francois Truffaut, 1973), it proclaims itself in the direct lineage of a European art cinema tradition, an effect enhanced by the presence of Geraldine Chaplin.[134] At the same time, because its subject matter is an arrival scene, and because its themes pertain to racial and ethnic politics in postcolonial Bolivia, it is very much a science fiction film in the Rouchian sense, like *Jaguar*.

Many events depicted in the film are familiar from Sanjinés's essay: the group's crass offer of monetary compensation and medical assistance in an effort to win over the populace; the discussion with the village's *Mallku*, Ubaldino (played by Reynaldo Yujra), in which he is asked why he does not just order the villagers to cooperate; the rocks thrown during the night against the door of the room in which the crew is sleeping; the coca ceremony the *yatiri* uses to divine their intentions. The subplot of Fernando, the producer's younger brother, who falls in love with Rosa, the village is from the first, abandoned scenario for *Yawar Mallku*. Unlike the international Ukamau Group of the late-1960s, the crew in the film is a multiethnic microcosm of Bolivian society. The ethnic tensions the group keeps concealed erupt when the villagers surround the schoolroom they are camped out in at night and hurl rocks through the windows. The *blancos* among them suddenly see certain of their group as *indios* and accuse them of betrayal. The accused subsequently deny their Indianness, and the "leftist" leaders of the group, in a particularly scathing image, attempt to protect themselves by donning the

armor used as props in their film, completing the identification of them with the Conquistadors that had been established through parallel editing earlier in the film. Later in the film Pedro, the producer, after being rescued from a fall by a group of indigenous people, sees a Conquistador who has killed the other members of his party in order to keep all the riches they have looted to himself. Their eyes meet, and we expect a camera to drop into the frame, resolving the temporal ambiguity of the scene as has already happened three times previously. But it does not. Our expectation is disappointed, and we are left to understand that this time the conquistador is what he appears to be, not an actor. The withholding of the self-reflexive gesture established as a trope in the film creates a void into which the Aymara sense of time rushes.

In *Para recibir el canto de los pájaros* Sanjinés exhibits the exquisite control of cinematic form that characterizes the self-reflexive art film, but he maintains a delicate balance in its use that is indicative of his ambivalent attitude toward European art cinema. The obtuseness and venality of the film crew is at odds with the formal sophistication and visual beauty of the film that portrays their acts. At the same time, the elaborate self-reflexive technique we have come to expect is eschewed at the moment when time is collapsed, implicating it in the obfuscation of an ongoing colonialism. And the film concludes with an allegory about the limits of western technology. Early in the film, the crew's two sound people are shown wantonly shooting songbirds. At the end, once the crew has been given permission to attend the ceremony in which the village greets migrating birds, from whom they learn new melodies, we again see these two pointing a gun at the birds, but this time it is a shotgun microphone. The costumed dancers and other villagers stop to listen to the birds, and we see shots of birds and hear their singing on the soundtrack. The sound team points their microphone at these same birds, and we see silent shots of them. They test their equipment and find it to be working. For some reason, it is incapable of recording the birdsong so clearly heard by everyone present. Among other things, this scene critiques Sanjinés's own earlier assumptions that

indigenous rituals, like the coca leaf reading in *Yawar Mallku*, could be transparently represented using film.

Just because we can read films like *Para recibir el canto de los pájaros* as critiques of ethnography does not invalidate the use of ethnographic knowledge in the interpretation of Sanjinés's films. Bastien chose Kaata for his researches for much the same reason Ukamau set their film there. The *ayllu* of Kaata was known for its high number of *yatiri* and the region surrounding it is home to the *Quollahuayas* (also spelled *Kallawayas*), a secretive group who practice traditional, herb-based medicine.[135] This knowledge would be available to Bolivian audiences of *Yawar Mallku*, but the significance of the location is not revealed for non-native audiences. The film is rich in such details that remain unexplained; for instance, what does the dead chicken hung upside down on the wall just outside the door to Ignacio's house mean?

Yawar Mallku mobilizes indigenous ways of knowledge that go unremarked even in Alfonso Gumucio Dagron's and Carlos Mesa's histories. Ethnographers like Libbet Crandon-Malamud, though, have connected the film with a legend that circulates among Andean cultures in various forms, that of the *kharisiri* (also spelled *Qhariciri*).[136]

Kharisiri and *kharikhari* (or *qari quari*) are all Aymara words for a vampire of sorts that cuts out a person's fat, after which their victim usually wastes away and dies. Among Quechua speakers in Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador, it is known as a *ñakaq*, and in Peru it is given the Spanish name *pishtako* (sometimes *pishtaco*). There are numerous regional variations on this legend and there is a substantial ethnographic literature recording them. That there is such an extensive ethnographic literature on *kharisiri* speaks to the pleasure people in the Andes take in telling these legends to outsiders, who, not coincidentally, are often "mistaken" for *kharisiri* themselves.[137] That they rob their victims of fat is highly significant. In Andean cultures fat (*wira* in Quechua) is considered the energy principle and blood (*yawar* in Quechua) the life principal.[138] Fat is considered so important that one of the principal divinities in Andean theology is called

Wiraqocha (or *Viracocha*), which translates roughly as "Sea of Fat." According to Nathan Wachtel, fat and blood are somewhat interchangeable, so it could also be translated as "Sea of Blood."[139] Therefore, anyone who takes blood can also thought of as a *kharisiri*.[140] He notes that the semantic core unifying the various names for the *kharisiri* is not a reference to fat but some form of a verb used to describe cutting: *ñakaq* comes from *nakay*, to slaughter; *kharisiri* comes from *kharina*, to cut with a sharp instrument, etc.[141]

Until around the 1950s the *kharisiri* was portrayed as being a Franciscan monk who stole people's fat to make holy oil.[142] After that he was increasingly depicted as a *gringo*. Many explanations are given as to why these *gringos* steal fat. Crandon-Malamud records that the fat was believed to be destined for La Paz, where it would be made into soap or perfume to be consumed by the elite or sold to tourists.[143] Other accounts are even more fantastic, suggesting that the fat is taken back to North America where it is used to lubricate factory machinery or even power rockets. There is a general consensus among anthropologists that these stories are used as an expression of labor and economic relations, subtended by race.[144] More recently it has been claimed that the *kharisiri* legend has been revived as a consequence of neoliberal reforms.[145]

When Ignacio peers into the window of the Peace Corps clinic and sees the doctors, scalpels in hand and blood on their scrubs, we are not told what he thinks. For a western audience this is the moment he realizes that the women giving birth there are being sterilized. For a Bolivian audience, this is also where he realizes that the Peace Corps members are *kharisiri*. The two interpretations, one based in rationality, the other in legend, are mutually exclusive in the western mind. But, as June Nash convincingly demonstrates in her classic ethnography of Bolivian miners, *We Eat the Mines and the Mines Eat Us*, the ability to hold in balance such irreconcilable views is characteristic of indigenous Bolivians; they use it to endure oppression by creating a sense of their own identity and to fight against that oppression.[146]

In *¡Fuera de aquí!* Sanjinés again evokes the *kharisiri* when a man is brought into a medical clinic run by the missionaries and given their all-purpose cure, a bleeding. On the door to the clinic a sign is posted with a quote from the gospels, "This is my blood," making explicit what Canessa notes is the persistent religious undertones in the modern *kharisiri* legends.[147]

Throughout this work I have analyzed the formal means Sanjinés uses to cinematically represent a particular Andean subjectivity. In this I have taken the lead from his own writings, which are, as I have argued, intended as interventions in international debates about film form and politics. This discursus about the *kharisiri*, about which I would have known nothing, except for conversations with Bolivians and reading ethnographic literature, suggests that there are other means, other ways of knowledge, Sanjinés uses to communicate with indigenous Andeans, ones that are private, passed over in silence in his writings. It further suggests the usefulness of anthropological knowledge in interpreting his films and that they can profitably be considered ethnographic films using Nichols's more expansive definition of the category. Steven Feld notes of Rouch's 1974 film *Cocorico, Monsieur Poulet*, a collective improvisation on a popular Nigerien fable, that his goal was to "develop a visual poetic of African storytelling."[148] I suspect that for all my efforts I have only scratched the surface of Sanjinés's effort to develop a visual poetic of Andean storytelling.

Notes

[1] The *Trilogy of Life* is what Pasolini called his three adaptations of classic medieval texts which began with *Il Decameron*, continued with *I racconti di Canterbury* (*The Canterbury Tales*, 1972), and concluded with *Il fiore delle mille e una notte* (*Arabian Nights*, 1974).

[2] Birgit Haustedt, "Die Fremdheit Pasolinis: Zur Rezeption seines Werkes in Deutschland 1975-1995," in Hansgeorg Schmidt-Bergman, ed. *Zwischen Kontinuität und Reknstruktion: Kulturtransfer zwischen Deutschland und Italien nach 1945* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1998), 201, 205.

[3] Naomi Greene, *Pier Paolo Pasolini: Cinema as Heresy* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1990), 164, note 24.

[4] Antonio Costa, "The Semiological Heresy of Pier Paolo Pasolini," in Paul Willemen, ed. *Pier Paolo Pasolini* (London: BFI, 1977), 41.

[5] Paul Willemen, "Preface," in Paul Willemen, ed. *Pier Paolo Pasolini* (London: BFI, 1977), vi.

[6] G. Nowell-Smith, "Pasolini's Originality," in Paul Willemen, ed. *Pier Paolo Pasolini* (London: BFI, 1977), 10. As will become clear at the end of this chapter, such ideas can be attributed to a lack familiarity with or misreading of Pasolini's essay "Observations on the Sequence Shot."

[7] Pier Paolo Pasolini, *Pasolini*, interviews with Oswald Stack, Cinema One, vol. 11 (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1970), 7.

[8] It is difficult not to suspect that homophobia accounted for at least part of the animus directed at Pasolini by his leftist critics. Homophobic attacks often appeared in the rather perverse form of analyses of Pasolini's "self-oppression," the evidence for which lay in his steadfast refusal to align himself with gay rights groups, which he saw as merely soliciting a false tolerance from the bourgeois state. As with many of Pasolini's positions, this one too has been reevaluated lately and is now seen by some as being considerably ahead of its time.

[9] Teresa DeLauretis, "Re-Reading Pasolini's Essays on Cinema," *Italian Quarterly* nos. 82-3 (1980-1): 164.

[10] Ibid., 164.

[11] Giuliana Bruno, "Heresies: The Body of Pasolini's Semiotics," *Cinema Journal* 30.3 (1991): 37. Pasolini had a conflicted relationship with Italian feminists, especially near the end of his life, owing to his strident opposition to legalized abortion. Bruno's piece suggests, though, that Pasolini thoughts on subjectivity and alterity were informed by feminist arguments. Pasolini the anti-feminist is perhaps another piece of received wisdom about him that is ripe for reexamination.

[12] Patrick Rumble, *Allegories of Contamination: Pier Paolo Pasolini's* *Trilogy of Life* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1996), 136.

[13] Angelo Restivo, *The Cinema of Economic Miracles: Visuality and Modernization in the Italian Art Film* (Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 2001), 91.

[14] Pasolini, *Pasolini*, 26.

[15] Qtd. in Naomi Green, *Pier Paolo Pasolini: Cinema as Heresy* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1990), 218.

[16] Ibid., 218.

[17] Mauricio Viano, *A Certain Realism: Making Use of Pasolini's Film Theory and Practice* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1993), 35.

[18] Qtd. in Ibid., 34.

[19] Jorge Sanjinés, "El tiempo circular de Jorge Sanjinés," interview by Ricardo Bajo Herreras, *El ojo que piensa*, no. 0 (2003): [journal online], available from http://www.elojoquepiensa.udg.mx/espanol/numero00/cinejournal/01_jorgesanjines.html; Internet; accessed 23 April 2009.

[20] Qtd. in Sam Rohdie, *The Passion of Pier Paolo Pasolini* (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1995), 18.

[21] Greene, *Pier Paolo Pasolini: Cinema as Heresy*, 55.

[22] Ibid., 185.

[23] Ibid., 55.

[24] Qtd. in Rumble, *Allegories of Contamination*, 27.

[25] Pier Paolo Pasolini, *Heretical Empiricism* Trans. and Ed. by Ben Lawton and Louise K. Barnett (Washington, D.C.: New Academic Publishing, 2005), 270.

[26] Ibid., 273, 159. (italics in the original)

[27] I use the adjective "African" here advisedly, keeping it consistent with Pasolini's own use. One of the students corrects Pasolini when he speaks of "African culture," noting that Africa is a continent, not a nation.

[28] Pier Paolo Pasolini, "Pasolini on Film," in Willemen, ed. *Pier Paolo Pasolini*, 77.

[29] Sam Rohdie, *The Passion of Pier Paolo Pasolini* (London: BFI), 55.

[30] Restivo, *The Cinema of Economic Miracles*, 49.

[31] Rohdie, *The Passion of Pier Paolo Pasolini*, 9.

[32] Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 122.

[33] Qtd. in Millicent Marcus, *Filmmaking by the Book: Italian Cinema and Literary Adaptation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1993), 137.

[34] Rohdie, *The Passion of Pier Paolo Pasolini*, 63.

[35] Sam Rohdie, "Neo-Realism and Pasolini: The Desire for Reality," in Zygmunt G. Baránski, ed. *Pasolini Old and New: Surveys and Studies* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1999), 172.

[36] Rohdie, "Neo-Realism and Pasolini," 180.

[37] Leonardo García Pabón, *La patria íntima: Álegorias nacionales en la literatura y el cine de Bolivia* (La Paz: Plural Editores, 1998), 251-3.

[38] Pasolini, *Heretical Empiricism*, 81.

[39] Louis-Georges Schwartz, "Typewriter: Free Indirect Discourse in Deleuze's *Cinema*," *Substance* 34.3 (2005): 116.

