

INTRODUCTION

“An Invention without a Future”

The cinema is an invention without a future.

—LOUIS LUMIÈRE, AUTHOR OF THE
FIRST FILM MANIFESTO

To forge oneself iron laws, if only in order to obey
or disobey them *with difficulty* . . .

—ROBERT BRESSON, *NOTES ON THE CINEMATOGRAPHER*

THE FOURTH COLUMN

Manifestos are typically understood as ruptures, breaks, and challenges to the steady flow of politics, aesthetics, or history. This is equally true of film and other moving image manifestos. Paradoxically, film manifestos pervade the history of cinema yet exist at the margins of almost all accounts of film history itself. An examination of this elision raises not simply the question of whether manifestos have changed the cinema (even if their existence has often been marginalized in film history) but whether the act of calling into being a new form of cinema changed not only moving images but the world itself. For this proposition to make any sense at all, one cannot take moving images to be separate from the world or to be simply a mirror or reflection of the real. Instead, one must see moving images as a constitutive part of the real: as images change, so does the rest of the world. By way of introduction to *Film Manifestos and Global Cinema Cultures*, I examine what exactly a manifesto is, consider the role played by manifestos in film culture, offer an overview of some of the film manifestos and manifesto movements covered in the book, and map out a critical model of what constitutes a film manifesto and a manifesto-style of writing. My aim is to outline a theoretically informed counterhistory that places film manifestos, often neglected, at the center of film history, politics, and culture.

Film manifestos are a missing link in our knowledge of the history of cinema production, exhibition, and distribution. Often considered a subset of aesthetics or mere political propaganda, film manifestos are better understood as a creative and political engine, an often unacknowledged force pushing forward film theory, criticism, and history. Examining these writings as a distinct category—constituting calls to action for political and aesthetic changes in the cinema and, equally important, the cinema’s role in the world—allows one not only to better understand their use-value but also the way in which

they have functioned as catalysts for film practices outside the dominant narrative paradigms of what Jean-Luc Godard pejoratively calls “Hollywood-Mosfilm.” Yet manifestos and manifesto-style writing have also greatly influenced, and indeed regulated, narrative cinema, especially that of the classical Hollywood period.

One of the other goals of *Film Manifestos and Global Cinema Cultures* is to reconsider the status of the film manifesto in film theory and history. Part of my desire to do this stems from my coming of age, as an academic, during the “theory wars” of the 1990s (nowhere near as sexy as the “Clone Wars” but similarly populated with mutterings about the “dark side”). Many of the most contentious essays at the center of the “theory wars” are better understood not as theory *qua* theory, in some empirical sense, but as manifestos—calls to arms to change, destroy, and reimagine the cinema. Certainly, this is the political and aesthetic power that lies behind a multitude of central writings on the cinema, from Sergei Eisenstein’s “The Method of Making Workers’ Films,” and Dziga Vertov’s “WE: Variant of a Manifesto” through Laura Mulvey’s “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema” and Claire Johnston’s “Women’s Cinema as Counter-Cinema” (indeed, some of the writings from the analytic side of the debate by Noël Carroll and Gregory Currie can be read as manifestos for film theory itself).¹ To get tied up in positivist arguments about the empirical nature of these texts is to miss the means by which they functioned as catalysts for writers and filmmakers alike to reimagine the cinema.

Film Manifestos and Global Cinema Cultures brings together film manifestos from the global history of cinema, constituting the first historical and theoretical account of the role played by film manifestos in filmmaking and film culture.² Focusing equally on political and aesthetic manifestos (and the numerous ones that address the relationship between aesthetics and politics), *Film Manifestos and Global Cinema Cultures* uncovers a neglected yet central history of cinema through the exploration of a series of documents that postulate ways in which to reimagine the medium, how moving images intervene in the public sphere, and the ways film might function as a catalyst to change the world. Many film manifestos accomplish these goals by foregrounding the dialectical relationship between questions of aesthetic form and political discourse, raising salient questions about how cinematic form is in and of itself a form of political action and intervention in the public sphere. Indeed, one of the defining characteristics of film manifestos could be understood by the maxim “aesthetics as action.”

Film Manifestos and Global Cinema Cultures brings together key manifestos of the last 110 years, alongside many little-known manifestos that, despite their obscurity, have nevertheless served to challenge and reimagine cinema aesthetics, politics, distribution, production, and exhibition. To this end the book includes the major European manifestos (those of Sergei Eisenstein, François Truffaut, Free Cinema, Oberhausen, Dogme ’95, et al.), the Latin American political manifestos (Fernando Birri, Jorge Sanjinés, Julio García Espinosa, Fernando Solanas, et al.), those of the postcolonial nation-state independence movements (Scotland, Québec, Palestine) and those of avant-garde filmmakers and writers (Stan Brakhage, Maya Deren, Jonas Mekas, Keith Sanborn, et al.). *Film*

Manifestos and Global Cinema Cultures also brings to light many manifestos largely unknown in Anglo-American film culture, as the book contains many previously untranslated manifestos authored or coauthored by figures such as Icíar Bollaín, Luis Buñuel, Guy Debord, Jean-Luc Godard, Jaime Humberto Hermosillo, Isidore Isou, Krzysztof Kieślowski, and François Truffaut. The book also includes thematic sections addressing documentary cinema, feminist and queer film cultures, and state-controlled filmmaking and archives. Furthermore, it includes texts that have been traditionally left out of the canon of film manifestos, such as the Motion Picture Production Code and Pius XI's *Vigilanti Cura*, which have nevertheless played a central role in film culture (indeed, the Production Code can be seen as the most successful film manifesto of all time). Finally, I have also included many local manifestos, ones that were influential in specific scenes and micromovements. The counterhistory that emerges from these varied texts brings to life, in essence, a new history of the cinema.

WHAT IS A MANIFESTO?

Before turning to film manifestos, consideration must be given to what, in general, constitutes a manifesto. To begin, then, a perhaps audacious claim: the last three thousand years of Judeo-Christian history are based on a manifesto. The Decalogue, or the Ten Commandments, declaimed in both Exodus and Deuteronomy, functions as Western culture's first and most definitive manifesto. The rules it sets out defined the basic structures around which Western culture has organized itself and its belief systems. The Commandments, like any good subsequent manifesto, offer not only rules to live by but nothing less than a totalizing vision of how one ought to live one's life. An examination of the Decalogue also allows one to delineate the difference between a manifesto and what could be more broadly construed as rules: "You shall have no other gods before me" or "You shall not make wrongful use of the name of the Lord your God" (Exodus 20:3, 7; and Deuteronomy 5:7, 11) are imperatives that effect one's morality and ethics in a way that "don't run with scissors" does not (even though the latter may be considered a more pragmatic piece of advice).

While the Decalogue is only the most prominent of the myriad of totalizing theological proclamations of the way in which one ought to live one's life, contemporary manifestos and our understanding of them date from the upheavals of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, most notably with the United States' Declaration of Independence of 1776, the Constitution of 1788, and the Bill of Rights of 1791; France's *Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen* of 1789; and Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels's *Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei* (*The Communist Manifesto*) of 1848. These foundational documents of two of the three competing ideologies of the twentieth century (the other being fascism) have taken on a quasi-religious status, partly replacing old messianic principles with newly found societal and secular ones; for instance, James Madison once referred to the founding American documents as "political scripture." Here, the political

manifesto takes on the totalizing role of societal definition once held by the Decalogue. Indeed, Fredric Jameson sees connections between these forms of writings, codifies both manifestos and constitutions as subsets of utopian writing, and delineates the four different kinds of utopian writing: “the manifesto; the constitution; the ‘mirror of princes’; and great prophecy, which includes within itself that mode called satire.”³ All four kinds of writing can be seen as means by which to reimagine the world by calling a new world into being through the act of writing.

The aesthetic manifesto demonstrates many of the same qualities as the classical political manifesto, even when lacking an overt political or ideological goal. The rules put forth in aesthetic manifestos set structures that not only pertain to artistic form but do so with the implicit or explicit belief that following aesthetic rules in artistic production has political, social, and cultural consequences in the world at large. The rules or constraints placed on poetic form, from haiku to iambic pentameter, may lead to aesthetically pleasing texts, but the rules themselves don’t speak to larger cultural, political, or aesthetic issues. Aesthetic manifestos, then, make claims about not only the formal aspects of art but the ways in which these formal rules will help transform the world at large.

What constitutes the preferred discursive model of the manifesto in order to bring this transformation into being is open to debate. As a form of speech, manifestos have been understood as both monological and dialectical in nature. Janet Lyon, for instance, argues that traditional aesthetic and political modernist manifestos are both exhortations to action and simultaneous attempts to eradicate dissent and debate:

The literary and political manifestoes that flag the history of modernity are usually taken to be transparent public expressions of pure will: whoever its author and whatever its subject, a manifesto is understood as the testimony of a historical present tense spoken in the impassioned voice of its participants. The form’s capacity for rhetorical *trompe l’oeil* tends to shape its wide intelligibility: the syntax of a manifesto is so narrowly controlled by exhortation, its style so insistently unmediated, that it appears to say only what it means, and to mean only what it says. The manifesto declares a position; the manifesto refuses dialogue or discussion; the manifesto fosters antagonism and scorns conciliation. It is univocal, unilateral, single-minded. It conveys resolute oppositionality and indulges no tolerance for the faint hearted.⁴

For Lyon it is a strategic necessity for the manifesto to be monological in nature. To engage in a dialogical process in regard to what the manifesto is calling into being is to undercut its very efficacy as a speech act. In contrast, for Louis Althusser the manifesto is dialectical in nature, mediating past and present. Writing on Antonin Gramsci’s reading of Machiavelli’s *The Prince* as a manifesto, Althusser writes, “Machiavelli ‘speaks’ to Gramsci in the future tense. . . . Gramsci calmly writes that *The Prince* is a manifesto and a ‘revolutionary utopia.’ For the sake of brevity, let us say ‘a revolutionary utopian manifesto.’”⁵ He argues elsewhere, also in relation to *The Prince*, that “for the manifesto to be

truly political and realistic—materialistic—the theory that it states must not only be stated by the manifesto, but located by it in the social space into which it is intervening and which it thinks.”⁶ Manifestos for Althusser, then, are invocations: they call the future into being through a dialectical mediation of the present and the past. This utopian drive is central to the post-Enlightenment manifesto and to the calls for a radical reimagining of the cinema in film manifestos, bringing into being not only a new cinema but a new world.

MANIFESTOS AND UTOPIAS

What would a new intellectual history of film culture, read through the prism of the manifesto, look like; and how can one, in a theoretical frame, begin to synthesize this kind of history and writing with the concept of the utopian? What kind of form might this kind of “secret history” take, and what might this history reveal? One notion that comes to mind is that a radically different kind of dialogical process would occur among different historical, political, national, and cultural moments in film theory, criticism, and history. This reimagining of the history of cinema through the utopian ruptures of film manifestos has philosophical precedents: in strikingly different ways the works of Walter Benjamin and Guy Debord engage in this process, as both these Marxist philosophers examine the role of the image in twentieth-century culture.

Greil Marcus’s *Lipstick Traces: A Secret History of the Twentieth Century*, his classic study of punk, the Diggers, the Lettristes, the Situationists, and a cornucopia of other “termite-like” political and aesthetic movements, is also an example of this kind of radical utopian critical approach to cultural history. Marcus traces dialogical relationships among different moments of radical cultural history and uses punk as a contemporary culmination of many of these cultural and political practices:

In “Anarchy in the UK,” a twenty-year-old called Johnny Rotten has rephrased a social critique generated by people who, as far as he knew, had never been born. Who knew what else was part of the conversation? If one can stop looking at the past and start listening to it, one might hear echoes of a new conversation; then the task of the critic would be to lead speakers and listeners unaware of each other’s existence to talk to one another. The job of the critic would be to maintain the ability to be surprised at how the conversation goes, and to communicate that sense of surprise to other people, because a life infused with surprise is better than a life that is not.⁷

This analysis is both utopian and dialogical in nature. But it also speaks of the ways by which social and political breaks and ruptures take place in culture—in other words, how radical interventions from radical voices come about. Part of the task of *Film Manifestos and Global Cinema Cultures* is not simply to document, in some sort of Rankéan manner, the inexorable progression of one manifesto movement to another; instead, it is to place these manifestos, as if in a noisy room, in dialogue and debate with each other, much

like the role of the critics that Marcus outlines in the passage above. The reason to consider film manifestos as if they are in dialogue with each other is that this allows one to open up the possibility of seeing manifestos not simply as static, temporal texts but as discourses and exhortations, knowingly or not, in cacophonous debate, shouting from the margins an untold history of the cinema and its radical, utopian possibilities. This, in essence, is the goal of this collection: by placing film manifestos at the center of film history and culture, the book aims to reimagine a lost history of the cinema and to bring to light the way in which so many filmmakers, critics, theorists, archivists, activists, and historians have deployed cinema as a means to reconfigure the world.

This utopian, if not messianic, desire to radically reimagine the world deserves further consideration. Karl Mannheim was one of the first critical theorists to explore the role played by the utopian in contemporary theory, with his groundbreaking study *Ideology and Utopia*. Writing in 1936, he stated:

A state of mind is utopian when it is incongruous with the state of reality within which it occurs. This incongruence is always evident in the fact that such a state of mind in experience, in thought, and in practice, is oriented towards objects which do not exist in the actual situation. However, we should not regard as utopian every state of mind which is incongruous with and transcends the immediate situation (and in this sense, “departs from reality”). Only those orientations transcending reality will be referred to by us as utopian which, when they pass over into conduct, tend to shatter, either partially or wholly, the order of things prevailing at the time.⁸

Paul Ricoeur analyzes the perceived strengths and limitations of Mannheim’s theory by drawing distinctions between the utopian and the ideological: “ideologies relate mainly to dominant groups; to comfort the collective ego of these dominant groups. Utopias, on the other hand, are more naturally supported by ascending groups and therefore are more usually by the lower strata of society.” He continues: “Utopia is not only a set of ideas but a mentality, a *Geist*, a configuration of factors which permeates a whole range of ideas and feelings. . . . Mannheim speaks here of the ‘dominant wish,’ something which can be retained as a methodological concept if we understand it as an organizing principle that is more felt than thought.”⁹ Ricoeur concludes by drawing into relief the clear distinctions between the two concepts: “If we call ideology false consciousness of our real situation, we can imagine a society without ideology. We cannot imagine, however, a society without utopia, because this would be a society without goals.”¹⁰ One of Ricoeur’s critiques of Mannheim is that Mannheim postulates that society is moving toward a “gradual approximation of real life” and therefore no longer has a need to postulate utopias; Ricoeur fundamentally disagrees with this Rankéan conception. However, one can take away from Mannheim’s conception of the utopian the notion of the “dominant wish,” which echoes Walter Benjamin’s concept of the “dialectical image,” as outlined by Susan Buck-Morss:

As fore-history, the objects are prototypes, ur-phenomena that can be recognized as precursors to the present, no matter how distant or estranged they now appear. Benjamin implies that if the fore-history of an object reveals its possibility (including its utopian potential), its after-history is that which, as an object of natural history, it has in fact become. . . . In the traces left by the object's after-history, the conditions of its decay and the manner of its cultural transmission, the utopian images of past objects can be read as truth. . . . Benjamin was counting on the shock of this recognition to jolt the dreaming collective into a political "awakening."¹¹

Here are the beginnings of what a theory of the manifesto might look like: manifestos not only as diagnostic but as causing a "shock of recognition," a blow to the dominant order's illusion of ideological and aesthetic coherence: one witnesses the revival of the utopian as a political form, recasting a leftist critique of both culture and theory. In essence, then, film manifestos, read as utopian texts, function in a similar way to the "dialectical image." Along similar lines this relationship between the utopian and the political, and specifically the ideological, is outlined quite clearly by Fredric Jameson in his analysis of the relationship between ideology and utopia: "A Marxist negative hermeneutic, a Marxist practice of ideological analysis proper, must in the practical work of reading and interpretation be exercised *simultaneously* with a Marxist positive hermeneutic, or a decipherment of the Utopian impulses of these same ideological cultural texts."¹² In a more recent article, evaluating the possibility of the utopian in a globalized world, Jameson notes that "it is difficult enough to imagine any radical political programme today without the conception of systematic otherness, of an alternative society, which only the idea of utopia seems to keep alive, however feebly. This clearly does not mean that, even if we succeed in reviving utopia itself, the outlines of a new and effective practical politics for the era of globalization will at once become visible; but only that we will never come to one without it."¹³

What Jameson does not address here is the fact that the utopian can and has been mobilized by the right as often as it has been by the left. Certainly, the rightist ideologies and manifestos of fascism and Stalinism both postulate utopian visions of a future world. This is in no way to discount the leftist manifesto and its relationship to the utopian, but it is to foreground the ways in which the utopian is postulated across the ideological spectrum. Broadly speaking, while leftist utopias look to the future for a better world, the utopias of the right position the utopian by harking back to the past. Both kinds of utopias run through the histories of film manifestos.

RADICALS, REACTIONARIES, AND THE FILM MANIFESTO

Within most accounts of cinematic history, the film manifesto plays a decidedly marginal role. While moving image manifestos are often seen as relevant to the study of national cinemas or as cornerstones to aesthetic movements such as surrealism or Dadaism, they are rarely understood as one of the driving forces behind large swathes of film theory and

practice. *Film Manifestos and Global Cinema Cultures* readdresses this critical elision. The book traces the interface between film manifestos and film practice in the broadest sense—to consider not only the high art manifestos of surrealism, Dadaism, expressionism, and futurism, or more recently, the Oberhausen, Third Cinema, and Dogme '95 manifestos—but also to examine “manifesto-style writing,” found in documents as diverse as Laura Mulvey’s highly influential essay “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema,” Hollywood’s Motion Picture Production Code, and the papal encyclical *Vigilanti Cura*. The reason these documents can be usefully understood as instances of manifesto writing is precisely because of their authors’ attempts through polemics to radically reimagine the nature of cinema (and, by extension, social and political relations) and to delineate in a programmatic and utopian manner what the cinema ought to be and how it should best function within the public sphere. At times, this reimagining is undertaken in order to bring about political, social, aesthetic, or cultural revolution. At other times it is undertaken to preserve a quite reactionary status quo. In most cases film manifestos postulate a discursive, imaginary, but politically charged utopia of one form or another, be it purely social, political, aesthetic, or some combination thereof. My aim, therefore, is to delineate a critical history of the role played by film manifestos in the construction of both the cinema itself and the theoretical and critical practices and apparatuses that surround and underpin it.

Throughout the history of the cinema, radicals and reactionaries alike have used the film manifesto as a means of stating their key aesthetic and political goals. Indeed, film manifestos are almost as old as the cinema itself; the first film manifesto can be traced to 1898. By the early 1910s and 1920s, Italian futurists, French Dadaists and surrealists, and German expressionists were all producing manifestos, stating their political, aesthetic, and philosophical principles. In most cases these texts were calls to revolution—a revolution of consciousness, of political hierarchies, and of aesthetic practices, which all bled together in an attempt to radically redefine the cinema and the culture in which it existed. Luis Buñuel’s famous claim that the film *Un chien andalou* (France, 1928) was a call to murder is only the most infamous of the statements in circulation at the time; many others framed the ways in which avant-garde, experimental, and alternative film (and later, television and video) came to be understood throughout the history of moving images.¹⁴ Furthermore, film manifestos can be seen as constituting the earliest form of film theory; for instance, Ricciotto Canudo’s “The Birth of the Sixth Art” in many ways marks the beginnings of a theory of radical film practice. Similarly, Sergei Eisenstein, Vsevolod Pudovkin, and Grigori Alexandrov’s “A Statement on Sound” marks the beginnings of critical discussions on the relations between image and sound in the cinema. Surrealism, Free Cinema, and the emergence of film archives were all framed, to varying degrees, by manifestos. In subsequent decades virtually every artistic and political movement existing outside mainstream, narrative cinema sallied forth with a manifesto, proclaiming the end of the old regimes of representation and the need to wipe the slate clean and begin anew. Here, the slicing open of the eye in *Un chien andalou* again stands as a nodal point, encapsulating the preferred mode of address adopted by manifesto scribes.

Despite the wide variety of ideological and political points of view put forth in film manifestos, the rhetorical stances adopted by the writers—which foregrounded both an urgent call to arms and a profoundly undialectical form of argumentation—led to a certain similarity in the cinematic manifesto genre, at least in its modernist iteration. Because of the programmatic, proclamatory nature of most manifesto writing—which is an unavoidable occurrence, precisely because of the inflammatory nature of the discourse involved—the intended outcomes of manifestos were, for the most part, hopelessly doomed; yet this hopelessness added to the nihilistic romance of dramatic intervention in the public sphere. This romance was fortified by the fact that manifestos were most often texts of the moment. Intrinsicly tied not only to the cinema, but the immediate world surrounding the authors, manifestos have had, in most cases, quite short life spans; they quickly left the world of political intervention and became that most aberrant thing (at least in the eyes of the writers themselves), a declawed aesthetic text. This led to the need to write and rewrite basic principles, either by design, in order to maintain relevance, or by force, because of political pressures; one only has to look at the ways in which André Breton continually rewrote his manifestos of surrealism as an example of the former, or the ways in which the fundamental, guiding principles underlying the cinema of Sergei Eisenstein necessarily shifted as intellectual montage and Lenin led to Stalin and socialist realism—a sad but inevitable example of the latter.

Film Manifestos and Global Cinema Cultures elucidates, within this theoretical and historical framework, the role played by manifestos and manifesto-style writing in film culture. Through this analysis a very different, though crucial, history of the cinema comes to light—one that engages critically not only with moving images but also with the diverse and contradictory discourses that inevitably surround cinematic production and consumption within the public sphere. The perceived failure of film manifestos to create a new, utopian, revolutionary world through the moving image points to the fact that the interest they generate as texts, and as statements of purpose, are as tied to their extremism, and the possibility they offer the reader to reimagine the cinema, as they are to initiating programmatic changes in and of themselves. In many ways, therefore, it is the extremism of most manifestos that give them, if not their political foundation, then their intellectual appeal. Indeed, the cinema one imagines whilst reading these texts is often more compelling than some of the films produced under the auspices of their influence. Yet many manifesto writers have transformed the cinema: the *raison d'être* of the film manifesto is to provoke not only a new form of cinema but a way of reimagining the medium, and therefore the world, itself. If one is to analyze manifestos of any kind, one must return to Karl Marx. And while the spirit of *The Communist Manifesto* haunts everything from Godard to Dogme, it is most certainly Marx's posthumously published "Theses on Feuerbach" that sits at a key nodal point in the emergence of the manifesto-like nature of critical theory. Marx's most famous edict in the theses is number 11: "The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world, in various ways; the point is to *change* it."¹⁵

MANIFESTO ON THE DOCUMENTARY FILM (UK, 1933)

Oswell Blakeston

[First published in *Close Up* (UK) 10, no. 4 (1933).]

This documentary manifesto argues against both the rising tide of postsync documentaries and the influence of Soviet film aesthetics on the documentary film, staking the claim that true documentaries reveal the world, not the plasticity of the cinema.

Years ago the documentary film had value because it presented us with facts: from the documents of four or five years ago it was possible to learn.

We believed, then, that the document film had a rigorous and vigorous future: the clearer presentation of valuable information seemed to define the development of the filmic documentary.

Alas! A camorra of folk on the fringe of moviedom discovered, when talkies came in, that they could no longer afford to finance their own movies: but how desperately they wanted to go on telling their friends that they were in the movies, how pathetically they wanted to horde up a few more lines of print from the trade papers. So, they turned to the film document, realising that this less expensive genre of movie, which can be shot silent and post-synched, offered them the last chance to remain “directors.”

All the same, these hangers-on did not intend, and were not capable of adhering to the logical and excellent form of the document. Their shoddy minds were too muddled and doped with meretricious theatricalities to work with the purity of the real film document. They brought to the document outmoded montage belonging to a certain type of emotional drama, and their yards of theatre tinsel, in the form of joking commentaries, together with the rest of their aged properties. The result is that we now have documents about the making of a gramophone which are filled with trick angles and ultra rapid sections of montage, and which teach us nothing about the actual process of gramophone manufacture. We have travel documents which string together all the arty “nookies,” the against-the-sky shots of prognathous natives and tree-top silhouettes, while not the slightest attempt is made to catalogue scientifically the customs, flora, mineralogical structure, etcetera, of the country.

Probably, someone will try and twist our manifesto into a statement that a film without artistes cannot be dramatic: but we hold that a film without actors can be intensely dramatic, and also that the document has nothing to do with drama. We want back film documents with real cultural significance. We are infuriated with pseudo-documents that exploit the prestige of the worthwhile documentaries of yesterday: their obscene dramatic

over-layer abolishes their worth for the scholar, the lack of imagination of their directors guarantees their failure as drama.

It would be easy to make a dramatic film without artistes—easy for a Francis Bruguère. In his stills, Bruguère has shown how he can send the horses from an Italian painting thudding across the head of a Grecian statue, or how the spire of an English Cathedral can come to life and penetrate the shadow of a Florentine doorway. Inanimate objects or landscapes can be given, by the camera of a Bruguère, fibres, nerves, arteries, personalities, can be made to take part in a truly magic drama. Such a film would have no need to pose as a document—it would have its own possession.

To repeat: we are incensed because films are shown to the public, who are always about five years behind and have just dimly associated “document” with “culture,” under false prestige and false pretences: were these films to be presented to the public as drama, the exhibitors would be lynched.

To repeat: we want documents which will show, with the clarity and logic of a scholar’s thesis, the subjects they are supposed to tackle: we want no more filtered skies, “Russian” montage and other vulgarities in our educational productions.

DECLARATION OF THE GROUP OF THIRTY (France, 1953)

Jean Painlevé, Jacques-Yves Cousteau, Alain Resnais,
Alexandre Astruc, Georges Franju, Pierre Kast, Jean
Mitry, and thirty-seven others

[Launched in Paris, 20 December 1953. First published in French as “Déclaration du groupe des trente,” *Le technicien du film* 2 (1955). Trans. Scott MacKenzie.]

While not only concerned with documentary films, a majority of the signatories of this manifesto were defending the French documentary tradition that had just had a recent resurgence that would only grow over the 1950s, with films as diverse as Alain Resnais’s *Nuit et brouillard* (1955), Jacques-Yves Cousteau and Louis Malle’s *Le monde du silence* (1956), and Chris Marker’s *Lettre de Sibérie* (1957). The Group of Thirty became well known in France as defenders of the short film and ended up in a series of debates about their goals and tactics with other French filmmakers. Here they argue that the short film is the research lab of French filmmaking, where new ideas and concepts develop. In terms of this period of French cinema they are certainly not wrong.

The short film was struggling to stay alive. Today, its death has been decided.

film art, which gives our time living and plastic expression, can become an important means for the creation of a better, purer, and more realistic world of artistic potentialities.

If the movies adhere to these basic principles, they will conquer the world as a new form of artistic manifestation.

Germany has the honest intention to erect bridges that will connect all nations, but in back of us the greatness of life is waiting to find artistic expression. There is no other choice: We must lay hold of it and be part of it.

Let us start with the firm determination to be natural the way life is natural! Let us remain truthful so as to accomplish the effect of truth. Let us depict things, which fill and move the hearts of men so as to move these men's hearts and to transport them into a better world by revealing to them the eternal.

VIGILANTI CURA: ON MOTION PICTURES (Vatican City, 1936)

Pope Pius XI

[First published as a papal encyclical in Latin and English on 29 June 1936.]

This manifesto, written by the Italian Ambrogio Damiano Achille Ratti, is one of the most influential film manifestos ever written, accomplishing nothing less than changing the course of North American and, to a lesser extent, Western European cinema. One reason that Achille Ratti does not appear in most film histories is that he wrote under a nom de plume and is much better known as Pope Pius XI. *Vigilante Cura* is a papal encyclical on the motion picture in praise of the arrival of the Legion of Decency and deploring the sinful nature of most cinema. These edicts determined to a large degree the kinds of images that would be seen on American (and therefore world) screens. Also, one should not underestimate its impact on European cinemas, as both Vittorio De Sica's *Landri di biciclette* (Italy, 1949) and Roberto Rossellini's *L'amore* (Italy, 1948) were attacked by Catholics in light of this encyclical and the movements that sprang from it. *Vigilante Cura* also outlined the moral implications that watching "condemned" films had for one's soul. Like the far better known modernist manifestos, this text was a call to arms—though in this case for devout, right-wing Catholics.

INTRODUCTION

In following with vigilant eye, as Our Pastoral Office requires, the beneficent work of Our Brethren in the Episcopate and of the faithful, it has been highly pleasing to Us to learn of the fruits already gathered and of the progress which continues to be

made by that prudent initiative launched more than two years ago as a holy crusade against the abuses of the motion pictures and entrusted in a special manner to the “*Legion of Decency*.”

This excellent experiment now offers Us a most welcome opportunity of manifesting more fully Our thought in regard to a matter which touches intimately the moral and religious life of the entire Christian people.

First of all, We express Our gratitude to the Hierarchy of the United States of America and to the faithful who cooperated with them, for the important results already achieved, under their direction and guidance, by the “*Legion of Decency*.” And Our gratitude is all the livelier for the fact that We were deeply anguished to note with each passing day the lamentable progress—*magni passus extra viam*—of the motion picture art and industry in the portrayal of sin and vice.

I. PREVIOUS WARNINGS RECALLED

As often as the occasion has presented itself, We have considered it the duty of Our high Office to direct to this condition the attention not only of the Episcopate and the Clergy but also of all men who are right-minded and solicitous for the public weal.

In the Encyclical “*Divini illius Magistri*,” We had already deplored that “potent instrumentalities of publicity (such as the cinema) which might be of great advantage to learning and to education were they properly directed by healthy principles, often unfortunately serve as an incentive to evil passions and are subordinated to sordid gain.”