[40] Pasolini, *Heretical Empiricism*, 87.

[41] Ibid., 79.

[42] Ibid., 79.

[43] Pasolini, *Heretical Empiricism*, 198.

[44] Ibid., 89.

[45] Schwartz, "Typewriter," 109.

[46] Ibid., 124.

[47] Ibid., 178.

[48] Ibid., 185.

[49] Ibid., 299.

[50] Viano, *A Certain Realism*, 72-6.

[51] Ibid., 74.

[52] Ibid., 95. Viano analyzes each of Pasolini's films in a separate chapter—even the shorts—with the exception of the *Trilogy*, which are treated dismissively in a single chapter. At times Viano seems reminiscent of Pasolini's early 1970s critics, as when he describes his short film, *Le mura di Sana'a* (*The Walls of Saana'a*, 1971), as evidence of "progressive slippage toward the ontological fallacy." Ibid., 261.

[53] Christopher Orr, "The Politics of Film Form: Observations on Pasolini's Theory and Practice," *Film Criticism* 15.2 (1991): 45.

[54] Ibid., 46.

[55] Marcus, *Filmmaking by the Book*, 138. Chaucer's Middlesex dialect, like Boccaccio's Tuscan, similarily became the source of standard English. Pasolini attempted to dub the actors in *I racconti di Canterbury* with a variety of working-class English voices, essentially repeating the technique used in *Il decamerone*, but, perhaps because Pasolini did not speak English, this proved too difficult and the results unsatisfactory, so he reverted to dubbing the mostly English-speaking cast in Italian. Though this dubbing seems bizarre to English-speaking audiences, it is entirely in keeping with Pasolini's method, going back to at least *Il vangelo secondo Matteo*, of using separate performers for image and voice to create an audiovisual pastiche.

[56] Rumble, *Allegories of Contamination*, 15.

[57] Gilles Deleuze, *Cinema 2: The Time Image* (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1989), 222.

[58] Ibid., 223.

[59] Marcus, *Filmmaking by the Book*, 148.

[60] Pasolini, *Pasolini*, 32.

[61] Rumble, *Allegories of Contamination*, 33.

[62] Ibid., 46.

[63] Ibid., 70.

[64] Pasolini, *Heretical Empiricism*, 177-8.

[65] Ibid., 182.

[66] I do not wish to present Pasolini as captive to semiotic analysis or an *idée fixe* about the language of cinema he derived from it. Pasolini's insistence on style as the only available resource for cinematic difference is in keeping with his pastiche aesthetic. He described himself as a "*pasticheur* by passion..not by calculation" and once said, "The sign under which I work is always contamination," a term he borrowed from linguisitics to describe the mix of high and low culture in his work. See Pasolini, *Pasolini*, 28 and Pasolini et al., "Pier Paolo Pasolini: An Epical-Religious View of the World" *Film Quarterly* 18.4 (1965): 42.

[67] Pasolini, "Pasolini on Film," 76.

[68] Orr, "The Politics of Film Form," 42.

[69] Pasolini, *Heretical Empiricism*, 227.

[70] Rene Capriles Farfan, "Una memoria de la cultura negra: Jean Rouch," *Hablemos de cine* nos. 61-2 (1971): 4. No. 53 of *Hablemos de cine* from May-June of 1970 contains a review of Rouch and Morin's *Chronique d'un été* (*Chronicle of a*

Summer, 1960), brief descriptions of Rouch's *Moi, un noir* (*I, a Negro*, 1958) and *La pyramide humaine* (*The Human Pyramid*, 1959), as well as a partial filmography.

[71] Rouch, "Our Totemic Ancestors and Crazed Masters," 224.

[72] Paul Stoller, *The Cinematic Griot: The Ethnography of Jean Rouch* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1992), 43.

[73] Jean Rouch, *Ciné-Ethnography*, ed. and trans. Steven Feld (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 2003), 165. Here Rouch really means a sub-Saharan African; there were films being made in North Africa long before Rouch, especially in Egypt, which had the largest Arabic-language film industry.

[74] Dirk Nijland, "Jean Rouch: A Builder of Bridges," in Joram ten Brink, ed. *Building Bridges: The Cinema of Jean Rouch* (London: Wallflower Press, 2007), 28.

[75] Rouch, *Ciné-Ethnography*, 182.

[76] Ibid., 101.

[77] Ibid., 38.

[78] For details on Ganda's career see Steven Ungar, "Whose Voice? Whose Film?: Jean Rouch, Oumarou Ganda and *Moi, un noir*," in ten Brink, ed., *Building Bridges*, 111-23.

[79] See the Afterword for more on Yujra's career.

[80] Julianne Burton, ed. *Cinema and Social Change in Latin America: Conversations with Filmmakers* (Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1986), 261, 279.

[81] John King, *Magical Reels: A History of Cinema in Latin America* (New York: Verso, 1995), 208-9.

[82] Friya Shiwy, *Indianizing Film: Decolonization, the Andes, and the Question of Technology* (Newark: Rutgers Univ. Press, 2009), 73

[83] Jorge Sanjinés y Grupo Ukamau, *Teoría y práctica de un cine junto al pueblo* (Mexico: Siglo Ventiuno, 1979), 38-49.

[84] Paul Willemen, "The Third Cinema Question: Notes and Reflections," in Jim Pines and Paul Willemen, eds. *Questions of Third Cinema* (London: BFI, 1989), 22.

[85] Ibid., 22.

[86] Ibid., 23.

[87] Rouch, *Ciné-Ethnography*, 8.

[88] Paul Stoller, "Artaud, Rouch, and the Cinema of Cruelty," *Visual Anthropology Review* 8.2 (1992): 52.

[89] Stoller, *The Cinematic Griot*, 159.

[90] Anna Grimshaw, *The Ethnographer's Eye: Ways of Seeing in Modern Anthropology* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2001), 91.

[91] Ibid., 92.

[92] Rouch shot this film with three of his usual collaborators in 1954, before the advent of lightweight synchronized sound recording devices. The soundtrack is an improvised running commentary by the protagonists, recorded ten years later as they watched the film projected. With its themes of collective memory, colonial structures of class and race, and rural to urban migration, *Jaguar*, is particularly relevant to the cinema of Sanjinés.

[93] Paul Stoller tends to argue for the value of Rouch's ethnographic research; thus, he downplays his contributions to documentary and fiction films. Grimshaw tends to make her claims on the basis of his "science fiction" films, ignoring his vast body of "straight" ethnographic films.

[94] Anna Grimshaw, "Adventures on the Road: Some Reflections on Rouch and his Italian Contemporaries," in *Building Bridges*, 278. In note 1 on p. 283, Grimshaw takes this argument a step further, in reference to *Moi, un noir*. "Rouch's work raises the possibility that the origins of the *nouvelle vague* lie in Africa, not Europe." As a parallel to this, I would add that bringing Bolivian cinema into the mix raises the possibility that the Rouchian "science fiction" film has its origins in South America, with *Vuelve Sebastiana* (*Come Back Sebastiana*, dir. Jorge Ruiz, 1953), a film which influenced Sanjinés profoundly. See Chapter 1 for a detailed description of this film. *Moi, un noir*, considered a foundational text of both African Third Cinema (Willemen) and French New Wave (Grimshaw and Godard), is, like Sanjinés's films from the 1960s-1970s, a key text in the juncture between Third Cinema and European art film.

[95] See Chapter 3 for Paranaguá's theory of "triangulation" in Latin American cinema.

[96] Freya Schiwy, in the Introductory chapter to *Indianizing Film* writes, "Although not a unified movement championing one aesthetic solution to U.S. cultural imperialism, third cinema filmmakers from across Latin America and Africa agreed that Hollywood's hegemonic narrative form and visual style attested to the inseparable relation between capitalims and (neo)colonialism." Schiwy, *Indianizing Film*, 11. The context for this remark is an account of the historical background out of which indigenous video in the Andes emerged, one that necessarily takes Sanjinés into account. Schiwy mentions no African filmmakers by name, so it is impossible to tell whether or not she had Rouch in mind. Her statement explicitly contradicts Willemen's, and is more an assumption than a supported or supportable assertion. Still, it is revelatory in that it takes for granted an affinity and a relationship between Latin American and African political Third Cinema, indicating the emergence of a conventional wisdom that may be historically inaccurate. Schiwy and others have noted that the origins of indigenous video in the Andes can be traced in equal measure to both Sanjinés and Rouch (via *Cine Minero*), but this does not necessarily mean there was an earlier confluence in the 1960s-1970s. I remain aware throughout what follows that the question of direct influence one way or the other remains open. Still, this does not make any less valuable a comparative

study of these two filmmakers which emphasizes the Third Cinema aspects of Rouch's work and the anthropological value/critique in Sanjinés's.

[97] David MacDougall, "Beyond Observational Cinema," in *Principles of Visual Anthropology*, 116.

[98] Sanjinés, *Teoría y práctica*, 53. Rouch was not unsympathetic to these views. In an interview about the politics of anthropology he recounts witnessing Black Panther sympathizers disrupt a meeting of the Africa section of the American Anthropological Association, accusing those present of gathering information that was used to exploit workers. Although he criticizes the violence of their method, he does admit that there was some truth to their claims. See Rouch, *Ciné-Ethnography*, 220.

[99] Rouch, *Ciné-Ethnography*, 43.

[100] Catherine Russell, *Experimental Ethnography: The Work of Film in the Age of Video* (Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 1999), xi.

[101] Eric Ross, "Blood of the Condor (Yawar Mallku)," *American Anthropologist* 80.1 (1978): 203.

[102] Jay Ruby, *Picturing Culture: Explorations of Film and Anthropology* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2000), 33, 148, and passim.

[103] Ibid., 32, 212.

[104] Ibid., 266.

[105] David MacDougall, "When Less is More: The Long Take in Documentary," in Brian Henderson and Ann Martin, eds. *Film Quarterly: Forty Years—A Selection* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1999), 302.

[106] Grimshaw, *The Ethnographer's Eye*, 74ff.

[107] David MacDougall, *Transcultural Cinema* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1998), 114ff.

[108] Juan José Rossi, ed. *El cine etnobiográfico de Jorge Prelorán* (Buenos Aires: Ediciones Busqueda, 1987), 21.

[109] Johannes Fabian, *Time and the Work of Anthropology:Critical Essays 1971-1991* (Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1991), 199.

[110] Ibid., 198.

[111] Ibid., 198.

[112] Schiwy writes, "In contrast with cinema's colonial gaze, indigenous media inscribe their communities into the present rather than occupying a premodern realm—be it monstrous or pastoral." I argue that this takes place well before the advent of indigenous video, in some Third Cinema, but especially in the films of Sanjinés and Rouch. Schiwy, *Indianizing Film*, 28.

[113] Rouch, *Ciné-Ethnography*, 176.

[114] Stephen Felder, "Editors Introduction," in Rouch, *Ciné-Ethnography*, 9.

[115] Grimshaw, *TheEthnographer's Eye*, 107.

[116] Paul Stoller, "Jean Rouch and the Power of the Between," in William Rothman, ed., *Three Documentary Filmmakers: Errol Morris, Ross McElwee, Jean Rouch*. (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009), 127.

[117] Daniel Morgan, "The Pause of the World," William Rothman, ed. *Three Documentary Filmmakers: Errol Morris, Ross McElwee, Jean Rouch* (Albany: State Univ. of New York Press, 2009), 139.

[118] Ibid., 139.

[119] Ibid., 143.

[120] Ungar, "Whose Voice? Whose Film?," in ten Brink, ed. *Building Bridges*, 120.

[121] Rouch, *Ciné-Ethnography*, 87-88.

[122] Steven A. Tyler, *The Unspeakable: Discourse, Dialogue, and Rhetoric in the Postmdern World* (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1987), 203.

[123] Ibid., 202.

[124] Bill Nichols, *Blurred Boundaries: Questions of Meaning in Contemporary Culture* (Bloomington: Univ. of Indiana Press, 1994), 83.

[125] Ruby heavily critiques Nichols's use of Tyler. See Jay Ruby, *Picturing Culture*, 33.

[126] Bertolt Brecht, *Brecht on Film and Radio*, ed. and trans. Marc Silberman (NY:Methuen, 2000), 198.

[127] Ibid., 194.

[128] See Chapter 2 for a detailed summary.

[129] Joseph W. Bastien, *Mountain of the Condor: Metaphor and Ritual in an Andean Ayllu* (Prospect Heights: Waveland Press, 1985), 13-14.

[130] Danielle Caillet, who was French, was the wife of cinematographer Antonio Eguino and played the role of the blonde woman Peace Corps volunteer in the film.

[131] Mary Louise Pratt, "Fieldwork in Common Places," in James Clifford and George E. Marcus, eds. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1986), 32.

[132] Ibid., 31.

[133] Ibid., 27, 33.

[134] Chaplin plays a French anthropologist who came to Bolivia years ago because she believed a revolution was possible there. In her house, we see a photo of her from May 1968, standing before a wall painted with the slogan, "Be Realistic, Demand the Impossible."

[135] Bastien, *Mountain of the Condor*, 9ff.

[136] Libbet Crandon-Malamud, *From the Fat our our Souls: Social Change, Political Process, and Medical Pluralism in Bolivia* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1991), 120.

[137] For accounts of engineers, anthropologists and other outsiders suspected of being *kharisiri*, see Mary Weismantel, *Cholas and Pishtacos: Stories of Race and Sex in the Andes* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2001), 9, and Nathan Wachtel, *Gods and Vampires: Return to Chipaya* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1994), 53. For a succinct and useful review of the ethnographic literature on *kharisiri* see Andrew Canessa, "Fear and Loathing on the *Kharisiri* Trail; Alterity and Identity in the Andes," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* New Series no. 6 (2000): 706-7.

[138] Bastien, *Mountain of the Condor*, 45.

[139] Wachtel, *Gods and Vampires*, 72.

[140] I was told by friends in La Paz that to this day doctors and nurses take blood samples from indigenous patients only as a last resort.

[141] Wachtel, *Gods and Vampires*, 72.

[142] Crandon-Malamud, *From the Fat of Our Souls*, 120. Canessa claims it was originally a Bethlehemite friar, not a Franciscan. Those with particularly strong stomachs are directed to Canessa, "Fear and Loathing," 706, for a vivid description of how this order of friars first became associate with vampirism.

[143] Crandon-Malamud, *From the Fat of Our Souls*, 120.

[144] For a description of some dissenting interpretations see Weismantel, *Cholas and Pishtacos*, 7.

[145] Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui, "Liberal Democracy and *Ayllu* Democracy in Bolivia: The Case of Northern Potosí," *Journal of Development Studies* 26.4 (1990), 113-4. Rivera Cusicanqui suggests that the legend was all but dormant until the arrival of neoliberalism in the early 1980s. Evidence in the ethnographic literature as well as Sanjinés's mobilization of the legend in films made in 1969 and 1977 suggest otherwise. I see Rivera Cusicanqui's assertion as a political strategy not unlike Sanjinés's.

[146] June Nash, *We Eat the Mines and the Mines Eat Us: Dependency and Exploitation in Bolivian Tin Mines* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1979).

[147] Canessa, "Fear and Loathing," 707.

[148] Steven Feld, “Editor’s Introduction,” in Rouch, *Ciné-Ethnography*, 11.

AFTERWORD

"It is beginning with Sanjinés that the fortunes of Bolivian cinema truly changed. Through his profoundly politically and ideologically committed cinema, joined to a formalism plagued by shortages and limitations, he achieved a great and crude cinematic power, accentuated by the precariousness of the film he utilized, which accounts for all that is tremendous, valuable, and excellent in the stories he told. More than forty years have passed since the master Sanjinés began making films, and despite the fact that he is an invaluable and inescapable reference in our cinema, almost, one might say, to the point of being the North Star for all those who follow him, it must be made clear that time has passed and the world has changed greatly. The bipolar world of the Cold War has expired, the myth of the communist panacea has evaporated, the dream of the revolution with the machine gun on shoulder no longer takes place today, the ideals which infected the hopes and illusions of 1960s youth who felt able to change the world have weakened to a great extent. All of this has had its repercussions in the arts, just as ideological, political, and revolutionary delights had an influence in their moment, provoking into existence the South American Third Cinema with Sanjinés and Glauber Rocha at its head, and making other filmmakers in other latitudes of the globe focus their energies on narrating and denouncing political, ideological and social reality. Today we live in a world of political unease; the political utopia has disintegrated almost in its entirety, although in Bolivia many, in a diffuse sort of way, have returned to believing in it." Álvaro Loayza, Bolivian director of one feature-length and two short videos.[1]

"It is possible that Latin American cinema had fewer showcases in the countries in which it emerged than in Europe. Perhaps it might be more accurate to say that the relations between the Latin American countries in which innovative films were produced afforded filmmakers few opportunities to see each other's work and get together. This contradiction generates a "distance" from which we could free ourselves if the various minority cinemas could achieve closer and more fluid relations based on our own common expectations rather than the usual expectations we encounter every time we leave Latin America: the "third worlder" as identity, "underdevelopment" represented as in the paradigmatic images of the generation of the 60s and 70s; "reality" expressed exclusively as a problem of state policies, in resistance to imperial domination, and not as a result of contemporary causes such as multinational capital, which produces domination on a different scale, affecting all levels of society, and producing an impoverished globalization that generates enormous "distances" between the different social class." Daniela Goggi, director of one film and a television series.[2]

In April 2007 the *Espacio Simón I. Patiño*, an arts center in La Paz sponsored by the great tin baron's charitable foundation, and the *Consejo Nacional del Cine* (CONACINE) convened a meeting of aspiring Bolivian filmmakers under the age of forty—in other words, filmmakers born after the 1966 premiere of *Ukamau*. Judging by the published proceedings, Jorge Sanjinés loomed large at this gathering of post-Sanjinés filmmakers; well over half of the presenters felt the need to acknowledge their debt to him while, at the same time, distancing themselves from his revolutionary cinematic practice, as does Álvaro Loayza. Others, like Daniela Goggi, do not mention him by name, but are clearly speaking to the lingering effect of the generation of Latin American filmmakers of the 1960s and 1970s of which Sanjinés is such an integral part.

Sanjinés does indeed loom large in Bolivian cinema, which has experienced two "boom" years since the end of the Cold War.[3] The first was in 1995, when five feature films were released, including Sanjinés's *Para recibir el canto de los pájaros* (*To Hear the Birds Singing*) and *Sayari* (*Get Up!*, Mela Márquez), the first Bolivian feature-length film directed by a woman. 2003, the second boom year, there were eight, including Sanjinés most recent, *Los hijos del último jardín* (*Sons of the Last Garden*).[4] Specific convergences of political and economic factors help explain these booms, and Sanjinés's ability to produce new work is as contingent upon them as anyone else's. At the same time, the release of a new film by Sanjinés, the Bolivian filmmaker with the highest international profile, provides CONACINE with a strategic occasion for promoting Bolivian cinema abroad, which may explain in part these clusters of films released around his. However diminished his impact may be, his name is still the best guarantor that the eyes of the world will turn to Bolivian cinema, thus increasing the chances of the other films being able to find their way to international markets.

The 2007 *Sub-40* meeting recalls another held twenty years earlier at the 1987 Havana Festival of New Latin American Cinema. Planned to commemorate the accomplishments of New Latin American Cinema on the twentieth anniversary of the

first *Encuentro* at Viña del Mar, Chile, it quickly became a heated debate about the success, legacy, and future of the movement.[5] According to Patricia Auferdheide's account, confronted with a loss of funding from privatized European television networks like Germany's ZDF as well as the impending end of the Soviet era, foreshadowed by *perestroika*, some presenters advocated a more accommodating stance towards commercial cinema. Sanjinés, for his part, denounced filmmakers who even contemplated deviating from political commitment, and, invoking Jean-Luc Godard's late 1960s metaphor for commercial filmmaking, argued, "Many propose or produce sell-out cinema under a misguided justification that the important thing is to 'occupy screens,' as if the remedy for prostitution were to prostitute yourself."[6] Spanish critic Manuel Pérez Estremera also advocated a return to the movement's roots, albeit as a commercial, not political, strategy. He noted, "With its advantages and dangers, Latin American cinema is identified with New Latin American cinema," and he argued that the declining fortunes of Latin American cinema abroad was paradoxically attributable to the recent tendency toward the abandonment of commitment in search of larger audiences.[7]

The three films Sanjinés made after the 1987 festival in Havana, *La nación clandestina* (*The Hidden Nation*, 1989), *Para recibir el canto de los pájaros*, and *Los hijos del último jardín* are, by the standards of most Latin American cinema of the period, intensely political works, even if they do not proclaim revolution, as did, for instance, *El enemigo principal* (*The Principal Enemy*, 1974). Still, each production shares in common with other more commercial Latin American efforts one or more strategies for securing funding and reaching an audience. Most of these strategies, with the exception of one—the use of an internationally recognized performer, Geraldine Chaplin in *Para recibir el canto de los pájaros*—are available to and discussed by the *Sub-40* filmmakers. Sanjinés is not quite as of the past as they might like to think.

One is the use of genre. For the most part New Latin American Cinema firmly rejected genre except when used satirically, as in the case of Julio García Espinosa's *Las*

aventuras de Juan Quin Quin (*The Adventures of Juan Quin Quin*, 1967). As noted in the previous chapter, *Para recibir el canto de los pájaros* marked a tentative and uncharacteristic foray into genre for Sanjinés; I say tentative, because the self-reflexive film about filmmaking by the *auteur* director is not really a genre, although, if, as David Bordwell suggests, art cinema is a genre, then the *film à clef* must be considered an important subgenre within it. With *Los hijos del último jardín* this move becomes more explicit. As David Wood notes, it "ostensibly uses the fictional idiom of the thriller."[8] More important than the generic markings of the story is the way Sanjinés tells it, beginning with the end and moving backward in time. In a useful taxonomy of complicated plot structures in contemporary cinema, Charles Ramírez Berg notes that they have been used by U.S. independents and non-U.S. "art house" filmmakers alike as a strategy for differentiating their product from Hollywood's.[9] Sanjinés's film has what Ramírez Berg calls a "backwards plot," as do *Bakha satang* (*Peppermint Candy*, Chang-dong Lee, S. Korea, 2000), *Memento* (Christopher Nolan, U.S., 2000), and *Irréversible* (*Irreversible*, Gaspar Noé, France, 2002). We can speculate that Sanjinés was drawn to the use of an alternative plot structure in response to the extraordinary international success of *Amores perros* (Alejandro González Iñárritu, Mexico, 2000) and *Cidade de Deus* (*City of God*, Fernando Meirelles and Katía Lund, Brazil, 2002).

Los hijos del último jardín was also the first film Sanjinés shot on video.[10] He purchased a theatrical video projector especially for its January 2004 premiere at La Paz's *Cine Municipal 6 de Agosto*, but within months this projector, then the only one of its kind in Bolivia, was beginning to fail, damaged by the fluctuations in the city's electrical power.[11] Digital video is a two-edged sword for Bolivian filmmakers. On the one hand it allows them to produce work and reach audiences through alternative forms of distribution. On the other hand, it excludes them from all but a few of the country's cinema screens, unless they can afford to finish their video in 35mm. Even then, the

chances of receiving more than a limited theatrical release are slim, because distribution within the country is now monopolized by Manfer Films S.R.L.

When internationally known commercial filmmakers like Michael Mann or Werner Herzog release a film originating on video, critics regard this, whatever the real reason, as the *auteur's* aesthetic choice. The same is not true of beginning filmmakers, for whom the assumption is that video was a necessity, so young Bolivian filmmakers working in video have little chance of obtaining international distribution. Bolivian filmmakers have always struggled with the expense of filmmaking, and there is a certain cruel irony in the fact that now that a higher tech, lower cost alternative to film exists, it is an impediment to their ability to reach audiences at home and abroad. Cinema made on film may be technologically retrograde compared to digital video, but, because of the financial resources making a film proper still requires, it has become a prerequisite for a film's being taken seriously within international markets, even for veterans like Sanjinés.[12]

One area in which video has been an unqualified success in Bolivia is in the production of indigenous media. This movement, which represents a sizeable portion of contemporary Bolivian non-television audiovisual output, owes much to Sanjinés's practice, if not to his aesthetic. Bolivia has one of the most vibrant and prolific networks of indigenous video makers in Latin America, and much of this is owing, directly and indirectly, to Sanjinés and his practice of a cinema with the people. The main node for this network is the *Centro de Formación y Realización Cinematográfica* (Center for Cinematic Training and Production, or CEFREC), which was founded in La Paz in 1989 by Iván Sanjinés, one of Jorge Sanjinés's two sons. Since 1996, CEFREC has joined forces with the *Coordinadora Audiovisual Indígena de Bolivia* (Bolivian Indigenous Audiovisual Council, or CAIB), an organization of indigenous media activists in Bolivia that was originally formed in the department of Chuquisaca after CEFREC held a workshop there. Recent scholarship on CEFREC-CAIB, such as Freya Schiwy's

Indianizing Film, has tended to emphasize the extent to which indigenous video departs from the cinema of Sanjinés and *Grupo Ukamau*, although, besides the obvious family connection, there are many points of continuity. Reynaldo Yujra, one of CEFREC-CAIB's most prolific performers and producers most likely would never have received any training in film had he not been cast by Sanjinés in the role of Sebastian in *La nación clandestina*. According to Yujra, before rehearsals for the film began, Sanjinés had him read books on other New Latin American Cinema filmmakers as well as technical manuals on film direction, and he generously insists that what they do at CEFREC-CAIB is no different than what *Grupo Ukamau* does, with the exception that they use video and not 35mm film.[13]

CEFREC-CAIB uses some of the same survival strategies *Grupo Ukamau* pioneered. A substantial portion of their funding comes from European organizations like *Mujarik Gabe*, a Basque NGO, and the International Cooperation Agency of Spain.[14] Although the principal addressees of the videos are the indigenous communities within which they are produced, the videomakers also strive to make a product that will appeal to multiple audiences, first so as to communicate with other indigenous communities, and second, so that they can win prizes at international festivals and attract new sponsors.[15] And they insist upon the finished work demonstrating the highest possible professional standards so that they cannot be denied space on television "for technical reasons."[16]

Most of CEFREC-CAIB's productions have been documentaries, but as their confidence and resources grew, they began to make fiction films and have recently completed a first feature. One of the fiction films, *Angeles de la tierra* (*Angels of the Land*, 2001), is an almost explicit homage and updating of Sanjinés's best-known film, *Yawar Mallku*. Schiwy notes the resemblance only to dismiss it—too quickly in my estimation.[17] The central storyline of both films, a brother coming to the city to find another brother who is denying his Indian roots, is too close, and certain shots of the

younger brother's first glimpses of the skyscrapers of downtown Cochabamba seem to be a direct nod to *Yawar Mallku*. *La nación clandestina* is a clear intertext as well. Reynaldo Yujra plays Antonio, who, like Sebastian, turns his back on his heritage in order to succeed in the city. And in both films a younger brother is sent by his mother into the city to retrieve an older son who has changed his name.