THE INFLUENCE OF THE MOTION PICTURE

In August 1934, addressing Ourselves to a delegation of the International Federation of the Motion Picture Press, We pointed out the very great importance which the motion picture has acquired in our days and its vast influence alike in the promotion of good and in the insinuation of evil, and We called to mind that it is necessary to apply to the cinema the supreme rule which must direct and regulate the great gift of art in order that it may not find itself in continual conflict with Christian morality or even with simple human morality based upon the natural law. The essential purpose of art, its *raison d'être*, is to assist in the perfection of the moral personality, which is man, and for this reason it must itself be moral. And We concluded amidst the manifest approval of that elect body—the memory is still dear to Us—by recommending to them the necessity of making the motion picture “*moral, an influence for good morals, an educator*.”

And even recently, in April of this year, when We had the happiness of receiving in audience a group of delegates to the International Congress of the Motion Picture Press, held at Rome, We again drew attention to the gravity of the problem and We warmly exhorted all men of goodwill, in the name not only of religion but also of the true moral and civil welfare of the people, to use every means in their power, such as the Press, to

make of the cinema a valuable auxiliary of instruction and education rather than of destruction and ruin of souls.

THE NEEDS OF THE ENTIRE CATHOLIC WORLD

The subject, however, is of such paramount importance in itself and because of the present condition of society that We deem it necessary to return to it again, not alone for the purpose of making particular recommendations as on past occasions but rather with a universal outlook which, while embracing the needs of your own dioceses, Venerable Brethren, takes into consideration those of the entire Catholic world.

It is, in fact, urgently necessary to make provision that in this field also the progress of the arts, of the sciences, and of human technique and industry, since they are all true gifts of God, may be ordained to His glory and to the salvation of souls and may be made to serve in a practical way to promote the extension of the Kingdom of God upon earth. Thus, as the Church bids us pray, we may all profit by them but in such a manner as not to lose the goods eternal: *“sic transeamus per bona temporalia ut non admittamus aeterna.”*

Now then, it is a certainty which can readily be verified that the more marvellous the progress of the motion picture art and industry, the more pernicious and deadly has it shown itself to morality and to religion and even to the very decencies of human society.

The directors of the industry in the United States recognised this fact themselves when they confessed that the responsibility before the people and the world was their very own. In an agreement entered into by common accord in March, 1930, and solemnly sealed, signed, and published in the Press, they formally pledged themselves to safeguard for the future the moral welfare of the patrons of the cinema.

It is promised in this agreement that no film which lowers the moral standard of the spectators, which casts discredit upon natural or human law or arouses sympathy for their violation, will be produced.

PROMISES NOT CARRIED OUT

Nevertheless, in spite of this wise and spontaneously taken decision, those responsible showed themselves incapable of carrying it into effect and it appeared that the producers and the operators were not disposed to stand by the principles to which they had bound themselves. Since, therefore, the above-mentioned undertaking proved to have but slight effect and since the parade of vice and crime continued on the screen, the road seemed almost closed to those who sought honest diversion in the motion picture.

In this crisis, you, Venerable Brethren, were among the first to study the means of safeguarding the souls entrusted to your care, and you launched the *“Legion of Decency”* as a crusade for public morality designed to revitalize the ideals of natural and Christian

rectitude. Far from you was the thought of doing damage to the motion picture industry: rather indeed did you arm it beforehand against the ruin which menaces every form of recreation which, in the guise of art, degenerates into corruption.

THE "LEGION OF DECENCY" PLEDGE

Your leadership called forth the prompt and devoted loyalty of your faithful people, and millions of American Catholics signed the pledge of the "*Legion of Decency*" binding themselves not to attend any motion picture which was offensive to Catholic moral principles or proper standards of living. We are thus able to proclaim joyfully that few problems of these latter times have so closely united Bishops and people as the one resolved by cooperation in this holy crusade. Not only Catholics but also high-minded Protestants, Jews, and many others accepted your lead and joined their efforts with yours in restoring wise standards, both artistic and moral, to the cinema.

It is an exceedingly great comfort to Us to note the outstanding success of the crusade. Because of your vigilance and because of the pressure which has been brought to bear by public opinion, the motion picture has shown an improvement from the moral standpoint: crime and vice are portrayed less frequently; sin is no longer so openly approved and acclaimed; false ideals of life are no longer presented in so flagrant a manner to the impressionable minds of youth.

A USEFUL IMPETUS

Although in certain quarters it was predicted that the artistic values of the motion picture would be seriously impaired by the reform insisted upon by the "*Legion of Decency*," it appears that quite the contrary has happened and that the "*Legion of Decency*" has given no little impetus to the efforts to advance the cinema on the road to noble artistic significance by directing it towards the production of classic masterpieces as well as of original creations of uncommon worth.

Nor have the financial investments of the industry suffered, as was gratuitously foretold, for many of those who stayed away from the motion picture theatre because it outraged morality are patronizing it now that they are able to enjoy clean films which are not offensive to good morals or dangerous to Christian virtue.

When you started your crusade, it was said that your efforts would be of short duration and that the effects would not be lasting because, as the vigilance of Bishops and faithful gradually diminished, the producers would be free to return again to their former methods. It is not difficult to understand why certain of these might be desirous of going back to the sinister themes which pander to base desires and which you had proscribed. While the representation of subjects of real artistic value and the portrayal of the vicissitudes of human virtue require intellectual effort, toil, ability, and at times considerable outlay of money, it is often relatively easy to attract a certain type of person and certain classes

of people to a theatre which presents picture plays calculated to inflame the passions and to arouse the lower instincts latent in the human heart.

An unceasing and universal vigilance must, on the contrary, convince the producers that the "*Legion of Decency*" has not been started as a crusade of short duration, soon to be neglected and forgotten, but that the Bishops of the United States are determined, at all times and at all costs, to safeguard the recreation of the people whatever form that recreation may take.

II. THE POWER OF THE CINEMA

Recreation, in its manifold varieties, has become a necessity for people who work under the fatiguing conditions of modern industry, but it must be worthy of the rational nature of man and therefore must be morally healthy. It must be elevated to the rank of a positive factor for good and must seek to arouse noble sentiments. A people who, in time of repose, give themselves to diversions which violate decency, honour, or morality, to recreations which, especially to the young, constitute occasions of sin, are in grave danger of losing their greatness and even their national power.

It admits of no discussion that the motion picture has achieved these last years a position of universal importance among modern means of diversion.

THE MOST POPULAR FORM OF AMUSEMENT

There is no need to point out the fact that millions of people go to the motion pictures every day; that motion picture theatres are being opened in ever increasing number in civilized and semi-civilized countries; that the motion picture has become the most popular form of diversion which is offered for the leisure hours not only of the rich but of all classes of society.

At the same time, there does not exist today a means of influencing the masses more potent than the cinema. The reason for this is to be sought for in the very nature of the pictures projected upon the screen, in the popularity of motion picture plays, and in the circumstances which accompany them.

The power of the motion picture consists in this, that it speaks by means of vivid and concrete imagery which the mind takes in with enjoyment and without fatigue. Even the crudest and most primitive minds which have neither the capacity nor the desire to make the efforts necessary for abstraction or deductive reasoning are captivated by the cinema. In place of the effort which reading or listening demands, there is the continued pleasure of a succession of concrete and, so to speak, living pictures.

This power is still greater in the talking picture for the reason that interpretation becomes even easier and the charm of music is added to the action of the drama. Dances and variety acts which are sometimes introduced between the films serve to increase the stimulation of the passions.

IT MUST BE ELEVATED

Since then the cinema is in reality a sort of object lesson which, for good or for evil, teaches the majority of men more effectively than abstract reasoning, it must be elevated to conformity with the aims of a Christian conscience and saved from depraving and demoralizing effects.

Everyone knows what damage is done to the soul by bad motion pictures. They are occasions of sin; they seduce young people along the ways of evil by glorifying the passions; they show life under a false light; they cloud ideals; they destroy pure love, respect for marriage, affection for the family. They are capable also of creating prejudices among individuals and misunderstandings among nations, among social classes, among entire races.

On the other hand, good motion pictures are capable of exercising a profoundly moral influence upon those who see them. In addition to affording recreation, they are able to arouse noble ideals of life, to communicate valuable conceptions, to impart a better knowledge of the history and the beauties of the Fatherland and of other countries, to present truth and virtue under attractive forms, to create, or at least to favour understanding among nations, social classes, and races, to champion the cause of justice, to give new life to the claims of virtue, and to contribute positively to the genesis of a just social order in the world.

IT SPEAKS NOT TO INDIVIDUALS BUT TO MULTITUDES

These considerations take on greater seriousness from the fact that the cinema speaks not to individuals but to multitudes, and that it does so in circumstances of time and place and surroundings which are most apt to arouse unusual enthusiasm for the good as well as for the bad and to conduce to that collective exaltation which, as experience teaches us, may assume the most morbid forms.

The motion picture is viewed by people who are seated in a dark theatre and whose faculties, mental, physical, and often spiritual, are relaxed. One does not need to go far in search of these theatres: they are close to the home, to the church, and to the school and they thus bring the cinema into the very centre of popular life.

Moreover, stories and actions are presented, through the cinema, by men and women whose natural gifts are increased by training and embellished by every known art, in a manner which may possibly become an additional source of corruption, especially to the young. Further, the motion picture has enlisted in its service luxurious appointments, pleasing music, the vigour of realism, every form of whim and fancy. For this very reason, it attracts and fascinates particularly the young, the adolescent, and even the child. Thus at the very age when the moral sense is being formed and when the notions and sentiments of justice and rectitude, of duty and obligation and of ideals of life are being developed, the motion picture with its direct propaganda assumes a position of commanding influence.

It is unfortunate that, in the present state of affairs, this influence is frequently exerted for evil. So much so that when one thinks of the havoc wrought in the souls of youth and of childhood, of the loss of innocence so often suffered in the motion picture theatres, there comes to mind the terrible condemnation pronounced by Our Lord upon the corrupters of little ones: *“whosoever shall scandalize one of these little ones who believe in Me, it were better for him that a millstone be hanged about his neck and that he be drowned in the depths of the sea.”*

IT MUST NOT BE A SCHOOL OF CORRUPTION

It is therefore one of the supreme necessities, of our times to watch and to labour to the end that the motion picture be no longer a school of corruption but that it be transformed into an effectual instrument for the education and the elevation of mankind.

And here We record with pleasure that certain Governments, in their anxiety for the influence exercised by the cinema in the moral and educational fields, have, with the aid of upright and honest persons, especially fathers and mothers of families, set up reviewing commissions and have constituted other agencies which have to do with motion picture production in an effort to direct the cinema for inspiration to the national works of great poets and writers.

It was most fitting and desirable that you, Venerable Brethren, should have exercised a special watchfulness over the motion picture industry which in your country is so highly developed and which has great influence in other quarters of the globe. It is equally the duty of the Bishops of the entire Catholic world to unite in vigilance over this universal and potent form of entertainment and instruction, to the end that they may be able to place a ban on bad motion pictures because they are an offence to the moral and religious sentiments and because they are in opposition to the Christian spirit and to its ethical principles. There must be no weariness in combating whatever contributes to the lessening of the people's sense of decency and of honour.

This is an obligation which binds not only the Bishops but also the faithful and all decent men who are solicitous for the decorum and moral health of the family, of the nation, and of human society in general. In what, then, must this vigilance consist?

III. A WORK FOR CATHOLIC ACTION

The problem of the production of moral films would be solved radically if it were possible for us to have production wholly inspired by the principles of Christian morality. We can never sufficiently praise all those who have dedicated themselves or who are to dedicate themselves to the noble cause of raising the standard of the motion picture to meet the needs of education and the requirements of the Christian conscience. For this purpose, they must make full use of the technical ability of experts and not permit the waste of effort and of money by the employment of amateurs.

But since We know how difficult it is to organize such an industry, especially because of considerations of a financial nature, and since on the other hand it is necessary to influence the production of all films so that they may contain nothing harmful from a religious, moral, or social viewpoint, Pastors of souls must exercise their vigilance over films wherever they may be produced and offered to Christian peoples.

TO THE BISHOPS OF ALL COUNTRIES

As to the motion picture industry itself, We exhort the Bishops of all countries, but in particular you, Venerable Brethren, to address an appeal to those Catholics who hold important positions in this industry. Let them take serious thought of their duties and of the responsibility which they have as children of the Church to use their influence and authority for the promotion of principles of sound morality in the films which they produce or aid in producing. There are surely many Catholics among the executives, directors, authors, and actors who take part in this business, and it is unfortunate that their influence has not always been in accordance with their Faith and with their ideals. You will do well, Venerable Brethren, to pledge them to bring their profession into harmony with their conscience as respectable men and followers of Jesus Christ.

In this as in every other field of the apostolate, Pastors of souls will surely find their best fellow workers in those who fight in the ranks of Catholic Action, and in this letter We cannot refrain from addressing to them a warm appeal that they give to this cause their full contribution and their unwearying and unailing activity.

From time to time, the Bishops will do well to recall to the motion picture industry that, amid the cares of their pastoral ministry, they are under obligation to interest themselves in every form of decent and healthy recreation because they are responsible before God for the moral welfare of their people even during their time of leisure.

THE MORAL FIBRE OF A NATION

Their sacred calling constrains them to proclaim clearly and openly that unhealthy and impure entertainment destroys the moral fibre of a nation. They will likewise remind the motion picture industry that the demands which they make regard not only the Catholics but all who patronize the cinema.

In particular, you, Venerable Brethren of the United States, will be able to insist with justice that the industry of your country has recognized and accepted its responsibility before society.

The Bishops of the whole world will take care to make clear to the leaders of the motion picture industry that a force of such power and universality as the cinema can be directed, with great utility, to the highest ends of individual and social improvement. Why indeed should there be question merely of avoiding what is evil? The motion picture should not be simply a means of diversion, a light relaxation to occupy an idle hour; with

its magnificent power, it can and must be a bearer of light and a positive guide to what is good.

And now, in view of the gravity of the subject, We consider it timely to come down to certain practical indications.

A YEARLY PROMISE FROM THE FAITHFUL

Above all, all Pastors of souls will undertake to obtain each year from their people a pledge similar to the one already alluded to which is given by their American brothers and in which they promise to stay away from motion picture plays which are offensive to truth and to Christian morality.

The most efficacious manner of obtaining these pledges or promises is through the parish church or school and by enlisting the earnest cooperation of all fathers and mothers of families who are conscious of their grave responsibilities.

The Bishops will also be able to avail themselves of the Catholic Press for the purpose of bringing home to the people the moral beauty and the effectiveness of this promise.

The fulfilment of this pledge supposes that the people be told plainly which films are permitted to all, which are permitted with reservations, and which are harmful or positively bad. This requires the prompt, regular, and frequent publication of classified lists of motion picture plays so as to make the information readily accessible to all. Special bulletins or other timely publications, such as the daily Catholic Press, may be used for this purpose.