There are, however, key differences. *Angeles de la tierra* is closer to a Hindi *masala* film, a film with a mix of emotional registers, than revolutionary political cinema like *Yawar Mallku*. In place of the dignified, stoic mien of Ignacio (Marcelino Yanahuaya), Sichi, the younger brother, in his rural attire, is made to be a kind of Andean bumpkin, a complex figure of identification and disavowal, who represents the core values of the rural community from which he comes but in a light-hearted rather than idealized form. And as in Hindi popular cinema, the plot derives considerable suspense from a series of near misses, such as when Sichi unwittingly gives a job interview to his brother, or when Sichi walks into a bar seconds after Antonio has left. There are also parallel events—Sichi is in jail while Antonio is in the hospital—and extraordinary coincidences—Sichi hears an appeal for him to visit his brother in the hospital over the radio of a truck he has just boarded to leave the city.

Viewers familiar with Sanjinés's theories of anti-bourgeois cinema and cinematic form consonant with indigenous storytelling practices and cosmovisions are predisposed to seek their validation or negation in the formal practices of CEFREC-CAIB's productions. Some videos, such as *Qati Qati: Susurros de muerte* (*Qati Qati: Whispers of Death*, Reynaldo Yujra, 1999) suggest the interpenetration of a visible and a spiritual world and are grounded in indigenous oral traditions, while others are entirely conventional, even to the point of appearing to emulate Hollywood storytelling.[18] The indigenous video makers's sure grasp of Hollywood convention reflects the dominant cinema's increased penetration of Bolivia in the video age. At the same time, CEFREC-CAIB's facilitation of indigenous self-representation, its collaborative production

techniques (there are no directors or *auteurs*, only *responsables* [those responsible]), and its eschewal of markets in favor of exchange among indigenous communities, qualify its output as political cinema. As Jeff Himple notes, "indigenous video makers appropriate styles from commercial mass media yet they subvert the marketplace as a moral space for the accumulation of individual wealth."[19] Juan Francisco Salazar and Amalia Córdova, drawing on Faye Ginsburg's notion of an "embedded aesthetics" refer to a "poetics of Indigenous media" that focuses on culturally grounded processes rather than products, and they note that festivals of indigenous video have gradually come to privilege process, as opposed to just products, in their awards.[20] Here we can draw the clearest line between the cinema of Sanjinés and Bolivia's contemporary indigenous video movement. His theory of a cinema with the people was the first attempt in Latin America to create a filmmaking practice embedded in the culture of indigenous peoples.[21]

CEFREC-CAIB is a member organization of the *Consejo Latinoamericano de Cine y Comunicación de los Pueblos Indígenas* (CLACPI). As such it is part of a larger organization joining together networks of indigenous producers throughout Latin America. But it does not limit its contact with other indigenous producers to the Americas. Organizations like CEFREC-CAIB increasingly use international festivals as a way to establish contact with indigenous producers in other parts of the world, many of whom are in Asia and Australia. Similarly, conventional Bolivian filmmakers like Sanjinés are increasingly looking to Asia as a source of support, rather than Europe. Hints of this change of orientation appear in the initial frames of *La nación clandestina*, when the four co-funders are credited: Channel 4 Television (Great Britain), Television Española S.A. (Spain), AZF Stuttgart (West Germany), and Ota Masakuni (Japan). This last is not a production company but an individual, an author, political activist, and social commentator who published, in addition to several books on Che Guevara in Japan, a monograph about *Grupo Ukamau* in 2000.[22]

Armando de Urioste, executive director of CONACINE, is convinced that the salvation of Bolivian cinema lies in Asia. CONACINE was capitalized with approximately six million dollars in the early 1990s, and since then it has advanced funds to the producers of approximately forty films, none of which has made a return on its investment. In order to replenish CONACINE's funds so that it can start lending again, de Urioste would like to sell the DVD rights to the entire catalog to an East Asian company, perhaps in South Korea, Taiwan, or Hong Kong. De Urioste told me that conversations at festivals with Latin American directors, producers, and executives from other state-funded film initiatives have convinced him there is a growing consensus among Latin American film professionals that demand for Latin American cinema in Asia has been ignored for too long in favor of diminishing returns from Europe.[23] The cultivation of markets for Latin American cinema in Asia, should it come to pass, would parallel the reevaluation of trade relationships that has taken place recently in South American countries where left or center-left governments have come to power.[24] Increasingly, Brazil, Venezuela, Bolivia and other countries are trying to establish lateral trade relations with other countries in the Global South, bypassing the North American and European metrapoles through which their trade has historically passed, usually, leaders like Evo Morales in Bolivia argue, to the extreme disadvantage of the Latin American states.

Such a move on the part of CONACINE would be a belated acknowledgment that the primary node for the production of political art cinema has shifted from Europe to Asia. To what extent, though, was this shift mediated by Latin America? In 1995 Taiwanese director Hou Hsiao-hsien released *Hao non hao nu* (*Good Men, Good Women*), the final installment in his *Taiwan Trilogy*, and a film that bears notable similarity to *La nación clandestina*. Like Sanjinés, Hou began this trilogy in response to the lifting of martial law in 1987, and each of the three films explores moments in Taiwanese history that had been officially suppressed.[25] The subject of *Hao non hao nu*

is the "white terror" of the 1950s, when the Chang Kai-shek's authoritarian Kuomintang persecuted leftists, many of whom had fought heroically against the Japanese occupation. Like *La nación clandestina* and *O thiasos* (*The Travelling Players*, Theo Angelopoulos, 1974), *Hao non hao nu* is a film about history, memory and identity, and it employs their same aesthetic strategies.[26] It marked the first time Hou filmed almost entirely in sequence shots, but they are not used to naturalist effect; rather, they are used to create "an extremely complex structure, which juxtaposes multiple layers of time and perspective."[27] As Bérénice Reynaud notes, "The heroine, Liang Ching, exists simultaneously in several temporalities": her own past, her present, and the past of the character she will play in the film within the film.[28] Throughout the film Hou mixes black and white and recreation and reality, and near the end he collapses historical time and the present in several long takes.

At the time of this writing Sanjinés continues to seek funding for *La guerra del Chaco Boreal* (*The Chaco War*), a film he has been planning since at least the late 1970s. The Chaco War was fought between Bolivia and Paraguay in the years 1932-5, and the film, if completed, will be his costliest to date, since it requires extensive historical reconstruction. But for Sanjinés this is not just a film about a historical event. He considers the Chaco War key to understanding contemporary Bolivian politics and is drawn to this episode because it sets out issues he considers urgently important today, including: the politics of hydrocarbon extraction; environmental degradation; land distribution; secessionist tendencies among certain Bolivian departments; and relations between Bolivians who self-identify as indigenous and those who do not.[29] Sanjinés's comments on this project indicate that, more than twenty years after the 1987 Havana Festival, he remains unequivocally committed to a filmmaking practice that intervenes in what he sees as Bolivia's most pressing political issues.

In the window of the ticket booth at the *Sala Ukamau* there are three books for sale, *Teoría y práctica de un cine junto al pueblo*, *Los dias rabiosos* by Beatriz Palacios,

and a book called *América mágica: Simbiosis de cantos y ecuaciones* (*Magical America: Symbiosis of Songs and Equations*) by Hugo Romero Bedregal, a professor in Social Sciences at the *Universidad Mayor de San Andrés* in La Paz.[30] This book extends an argument Romero Bedregal made in a 1997 article titled "Los maestros del gran poder" ("The Masters of the Great Power"), which is not, as it first seems, a piece on the yearly *Gran Poder* parade in La Paz. Here the "great power" is what Romero Bedregal calls "interculturality," of which he claims Bolivians have achieved a high mastery. He argues that because Bolivia is so exceptionally diverse, geographically, economically, and ethnically, its citizens have certain advantages, which, if they draw upon them, will allow them to respond creatively to globalization and create sustainable development within its parameters.[31] One of his central examples, and one of crucial import to Bolivia today, has to do with the environment. Romero Bedregal argues that the Cartesian analytical approach to nature, which held that humans were separated from it, was supplanted in the twentieth century by a conception of the interconnectedness of all natural elements that was brought about by discoveries in physics.[32] Daily life in the Andes is governed by what he calls the "Andean dialectic," which is based in the complementarity of opposites and a conception of time and space as unified, an effective synthesis of the two opposing western paradigms.[33]

Sanjinés is far from being alone among Bolivian artists in pursuing syntheses of western and indigenous forms. Composer Cergio Prudencia, who wrote the scores for both *La nación clandestina* and *Para recibir el canto de los pájaros*, conducts the *Orquestra Experimental de Instrumentos Nativos* (Experimental Orchestra of Native Instruments), which plays modernist microtonal and 12-tone pieces written especially for *zampoñas* and other Andean instruments. On one occasion when I saw the *Orquestra* perform, they shared the program with an indigenous dance group from an *altiplano* village, one of many possible examples from contemporary Bolivian culture and politics

of the ultimate success of intellectuals like Sanjinés and Prudencio in opening lines of communication between vanguard intellectuals and popular organizations.

In reality Sanjinés opened two lines of communication; the one he desired most—with the *campesinos* of the Andes—he only achieved after the other—with European (and to a lesser extent North American) audiences for political and art cinema—had already been established. Neither was the accidental byproduct of the other. From the start Sanjinés positioned himself as simultaneously a Bolivian filmmaker and a filmmaker in the European avant-garde tradition who was determined to create a cinema that would be of use to the oppressed indigenous peoples of the Andes. Responding to his local audience often set him at odds with prevailing currents in European thinking on political cinema, as was the case with his insistence on the efficacy of beauty in political filmmaking. But such positions did not foreclose European reception for his films. They served instead to open a dialogue with European critics and filmmakers. That his films could communicate with both of these very different audiences is a result of the dialectic between the local and the European, which had always been in tension with one another in his work and which, after *Yawar Mallku*, he proceeded to calibrate. He did so not by abandoning European cinema as a resource but by selectively adapting certain of its techniques to his uses by subjecting them to processes of transculturation, resulting in a hybrid cinematic language that synthesized local and European forms.

The use to which he subjected these adapted techniques, the different coordinate under which he used them, was the pursuit of a formal means for representing an alternative, non-western subjectivity. The filmmakers whose techniques he adapted were not engaged in a similar project themselves, but Sanjinés saw in their films, especially in their use of sequence shots, the possibility of representing multiple temporalities and collective subjectivities while preserving the rhetorical force of montage a revolutionary cinema required. There were filmmakers in Europe similarly exploring alternative subjectivities, and among them were Pier Paolo Pasolini and Jean Rouch. But the fraught

intersection of Cold War geopolitics and the politics of Third World liberation struggles in which Sanjinés, Pasolini, and Rouch all found themselves concealed this aspect of their projects and all their profound similarities. Pasolini cast his theory in the language of scientific semiotics, while engaging in polemics with the sectarian left. As a result, criticism of his theory by his contemporaries tended to focus on its supposed diletantishness as semiotics, and his films were derided by critics on the left as reactionary. The end of debates about scientific semiology led to a reappraisal of Pasolini's theory that revealed how innovative his previously unnoticed thinking on subjectivity had been. With Rouch it was not a question of the politics of his films being attacked or misinterpreted; for the most part, they were not acknowledged at all. In the wake of a late twentieth century critical reassesment of anthropology's claims to detached, objective observation, Rouch's "sharing anthropology," another effort to create a poetics of an alternative subjectivity, could finally be seen for the principled political act it was.

The reevaluations of Pasolini and Rouch as theorists of subjectivity came from different disciplines within academia, but both were motivated by a more general intellectual trend toward conceiving of subjectivity as political. What was considered political in their work changed; it was no longer filtered exclusively through the politics of the period in which they worked. In the same way, the end of the Cold War and the accompanying politics of Third World liberation has made possible a reevaluation of the theories of Sanjinés. The overvalorization of Sanjinés's revolutionary politics obscured what was most innovative in his theory much the same way the rhetorics of semiotics and antropology had with Pasolini and Rouch. What we find in reappraising his theory and films is that Sanjinés was consistently engaged in exploring what cinema could and could not do as far as representing alternative subjectivities was concerned. He found solutions for this problem at the aesthetic level before his European contemporaries and before European theory recognized the possibility, or even the need to do so. Thanks to more

recent transnational approaches to the new waves of the 1960s and 1970s and the concept of global art cinema, which have effectively decentered Europe in Film Studies, we can now recognize the full extent of Sanjinés's contribution to debates about the aesthetics of poltical cinema during that period. As important as such a historical revision is, it risks overlooking once again the area of his theory with the most enduring impact and contemporary relevance, his attempt to represent a non-western subjectivity through the manipulation of cinematic time and shot composition. During the 1970s the theoretical language for addressing these concerns was only emerging. And Sanjinés did not fully formulate this aspect of his theory until the late 1980s. By then critical attention had shifted away from New Latin American Cinema, creating the impression that its major contributions to theory were in the past. Taking another look at his body of theory as a whole, we now see that it was developed in close dialogue with European theory and that Sanjinés deserves a place alongside such figures as Pasolini and Rouch at the forefront of early theorizing about altenative subjectities and film.

Notes

[1] Álvaro Loayza, "La busquéda del qué y cómo en el nuevo marco estético-tecnológico," in *Encuentro de Cineastas Sub-40*, 25 (translation mine).

[2] Daniela Goggi, "Hacia una integración real del cine latinoamericano joven," in *Encuentro de Cineastas Sub-40*, 79 (translation mine).

[3] Ricardo Bajo, "El último boom del cine boliviano," *El ojo que piensa* no. 2 (2003). Online journal. Available: http://www/elojoquepiensa.udg.mx/espanol/numero02/codex%202003/04_boombolivia.html. Accessed May 18 2009.

[4] *Los hijos del último jardín* had its English premiere in London along with Fernando Solanas's *Memoria del saqueo* (*A Social Genocide*, 2004) in 2004 at a festival titled "Discovering Latin American Cinema." The curators's belief that Latin American cinema and the work of these two directors in particular were in need of discovery succinctly indicates their declining visibility since the late 1980s. See Constanza Burucúa, Stephen Hart, and David Wood, "'New' Latin American Cinema and Authorship: Old Wine in New Bottles?" *Hispanic Research Journal* 9.2 (2008): 148 n. 2.