Were it possible, it would in itself be desirable to establish a single list for the entire world because all live under the same moral law. Since, however, there is here question of pictures which interest all classes of society, the great and the humble, the learned and the unlettered, the judgment passed upon a film cannot be the same in each case and in all respects. Indeed circumstances, usages, and forms vary from country to country so that it does not seem practical to have a single list for all the world. If, however, films were classified in each country in the manner indicated above, the resultant list would offer in principle the guidance needed.

A NATIONAL REVIEWING OFFICE

Therefore, it will be necessary that in each country the Bishops set up a permanent national reviewing office in order to be able to promote good motion pictures, classify the others, and bring this judgment to the knowledge of priests and faithful. It will be very proper to entrust this agency to the central organization of Catholic Action which is dependent on the Bishops. At all events, it must be clearly laid down that this service of information, in order to function organically and with efficiency, must be on a national basis and that it must be carried on by a single centre of responsibility. Should grave reasons really require it, the Bishops, in their own dioceses and through their diocesan

reviewing committees, will be able to apply to the national list—which must use standards adaptable to the whole nation—such severer criterions as may be demanded by the character of the region, and they may even censor films which were admitted to the general list.

FILMS IN PARISH HALLS

The above-mentioned Office will likewise look after the organization of existing motion picture theatres belonging to parishes and to Catholic associations so that they may be guaranteed reviewed and approved films. Through the organization of these halls, which are often known to the cinema industry as good clients, it will be possible to advance a new claim, namely that the industry produce motion pictures which conform entirely to our standards. Such films may then readily be shown not only in the Catholic halls but also in others.

We realize that the establishment of such an Office will involve a certain sacrifice, a certain expense for Catholics of the various countries. Yet the great importance of the motion picture and the necessity of safeguarding the morality of the Christian people and of the entire nation makes this sacrifice more than justified. Indeed the effectiveness of our schools, of our Catholic associations, and even of our churches is lessened and endangered by the plague of evil and pernicious motion pictures.

Care must be taken that the Office is composed of persons who are familiar with the technique of the motion picture and who are, at the same time, well grounded in the principles of Catholic morality and doctrine. They must, in addition, be under the guidance and the direct supervision of a priest chosen by the Bishops.

EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION

A mutual exchange of advice and information between the Offices of the various countries will conduce to greater efficiency and harmony in the work of reviewing films, while due consideration will be given to varying conditions and circumstances. It will thus be possible to achieve unity of outlook in the judgments and in the communications which appear in the Catholic Press of the world.

These Offices will profit not only from the experiments made in the United States but also from the work which Catholics in other countries have achieved in the motion picture field.

Even if employees of the Office—with the best of good will and intentions—should make an occasional mistake, as happens in all human affairs, the Bishops, in their pastoral prudence, will know how to apply effective remedies and to safeguard in every possible way the authority and prestige of the Office itself. This may be done by strengthening the staff with more influential men or by replacing those who have shown themselves not entirely suited to so delicate a position of trust.

PAINSTAKING VIGILANCE

If the Bishops of the world assume their share in the exercise of this painstaking vigilance over the motion picture—and of this We who know their pastoral zeal have no doubt—they will certainly accomplish a great work for the protection of the morality of their people in their hours of leisure and recreation. They will win the approbation and the approval of all right thinking men, Catholic and non-Catholic, and they will help to assure that a great international force—the motion picture—shall be directed towards the noble end of promoting the highest ideals and the truest standards of life.

That these wishes and prayers which We pour forth from a father's heart may gain in virtue, We implore the help of the grace of God and in pledge thereof We impart to you, Venerable Brethren, and to the Clergy and people entrusted to you, Our loving Apostolic Benediction.

Given at Rome, at St Peter's, the 29th day of June, Feast of SS Peter and Paul, in the year 1936, the fifteenth of Our Pontificate.

FOUR CARDINAL POINTS OF A REVOLUÇÃO DE MAIO (Portugal, 1937)

António Lopes Ribeiro

[Originally published in Portuguese as “Os quatro pontos cardeais de A Revolução de Maio,” *Cinéfilo* 9 (459), 5 June 1937. First published in English in “Edinburgh Film Festival Special Portuguese Cinema Dossier,” *Framework* 15/16/17 (1981): 46.]

This manifesto by director António Lopes Ribeiro reflects the “Estado Novo,” or New State, philosophy of Portuguese dictator António de Oliveira Salazar, who came to power in 1927. Lopes Ribeiro was consciously producing propaganda for Salazar and looked to Eisenstein's *Potemkin* (USSR, 1925) as a model. *A Revolução de Maio* is one of the few films that could be called “Estado Novo” cinema, celebrating as it does the tenth anniversary of the Salazar regime. The final line of the manifesto demonstrates a self-reflexivity that is often lacking in the work of propagandists.

I made this film in order to:

i. Serve the Portuguese cinema.

In spite of the efforts of about 10 people of good will, our cinema should still be considered infantile and I use the term in a non-pejorative sense. On the contrary, it is precisely in childhood that we may find a great spontaneity, freshness which is to be the measure of the future that lies before us. Only six sound films have been completed in Portugal and two more are almost finished. Ours is a very complex industry that keeps pace with a

MANIFESTO OF THE NEW CINEMA GROUP (Mexico, 1961)

El grupo nuevo cine: José de la Colina, Rafael Cordiki, Salvador Elizondo, J. M. García Ascot, Emilia García Riera, J. L. González de León, Heriberto Lafranchi, Carlos Monsiváis, Julio Pliego, Gabriel Ramírez, José María Sbert, and Luis Vicens. Subsequently signed by José Baez Esponda, Armando Bartra, Nancy Cárdenas, Leopoldo Chagoya, Ismael García Llaca, Alberto Isaac, Paul Leduc, Eduardo Lizalde, Fernando Macotela, and Francisco Pina

[First published in Spanish as “Manifiesto del Grupo nuevo cine,” *Nuevo cine* (Mexico) 1 (1961). Trans. Fabiola Caraza.]

It is often forgotten that along with Cuba, Mexico was at the forefront of arguing for new forms of Latin American cinema. This manifesto from 1961 not only argues for the cinema as a means of personal and national expression, but also for the need for Mexican audiences to see the emerging world cinemas so as to be in dialogue with developments taking place in the cinema globally. If later Latin American manifestos argue for the need of an expressly political cinema, this manifesto lays the groundwork for the ways in which Mexican cinema can take its place beside other national film “waves”—what will soon come to be known as “Second Cinema”—that reimagined the cinema at the beginning of the 1960s.

Hereby the undersigned the New Cinema group, filmmakers, aspiring filmmakers, critics and cinema club owners; we declare that our objectives are the following:

Improving the depressing state of Mexican Cinema. In order to accomplish that we feel it is imperative to open the doors to new filmmakers. In our opinion, nothing justifies the obstacles presented to those (directors, screenwriters, photographers, etc.) capable of making new cinema in Mexico, which without a doubt will be a far superior cinema than the one today. Any plan for renewal of the national cinema that does not take into account this problem is deemed to fail.

We state that filmmakers have as much right as the writer, painter or musician to express themselves freely. We will fight so that there is not only one type of cinema but

that there is a free endeavor for creation, with the diversity in aesthetics, morals and political points of view that that implies. Therefore we oppose all censure that curtails freedom of expression in cinema.

We promote the production and freedom of exhibition of an independent cinema produced in the margins of conventions and limitations imposed by those who monopolize film production. In the same manner, we will argue so that the short film and documentary films should have the support and encouragement they deserve and will be able to be screened to the greater audiences in fair conditions.

We promote the development of the filmmaking culture in Mexico through the following statements:

Achieve the establishment of a reputable institution for cinematography that will be specifically dedicated to the training of new filmmakers.

Achieve support and encouragement of the creation of film clubs, whether it be within or outside of the Distrito Federal (the Capital).

Achieve the establishment of a cinematheque that has the necessary resources and which will be in the charge of competent and responsible people.

Create specialized publications that guide the public, analyzing in depth the problems of cinema. In achieving the latter, the undersigned propose to publish the monthly magazine *Nuevo cine*.

Endeavor to study and research all aspects of Mexican Cinema.

Endeavor to gain the support of experimental cinema groups.

We promote to overcome the clumsiness that rules the collective criteria of the exhibitors of foreign films in Mexico, which has prevented us from knowing many great works of filmmakers such as Chaplin, Dreyer, Ingmar Bergman, Antonioni, Mizoguchi, etc. Works that have even been of great benefit to those who exhibit them in other countries.

To defend the *Reseña de Festivales* (Festivals in Review) in favor of the communication through films and actors within the best of world cinema. And to attack the flaws that have prevented the accomplished Reviews from reaching their goals.

These objectives circumscribe and complement each other. In order to accomplish these objectives, the New Cinema group hopes to enlist the support of film audiences, and of the growing spectator masses who see the cinema not only as a form of entertainment, but as one of the most formidable medium[s] of expression of our century.

CINEMA AND UNDERDEVELOPMENT (Argentina, 1962)

Fernando Birri

[First published in Spanish as “Cine y subdesarrollo,” in *Cine cubano* 64 (1967). First published in English in Michael Chanan, ed., *Twenty-Five Years of the New Latin American Cinema* (London: BFI, 1983), 9–12. Trans. Malcolm Coad.]

Founder of the Santa Fe Documentary School, Fernando Birri wrote “Cinema and Underdevelopment” shortly after one of the most violent juntas in Argentina. Birri argues for a cinema of the working classes and foreshadows Fernando Solas and Octavio Getino’s call for a cinema that is counter-Hollywood. He argues that film pedagogy is central to the cultivation of a new, independent Argentine cinema and argues against Western models of “modernization” that feed into colonial attitudes toward “development,” taking, in particular, Argentine director Torre Nilsson to task.

The following answers should all be understood, and very concretely so, as concerned with a sub-cinematography, that of Argentina and the region of underdeveloped Latin America of which it is a part. Furthermore, they reflect the point of view of a film director from a capitalist and neocolonialist country, the opposite pole from the situation in Cuba.

WHAT KIND OF CINEMA DOES ARGENTINA NEED? WHAT KIND OF CINEMA DO THE UNDER-DEVELOPED PEOPLES OF LATIN AMERICA NEED?

A cinema which develops them.

A cinema which brings them consciousness, which awakens consciousness; which clarifies matters; which strengthens the revolutionary consciousness of those among them who already possess this; which fires them; which disturbs, worries, shocks and weakens those who have a “bad conscience,” a reactionary consciousness; which defines profiles of national, Latin American identity; which is authentic; which is anti-oligarchic and anti-bourgeois at the national level, and anti-colonial and anti-imperialist at the international level; which is pro-people, and anti-anti-people; which helps the passage from underdevelopment to development, from sub-stomach to stomach, from sub-culture to culture, from sub-happiness to happiness, from sub-life to *life*.

Our purpose is to create a new person, a new society, a new history and therefore a new art and a new cinema. Urgently.

And with the raw material of a reality which is little and badly understood: that of the underdeveloped countries of Latin America (or, if you prefer the euphemism favoured by the Organisation of American States, the developing countries of Latin America). Understanding—or, rather, misunderstanding—of these countries has always come

about by applying analytical schemes imposed by foreign colonialists or their local henchmen (whose particular mentality has deformed such ideas even further).

WHAT KIND OF CINEMA DOES ARGENTINA HAVE AT THE MOMENT?

One with a solid industrial tradition whose Golden Age was in the 30s and 40s (Lucas Demare's *La Guerra Gaucha*, for example). It conquered the markets of Latin America, then prostituted itself under Peronism, before recovering once again, culturally speaking, under the guidance of Torre Nilsson, during the so-called "revolution of liberation" (actually a military dictatorship). It then evolved into an independent movement in which the left began to play a role. This development coincided with Frondizi's rise to power in 1961–2, when more than fifteen new feature directors and many more directors of shorts took their places in the national cinema. After the 1962 *frondizazo*, however, and during the provisional presidency of Guido, such independent efforts turned in on themselves, and "dependent" production became dominant once again. Only one independent film was made, Manuel Antín's *Los venerables todos*, the very epitome of alienation.

The problem is that cinema is a cultural product, a product of the superstructure. So it is subject to all the superstructure's distortions. In the case of cinema these are exacerbated further than in the other arts due to its nature as an industrial art. In countries like ours, which are in the throes of incipient industrialisation, political shocks make this condition chronic.

Furthermore, cinema is a language. A language, like others, which enables communication and expression at both the mass and personal levels. Here as well things get out of balance as bourgeois attitudes—which are either reactionary or, at best, liberal and always sub-cultural—typically give most attention to the "cinema of expression." This cinema (typified by Torre Nilsson) is set in opposition to "commercial" cinema (such as that of Amadori, Demare or Tynaire). At its height, in 1955, this opposition became a veritable battle within the structures of bourgeois culture. "Expression" won—and now where are we? What and who is to benefit from such "expression" (à la Torre Nilsson, Kohon, Kuhn, Antín)? The navel of Buddha? "Commercial" cinema has won its audience by any method going; or more precisely, the worst methods going. We cannot support *it*. The "cinema of expression" uses the best methods, and scorns the mass audience. We cannot support it either. Once again, the contradiction between art and industry is resolved very badly, except for the "select" minority which makes up the audience of the "cinema of expression," for whom such a solution is perfectly satisfactory.

We have already pointed out that cinema manifests the cultural and economic values of a society's superstructure. Neither its generic lack of culture nor its economic precariousness precludes it from these categories. Argentina, Latin America, 1963: a bourgeois superstructure, semi-colonial and underdeveloped. Its cinema, therefore, expresses these conditions, consciously or unconsciously if it favours them, always consciously if it is against.

This is the fact of the matter, and there is no way round it, like it or not, and whether or not we care to recognise it. It is true wherever you look, from Lucas Demare and Torre Nilsson, as representatives of those in favour, to the short filmmakers Oliva and Fisherman, new directors who have declared themselves against.

For the first group, those who are consciously or unconsciously in favour of the existing order of things, no problem arises. The superstructure keeps them, pampers them, and gives them official credits, prizes, national exhibition, "Argentinian Film Weeks" abroad, international festivals, travel as representatives of national culture, and press coverage of their triumphs and supposed triumphs (in its local newspapers an anxious but finally negative European criticism transforms a failure into "a polemical and very worthy film," as happened with Antín's *Los venerables todos* in Cannes in 1963, or Nilsson's *Homenaje a la hora de la siesta* in Venice in 1962). The superstructure serves them, when all is said and done, as a pedestal. A fragile enough pedestal for eternal glory, you may admonish us. Certainly, but meanwhile, down here, in the here-and-now, it keeps them able to produce films.

The only problems these directors have ever had to face have come from personal rivalry or, at worst, from the irrational infraction of some ultramontane moral taboo (as in the case of Beatriz Guido, for example) to do with sex or violence, never from any "political" offence. Such sins were rapidly forgiven, like those of prodigal children, when from 1957 onwards new and independent currents began to appear in our national cinema, pursuing not expression but ideas. Among those representing these currents were Murua, Feldman, Martínez Suarez, Alventosa, the Institute of Cinematography at the National University of the Litoral, sectors of the Association of Short Film Directors, Cinema Workshops, the Association of Experimental Cinema, the Nucleus Cinema Club, *Cinecritica* magazine, the writer of this article.