[5] Many of the presentations made at this conference, including Sanjinés's essay, "El perfíl imborrable" ["The Unerasable Profile"], are reproduced in *El nuevo cine latinoamericano en el mundo de hoy* [*New Latin American Cinema in Today's World*] (Mexico: UNAM, 1988).

[6] Patricia Auferdheide, *The Daily Planet: A Critic on the Capitalist Culture Beat* (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 2000), 245.

[7] Ibid., 246. Note that Goggi, in the quote above, makes much the same observation about expectations abroad. It seems unlikely, though, that in 2007 a filmmaker from, for instance, Argentina, would encounter the expectations Goggi describes. Rather than dismissing this as paranoia on her part, I would argue that it is indicative of the special place Bolivia still has in the world political imaginary as well as Sanjinés's efforts to keep a revolutionary cinema alive despite necessary accomodations to changes in global financing and distribution.

[8] Burucúa et al., "'New' Latin American Cinema and Authorship," 159.

[9] Charles Ramírez Berg, "A Taxonomy of Alternative Plots in Recent Films: Classifying the 'Tarentino Effect,'" *Film Criticism* 31.1-2 (2006): 7-8.

[10] Sanjinés shot the film quickly using students from his *Escuela Andina del Cine* as crew. See Bajo, "El último boom."

[11] Verónica Córdova, "Lo digital y lo nuevo en el cine boliviano," in *Encuentro de cineastas sub-40*, 44-5.

[12] Video would seem to offer filmmakers the opportunity to directly market their work to audiences, but in Bolivia, where commercial video markets are virtually nonexistant and piracy rampant, it is even more difficult than in more developed countries for filmmakers to recoup their expenses in this manner.

[13] Reynaldo Yujra, interview with the author, La Paz, Bolivia, 7 April 2009.

[14] Jeff D. Himpele, *Circuits of Culture: Media, Politics, and Indigenous Identity in the Andes* (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 2008), 204. Jeff Himpele, "Packaging Indigenous Media: An Interview with Ivan Sanjinés and Jesús Tapia," *American Anthropologist* 106.2 (2004): 357.

[15] Himpele, "Packaging Indigenous Media," 362.

[16] Himpele, *Circuits of Culture*, 200.

[17] Freya Schiwy, *Indianizing Film: Decolonization, the Andes, and the Question of Technology* (Newark: Rutgers Univ. Press, 2009), 45. *Angeles de la tierra* bears somewhat the same relation to *Yawar Mallku* as *Ukamau* did to *Vuelve Sebastiana*. In each case, through a system of internal or paratextual references, the filmmaker is self-consciously placing his work within a specifically Bolivian filmmaking tradition. The tendency by Schiwy and others to downplay the inheritance from the *Grupo Ukamau* in Bolivian indigenous video strikes me as a reiteration of the earlier resistance on the part of scholars of Latin American cinema to fully acknowledge its deep connections with European cinema.

[18] Schiwy, *Indianizing Film*, 12.

[19] Himpele, *Circuits of Culture*, 191.

[20] Juan Francisco Salazar and Amalia Córdova, "Imperfect Media and the Poetics of Indigenous Video in Latin America," in Pamela Wilson and Michelle Stewart, eds. *Global Indigenous Media: Cultures, Poetics, and Politics* (Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 2008), 40, 50.

[21] Peru's *Grupo Chaski*, which makes semi-documentary features about the lives of mostly urbanized indigenous people is explicitly modelled after *Grupo Ukamau*. For more on this see Sophia A. McClennen, "The Theory and Practice of the Peruvian *Grupo Chaski*" *Jump Cut* no. 50 (2008): available online http://www.ejumpcut.org/archive/jc50.2008/Chaski/text.html. Accessed 14 Sep 2009.

[22] Ota Masakuni, *Andesu de senjumin no eiga o toru: Ukamau no jissen 40nen to Nihon karano kyodo 20en* (Tokyo: Gendai kikakushitsu, 2000).

[23] Armando de Urioste, interview with the author, La Paz, Bolivia, 6 March 2008.

[24] For example, on 16 Sep 2009 Venezuela announced a $16 billion dollar investment deal with China for oil exploration in the Orinoco river.

[25] June Yip, *Revisioning Taiwan: Fiction, Cinema, and the Nation in the Cultural Imaginary* (Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 2004), 87.

[26] The shot with that opens and closes the film, a long take of actors with their suitcases and other equipment traversing a landscape, seems a direct nod to Angelopoulos's film.

[27] Yip, *Revisioning Taiwan, 126.*

[28] Bérénice Reynaud, *A City of Sadness* (London: BFI, 2002), 77.

[29] Jorge Sanjinés, Interview by the author, La Paz, Bolivia, 21 April 2008.

[30] Hugo Romero Bedregal, *América mágica: Simbiosis de cantos y ecuaciones* (La Paz: Plural Editores, 2006).

[31] Hugo Romero Bedregal, "Los maestros del gran poder," *Reunión anual de etnología* 11.2 (1997): 397.

[32] Ibid., 402-4.

[33] Ibid., 405.

REFERENCES

Albó, Xavier. "El Alto, la vorágine de una ciudad única." *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 11, no. 2 (2006): 329-50.

Albó, Xavier and Matías Preiswerk. "El Gran Poder: Fiesta de aimara urbano," *América indígena* 51, nos. 2-3 (1991): 293-352.

Althusser, Louis. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. Translated by Ben Brewster. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2001.

———. *For Marx*. Translated by Ben Brewster. New York: Verso, 2005.

Arbona, Juan M. and Benjamin Kohl, "City Profile: La Paz-El Alto," *Cities* 21, no. 3 (2004): 255-265.

Armes, Roy. *Third World Film Making and the West*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1987.

Auferdheide, Patricia. *The Daily Planet: A Critic on the Capitalist Culture Beat*. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 2000.

Bajo, Ricardo. "El último boom del cine boliviano." *El ojo que piensa*, no. 2 (2003). Online journal. Available: http://www/elojoquepiensa.udg.mx/espanol/numero02/codex%202003/04_boombolivia.html. Accessed May 18 2009.

Baránski, Zygmunt G., ed. *Pasolini Old and New: Surveys and Studies*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1999.

Barrios de Chungara, Domitila. *Let Me Speak! Testimony of Domitila, a Woman of the Bolivian Mines*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1978.

Barthes, Roland. "Diderot, Brecht, Eisenstein." *Screen* 15, no. 2 (1974): 33-39.

Bastien, Joseph W. *Mountain of the Condor: Metaphor and Ritual in an Andean Ayllu*. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press, 1979.

Baudry, Jean-Louis. "The Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinema Apparatus." *Film Quarterly* 28, no. 2 (1974-5): 39-47.

Bazin, André. *What is Cinema?* Vols. 1 and 2. Edited and translated by Hugh Gray. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.

Béjar, Héctor. *Peru 1965: Notes on a Guerilla Experience*. Translated by William Rose. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1970.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Author as Producer." In *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings*. Edited by Michael W. Jennings. Vol. 2, *1927-1934*. Translated by Rodney Livingston and others. Edited by Michael W. Jennings, Howard Eiland, and Gary Smith, 768-82. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press, 1999.

———. “Bert Brecht.” In *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings*. Edited by Michael W. Jennings. Vol. 2, *1927-1934*. Translated by Rodney Livingston and others. Edited by Michael W. Jennings, Howard Eiland, and Gary Smith, 365-71. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press, 1999.

———. “On the Concept of History.” In *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings*. Edited by Michael W. Jennings. Vol. 4, *1938-1940*. Translated by Edmund Jephcott and others. Edited by Howard Eiland and Michael W. Jennings, 389-400. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press, 2003.

Beverly, John. *Subalternity and Representation: Arguments in Cultural Theory*. Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 1999.

Biro, Yvette. “Landscape During the Battle.” *Millenium Film Journal*, nos. 4/5 (summer/fall 1979): 117-121.

Blanco, Ricardo. *Von Apu Ollantay bis Brecht: Theater asl Waffe im Klassenampf Lateinamerikas*. East Berlin: Henschelverlag, 1983.

Boal, Augusto. *Theater of the Oppressed*. Translated by Charles A. and Maria-Odilla Leal McBride. New York: Urizen Books, 1979.

———. *Legislative Theater*. New York: Routledge, 1998.

Bordwell, David. “Classical Hollywood Cinema: Narrational Principals and Procedures.” In *Narrative, Apparatus, Ideology*, edited by Philip Rosen, 17-34. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1986.

Brakhage, Stan. *Brakhage Scrapbook: Collected Writings 1964-1980*. Edited by Robert A. Haller. New Paltz: Documentext, 1982.

Brecht, Bertolt. *Brecht on Theater: The Development of an Aesthetic*. Translated and Edited by John Willett. New York: Hill and Wang, 1964.

———. *Bertolt Brecht on Film and Radio*. Translated and edited by Marc Silberman. London: Methuen, 2000.

Brewster, Ben. “The Fundamental Reproach.” *Cine-Tracts* 2, no. 1 (1977): 44-53.

Bruno, Giuliana. “Heresies: The Body of Pasolini’s Semiotics.” *Cinema Journal* 30, no. 3 (1991): 29-42.

Burton, Julianne. *Cinema and Social Change in Latin America: Conversations with Filmmakers*. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1986.

Burton-Carvajal, Julianne. “Marginal Cinemas and Mainstream Critical Theory.” *Screen* 26, nos. 3-4 (1985): 2-21.

Burucúa, Constanza, Stephen Hart, and M. J. Wood. “‘New’ Latin American Cinema and Authorship: Old Wine in New Bottles?” *Hispanic Research Journal* 9, no. 2 (2008): 147-63.

Canella, Mario. “Ideology and Aesthetic Hypotheses in the Criticism of Neo-Realism.” *Screen* 14, no. 4 (1973-4): 5-60.

Canessa, Andrew. “Fear and Loathing on the *Kharisiri* Trail; Alterity and Identity in the Andes.” *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* New Series no. 6 (2000): 705-720.

Capriles Farfan, René. “Una memoria de la cultura negra: Jean Rouch y el Cine Africano.” *Hablemos de cine*, nos. 61-2 (1971): 4-9.

Chanan, Michael. *The Cuban Image: Cinema and Politics in Cuba*. London: BFI, 1985.

———. *New cinema of Latin America El nuevo cine latinoamericano*. Cinema Guild, 1989. Videocassette.

———. *Cuban Cinema*. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 2004.

———. “Latin American Cinema: From Underdevelopment to Postmodernism.” In *Remapping World Cinema: Identity, Culture, and Politics in Film*, edited by Stephanie Dennison and Song Hwee Lim, 38-51. London: Wallflower Press, 2006.

Cine 16 de Julio 10 años 1968-1978. La Paz: Escuela de artes graficas del colegio Don Bosco, 1978.

“Compaginación Tiempo y Tiempo.” *Warawara* 1, no. 1 (1954): n.p.

Córdova, Verónica. “Lo digital y lo nuevo en el cine boliviano,” in *Encuentro de cineastas sub-40*, 41-47. La Paz: Fundación Simón I. Patiño and *Alejandría*, 2007.

Corrigan, Timothy and Patricia White. *The Film Experience: An Introduction*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2004.

Costa, Antonio.“The Semiological Heresy of Pier Paolo Pasolini.” In *Pier Paolo Pasolini*, edited by Paul Willemen, 32-42. London: BFI, 1977.

Cotta, Renzo. *El cineforum*. Cuadernos de Cine, no. 1. La Paz: Editorial Don Bosco, 1972.

Crandon-Malamud, Libbet. *From the Fat of Our Souls: Social Change, Political Process, and Medical Pluralism in Bolivia*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1991.

Dangl, Benjamin. *The Price of Fire: Resource Wars and Social Movements in Bolivia*. Oakland: AK Press, 2007.

Dawson, Jan, ed. *Alexander Kluge & The Occasional Work of a Domestic Slave*. New York: Zoetrope, 1977.

DeLauretis, Teresa. “Re-Reading Pasolini’s Essays on Cinema.” *Italian Quarterly* nos. 82-3 (1980-1): 159-166.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Cinema 2: The Time Image*. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1989.

Dosh, Paul and Nicole Kligerman. “Correa vs. Social Movements: Showdown in Ecuador.” *NACLA Report on the Americas* 42, no. 5 (2009): 21-4.

Driskell, Charles B. “The Teatro de Arena of São Paulo: An Innovative Professional Theater for the People.” In *Popular Theater for Social Change in Latin America: Essays in Spanish and English*, edited by Gerardo Luzuriaga, 270-80. UCLA Latin American Studies, Vol. 41, edited by Johannes Wilbert. Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publications, 1978.

Dunkerley, James. *Rebellion in the Veins: Political Struggle in Bolivia 1952-1982*. New York: Verso, 1984.

Durgnat, Raymond. “The Long Take in *Voyage to Cythera*: Brecht and Marx vs. Bazin and God.” *Film Comment* 26, no. 6 (1990): 43-46.

Eguino, Antonio. “Neo-realism in Bolivia: An Interview with Antonio Eguino.” Interview by Udayan Gupta. *Cinéaste* 9, no. 2 (1978-9): 26-29, 59.

———. Interview by the author. La Paz, Bolivia, 5 June 2007.

Eisenstein, Sergei. *Film Form*. Translated and edited by Jay Leyda. San Diego: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1949.

Elsaesser, Thomas. “From Anti-illusionism to Hyper-realism: Bertolt Brecht and Contemporary Film.” In *Re-inventing Brecht: His Influence on Contemporary Drama and Film*, edited by Pia Kleber and Colin Visser, 170-211. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1990.

Encuentro de Cineasta—Sub 40. La Paz: Fundación Simón I. Patiño and Revista *Alejandría*, 2007.

“Encuesta a cineastas latinoamericanos sobre influencía del cine silente sovietico.” *Cine cubano* no. 93 (1979): 44-65.

Even, Martin and others. “Le Cinema Militant, en France, Aujourd’hui.” *Cinema D’Aujourd’hui*, New Series, nos. 5-6 (1975): 33-159.

Fabian, Johannes. *Time and the Work of Anthropology: Critical Essays 1971-1991*. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1991.

Fainaru, Dan, ed. *Theo Angelopoulos: Interviews*. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2001.

Farthing, Linda. “Bolivia’s Dilemma: Development Confronts the Legacy of Extraction.” *NACLA Report on the Americas* 42, no. 5 (2009): 25-29.

Felder, Stephen. Editor’s introduction to *Ciné-Ethnography* by Jean Rouch. Visible Evidence, Vol. 13, translated and edited by Steven Feld. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 2003.

Festival Iberoamericana de Cine de Santa Cruz, ed. *El cine de Jorge Sanjinés*. Santa Cruz: Federación para la Educación y Desarrollo de las Artes y Media—FEDAM, 1999.

Font, Ramón, ed. *Jean-Luc Godard y el Grupo Dziga Vertov: Un nuevo cine político*. Barcelona: Editorial Anagrama, 1976.

Fuentes, Víctor. "La Creación Colectiva del Teatro Experimental de Cali." In *Popular Theater for Social Change in Latin America: Essays in Spanish and English*, edited by Gerardo Luzuriaga, 325-337. UCLA Latin American Studies, Vol. 41, edited by Johannes Wilbert. Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publications, 1978.

García Canclini, Néstor. "Así es y no de otra manera." In *El cine de Jorge Sanjinés*, edited by Festival Iberoamericana de Cine de Santa Cruz, 81-89. Santa Cruz: Federación para la Educación y Desarrollo de las Artes y Media—FEDAM, 1999.

García Espinosa, Julio, "Cine y revolución." In *Problemas del nuevo cine*, edited by Manuel Pérez Estremera, 193-195. Madrid: Allianze Editorial, 1971.

———. *Una imagen recorre el mundo*. Documentos de la Filmoteca no. 4. Mexico: Filmoteca de la UNAM, 1982.

———. "For an Imperfect Cinema." In *New Latin American Cinema*. Vol. 1, *Theory, Practices, and Transnational Articulations*, edited by Michael T. Martin, 71-82. Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1997.

———. *Un largo camino hacia la laz*. Havana: Fondo Editorial Casa de las Américas, 2002.

———. *Conversaciones con un cineasta incómodo: Julio García Espinosa*. Interviews by Victor Fowler Calzada. Havana: Ediciones ICAIC, 2004.

García Pabón, Leonardo. *La patria íntima: Alegorials nacionales en la literatura y cine de Bolivia*. La Paz: Plural, 1998.

Gatewood, Frances and David Desser. "Introduction: Indian Cinema and Film Studies." *PostScript* 25, no. 3 (2006): 3-6.

Georgakas, Dan. "Revolutionary Cinema—Italian Style." *Cinéaste* 4, no. 3 (1970-1): 33-4.

Getino, Octavio, and Susana Valleggia. *El cine de las historias de la revolución: Aproximación a las teorías y practicas del cine político en América Latina (1967-1977)*. Buenos Aires: Grupo Editor Altamira, 2002.

Gill, Lesley. *Teetering on the Rim: Global Restructuring, Daily Life, and the Armed Retreat of the Bolivian State*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 2000.

Godard, Jean-Luc. *Godard on Godard*. Translated and dited by Tom Milne. New York: Da Capo Press, 1972.

Goggi, Daniela. "Hacia una integración real del cine latinoamericano joven." In *Encuentro de Cineastas Sub-40*, 79-85. La Paz: Fundación Simón I. Patiño and *Alejandría*, 2007.

Gotkowitz, Laura. *A Revolution For Our Rights: Indigenous Struggles for Land and Justince in Bolivia, 1880-1952*. Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 2007.

Greene, Naomi. *Pier Paolo Pasolini: Cinema as Heresy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Grimshaw, Anna. *The Ethnographer's Eye: Ways of Seeing in Modern Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2001.

———. "Adventures on the Road: Some Reflections on Rouch and his Italian Contemporaries," in *Building Bridges: The Cinema of Jean Rouch*, edited by Joram ten Brink, 277-284. London: Wallflower Press, 2007.

Grupo Teatro Ollantay. "Cuánto Nos Cuesta el Petróleo." In *Popular Theater for Social Change in Latin America: Essays in Spanish and English*, edited by Gerardo Luzuriaga, 325-337. UCLA Latin American Studies, Vol. 41, edited by Johannes Wilbert. Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publications, 1978.

Gumucio Dagron, Alfonso. *El cine de los trabajadores: Manual de apoyo teórico y práctico a la generación de talleres de cine super 8*. Managua: Central Sandinista de Trabajadores, 1981.

———. *Historia del cine en Bolivia*. La Paz: Editorial Amigos del Libro, 1982.

———. *Cine, censura y exilio en America Latina*. Mexico: Federación Editorial Mexicana, 1984.

Gumucio Dagron, Alfonso and Thomas Tufte, eds. *Communication for Social Change Anthology: Historical and Contemporary Readings*. South Orange: Communication for Social Change Consortium, 2006.

Guss, David M. "The Gran Poder and the Reconquest of La Paz." *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 11, no. 2 (2006): 294-328.

Gutiérrez Alea, Tomás. *Dialéctica del espectador*. Arte, Ciencia y Sociedad no. 2, edited Rogelio Vallareal Macías. Mexico: Federación Editorial Mexicana, 1983.

Haustedt, Birgit. "Die Fremdheit Pasolinis: Zur Rezeption seines Werkes in Deutschland 1975-1995." In *Zwischen Kontinuität und Reknstruktion: Kulturtransfer zwischen Deutschland und Italien nach 1945*, edited by Hansgeorg Schmidt-Bergman, 201-215. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1998.

Henderson, Brian. "The Long Take." In *Movies and Methods*. Vol. 1, edited by Bill Nichols, 314-324. Berkeley, Univ. of California Press, 1976.

———. "Toward a Non-Bourgeois Camera Style." In *Film Theory and Criticism*. 6th edition, edited by Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen, 54-64. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2004.

Hennebelle, Guy and Alfonso Gumucio Dagron. *Les Cinémas de l'Amerique latine: pays par pays, l'histoire, l'economie, les structures, les auteurs, les œvres*. Paris: Lherminier, 1981.

Hess, John. "Neo-Realism and New Latin American Cinema: *Bicycle Thieves* and *Blood of the Condor*." In *Mediating Two Worlds: Cinematic Encounters in the Americas*, edited by John King, Ana M. López, and Manuel Alvarado, 104-118. London: BFI, 1993.

Himpele, Jeff D. "The Gran Poder Parade and the Social Movement of the Aymara Middle Class: A Video Essay," *Visual Anthropology* no. 16 (2003): 207-243.

———. "Packaging Indigenous Media: An Interview with Ivan Sanjinés and Jesús Tapia." *American Anthropologist* 106, no. 2 (2004): 353-373.

———. *Circuits of Culture: Media, Politics, and Indigenous Identity in the Andes*. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 2008.

Hjort, Mette. "Danish Cinema and the Politics of Recognition." In *Post-Theory: Reconstructing Film Studies*, edited by David Bordwell and Noël Carroll, 520-532. Madison: University of Wisconson Press, 1996.

———. *Small Nation, Global Cinema: The New Danish Cinema*. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 2005.

Hjort, Mette and Scott MacKenzie. *Purity and Provocation: Dogma 95*. London: BFI, 2003.

Hockings, Paul, ed. *Principals of Visual Anthropology*. 2nd Ed. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1995.

Holm Jensen, Viggo and Vibeke Pedersen. "Bolivia." In *International Film Guide 1972*, edited by Peter Cowie, 62. London: The Tantivy Press, 1971.

Horton, Andrew. *The Films of Theo Angelopoulos: A Cinema of Contemplation*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1997.

Hylton, Forrest and Sinclair Thompson. *Revolutionary Horizons: Past and Present in Bolivian Politics*. New York: Verso, 2007.

Johnson, Randal and Robert Stam, eds. *Brazilian Cinema*. Expanded Edition. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1995.

Keel, Erich. "From Militant Cinema to Neo-Realism: The Example of *Pueblo Chico*." *Film Quarterly* 29, no. 4 (1976): 17-24.

King, John. *Magical Reels: A History of Cinema in Latin America*. New York: Verso, 2000.

Klein, Herbert S. *A Concise History of Bolivia*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2003.

Kluge, Alexander. "But Why are the Questions so Abstract? An Interview with Alexander Kluge," in *Alexander Kluge and the Occasional Work of a Domestic Slave*. Edited by Jan Dawson, 26-48. New York: Zoetrope, 1977.

Kohl, Benjamin and Linda Farthing. *Impasse in Bolivia: Neoliberal Hegemony and Popular Resistance*. New York: Zed Books, 2006.

Kracauer, Siegfried. *Theory of Film: The Redemption of Physical Reality*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1997.

Lellis, George. *Bertolt Brecht, Cahiers du Cinéma, and Contemporary Film Theory*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1982.

León Frias, Isaac. *Los años de la conmoción: 1967-1973 Entrevistas con realizadores sudamericanos.* Cuadernos de cine, no. 28. Mexico: UNAM, 1979.

Lesage, Julia. "Godard-Gorin's *Wind from the East*: Looking at a Film Politically." *Jump Cut*, no. 4 (1974): 18-23.

Loayza, Álvaro. "La búsqueda del qué y el cómo en el nuevo marco estético-tecnológico." In *Encuentro de Cineastas Sub-40*, 25-30. La Paz: Fundación Simón I. Patiño and *Alejandría*, 2007.

López, Ana. "A Short History of Latin American Film Histories." *Journal of Film and Video* 37, no. 1 (1985): 55-69.

———. "An 'Other' History: The New Latin American Cinema." In *New Latin American Cinema*. Vol. 1, *Theory, Practices, and Transnational Articulations*, edited by Michael T. Martin, 135-66. Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1997.

MacBean, James Roy. *Film and Revolution*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1975.

MacCabe, Colin. "Realism and the Cinema: Notes on some Brechtian Theses." *Screen* 15, no. 2 (1974): 7-27.

———. "The Politics of Separation." *Screen* 16, no. 4 (1975-6): 46-57.

McClennan, Sophie A. "The Theory and Practice of the Peruvian Gupo Chaski." *Jump Cut*, no. 50 (2008)): [journal online]. Available from http://www.ejumpcut.org/currentissue/Chaski/index.html; Internet; Accessed 15 May 2009.

MacDougall, David. "Beyond Observational Cinema." In *Principles of Visual Anthropology*. 2nd Ed., edited by Paul Hocking, 115-132. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyer, 1995.

———. *Transcultural Cinema*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1998.

———. "When Less is Less: The Long Take in Documentary." In *Film Quarterly: Forty Years—A Selection*, edited by Brian Henderson and Ann Martin, 290-306. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1999.

Marcus, Millicent. *Filmmaking by the Book: Italian Cinema and Literary Adaptation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1993.

Mariátegui, José Carlos. *Seven Interpretive Essays on Peruvian Reality*. Translated by Marjory Urquidi. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1971.

Martin, Michael T., ed. *New Latin American Cinema*. Vol. 1, *Theory, Practices, and Transnational Articulations*. Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1997.

———., ed. *New Latin American Cinema*. Vol. 2, *Studies of National Cinemas*. Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1997.

Masakuni, Ota. *Andesu de senjumin no eiga o toru: Ukamau no jissen 40nen to Nihon karano kyodo 20en*. Tokyo: Gendai kikakushitsu, 2000.

Mesa G., Carlos D., ed. *Cine boliviano: Del realizador al crítico*. La Paz: Editorial Gisbert, 1979.

Mesa Gisbert, Carlos D. *La aventura del cine boliviano 1952-1985*. La Paz: Editorial Gisbert, 1985.

Morgan, Daniel. "The Pause of the World." In *Three Documentary Filmmakers: Errol Morris, Ross McElwee, Jean Rouch*, edited by William Rothman, 139-156. Albany: State Univ. of New York Press, 2009.

Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." *Screen* 16, no. 3 (1975): 6-18.

Nash, June C. *We Eat the Mines and They Eat Us: Dependency and Exploitation in Bolivian Tin Mines*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

Nichols, Bill. *Blurred Boundaries: Questions of Meaning in Contemporary Culture*. Bloomington: Univ. of Indiana Press, 1994.

Nijland, Dirk. "Jean Rouch: A Builder of Bridges." In *Building Bridges: The Cinema of Jean Rouch*, edited by Joram ten Brink, 21-35. London: Wallflower Press, 2007.

Nowell-Smith, G. "Pasolini's Originality." In *Pier Paolo Pasolini*, edited by Paul Willemen, 4-20. London: BFI, 1977.

El nuevo cine en el mundo de hoy. Mexico: UNAM, 1988.

O'Hara, John. "Miklos Jancso—Circles and Plains." *Cinema Papers*, no. 9 (1976): 24-29, 91.

Orr, Christopher. "The Politics of Film Form: Observations on Pasolini's Theory and Practice." *Film Criticism* 15, no. 2 (1991): 38-46.

Ortiz, Fernando. *Contrapunteo cubano del tabaco y del azúcar*. Havana: Jesús Montero, 1940.

Ortiz, Fernando. *Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar*. Translated by Harriet de Onís New York: Knopf, 1947.

Overby, David, ed. and trans. *Springtime in Italy: A Reader on Neo-realism*. Hamden: Archon Books, 1978.

Palacios, Beatriz. "A proposito de una ponencia sobre el cine boliviano." *Cine boliviano: Del realizador al critico*, edited by Carlos D. Mesa G., 121-134. La Paz: Editorial Gisbert, 1979.