GIVEN THIS SITUATION, HOW AND WHY WAS THE INSTITUTE OF CINEMATOGRAPHY AT THE NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF THE LITORAL FORMED?

Today the Institute of Cinematography is a material fact. But in 1956 it was only an idea.

This idea was born at a time when Argentinian cinematography was disintegrating, both culturally and industrially. It affirmed a goal and a method. The goal was realism. The method was training based in theory and practice.

To locate this goal historically, remember that the dominant characteristic of Argentinian cinema at that time was precisely its "unrealism." This was true of both its extremes. The opportunism of the numerous box-office hits (such as those of the main studio Argentina Sono Films, or the Demare-Pondal Ríos *Después del silencio*, or *chanchada* comedies) and the evasiveness of the few "intellectualised" films (Torre Nilsson's *La casa del ángel*, Ayala's *El jefe*) made the cinematographic images of the country they presented to audiences equally unreal and alien. Popular and art cinema were falsely made out to be irreconcilable opposites, when what were actually being discussed were "commercial" and "elitist" cinema.

Our objective was a realism which would transcend this tendentious duality. In it we were joined by other non-cinematic groups all of whom shared the aspiration towards an art which would be simultaneously popular and of high quality.

To locate our method historically, remember that the national cinema industry had always been founded on the purest empiricism, usually manifest in a frustrating degree of improvisation.

Remember also that at this time there was not even a plan for a National Film School, despite the inclusion of the idea in the 1957 Decree Law 62 (it was not carried through). The teaching facilities which did exist made no impact on the industry itself, much less on public opinion.

We should be wary of schematic generalisation, for there were exceptions which proved the rule and we must give credit to the significant positive moments on the curve of the old national cinema (such as Mario Soffici's *Prisioneros de la tierra*, or Hugo del Carril's *Las aguas bajan turbias*). But any objective analysis must finally lead to the general negative conclusion recorded here.

The goal and method I have described, those of a realist cinematography and a theoretico-practical training, came together polemically in the Documentary School at Santa Fe. They did so as a simultaneously critical and constructive contribution—or constructively critical, if you prefer—to national cinema, and as a response to a need for national transformation which we believe exists throughout Latin America, given the continent's common condition of underdevelopment. It was these artistic principles which inspired our work from *Tire Die*, the Institute's first film of social inquiry, to *Los inundados*, our first fictional feature, which synthesised our experience. On the way we also made *Los 40 cuartos*, a documentary which was banned and whose prints and negative were confiscated under the 1959 Decree 4965, which was passed by provisional President Guido to suppress "insurrectionary activities." This banning and confiscation remain in force to the present day. *Los inundados* synthesises the experience of the Institute, enlarging its scope and giving it its fullest expression both professionally and as entertainment, in the best senses of these terms. For these reasons, and because it answers to the founding intentions of the Santa Fe Documentary School, both experimental and academic, this film bears the responsibility of being our movement's manifesto, carried forth under the banner of a national cinematography which is "realist, critical and popular."

WHAT ARE THE FUTURE PERSPECTIVES FOR LATIN AMERICAN CINEMA?

Seen from the general perspective of developments in cinema, and given that this is an Argentinian film, a Latin American film, the most important thing right now if we are to ensure such a future is that the film should be seen. In other words, the most important thing is exhibition and distribution.

The starting point for this statement is the fact that our films are not seen by the public, or are only seen with extreme difficulty. This happens—and we denounce the

fact—not because of the films themselves or our public, but because the films are systematically boycotted by both national and international distributors and exhibitors, who are linked to the anti-national and colonial interests of foreign producers, above all those of North American cinema and the monopoly it has imposed on us. Of about 500 films shown in 1962, 300 were in English, and most of them North American, while some 30 were Argentinian.

An additional fact: Latin America has a potential market of 200 million spectators, more than enough to provide a natural market for our films. It would save us the effort of sporadic entry into other markets, and the outlay of hard currency which is being drained away in importing mediocre foreign films.

The urgent need, and only firm solution, must therefore be to guarantee the distribution and exhibition of nationally produced films in each of our countries individually, and in Latin America as a whole. This must come about through government action. The procedures may be different, but in the same way that a government can cancel an oil contract so, for the same reasons of the social good and with the same authority, that same government can and should regulate the prejudicial cultural and economic exploitation that comes with the uncontrolled flow of foreign films into its territory. Exhibitors and distributors justify their permanent blocking of nationally produced films by appealing to the spectator's right to choose what films he or she wishes to see. But this free-market sophism omits one small detail: that for an audience to choose a film, it must first be exhibited, which generally does not happen with national films, or does so only in appalling conditions. State aid, bank credits, and prizes are also means of stimulating the development of Latin American cinema, so long as inflation is avoided by making ticket-receipts the basis of the system. Film must be funded by its audience. As well as maintaining financial health, the fact that the audience pays for its tickets confirms its interest in the film, and keeps film-makers committed to their audience.

Such a solution must be complemented by a reduction in non-essential industrial costs. We must have low-cost production. This may not provide an overall or permanent solution but it is at the very least the beginning of a solution in current circumstances. If it is valid for independent production in developed countries, it is even more so in underdeveloped countries. Such a formula would protect the independent producer from the fluctuations of recovering capital in a market where income from nationally produced films is uncertain. Furthermore, a more rapid recovery of production costs would allow the possibility of continuous investment in new productions. Low costs would also allow participation by non-state capital, which would free the film-maker of all, or almost all, dependence on official credits, which restrict freedom, and always bring with them censorship and self-censorship. This kind of production also renews expressive creativity, because it requires the replacement of the traditional crew by a more functional method of operation, adapted to the actual conditions of filming. Such a conception and practice of making films not with the resources one would like but with those which are possible,

will determine a new kind of language, hopefully even a new style, the fruit of convergent economic and cultural necessity. We Latin American film-makers must transform all such technical limitations into new expressive possibilities, if we are not to remain paralysed by them.

In the same way, the moment has come not only to oblige the “commercial” circuits to carry national films, but also to set up “independent” circuits in trade unions, schools, neighbourhood associations, sports centres and in the countryside through mobile projection units. A circuit based in existing grass-roots organisations, where films can be shown which, because they are openly didactic (or documentary) or ideologically progressive, come up against the greatest resistance from “commercial” distributors and exhibitors.

FOR WHAT AUDIENCE DO YOU YOURSELF MAKE FILMS?

Having set aside any residual notions of “art for art’s sake,” and committed ourselves to “useful” creation, we find our intention of the last few years, that of making films not for ourselves but for the audience, is no longer enough. Following our most recent experience, which was our first with a fictional feature shown to a so-called “ordinary” or “commercial” audience, we can no longer put off defining the audience—or, more precisely, the *class* of audience, in the economic and historical sense of the term—for whom we are making our films.

We’ll not delay the answer. We are making our films for a working-class audience, both urban and rural. This is our most fundamental purpose. Let us spell it out very clearly. We are interested in making our future films *only* if they reach a working-class and peasant audience, an audience made up of workers from the existing industrial belts of our great cities, the urban and suburban proletariat in areas of newer industrialisation, and peasants, small farmers and herdsmen on both small immigrant farms and large estates belonging to the oligarchy (where film, if it speaks the people’s own language, can be a means of culture of unequalled impact, given existing rates of literacy). Then, having made this clear, let us add that we also wish to reach sections of the petty bourgeoisie and even of the bourgeoisie proper (the so-called “national bourgeoisie”), including them in the audience for this new cinema which seeks to awaken consciousness, and which is directed towards spectators who are open to being enlightened and also to working out matters for themselves in a new light.

But I am talking about Argentina as it is now, where there is no such cinema and no national cinema to stimulate the gathering together of such an audience, and where even *if* such a cinema did exist there would be nowhere to show it.

As for the rest of Latin America, we would say from what we know of it that the audience which interests us—I should say, which preoccupies us—will be made up of the same sections of the population everywhere, depending on variations in the degree of backwardness or development in each country, or whether it is dominated by an agricultural and rural economy, or is in the process of industrialisation. To conjure away any

fetishes which may make this proposal seem utopian, we would recall that the audience which already sees our “national films”—which are so scorned by the bourgeoisie and only accepted with reservations by the petty-bourgeoisie—is in its great majority already made up of the kinds of people we have described. But there is an urgent need here for large-scale market research, complete with tables and social statistics. Even in our country we still lack such research. It must be one of the priority tasks of the CLAC (Latin American Cinematography Centre) as it documents, analyses and plans film production.

WHAT IS THE REVOLUTIONARY FUNCTION OF CINEMA IN LATIN AMERICA?

Underdevelopment is a hard fact in Latin America. It is an economic and statistical fact. No invention of the left, the term is used as a matter of course by “official” international organisations, such as the UN, or Latin American bodies, such as the OAS or the ECLA, in their plans and reports. They have no alternative.

The cause of underdevelopment is also well known: colonialism, both external and internal.

The cinema of our countries shares the same general characteristics of this superstructure, of this kind of society, and presents us with a false image of both society and our people. Indeed, it presents no real image of our people at all, but conceals them. So, the first positive step is to provide such an image. This is the first function of documentary.

How can documentary provide this image? By showing how reality *is*, and in no other way. This is the revolutionary function of social documentary and realist, critical and popular cinema in Latin America. By testifying, critically, to this reality—to this sub-reality, this misery—cinema refuses it. It rejects it. It denounces, judges, criticises and deconstructs it. Because it shows matters as they irrefutably are, and not as we would like them to be (or as, in good or bad faith, others would like to make us believe them to be).

As the other side of the coin of this “negation,” realist cinema also affirms the positive values in our societies: the people’s values. Their reserves of strength, their labours, their joys, their struggle, their dreams.

The result—and motivation—of social documentary and realist cinema? Knowledge and consciousness; we repeat: the awakening of the consciousness of reality. The posing of problems. Change: from sub-life to life.

Conclusion: to confront reality with a camera and to document it, filming realistically, filming critically, filming underdevelopment with the optic of the people. For the alternative, a cinema which makes itself the accomplice of underdevelopment, is sub-cinema.

STATEMENT (USA, 1969)

Kenneth Anger

[Originally published in Tony Rayns, "Lucifer: A Kenneth Anger Kompendium," *Cinema* (UK) 4 (1969): 23.]

A brief manifesto by Kenneth Anger inspired, like so much of his work, by the writings of Aleister Crowley (1875–1947), addressing the "magickal" aspects of his cinema and the way in which film can be seen as capturing its subject for the rapture of the filmmaker.

I have always considered the movies evil; the day that cinema was invented was a black day for mankind. Centuries before photography there were talismans, which actually anticipated photographs, since the dyes they used on the cheap vellum produced patterns when they faded in light. A talisman was a sticky fly-paper trying to trap a spirit—cunningly you printed it on a "photograph" of the demon you wanted to capture in it. Photography is a blatant attempt to steal the soul. The astral body is always just latent in a person, and certain cunning and gifted photographers can take an *image* of the astral body. The whole thing is having an image of someone to *control* them. If you're out of your mind with love, it becomes understandable. *Any* crime is justified in the name of Love. In fact, it shouldn't have to be a "crime": *Anything* is justifiable in the name of Love.

My films are primarily concerned with sexuality in people. My reason for filming has nothing to do with "cinema" at all; it's a transparent excuse for capturing people, the equivalent of saying "Come up & see my etchings" . . . it's wearing a little thin now . . . So I consider myself as working Evil in an evil medium.

WET DREAM FILM FESTIVAL MANIFESTO (The Netherlands, 1970)

S.E.L.F. (Sexual Egalitarianism and Libertarian Fraternity: Germaine Greer, Al Goldstein, Jean Shrimpton, Jay Landeman, Richard Neville, Didi Wadidi, Mike Zwerkin)

A manifesto released at the first Wet Dream Film Festival in Amsterdam in November 1970, S.E.L.F. brought together an unlikely group of writers and curators interested in sexual freedom. The festival itself screened porn films, and S.E.L.F. functioned as the festival judges. The jury members are a strange lot with Greer alongside *Screw* publisher Goldstein. Greer later disavowed the festival as a failure.

When we are unafraid and free from possessiveness it will make little difference what kind of social organization we choose to live under, because we will be open, kind and generous. It is sexual frustration, sexual envy, sexual fear, which permeates all our human relationships and which perverts them. The sexually liberated, the sexually tolerant and the sexually generous individuals are open, tolerant and generous in all their activities. Therefore S.E.L.F (Sexual Egalitarian and Libertarian Fraternity) wishes to encourage sexual freedom, sexual tolerance and sexual generosity.

WOMEN'S CINEMA AS COUNTER-CINEMA (UK, 1973)

Claire Johnston

[First published in Claire Johnston, ed., *Notes on Women's Cinema* (London: SEFT, 1973): 24–31.

Claire Johnston draws on Marx, Freud, and Barthes's conception of myth, and unlike many of the feminist cine-structuralists that followed her, she argues for a cinema that embraces both the political and the popular, dismissing the false dichotomy often postulated between the two forms. In so doing, Johnston analyzes "woman as myth" in the Barthesian sense of the term, and considers how sexist ideology has been normalized through the cinema and the means by which this process of mythification can be counteracted.

1. MYTHS OF WOMEN IN THE CINEMA

. . . there arose, identifiable by standard appearance, behaviour and attributes, the well-remembered types of the Vamp and the Straight Girl (perhaps the most convincing modern equivalents of the medieval personifications of the Vices and Virtues), the Family Man and the Villain, the latter marked by a black moustache and walking stick. Nocturnal scenes were printed on blue or green film. A checkered table-cloth meant, once for all, a "poor but honest" milieu; a happy marriage, soon to be endangered by the shadows from the past symbolised by the young wife's pouring of the breakfast coffee for her husband; the first kiss was invariably announced by the lady's gently playing with her partner's necktie and was invariably accompanied by her kicking out with her left foot. The conduct of the characters was predetermined accordingly. (Erwin Panofsky, *Style and Medium in the Motion Pictures* [1934]; and *Film: An Anthology*, ed. D. Talbot [New York, 1959])

subtle art: a national cinema cannot expect to achieve perfection after such a small number of films.

2. Serve the Portuguese people.

The Portuguese public of Brazil, the colonies, of Europe, America, Africa and Portugal demands films in their own language. I am committed to them and to the principle of providing one more film wholly aware of the great responsibility that a spectacle of that nature must provide . . .

3. Serve the propaganda machine of Portugal.

If I have succeeded in not spoiling by my incompetence (and certainly not by my lack of love) the formidable spectacle that occurred before the cameras I had at my disposal: the most beautiful landscapes of Portugal, the most beautiful costumes, our best artists, and wonderful work of “Estado Novo,” our Army, our Navy, our Airforce—then, it is certain that *A Revolução de Maio* will be a most efficient propaganda weapon for Portugal.