———. *Los días rabiosos*. La Paz: Gente Común and Grupo Ukamau, 2005.

Paranaguá, Paolo Antonio. "América latina, Europa y Estados Unidos: Relaciones triangulares en la historia del cine." *Journal of Film Preservation*, no. 62 (2001): 9-15.

———. *Tradición y modernidad en el cine de América Latina*. Madrid: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2003.

Partlow, Joshua. "Policy and Passions Collide in Bolivia." *Washington Post*, 23 October 2008, A01.

Pasolini, Pier Paolo. *Pasolini on Pasolini: Interviews with Oswald Stack*. Cinema One Series, no. 11. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1969.

———. "*Accattone* Today." *Framework* no. 2 (1975): 21-23.

———. "Pasolini on Film." In *Pier Paolo Pasolini*, edited by Paul Willemen, 67-77. London: BFI, 1977.

———. *Heretical Empiricism*. 2nd English Ed. Translated by Ben Lawton and Louise K. Barnett. Washington D.C.: New Academia Publishing, 2005.

Pasolini, Pier Paolo and others. "Pier Paolo Pasolini: An Epical-Religious View of the World." *Film Quarterly* 18, no. 4 (1965): 31-45.

Pérez Estremera, Manuel, ed. *Problemas del nuevo cine*. Madrid: Allianze Editorial, 1971.

Petrie, Graham. *Red Psalm • Még kér a nép*. Trowbridge: Flick Books, 1998.

Pick, Zuzana M. *The New Latin American Cinema: A Continental Project*. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1993.

Pines, Jim and Paul Willemen, eds. *Questions of Third Cinema*. London: BFI, 1989.

Polan, Dana P. *The Political Language of Film and the Avant-Garde*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1985.

Poole, Deborah. *Vision, Race, and Modernity: A Visual Economy of the Andean World Image*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1997.

Pratt, Mary Louis. "Fieldwork in Common Places." In *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, edited by James Clifford and George E. Marcus, 27-50. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1986.

———. "Modernity and Periphery: Toward a Global and Relational Analysis." In *Beyond Dichotomies: Histories, Identities, Cultures, and the Challenge of Globalization*, edited by Elisabeth Mudimbe-Boyi, 21-47. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002.

Quijano, Aníbal and Immanuel Wallerstein. "Americanity as a Concept, or the Americas in the Modern World System." *International Social Science Journal* 44, no. 4 (1992): 549-557.

Rama, Ángel. *Transculturación narrativa en América Latina*. Mexico: Siglo XXI, 1982.

Rama, Ángel Rama. *La ciudad letrada*. Hanover: Ediciones del Norte, 1984.

Rama, Ángel. *The Lettered City*. Translated by John Charles Chasteen. Durham: Duke UP, 1996.

Ramírez Berg, Charles. "A Taxonomy of Alternative Plots in Recent Films: Classifying the 'Tarentino Effect.'" *Film Criticism* 31, nos. 1-2 (2006): 5-61.

Restivo, Angelo. *The Cinema of Economic Miracles: Visuality and Modernization in the Italian Art Film*. Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 2001.

Reynaud, Bérénice Reynaud. *A City of Sadness*. London: BFI, 2002.

Rivera Cusicanqui, Silvia. "Liberal Democracy and *Ayllu* Democracy in Bolivia: The Case of Northern Potosí." *Journal of Development Studies* 26, no. 4 (1990): 97-121.

Rocha, Glauber. "The Tricontinental Filmmaker: That is Called the Dawn." In *Brazilian Cinema*. Expanded Edition, edited by Randal Johnson and Robert Stam, 77-80. New York: Columbia UP, 1995.

———. "An Esthetic of Hunger." In *New Latin American Cinema*. Vol. 1, *Theory, Practices, and Transnational Articulations*, edited by Michael T. Martin, 59-61. Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1997.

———. "History of Cinema Novo." In *New Latin American Cinema*. Vol. 2, *Studies of National Cinemas*, edited by Michael T. Martin, 275-94. Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1997.

Rohdie, Sam. *The Passion of Pier Paolo Pasolini*. London: BFI, 1995.

———. "Neo-Realism and Pasolini: The Desire for Reality." In *Pasolini Old and New: Surveys and Studies*, edited by Zygmunt G. Baránski, 163-183. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1999.

Romero Bedregal, Hugo. "Los maestros del gran poder." *Reunión anual de etnología* 11, no. 2 (1997): 397-409.

———. *América mágica: Simbiosis de cantos y ecuaciones*. La Paz: Plural, 2006.

Ross, Eric. "Blood of the Condor (Yawar Mallku)." *American Anthropologist* 80, no. 1 (1976): 203-4.

Rossellini, Roberto, "A Few Words About Neo-realism." In *Springtime in Italy: A Reader on Neo-realism*, edited and translated by David Overby, 89-91. Hamden: Archon Books, 1978.

Rossi, Juan José, ed. *El cine etnobiográfico de Jorge Preloran*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Busqueda, 1987.

Rothman, William, ed. *Three Documentary Filmmakers: Errol Morris, Ross McElwee, Jean Rouch*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009.

Rouch, Jean. "Our Totemic Ancestors and Crazed Masters." In *Principles of Visual Anthropology*. 2nd Ed., edited by Paul Hocking, 217-232. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyer, 1995.

———. *Ciné-Ethnography*. Visible Evidence, Vol. 13, translated and edited by Steven Feld. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 2003.

Ruberto, Laura E. and Kristi M. Wilson. Introduction to *Italian Neorrealism and Global Cinema*, edited by Laura E Ruberto and Kristi M. Wilson, 1-21. Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 2007.

Ruby, Jay. *Picturing Culture: Explorations of Film and Anthropology*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2000.

Ruiz, Guillermo. Interview by the author. La Paz, Bolivia, 4 May 2008.

Ruiz, Jorge. "Propaganda no es una mala palabra." *Decursos: Revista de Cinecias Sociales* 5, no. 10 (2003): 5-14.

Rumble, Patrick. *Allegories of Contamination: Pier Paolo Pasolini's Trilogy of Life*. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1996.

Russell, Catherine. *Experimental Ethnography: The Work of Film in the Age of Video*. Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 1999.

Said, Edward. "Travelling Theory." *Raritan* 1, no. 3 (1982): 41-67.

Salazar, Juan Francisco and Amalia Córdova. "Imperfect Mediaa nd the Poetics of Indigenous Video in Latin America." In *Global Indigenous Media: Cultures, Poetics, and Politics*, edited by Pamela Wilson and Michelle Stewart, 39-57. Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 2008.

Sánchez-H, José. "Neo-realism in Contemporary Bolivian Cinema: A Case Study of Jorge Sanjines's *Blood of the Condor* and Antonio Eguino's *Chuquiago*." Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1985.

———. *The Art and Politics of Bolivian Cinema*. Lanham: The Scarecrow Press, 1999.

Sanjinés, Javier. "Transculturación y subalternidad en el cine boliviano." *Objeto visual*, no. 10 (2004): 11-29.

Sanjinés C., Javier. *Meztizaje Upside-Down: Aesthetic Politics in Modern Bolivia*. Pittsburgh: Univ. of Pittsburgh Press, 2004.

Sanjinés, Jorge. "A Talk with Jorge Sanjines." Interview. *Cinéaste* 4, no. 3 (1970-1): 12-13.

———. "Jorge Sanjines, Ukamau & Yawar Mallku." Interview. *Afterimage*, no. 3 (1971): 40-53.

———. "Un cine militante." *Cine cubano*, no. 68 (1971): 45-47.

———. "Jorge Sanjines una entrevista." Interview by Fernando Pérez. *Cine cubano*, nos. 71-2 (1972): 52-59.

———. “Conversacion con un cineasta revolucionario: Jorge Sanjines.” Interview. *Cine cubano*, nos. 73-5 (1972): 1-7.

———. “Cine revolucionario la experiencia boliviano.” *Cine cubano*, nos. 76-7 (1972): 1-15.

———. “The Courage of the People: An Interview with Jorge Sanjines.” Interview by Dina Nascetti. *Cinéaste* 5, no. 2 (1972): 18-20.

———. “Vlijnaie na s’vetskoto njamo kino v’rhu revoljucionnoto kino v Bolivija.” *Kinoizkustvo* 32, no. 9 (1977): 5-10.

———. “A Militant Cinema.” In *Latin American Filmmakers and the Third Cinema*. Edited by Zuzana Pick, 73-7. Ottawa: Carleton Univ. Film Studies Program, 1978.

———. “Revolutionary Cinema: The Bolivian Experience.” In *Latin American Filmmakers and the Third Cinema*. Edited by Zuzana Pick, 78-87. Ottawa: Carleton Univ. Film Studies Program, 1978.

———. “The Search for a Popular Cinema.” In *Latin American Filmmakers and the Third Cinema*. Edited by Zuzana Pick, 88-95. Ottawa: Carleton Univ. Film Studies Program, 1978.

———. “Bolivia Sanjines.” Translated by John King. *Framework*, no. 10 (1979): 31-33.

———. “Sobre ¡Fuera de aquí!” *Cine cubano*, no.93 (1979): 126-132.

———. “Para ser verdaderamente bolivianos tenemos que estar integrados a la vida de las mayorias.” Interview by Romulado Santos. *Cine cubano*, no. 98 (1981): 56-64.

———. “El cine revolucionario en Bolivia.” *Cine cubano*, no. 99 (1981): 80-83.

———. “Nuestro principal destinatario.” *Cine cubano* no. 105 (1983): 40-44.

———. “Problems of Form and Content in Revolutionary Cinema.” In *Twenty-five Years of the New Latin American Cinema*, edited by Michael Chanan, 34-8. London: BFI and Channel 4, 1983.

———. “Ein neues Konzept.” *Film und Fernsehen* 15, no. 9 (1987): 24.

———. “El perfil imborrable.” *Cine cubano*, no. 122 (1988): 29-33.

———. “Testimonio en Mérida (Venezuela).” In *Hojas de cine: testimonios y documentos del nuevo cine latinoamericano*. Vol. 2. *Centro y Sudamérica*. Mexico: UNAM, 1988.

———. “El plano secuencia integral.” *Cine cubano*, no. 125 (1989): 65-71.

———. “La nacion clandestina.” Cinemateca Boliviana, 1990. Photocopied brochure.

———. “Problems of Form and Content in Revolutionary Cinema.” In *New Latin American Cinema*. Vol. 1, *Theory, Practices, and Transnational Articulations*, edited by Michael T. Martin, 62-70. Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1997.

———. “Sobre el cortometraje.” In *El cine de Jorge Sanjinés*, edited by Festival Iberoamericana de Cine de Santa Cruz, 28-33. Santa Cruz: Federación para la Educación y Desarrollo de las Artes y Media—FEDAM, 1999.

———. “Neorrealismo y nuevo cine latinoamericano: La herencia, las coincidencias y las diferencias.” *El Ojo Que Piensa Revista Virtual de Cine Iberoamericano* no. 0 (2003): [journal online]. Available from http://www.elojoquepiensa.udg.mx/espanol/numero00/veryana/07_neorrealismo.html; Internet; accessed 23 April 2009.

———. “El tiempo circular de Jorge Sanjinés.” Interview by Ricardo Bajo Herreras. *El Ojo Que Piensa Revista Virtual de Cine Iberoamericano* no. 0 (2003): [journal online]. Available from http://www.elojoquepiensa.udg.mx/espanol/numero00/cinejournal/01_jorgesanjines.html; Internet; accessed 23 April 2009.

———. Interview by the author. La Paz, Bolivia. 21 April 2008.

Sanjinés, Jorge y Grupo Ukamau. *Teoría y práctica de un cine junto al pueblo*. Mexico: Siglo Ventiuno, 1979.

Sanjinés, Jorge and the Ukamau Group. *Theory and Practice of a Cinema with the People*. Art on the Line, no. 6, translated by Richard Schaaf. Willimantic: Curbstone Press, 1989.

Sanjinés, Jorge and Oscar Soria. “La negación del indigenismo: Entrevista con Jorge Sanjinés con la participación de Oscar Soria.” *Hablemos de cine*, no. 52 (1972): 36-40.

Schiwy, Freya. *Indianizing Film: Decolonization, the Andes, and the Question of Technology*. Newark: Rutgers Univ. Press, 2009.

Schumann, Peter B., ed. *Kino und Kampf in Lateinamerika: Zur Theorie und Praxis des politischen Kinos*. München: Hanser Verlag, 1976.

Schwartz, Louis-Georges. “Typewriter: Free Indirect Discourse in Deleuze’s *Cinema*.” *Substance* 34, no. 3 (2005): 107-135.

Schwartz, Roberto. *Misplaced Ideas: Essays on Brazilian Culture*. New York: Verso, 1992.

Shedlin, Michael. “Case Study vs. Process Study: Two Films Made for Italian Television.” *Film Quarterly* 27, no. 3 (1974): 27-39.

Siekmeier, James F. “A Sacraficial Llama? The Expulsion of the Peace Corps from Bolivia in 1971.” *Pacific Historical Review* 6, no. 1 (2000): 65-87.

Silverman, Kaja. *The Subject of Semiotics*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1983.

Smith, Murray. “The Logic and Legacy of Brechtianism.” In *Post-Theory: Reconstructing Film Studies*, edited by David Bordwell and Noël Carroll, 130-48. Madison: University of Wisconson Press, 1996.

Solanas, Fernando and Octavio Getino. *Cine, cultura y descolonización*. Buenos Aires: Siglo Ventiuno, 1973.

———. “Towards a Third Cinema: Notes and Experiences fro the Development of a Cinema of Liberation for the Third World.” In *New Latin American Cinema*. Vol. 1, *Theory, Practices, and Transnational Articulations*, edited by Michael T. Martin, 33-58. Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1997.