4. Serve the Salazar regime.

In our uncertain world, Salazar represents a unique example of co-ordination between thought and action and all his actions are connected to the heart. If I am not mistaken, if the film succeeds in communicating to each spectator, not the respect owed to him and on which he can rely, but just my enthusiasm, my admiration for the Man and his work, then I am convinced that all these former points can be contained in this one. By serving Salazar I have implicitly served Portugal, the public and the cinema of Portugal. I hope I am not mistaken.

FROM *ON THE ART OF CINEMA* (North Korea, 1973)

Kim Jong-il

[First published in English as chapter 1 of *On the Art of Cinema* (Pyongyang, Korea: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1987), 1–13.]

In *On the Art of Cinema* (1973), Kim Jong-il's massive manifesto on the future of North Korean cinema, he foregrounds the North Korean Marxist theory of *Juche* (the idea of a post-Stalinist self-sufficiency arising from the nation's subjects), which delineates the proper mode of aesthetic expression in North Korean society. *Juche* foregrounds the way in which all art must work in the function of building, sustaining, and supporting the State through the principles of self-reliance, independence, and being master of one's own actions. Here we see in theory, if not in practice, the ultimate idea of art working for and conforming to the dictates of the State and, indeed, that these goals are the only reason for artistic creation in the first place. Artistic autonomy gives way to becoming an artistic automaton, with the cinema imagining the world the State puts forward as its ultimate goal and as the ultimate reflection of the people, who are coexistent and at one with the State itself.

Like the leading article of the Party paper, the cinema should have great appeal and move ahead of the realities. Thus, it should play a mobilizing role in each stage of the revolutionary struggle.

—KIM IL-SUNG

If cinematic art is to be developed to meet the requirements of the Juche age, it is necessary to bring about a fundamental change in film-making. From the time of the emergence of cinema art to this day, many changes and advances have been made in artistic and technical matters, as a result of the changes in the times and social institutions, but the vestiges of the old system and methods have not yet been overcome in creative work. There still remain remnants of capitalist and dogmatic ideas to a considerable extent, particularly in the system and methods of direction, which constitutes the nucleus of film-making. Unless the old pattern is broken completely and a new system and methods of creation are established in direction, it will be impossible to accomplish the tasks set before the cinema, which has entered a new stage of development.

Today the cinema has the task of contributing to the development of people to be true communists and to the revolutionization and working-classization of the whole of society. In order to carry out this historic task successfully, it is necessary, above all, to revolutionize direction, which holds the reins of film-making.

To revolutionize direction means to completely eradicate capitalist elements and the remaining dogmatism from the realm of directing and establish a new Juche-inspired system and methods of directing.

In establishing the new system and methods of directing it is particularly important to clarify the duty of the director and continually enhance his role in keeping with the intrinsic nature of socialist society and the character of revolutionary cinema.

The director is the commander of the creative group. He should have the overall responsibility for artistic creation, production organization and ideological education and guide all the members of the creative team in film-making.

The director in the socialist system of film-making is fundamentally different from the “director” in capitalist society.

In the capitalist system of film-making the director is called “director” but, in fact, the right of supervision and control over film production is entirely in the hands of the tycoons of the film-making industry who have the money, whereas the directors are nothing but their agents.

In capitalist society the director is shackled by the reactionary governmental policy of commercializing the cinema and by the capitalists’ money, so that he is a mere worker who obeys the will of the film-making industrialists whether he likes it or not. On the other hand, in socialist society the director is an independent and creative artist who is responsible to the Party and the people for the cinema. Therefore, in the socialist system of film-making the director is not a mere worker who makes films but the commander, the chief who assumes full responsibility for everything ranging

from the film itself to the political and ideological life of those who take part in film-making. The director should be the commander of the creative group because of the characteristic features of direction. In the cinema, which is a comprehensive art, directing is an art of guidance which coordinates the creativity of all the artists to make an integrated interpretation.

Just as victory in battle depends on the leadership ability of the commander, so the fate of the film depends on the director's art of guidance. Even though he works to make a good film, the director cannot do so if he has no ability to guide the creative team in a coordinated way to realize his creative conceptions. The film is conceived and completed by the director, but it cannot be created without the collective efforts and wisdom of the creative team. Therefore, success in film-making depends on how the director works with all the artists, technicians and production and supply personnel in the creative group.

If the director is to unite the creative group with one ideology and one purpose and make an excellent film of high ideological and artistic value, he must free himself once and for all from the old domineering and bureaucratic system and methods of direction, under which the direction-first policy is pursued, the boss-gang relationship within the creative group is established, arbitrary decisions are made and creative workers are dealt with through orders and commands. If the director resorts to bureaucracy and shouts down or ignores the creative team, it will break their unity and cohesion in ideology and purpose which constitute the basis of collective creation, and deprive him of his potential to create films and bind him hand and foot. The old system and methods of directing not only do not conform with the intrinsic nature of our socialist system, where the unity and cohesion of the popular masses underlie social relations, but also do not conform with the collectivity of film-making and the intrinsic nature of direction.

In film directing, the basic factor is also to work well with the artists, technicians and production and supply personnel who are directly involved in film-making. This is the essential requirement of the Juche-inspired system of directing. This system is our system of directing under which the director becomes the commander of the creative group and pushes ahead with creative work as a whole in a coordinated way, giving precedence to political work and putting the main emphasis on working with the people who make films. This system embodies the fundamental features of the socialist system and the basic principle of the Juche idea that man is the master of everything and decides everything. Hence, it fully conforms with the collective nature of film-making and the characteristic features of direction.

Since the film is made through the joint efforts and wisdom of many people, every participant in the production should fulfil his role and responsibility like the master he is, and this collective should firmly unite with one ideology and will in order to perform creative assignments jointly. This fundamental requirement which emanates from the characteristic features of film-making can never be met by the old system of directing; it can be properly met only by the system which attaches basic importance to working with people, working with the creative team.

Under the new system of direction, film-making becomes the work of the director himself as well as the joint work of the entire creative group, and both the director and creative team assume the responsibility for creation. Therefore, everybody buckles down to creation voluntarily. Also, while making films, the director helps and leads all the members of the collective, and the creative staff learn from one another in the course of their work. Such communist ethics in creation and the revolutionary way of life are demonstrated to the full. Thus everybody is closely knit in the collectivist spirit and rises up as one in the creative work to attain the common objectives.

Under the new system of direction, the director is responsible not only for the creative work of the team but also for their political and ideological life. Therefore, he regularly conducts political work and ideological education closely combined with their creative activities and, accordingly, the process of creation becomes that of revolutionizing and working-classing them.

In short, the system of directing based on working with people not only accords with the intrinsic nature of film-making and direction, but also enables the director to extricate himself from domineering and bureaucratic tendencies and decisively improve his ability to guide creation; it also enables him to eradicate deviation towards the idea of art for art's sake, which gives exclusive precedence to artistic creation and to advance both creative work and the work of making the collective revolutionary.

The strength of the new system lies in the fact that it guarantees the solid unity and cohesion of the creative group based on the Juche idea and gives full play to the awareness and creativity of all the members, and the director's guidance goes deep into the creative work and life so as to bring about an uninterrupted flow of innovation.

Under the new system the director should emphasize artistic guidance to the creative workers.

The basic duty of the creative group is to make revolutionary films of high ideological and artistic value, which make an effective contribution to arming people fully with the Party's monolithic ideology and which imbue the whole of society with the great Juche idea. Whether this duty is carried out at the right time and properly depends on how the director works with the members of the creative team.

The creative workers are the main figures who directly execute the revolutionary tasks devolving on their group. The director's plan is realized through these workers and all assignments of presentation arising in the course of creation are also carried out by them. Therefore, the director should work well with the creative workers and improve his role as their guide. Then, the creative group will be able to carry out the revolutionary tasks facing it successfully.

The first thing the director must do in his work with the creative workers is to bring about a consensus of opinion with regard to the production. This is the basic guarantee for successful creation and is the starting point of the director's work. If each creative worker has his own views on the production, the director cannot lead them to perform

the same presentation assignment and creative activities are thrown into confusion from the outset.

The director must carefully analyse the general characteristics of the content and form of a production, so that the creative workers can all understand and accept it.

In analysing and considering a production the director should not be too egotistical. Every artist has his own creative individuality and may have different views on a production. If the director does not take this into account and holds to his own views and ignores the opinions of other creative workers, it will be difficult to establish a uniform view on a production.

The interpretation of a production should be understood by everybody and win their consent; when it is accepted by everyone as their own, the work will be done effectively.

The director must always put forward his opinions on a production and create an atmosphere of free discussion so that many constructive views can be voiced, and he must sincerely accept the views of the creative workers. Once agreement is reached in discussion, the director must quickly act on it and base the production on it firmly and, then, must never deviate from it, whatever happens. If the director falters, the whole collective will do so and, if this happens, the production will fail.

When all the creative workers fully understand the production, the director must begin to work with each person individually.

Artistic guidance to individual creative workers must always be specific. If the director only gives general guidance and indications, he cannot give them any substantial help or lead them confidently to achieve his aims.

Taking into consideration the characteristic features and requirements of a production, the director should clearly tell the creative workers their assignments for its representation and the ways and means of carrying them out and consult them on problems which they may come across in the course of their work. Only then can his guidance conform with their work.

For example, take guidance to the acting. The role and position of the characters to be represented by actors and actresses throughout the presentation and their personalities should be analysed and, on this basis, the direction of acting should be set and the tasks of presentation and methods of acting for each stage and situation of the drama should be specifically taught. When the director's guidance is precise, then his plan will agree with that of the creative team and their work will proceed smoothly.

The important factor in the director's guidance of the interpretation is to help the creative workers to have a clear understanding of the seed of a given production and present it well.

The ideological kernel of a production is the seed which the director and all the other creative workers should bring into flower through their collective efforts and wisdom. It is not only the basis of the interpretation by individual creative workers, but also the foundation on which they all combine to produce one single cinematic presentation. When all interpretations are conducted on the basis of one seed, they form the compo-

nents of one cinematic presentation because they are built on the same foundation, although various forms of presentation are created by different artists with different personalities. Therefore, the director should be very careful that none of the creative team loses the seed or introduces anything which has nothing to do with it.

Another aspect in which the director must make a great effort in his guidance to the presentation is to ensure that the creative interaction between artists is efficient and to lead their teamwork correctly.

Basically, a comprehensive artistic presentation cannot be achieved properly by the talents or efforts of individual artists. When every artist establishes a close working relationship with the others and carries out the teamwork efficiently, the different elements which make up the comprehensive presentation will harmonize well with each other.

The director should always be in the centre of creative operations and provide a close link between the activities of individual members of the creative team, taking care to prevent possible friction and departmentalist tendencies amongst them.

The director should guide the artists correctly so that they exhibit a high degree of independence and initiative in the course of creation. Giving full play to their independence and initiative is the main factor which increases their sense of responsibility and rouses their creative ardour and imagination. Creative cooperation between the director and the creative workers and amongst the workers themselves is only successfully achieved when each plays his part properly in his appointed post.

The director must guide the creative workers in a very strict yet enlightened manner. For their part, the creative workers have to accept and understand each of his plans and carry them out in a creative manner. In this way the director should give guidance on the principle of making the creative workers in charge of individual fields of presentation assume full responsibility for their own creative work. This is effective artistic guidance.

The original ideas of creative workers in film-making should be used to perfect the harmony of a comprehensive interpretation, while at the same time giving life to the personality of individual artistic portrayals. The director should be talented enough to maintain the originality of the creative workers and raise the level of interpretation in each field and, on this basis, achieve the harmony of the whole film. This is creation in the true sense of the word.

In his efforts to ensure that the creative workers express their original ideas, the director should not allow the harmony of the overall interpretation to be destroyed, nor should he suppress this originality in order to guarantee the harmony of interpretation.

The director, the commander of the creative group, should also work well with the production and supply personnel.

The director should be responsible for the production of films and must advance this work in a coordinated manner.

Film-making, which is complex in content and large in scale, cannot move forward unless it is flawlessly supported by production organization. In film-making the processes of creation and production are inseparably linked. If production is not well organized,

the whole process of creation and production cannot run smoothly. It is only when production is well organized that it is possible to make an excellent film in a short time and with a small amount of manpower, funds and materials.

Production organization helps to ensure success in film-making. It moves the creative group in a unified and planned way so that all fields and units are well geared to each other, observing strict order and discipline, and it also makes rational use of materials and technical means and controls financial and supply activities. This is an important task which the director must control in a responsible manner.

The director should not work with production, technical and supply personnel in an administrative and technical manner just because production organization is administrative and technical in content. Administrative and technical guidance runs counter to the intrinsic nature of the Juche-inspired system of directing, and prevents production, technical and supply personnel from being actively drawn into film-making. In his guidance of production organization the director should work with people sincerely.

One of the major criteria for the new type of director is that he is the ideological educator of the creative group. The director should be responsible for their politico-ideological life and keep intensifying their politico-ideological education, so as to lead them to perform their mission conscientiously as revolutionary artists.

The unity of ideology and purpose of the creative team is a major factor for ensuring the successful completion of a film. Even if the director has the talent and skill to fuse together the diverse elements of interpretation organically, a harmonious film cannot be made with this alone. No production of high ideological and artistic value can evolve out of a creative group whose members are not united ideologically and in which discipline and order have not been established.

The unity of ideology and purpose of the creative team is not only a basic requirement for maintaining consistency throughout a film but it also has an important bearing on waging the speed campaign, establishing a revolutionary spirit of creation and hastening the revolutionization and working-classization of all the personnel.

Education in the Party's monolithic ideology is basic to the ideological education of the creative team. This work should always precede creative work and should be conducted forcefully throughout the creative battle.

Ideological education by the director is aimed at equipping the creative team fully with the Party's lines and policies so as to make better revolutionary films more rapidly. So, when ideological education is combined with creative work, great vitality can be demonstrated and artists can be roused to the creative battle.

The director must keep a grip on ideological education throughout the whole course of creative work, and give absolute priority to political work at each stage of the creative process. The new system of directing proves effective only when the director gives absolute priority to political work in everything that is done. The system is meaningless if the director neglects political work and remains as bureaucratic as ever.

To give priority to political work and keep raising the political awareness of the creative staff so that they willingly participate in film-making is an application in film-making of the fundamental requirements of our Party's traditional revolutionary work method. The director should fully adhere to this revolutionary method of creation. Whatever he produces, the director must thoroughly explain its ideological content and artistic features to all the creative staff and tell them in full about the purpose and significance of the production, so as to encourage them to take part in creative work with great revolutionary zeal.

The director should take control of working with the creative team and energetically conduct political work prior to all other work. It is only then that he can satisfactorily perform his role as artistic leader, production organizer and ideological educator and become a distinguished commander of the creative group.

because with the twelve million used for the production of *Zapata*, for example, we could have made 10,000 super-8 films which would represent all our historical, social and artistic context.

- 3) We wish to set forth once and for all that the movement of new Mexican cinema was conceived on May 15, 1970, with the first National Independent Cinema Competition "Luis Buñuel," and that those who preserve or are working in the same spirit can validly represent the spirit of independence of criteria, despite the ideological divisions which the Cooperatives and other groups of independent cinema have to face.
- 4) We also wish to establish that we will continue to work through the exhibition channels from the humblest to those with the latest technologies, but always with the very clear idea that the language of cinema must be at the service of the community and that we will continue to criticise the faults and errors of the system, likewise, we will make known the existing achievements.
- 5) To conclude, we are aware that the movement which is emerging here in Mexico, a means of expression through the language of independent cinema, is the most dynamic and has national characteristics so far unrivalled abroad in the world panorama of cinema.

MANIFESTO OF THE PALESTINIAN CINEMA GROUP (Palestine, 1973)

Palestinian Cinema Group

[First published in French as "Manifeste des cinéastes palestiniens," *Écran* 73 18 (1973). First published in English in *Cineaste* 9, no. 3 (1979): 35.]

In the aftermath of the Six Day War of June 1967, there was an increasing sense that radical, pro-Palestinian cinema needed to develop as both an educational and propagandistic tool. The Palestinian Cinema Group, early on in the manifesto paraphrasing Marx and comparing contemporary Arab cinema to Marx's oft-quoted "religion is the opiate of the masses" from *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* (1843), foregrounds the need to radically redefine Arab cinema so that films are made by and for the people, and their liberation from oppression becomes paramount.

The Arab cinema has for too long delighted in dealing with subjects having no connection to reality or dealing with it in a superficial manner. Based on stereotypes, this approach has created detestable habits among the Arab viewers for whom the cinema has become

a kind of opium. It has led the public away from the real problems, dimming its lucidity and conscience.

At times throughout the history of Arab cinema, of course, there have been serious attempts to express the reality of our world and its problematic, but they have been rapidly smothered by the supporters of reaction who fought ferociously against any emergence of a new cinema.

While recognizing the concern of those attempts, it should nevertheless be made clear that in terms of content they were usually poorly developed and on a formal level were always inadequate. It seems one could never escape the cumbersome heritage of the conventional cinema.

The defeat of June '67, however, was a jarring experience and it raised some fundamental questions. There also appeared, at long last, young talents committed to creating a completely new cinema in the Arab world, film-makers convinced that a complete change must affect the form as well as the content.

These new films raise questions about the reasons for our defeat and take courageous stands in favor of the resistance. It is important, in fact, to develop a Palestinian cinema capable of supporting with dignity the struggle of our people, revealing the actual facts of our situation and describing the stages of our Arab and Palestinian struggle to liberate our land. The cinema to which we aspire will have to devote itself to expressing the present as well as the past and the future. Its unified vigor will entail regrouping of individual efforts: indeed, personal initiatives—whatever their value may be—are doomed to remain inadequate and ineffective.

It's towards this end that we, men of the cinema and literature, distribute this Manifesto and call for the creation of a Palestinian Cinema Association. We assign to it six tasks:

- 1) Produce films directed by Palestinians on the Palestinian cause and its objectives, films which originate from within an Arab context and which are inspired by a democratic and progressive content.
- 2) Work for the emergence of a new aesthetic to replace the old, one able to coherently express a new content.
- 3) Put the entire cinema at the service of the Palestinian revolution and the Arab cause.
- 4) Conceive films designed to present the Palestinian cause to the whole world.
- 5) Create a film archive which will gather film and still photograph material on the struggle of the Palestinian people in order to retrace its stages.
- 6) Strengthen relations with revolutionary and progressive cinema groups throughout the world, participate in film festivals in the name of Palestine and facilitate work of all friendly groups working toward the realization of the objectives of the Palestinian revolution.

The Palestinian Cinema Association considers itself an integral part of the institutions of the Palestinian revolution. Its financing will be assured by the Arab and Palestinian organizations which share its orientation. Its office will be at the Research Center of the Palestinian Liberation Organization.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE THIRD WORLD FILMMAKERS MEETING (Algeria, 1973)

Fernando Birri, Ousmane Sembène, Jorge Silva, Santiago Alvarez, Med Hondo, Jorge Cedron, Moussa Diakite, Flora Gomes, Mohamed Abdelwahad, El Hachmi Cherif, Lamine Merbah, Mache Khaled, Meziani Abdelhakim, Mamadou Sidibe, Mostefa Bouali, and more than twenty other filmmakers

[First published in English in *Cineaste Pamphlet*, no. 1 (New York: Cineaste, 1973).]

Introduction from *Cineaste Pamphlet*, no. 1:

The Third World Filmmakers Meeting, sponsored by the National Office for Cinematographic Commerce and Industry (ONCIC) and the cultural information center, was held in Algiers from December 5 to 14, 1973. The meeting brought together filmmakers from all areas of the third world for the purpose of discussing common problems and goals to lay the ground-work for an organization of third world filmmakers. The filmmakers attending the conference organized themselves into separate committees to discuss the specific areas of production and distribution as well as how the filmmaker fits into the political struggle of the third world. The resolutions of the various committees are published here as they were released in Algiers, with only slight modifications in grammar and spelling.

COMMITTEE 1: PEOPLE'S CINEMA

The Committee on People's Cinema—the role of cinema and filmmakers in the third world against imperialism and neocolonialism—consisted of the following filmmakers and observers: Fernando Birri (Argentina); Humberto Rios (Bolivia); Manuel Perez (Cuba); Jorge Silva (Columbia); Jorge Cedron (Argentina); Moussa Diakite (Republic of Guinea); Flora Gomes (Guinea-Bissou); Mohamed Abdelwahad (Morocco); El Hachmi

demonstrate the interest of women's films made within the system. Voluntarism and utopianism must be avoided if any revolutionary strategy is to emerge. A collective film *of itself* cannot reflect the condition of its production. What collective methods do provide is the real possibility of examining how cinema works and how we can best interrogate and demystify the workings of ideology: it will be from these insights that a genuinely revolutionary conception of counter-cinema for the women's struggle will come.

MANIFESTO FOR A NON-SEXIST CINEMA (Canada, 1974)

FECIP (Fédération européenne du cinéma progressiste)

[Manifesto ratified at the Fédération européenne du cinéma progressiste conference in Montréal, Quebec, 1974. First published in *Cineaste* 8, no. 4 (1978): 51.]

Like many aspects of the relationship between 1970s feminism and the New Left, the role of cinema in the struggle for global change was fraught. In the "Manifesto for a Non-sexist Cinema" feminists outline for the at-times-patriarchal New Left just exactly what sexism is, how it is often perpetuated in film production, and how it is intrinsically linked to other forms of discrimination and to liberation movements more generally.

1) BEGINNINGS OF THEORETICAL THOUGHT ABOUT SEXISM AND ANTI-SEXISM.

We don't want the recognition of the anti-sexist struggle to be a concession granted to the women's movement, like a bone thrown for us to nibble on, hoping we will stop clamouring.

We want every person to realize that she (or he) is deeply and intimately concerned with this question, whatever may be her (his) age, sex, profession or nationality.

Sexism intermingles insidiously in our most everyday and commonplace activities and—whether man or woman, child, adult or elderly person—freezes us in stereotyped roles by stifling multiple possibilities in each of us. To get away from slogans, we propose first to specify notions of sexism and anti-sexism.

A) SOME DEFINITIONS OF SEXISM.

We think that sexism consists especially of perpetuating feminine and masculine stereotypes without denouncing them.

A sexist film is one that, without criticism, shows sexual, professional or political passivity of women who are reduced to the bedroom, the kitchen, childcare or subordinate tasks if by any chance they are active elsewhere.

A sexist film is one that shows men active sexually, professionally or politically without doing the same for feminine characters and which implies that women are inferior to men in these fields.

A sexist director is one who surrenders to the terrorism of youth and beauty and dares only to employ actresses who are young and beautiful.

A sexist film is one that emphasizes sexual stereotypes about the passivity of women, including their so-called masochism (*Histoire d'O* style). However, thanks particularly to a series of convergent struggles, the criticism of sexism on the screen has improved and instead of remaining solely on the level of denouncement, it seems preferable to develop the initiatives already taken here and there for an anti-sexist cinema.

B) SOME DEFINITIONS OF ANTI-SEXISM.

Anti-sexist films are those which don't perpetuate the traditional partition of male and female roles, without condemning it explicitly or implicitly, as are those films which show struggles to change the current situation.

a) As for women: it is anti-sexist to denounce their particular oppression in the professional field (lower wages than men, more extensive un-employment, etc.) and the denouncement of their specific alienation (terrorism of fashion and beauty, obsession with aging, rivalry between women, taboo of lesbianism, sexual passivity, unwanted pregnancy, abortion performed in poor conditions, rape and physical violence, housekeeping and educational tasks performed, and deeply despised, solely by women, self-disparagement and sometimes self-hate, mythology of self-sacrifice and devotion).

b) As for men: it is anti-sexist to criticize the notion of virility reduced to the ejaculatory ability and the desire for power. As a matter of fact, men are also oppressed by sexism. For example, it is obvious that young boys' sensibilities are systematically castrated. The time and energy of most adult men are consumed by the necessity to build a career and to feed their families. Most certainly, their oppression confers upon them privileges—for instance, they are fed and washed at home—but on the moral level, sexism mutilates them as severely as, from a certain viewpoint, colonialism once mutilated the whites who exploited the Africans or the Asians. The dialectic of master and slave is never innocent.

c) The core of sexist oppression is the present family structure, insofar as it is still dependent upon the patriarchal heritage. In this cell, the mother and the child are bound together and we can observe that men and elderly people are deprived, or deny themselves, of close contacts with children.

All attempts to get out of this situation are anti-sexist, from individual revolt to collective struggle in the sexual, professional, political and ideological fields to obtain equality between men and women.

All efforts to change the female and male roles are anti-sexist. For example, anti-sexist films that demonstrate a genuine and tender relationship between a man and a child, or the sisterhood that is developing between women. Even more, movies are anti-sexist when they show men who are capable of tenderness and sensitivity and women who are strong and efficient and who do not only give birth but also create works. It is important to show the participation of women in the working class, peasant, student and anti-imperialist struggles. We will take as our watchword this well-known phrase: "What a man can do, a woman can also do," but we will complete it with its opposite: "What a woman can do, a man can also do" (except child-bearing!).

It is anti-sexist for men to participate in daily life, in the heart of daily routine, to take care of children and to assume housework tasks (the cost of which, by the way, should be reevaluated and its real value analyzed). Housework is not just a series of robotlike motions but implies a multiplicity of abilities in the same way as management.

An anti-sexist film is one that features elderly people, especially old women, and shows that even with wrinkles and grey hair, we still have a heart, a head and experiences from which everybody can profit.

2) BEGINNINGS OF THOUGHT ABOUT WOMEN'S CREATIVITY.

In the context of the women's liberation movement against patriarchal societies, it is important for women to debate the essential question of feminine creativity. Is there a specific nature of feminine creativity?

We have just begun to know the multiple repressions which, more among women than among men, have stifled our creative potential. But we don't yet know what a thought, a look, a word—if it was to be decolonized, deconditioned of male thinking, of its mental structures centered on the male standard as sole criterion of evaluation for all creativity—could reveal of the specificity of women, of our relation to the language (our mother's language), to our body, to space, to time and to the future.

We don't know anything about creative energy because for centuries we have centered our energy towards expiatory and sacrificial love. We have to learn everything about ourselves. We have to use our energies to liberate everything. Let's not be afraid to seek our unknown self which no present theory, whether Marxist or psychoanalytic, can completely explore.

WHAT IS THE CINEMA FOR US? (Mauritania, 1979)

Med Hondo

[First published in English in *Framework* (UK) 11 (1979): 20–21.]

Med Hondo is a Mauritanian filmmaker who has worked extensively in France, best known for his film *Soleil O* (France/Mauritania, 1967). He has done extensive work in dubbing Hollywood films (most notably the roles played by Eddie Murphy) in France. This manifesto addresses both the absence of African and Arab cultures onscreen and decries the colonization of Arab and African cinema screens that profoundly limits the circulation of films made by Arabs and Africans on their screens and abroad, along with the inability of many filmmakers to work in their home countries, forcing them to go and work in the cinema industries of the colonizers.

Throughout the world when people use the term *cinema*, they all refer more or less consciously to a single cinema, which for more than half a century has been created, produced, industrialised, programmed and then shown on the world's screens: *Euro-American cinema*.

This cinema has gradually imposed itself on a set of dominated peoples. With no means of protecting their own cultures, these peoples have been systematically invaded by diverse, cleverly articulated, cinematographic products. The ideologies of these products never “represent” their personality, their collective or private way of life, their cultural codes, and never reflect even minimally on their specific “art,” way of thinking, or communicating—in a word, their own history . . . their civilization.

The images this cinema offers systematically exclude the African and the Arab.

It would be dangerous (and impossible) for us to reject this cinema simply as alien—the damage is done. We must get to know it, the better to analyse it and to understand that this cinema has never *really* concerned African and Arab peoples. This seems paradoxical, since it fills all the cinemas, dominates the screens of all African and Arab cities and towns.

But do the masses have any other choice? “Consuming” at least a reflection of one’s own people’s life and history—past, present and future? . . .

Lawrence of Arabia disseminates an image of Lawrence, not of the Arabs. In *Gentleman of Cocodie* a European is the gentleman hero, and not an Ivory Coast African. Do we have a single image of the experiences of our forefathers and the heroes of African and Arab history? Do we see a single film showing the new reality of cooperation, communication, support, and solidarity among Africans and Arabs?

This may seem exaggerated. Some critics will say that at least one African country, Egypt, produces some relatively important films each year . . . that since independence a number of cineastes have made a future for themselves in African countries. In the whole

continent of Africa, Egypt is only one country, one cultural source, one sector of the market—and few African countries buy Egyptian films. They produce too few films, and the market within Egypt is still dominated by foreign films.

African and Arab film-makers have decided to produce their own films. But despite the films' undoubted quality, they have no chance of being distributed normally, at home or in the dominant countries, except in marginalised circuits—the dead-end art cinemas.

Even a few dozen more film-makers producing films would only achieve a ratio of one to ten thousand. An everyday creative dynamic is necessary. We need to make a radical change in the relation between the dominant Euro-American production and distribution networks and African and Arab production and distribution, which we must control.

Only in this way, in a spirit of creative and stimulating competition among African and Arab film-makers, can we make artistic progress and become “competitive” on the world market. We must first control our own markets, satisfy our own people's desires to liberate their screens, and then establish respectful relations with other peoples, and balanced exchange.

WE MUST CHANGE THE HUMILIATING RELATION BETWEEN DOMINATING AND DOMINATED, BETWEEN MASTERS AND SLAVES.

Some flee this catastrophic state of affairs, thinking cinema restricted for Western, Christian and capitalist elites . . . or throwing a cloak of fraternal paternalism over our film-makers, ignoring and discrediting their works, blaming them, in the short term forcing them to a formal and ethical “mimesis”—imitating precisely those cinemas we denounce—in order to become known and be admitted into international cinema; in the end, forcing them into submission, renouncing their own lives, their creativity and their militancy.