Stoller, Paul. “Artaud, Rouch, and the Cinema of Cruelty.” *Visual Anthropology Review* 8, no. 2 (1992): 50-57.

———. *The Cinematic Griot: The Ethnography of Jean Rouch*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1992.

———. “Jean Rouch and the Power of the Between,” in *Three Documentary Filmmakers: Errol Morris, Ross McElwee, Jean Rouch*, edited by William Rothman, 125-137. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009.

ten Brink, Joram, ed. *Building Bridges: The Cinema of Jean Rouch*. London: Wallflower Press, 2007.

Thompson, Sinclair. *We Alone Will Rule: Native Andean Politics in the Age of Insurgency*. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 2002.

Traverso, Antonio. “Migrations of Cinema: Italian Neorealism and Brazilian Cinema.” In *Italian Neorrealism and Global Cinema*, edited by Laura E Ruberto and Kristi M. Wilson, 165-86. Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 2007.

Tyler, Steven A. *The Unspeakable: Discourse, Dialogue, and Rhetoric in the Postmdern World*. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1987.

Ungar, Steven.“Whose Voice? Whose Film?: Jean Rouch, Oumarou Ganda and *Moi, un noir*.” In *Building Bridges: The Cinema of Jean Rouch*, edited by Joram ten Brink, 111-123. London: Wallflower Press, 2007.

Urban, Greg. *Metaculture: How Culture Moves Through the World*. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 2001.

de Urioste, Armando J. Interview by author. La Paz, Bolivia, 6 March 2008.

———. Interview by author. La Paz, Bolivia, 25 April, 2008.

Valdivia, José Antonio. *Testigo de la realidad Jorge Ruiz: Memorias del cine documental boliviano*. La Paz: Plural, 1998.

Vesény, Adam. *Theater in Latin America: Religion, Politics, and Culture from Cortés to the 1980s*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993.

Viano, Maurizio. *A Certain Realism: Making Use of Pasolini’s Film Theory and Practice*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1993.

Wachtel, Nathan. *Gods and Vampires: Return to Chipaya*. Translated by Carrol Volk. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1994.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. *Geopolitics and Geoculture: Essays on the Changing World System*. Cambridge: Univ. of Cambridge Press, 1991.

Warawara 1, no. 1 (1954): n.p.

Weismantel, Mary. *Cholas and Pishtacos: Stories of Race and Sex in the Andes*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2001.

Weiss, Judith A. and others. *Latin American Popular Theater: The First Five Centuries*. Albuquerque: Univ. of New Mexico Press, 1993.

Willemen, Paul, ed. *Pier Paolo Pasolini*. London: BFI, 1977.

———. Preface to *Pier Paolo Pasolini*, edited by Paul Willemen. London: BFI, 1977.

———. "The Third Cinema Question: Notes and Reflections." In *Questions of Third Cinema*, edited by Jim Pines and Paul Willemen, 1-29. London: BFI, 1989.

Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Wollen, Peter. *Readings and Writings: Semiotic Counter-Strategies*. London: Verso, 1982.

———. "Godard and Counter Cinema: *Vent d'Est*. In *Film Theory and Criticism*. 6th edition, edited by Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen, 525-533. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2004.

Yip, June. *Revisioning Taiwan: Fiction, Cinema, and the Nation in the Cultural Imaginary*. Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 2004.

Yujra, Reynaldo. Interview with the author. La Paz, Bolivia, 7 April 2009.

Filmography

Published sources may offer disparate titles and years for foreign films. This filmography uses the following format:

Domestic release title/U.S. release title or, where none, standard English translation, unless the film was released under its original name (director or directors, country or countries of production, year of first theatrical release)

2 ou 3 choses que je sais d'elle/Two or Three Things I Know About Her (Jean-Luc Godard, France, 1967)

8 1/2 (Federico Fellini, Italy, 1963)

Accattone (Pier Paolo Pasolini, Italy, 1960)

Amores perros (Alejandro González Iñárritu, Mexico, 2000)

Angeles de la tierra/*Angels of the Land* (Patricio Luna, Bolivia, 2001)

Appunti per un'Oriestiade Africana/Notes for an African Orestia (Pier Paolo Pasolini, Italy, 1970)

Las aventuras de Juan Quin Quin/*The Adventures of Juan Quin Quin* (Julio García Espinosa, Cuba, 1967)

¡Aysa!/Landslide! (Jorge Sanjinés, Bolivia, 1965)

Bakha satang/*Peppermint Candy* (Chang-dong Lee, S. Korea, 2000)

Las banderas del amanecer/The Flags of Dawn Jorge Sanjinés, Bolivia, 1983)

Barravento (Glauber Rocha, Brazil, 1962)

Bataille sur le grand fleuve/*Hippopotamus Hunt* (Jean Rouch, Niger, 1952)

Bolivia busca la verdad/*Bolivia Seeks the Truth* (Jorge Ruiz, Bolivia, 1950)

Bolivia se libera/*Bolivia Liberates Itself* (Waldo Cerruto, Bolivia, 1952)

À bout de souffle/Breathless (Jean-Luc Godard, France, 1960)

Bronenosets Potyemkin/Battleship Potemkin (Sergei Eisenstein, USSR, 1925)

Los caminos de la muerte/The Roads of Death (Jorge Sanjinés, Bolivia, 1970)

La chasse au lion à l'arc/*Hunting the Lion with Bow and Arrow* (Jean Rouch, Niger, 1965)

La Chinoise/*The Chinese* (Jean-Luc Godard, France, 1967)

Chircales/*The Brickmakers* (Marta Rodríguez and Jorge Silva, Colombia, 1972)

Chronique d'un été/Chronicle of a Summer (Jean Rouch and Edgar Morin, France, 1960)

Chuquiago (Antonio Eguino, Bolivia, 1977)

Cidade de Deus/*City of God* (Fernando Meirelles and Katía Lund, Brazil, 2002)

Cocorico, Monsieur Poulet (Jean Rouch, Niger, 1974)

Comizi d'amore/*Love Meetings* (Pier Paolo Pasolini, Italy, 1965)

El coraje del pueblo/*The Courage of the People* (Jorge Sanjinés, Bolivia, 1971)

Corazón aymara/*Aymara Heart* (Pedro Sambarino, Bolivia, 1925)

Csend és kiáltás/Silence and Cry (Miklós Jancsó, Hungary, 1967)

Csillagosok, katonák /The Red and the White (Miklos Jancsó, Hungary, 1967)

Il Decameron/*The Decameron* (Pier Paolo Pasolini, Italy, 1971)

Il deserto rosso/*Red Desert* (Michelangelo Antonioni, Italy, 1964)

Donde nació un imperio/*Where an Empire Was Born* (Jorge Ruiz, Bolivia, 1949)

Edipo Re/*Oedipus Rex* (Pier Paolo Pasolini, Italy, 1967)

El enemigo principal/*The Principal Enemy* (Jorge Sanjinés, Peru, 1974)

Estaño, tragedia y gloria/*Tin, Tragedy and Glory* (Walldo Cerruto, Bolivia, 1953)

La fantôme de la liberté/The Phantom of Liberty (Luis Buñuel, France, 1974)

Il fiore delle mille e una notte/Arabian Nights (Pier Paolo Pasolini, Italy, 1974)
¡Fuera de aquí!/Get Out of Here! (Jorge Sanjinés, Ecuador, 1977)

Funérailles à Bongo: Le vieil Anaï, 1848-1971/Funeral at Bongo: The Old Anaï (1848-1971) (Jean Rouch, Mali, 1972)

Gare du nord (Jean Rouch, France, 1965)

Geschichtsuntericht/History Lessons (Jean-Marie Straub and Danielle Huillet, W. Germany, 1972)

Hadaka no shima/The Naked Isle (Kaneto Shindo, Japan, 1960)

Hao nan hao nu/Good Men, Good Women (Hsiao-hsien Hou, Taiwan, 1995)

Los hijos del último jardín/The Sons of the Last Garden (Jorge Sanjinés, Bolivia, 2003)

La hora de los hornos/The Hour of the Furnaces (Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino, Argentina, 1968)

Irréversible/Irreversible (Gaspar Noé, France, 2002)

Jaguar (Jean Rouch, Niger, 1967)

Jaws (Steven Spielberg, U.S., 1975)

La joli mai (Chris Marker, France, 1963)

Kuhle Wampe: oder wem gehört die Welt?/Kuhle Wampe, or Who Owns the World? (Bertolt Brecht and Slatan Dudow, Germany, 1931)

Ladri di biciclette/Bicycle Thieves (Vittorio De Sica, Italy, 1949)

Loin du Vietnam/Far From Vietnam (Jean-Luc Godard, Joris Ivens, William Klein, Claude Lelouche, Chris Marker, Alain Resnais, and Agnes Varda, 1968)

Los que nunca fueron/The Ones That Never Were (Jorge Ruiz, Bolivia, 1954)

Les maîtres fous/The Mad Masters (Jean Rouch, Ghana, 1955)
Mamma Roma (Pier Paolo Pasolini, Italy, 1962)

Medea (Pier Paolo Pasolini, Italy, 1969)

Még kér a nép (*Red Psalm*, Miklós Jancsó, 1972)

El mégano (Julio García Espinosa andTomás Gutiérrez Alea, Cuba, 1955)

Memento (Christopher Nolan, U.S., 2000)

Memorias del subdesarrollo/Memories of Underdevelopment (Tomás Gutiérrez Alea, Cuba, 1968)

Le mépris (*Contempt*, Jean-Luc Godard, France, 1963)

Miracolo en milano/Miracle in Milan (Vittorio De Sica, Italy, 1951)

Moi, un noir/I, a Negro (Jean Rouch, Ivory Coast, 1958)

La nación clandestina/The Hidden Nation (Jorge Sanjinés, Bolivia, 1989)

La nuit américaine/Day for Night (Francois Truffaut, France, 1973)

Oktyabr/October (Sergei Eisenstein, USSR, 1928)

Paisà (Roberto Rossellini, Italy, 1946)

Para recibir el canto de los pájaros/To Hear the Birds Singing (Jorge Sanjinés, Bolivia, 1995)

Paris vu par…/Six in Paris (Claude Chabrol, Jean Douchet, Jean-Luc Godard, Jean-Daniel Pollet, Eric Rohmer, and Jean Rouch, France, 1965)

Petit á petit/Little by Little (Jean Rouch, France, 1971)

Porcile/Pigpen (Pier Paolo Pasolini, Italy, 1969)

Preludio 11 (*Prelude 11*, Kurt Maetzig, Cuba, 1964)

Prima della rivoluzione/Before the Revolution (Bernardo Bertolucci, Italy, 1964)

Pueblo Chico (Antonio Eguino, Bolivia, 1975)

La Pyramide humaine/The Human Pyramid (Jean Rouch, Ivory Coast, 1958)

Qati Qati: Susurros de muerte/Qati Qati: Whispers of Death (Reynaldo Yujra, Bolivia, 1999)

¡Que viva Mexico! (Sergei Eisenstein, Mexico, 1931)

Revolución/Revolution (Jorge Sanjinés, Bolivia, 1963)

I riconti di Canterbury/The Canterbury Tales (Pier Paolo Pasolini, U.K., 1972)

La ricotta (Pier Paolo Pasolini, Italy, 1963)

Rio 40 Graus/Rio 40 Degrees (Nelson Pereira dos Santos, Brazil, 1955)

Rio Zona Norte/Rio, Northern Zone (Nelson Pereira dos Santos, Brazil, 1957)

Roma città libera/Rome, Open City (Roberto Rossellini, Italy, 1946)

Salò, o la 120 giornate di Sodoma/Salò, or the 120 Days of Sodom (Pier Paolo Pasolini, Italy, 1975)

Salvatore Giuliano (Francesco Rosi, Italy, 1962)

Sayari/Get Up! (Mela Márquez, Bolivia, 1995)

Sciuscià/Shoeshin (Vittorio De Sica, Italy, 1946)

Señores generales, Señores coroneles (Alfonso Gumucio Dagron, France, 1976)

Son o no son/To Be or Not To Be (Julio García Espinosa, Cuba, 1978)

Song of Ceylon (Basil Wright, Ceylon, 1934)

Sueños y realidades/Dreams and Realities (Jorge Sanjinés, Bolivia, 1961)

Szegénylegények/The Round Up (Miklós Jancsó, Hungary, 1966)

Les tambours d'avant: Tourou et Bitti/Tourou et Bitti (Jean Rouch, Niger, 1971)

La terra trema/The Earth Trembles (Luchino Visconti, Italy, 1948)

O thiasos/The Travelling Players (Theo Angelopoulos, Greece, 1974)

Tire dié/Throw a Dime (Fernando Birri, Argentina, 1957)

Tout va bien /All's Well (Jean-Luc Godard and Jean-Pierre Gorin, France, 1972)

Uccellachi e Uccellini/The Hawks and Sparrows (Pier Paolo Pasolini, Italy, 1966)

Ukamau (Jorge Sanjinés, Bolivia, 1966)

Un día Paulino/One Day, Paulino (Jorge Sanjinés, Bolivia, 1962)

Los Urus/The Uru (Jorge Ruiz, Bolivia, 1951)

Il vangelo secondo Matteo/The Gospel According to Matthew (Pier Paolo Pasolini, Italy, 1964)

Le Vent d'est/Wind From the East (Jean-Luc Godard and Jean Pierre Gorin, France, 1970)

La vertiente/The Source (Jorge Ruiz, Bolivia, 1958)

Voces de la tierra/Voices of the Earth (Jorge Ruiz, Bolivia, 1958)

Vuelve Sebastiana/Come Back, Sebastiana (Jorge Ruiz, Bolivia, 1953)

Wara-Wara (José María Velasco Maidana, Bolivia, 1929)

Weekend (Jean-Luc Godard, France, 1967)

Yawar Mallku/Blood of the Condor (Jorge Sanjinés, Bolivia, 1969)