Since our independence many of our filmmakers have proved their abilities as *auteurs*. They encounter increasing difficulties in surviving and continuing to work, because their films are seldom distributed and no aid is available. Due to the total lack of a global cultural policy, African and Arab cinema becomes relegated to an exotic and episodic sub-product, limited to aesthetic reviews at festivals, which, although not negligible, are undoubtedly insufficient.

Each year millions of dollars are “harvested” from our continents, taken back to the original countries, and then used to produce new films which are again sent out onto our screens.

50% of the profits of multinational film companies accrue from the screens of the Third World. Thus each of our countries unknowingly contributes substantial finance to the production of films in Paris, New York, London, Rome or Hong Kong. They have no control over them, and reap no financial or moral benefit, being involved in neither the production nor the distribution. In reality, however, they are coerced into being “co-producers.” *Their resources are plundered.*

The United States allows less than 13% foreign films to enter its market—and most of these are produced by European subsidiaries controlled by the U.S. majors. They exercise an absolute protectionism.

Most important is the role of the cinema in the construction of peoples' consciousness.

Cinema is the mechanism *par excellence* for penetrating the minds of our peoples, influencing their everyday social behaviour, directing them, and diverting them from their historic national responsibilities. It imposes alien and insidious models and references, and without *apparent* constraint enforces the adoption of modes of behaviour and communication of the dominating ideologies. This damages their own cultural development and blocks true communication between Africans and Arabs, brothers and friends who have been historically united for thousands of years.

This alienation disseminated through the image is all the more dangerous for being insidious, uncontroversial, "accepted," seemingly inoffensive and neutral. It needs no armed forces and no permanent programme of education by those seeking to maintain the division of the African and Arab peoples—their weakness, submission, servitude, their ignorance of each other and of their own history. They forget their positive heritage, united through their foremothers with all humanity. Above all they have no say in the progress of world history.

Dominant imperialism seeks to prevent the portrayal of African and Arab values to other nations; were they to appreciate our values and behaviour they might respond positively to us.

We are not proposing isolation, the closing of frontiers to all Western film, nor any protectionism separating us from the rest of the world. We wish to survive, develop, participate as sovereign peoples in our own specific cultural fields, and fulfil our responsibilities in a world from which we are now excluded.

The night of colonialism caused many quarrels among us; we have yet to assess the full consequences. It poisoned our potential communications with other peoples; we are forced into relations of colonial domination. We have preconceived and false ideas of each other imprinted by racism. They believe themselves "superior" to us; they are unaware of our peoples' roles in world history.

Having been colonised and then subjected to even more pernicious imperialist domination, if we are not entirely responsible for this state of affairs, some intellectuals, writers, film-makers, thinkers, our cultural leaders and policy-makers are also responsible for perpetuating this insatiable domination.

It has never been enough simply to denounce our domination, for they dictate the rules of their game to their own advantage. Some African and Arab film-makers realise that the cinema alone cannot change our disadvantaged position, but they know that it is the best means of education and information and thus of solidarity.

It is imperative to organise our forces, to reassert our different creative potentialities, and fill the void in our national, regional and continental cinemas. We must establish relations of communication and co-operation between our peoples, in a spirit of equality, dignity and justice. We have the will, means and talent to undertake this great enterprise.

Without organisation of resources, we cannot flourish at home, and dozens of African and Arab intellectuals, film-makers, technicians, writers, journalists and leaders have had

to leave their countries, often despite themselves, to contribute to the development and overdevelopment of countries that don't need them, and that use their excesses to dominate us.

This will continue until we grasp the crucial importance of cultural and economic strategy, and create our own networks of film production and distribution, liberating ourselves from all foreign monopolies.

NIAMEY MANIFESTO OF AFRICAN FILMMAKERS (Niger, 1982)

FEPACI (Fédération panafricaine des cinéastes)

The first international conference on cinema was held in Niamey, Niger, March 1–4, 1982. The participants were filmmakers, critics, officials from several African countries, and international cinema experts. The participants recognized the underdevelopment of cinema, including regular film productions in the majority of African countries.

Further, the participants are convinced that African cinema must be committed to asserting the cultural identity of African peoples; be an effective means for international understanding, education, and entertainment; provide an incentive for development; and contribute to national and regional economic policies.

The Conference started by making a serious evaluation of African and international policies on cinema.

The participants then studied proposals for the development of African cinema, production and the financing of productions, and the possibilities of legislation that would promote pan-African strategies for the development of the African cinema industry. They examined ways of implementing the proposals.

The conference finally adopted the following resolutions and recommendations:

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

The participants considered and set up the following principles:

The viability of cinema production is closely tied to the complementary viability of the other four main sectors of cinema, namely the exploitation of cinema theaters, importation of films, distribution of films, and technical infrastructure and training.

There cannot be any viable cinema without the involvement of African states for the organization, the support, the stabilization of cinema, and the encouragement and protection of private public investment in cinema.

ANTI-100 YEARS OF CINEMA MANIFESTO (USA, 1996)

Jonas Mekas

[First presented 11 February 1996 at the American Center, Paris. First published in *Point d'ironie* (France) 0 (1997).]

This manifesto, a response to the celebration and marketing of the centenary of the cinema, makes a case that the official histories written at the time were dictated by capital, like much of film production throughout its history. Mekas celebrates the artisanal aspect of experimental cinema and shines light on the importance of the cinema as a shared experience between viewers and audiences but most importantly between friends.

As you well know it was God who created this Earth and everything on it. And he thought it was all great. All painters and poets and musicians sang and celebrated the creation and that was all OK. But not for real. Something was missing. So about 100 years ago God decided to create the motion picture camera. And he did so. And then he created a filmmaker and said, "Now here is an instrument called the motion picture camera. Go and film and celebrate the beauty of the creation and the dreams of human spirit, and have fun with it."

But the devil did not like that. So he placed a money bag in front of the camera and said to the filmmakers, "Why do you want to celebrate the beauty of the world and the spirit of it if you can make money with this instrument?" And, believe it or not, all the filmmakers ran after the money bag. The Lord realized he had made a mistake. So, some 25 years later, to correct his mistake, God created independent avant-garde filmmakers and said, "Here is the camera. Take it and go into the world and sing the beauty of all creation, and have fun with it. But you will have a difficult time doing it, and you will never make any money with this instrument."

Thus spoke the Lord to Viking Eggeling, Germaine Dulac, Jean Epstein, Fernand Léger, Dmitri Kirsanoff, Marcel Duchamp, Hans Richter, Luis Buñuel, Man Ray, Cavalcanti, Jean Cocteau, and Maya Deren, and Sidney Peterson, and Kenneth Anger, Gregory Markopoulos, Stan Brakhage, Marie Menken, Bruce Baillie, Francis Lee, Harry Smith and Jack Smith and Ken Jacobs, Ernie Gehr, Ron Rice, Michael Snow, Joseph Cornell, Peter Kubelka, Hollis Frampton and Barbara Rubin, Paul Sharits, Robert Beavers, Christopher McLaine, and Kurt Kren, Robert Breer, Dore O, Isidore Isou, Antonio De Bernardi, Maurice Lemaître, and Bruce Conner, and Klaus Wyborny, Boris Lehman, Bruce Elder, Taka Iimura, Abigail Child, Andrew Noren and too many others. Many others all over the world. And they took their Bolex[es] and their little 8mm and Super 8 cameras and began filming the beauty of this world, and the complex adventures of the human spirit,

and they're having great fun doing it. And the films bring no money and do not do what's called useful.

And the museums all over the world are celebrating the one-hundredth anniversary of cinema, costing them millions of dollars the cinema makes, all going gaga about their Hollywoods. But there is no mention of the avant-garde or the independents of our cinema.

I have seen the brochures, the programs of the museums and archives and cinema-theques around the world. But these say, "we don't care about your cinema." In the times of bigness, spectaculars, one hundred million dollar movie productions, I want to speak for the small, invisible acts of human spirit: so subtle, so small, that they die when brought out under the clean lights. I want to celebrate the small forms of cinema: the lyrical form, the poem, the watercolor, etude, sketch, portrait, arabesque, and bagatelle, and little 8mm songs. In the times when everybody wants to succeed and sell, I want to celebrate those who embrace social and daily tailor to pursue the invisible, the personal things that bring no money and no bread and make no contemporary history, art history or any other history. I am for art which we do for each other, as friends.

I am standing in the middle of the information highway and laughing, because a butterfly on a little flower somewhere in China just fluttered its wings, and I know that the entire history, culture will drastically change because of that fluttering. A Super 8mm camera just made a little soft buzz somewhere, somewhere on the lower east side of New York, and the world will never be the same.

The real history of cinema is invisible history: history of friends getting together, doing the thing they love. For us, the cinema is beginning with every new buzz of the projector, with every new buzz of our cameras. With every new buzz of our cameras, our hearts jump forward my friends.

THE DECALOGUE (Czech Republic, 1999)

Jan Švankmajer

[Originally published in Czech in Jan Švankmajer, *Síla imaginace* (Prague: Dauphin, 2001), 113–116. Published in English in Peter Hames, ed., *The Cinema of Jan Švankmajer: Dark Alchemy*, 2nd ed. (London: Wallflower, 2007), 141.]

Czech animator Jan Švankmajer's surrealist cinema has influenced filmmakers as diverse as Terry Gilliam, the Brothers Quay, and Tim Burton. Švankmajer's manifesto "The Decalogue" is a statement of principles that proclaims the need of the filmmaker to channel the forces of the imagination and the subconscious. For Švankmajer, immersion and affect are the guiding principles of both the filmmaker and the audience. His manifesto is a self-reflexive account of his own practice—not a set of edicts as much as a reflection of how to explode the perception of everyday life as the only viable representation of the real.

and they're having great fun doing it. And the films bring no money and do not do what's called useful.

And the museums all over the world are celebrating the one-hundredth anniversary of cinema, costing them millions of dollars the cinema makes, all going gaga about their Hollywoods. But there is no mention of the avant-garde or the independents of our cinema.

I have seen the brochures, the programs of the museums and archives and cinema-theques around the world. But these say, "we don't care about your cinema." In the times of bigness, spectaculars, one hundred million dollar movie productions, I want to speak for the small, invisible acts of human spirit: so subtle, so small, that they die when brought out under the clean lights. I want to celebrate the small forms of cinema: the lyrical form, the poem, the watercolor, etude, sketch, portrait, arabesque, and bagatelle, and little 8mm songs. In the times when everybody wants to succeed and sell, I want to celebrate those who embrace social and daily tailor to pursue the invisible, the personal things that bring no money and no bread and make no contemporary history, art history or any other history. I am for art which we do for each other, as friends.

I am standing in the middle of the information highway and laughing, because a butterfly on a little flower somewhere in China just fluttered its wings, and I know that the entire history, culture will drastically change because of that fluttering. A Super 8mm camera just made a little soft buzz somewhere, somewhere on the lower east side of New York, and the world will never be the same.

The real history of cinema is invisible history: history of friends getting together, doing the thing they love. For us, the cinema is beginning with every new buzz of the projector, with every new buzz of our cameras. With every new buzz of our cameras, our hearts jump forward my friends.

THE DECALOGUE (Czech Republic, 1999)

Jan Švankmajer

[Originally published in Czech in Jan Švankmajer, *Síla imaginace* (Prague: Dauphin, 2001), 113–116. Published in English in Peter Hames, ed., *The Cinema of Jan Švankmajer: Dark Alchemy*, 2nd ed. (London: Wallflower, 2007), 141.]

Czech animator Jan Švankmajer's surrealist cinema has influenced filmmakers as diverse as Terry Gilliam, the Brothers Quay, and Tim Burton. Švankmajer's manifesto "The Decalogue" is a statement of principles that proclaims the need of the filmmaker to channel the forces of the imagination and the subconscious. For Švankmajer, immersion and affect are the guiding principles of both the filmmaker and the audience. His manifesto is a self-reflexive account of his own practice—not a set of edicts as much as a reflection of how to explode the perception of everyday life as the only viable representation of the real.

1. Remember that there is only one poetry. The antithesis of poetry is professional expertise.

Before you start filming, write a poem, paint a picture, put together a collage, write a book or an essay etc. Because only the nurture of the universality of expression will guarantee that you create a good film.

2. Succumb totally to your obsessions. You have nothing better anyway. Obsessions are relics of your childhood. And from those very depths of your childhood come the greatest treasures.

The gate has to always remain open in that direction. It's not about memories but about emotions. It's not about consciousness but about subconsciousness. Let this underground stream freely flow through your inner self. Focus on it but, at the same time, let yourself go. When you are filming you have to be "immersed" for 24 hours-a-day. Then all your obsessions, all your childhood transfers itself onto film without you even noticing it. In this way your film becomes a triumph of infantility. And that's what it's about.

3. Use animation as a magical act. Animation isn't moving about inert things but their revival. More precisely their awakening to life. Before you attempt to bring some object to life try to comprehend it. Not its utilitarian role but its inner life. Objects, particularly old ones, have witnessed all sorts of events and lives, and bear their imprint. People have touched them in different situations and with different emotions and printed into them their psychological states. If you wish to make their hidden contents visible through the use of a camera then you have to listen to them. Sometimes for several years. You have to become a collector and only then a film-maker. Reviving objects using animation must proceed naturally. It must come from the objects and not from your wishes. Never violate an object! Don't tell your own stories with the help of subjects (objects) but tell their stories.

4. Keep interchanging dream for reality and vice versa. There are no logical bridges. Between dream and reality there is only one slight physical operation: the raising and closing of eyelids. With daydreams even that is unnecessary.

5. If you are deciding which to give priority to—whether visual perspective or physical experience—then always trust the body because touch is an older sense than eyesight and its experience is more fundamental. Furthermore, the eye is pretty tired and "spoiled" in our contemporary audio-visual civilisation. The experience of the body is more authentic, not yet encumbered by aesthetics. A marker which you shouldn't lose sight of is synaesthesia.

6. The deeper you go into a fantastic plot the more you have to be realistic in detail. Here it's necessary to rely on the experience of the dream. Don't be afraid of "a boring description," pedantic obsessions, "unimportant detail," or documentary emphasis if you want to persuade the audience that everything they see in the film relates to them, that it does not concern something outside of their world but that it's about something,

without them realising it, in which they are up to their ears. And use all tricks at your disposal to convince them of this.

7. Imagination is subversive because it puts the possible up against the real. That's why always use the craziest imagination possible. Imagination is humanity's greatest gift. It is imagination that makes us human, not work. Imagination, imagination, imagination

...

8. As a matter of principle chose [*sic*] themes toward which you feel ambivalent. That ambivalence must be so strong (deep) and unshakeable that you can thread its knife-edge without falling off on one side or the other, or, as the case may be, falling off both sides at the same time. Only this way will you avoid the greatest pitfall: the film *à la thèse*.

9. Nurture creativity as a means of auto-therapy. Because this anti-aesthetic standpoint brings art nearer to the gates of freedom. If creativity has a point at all then it is only in that it liberates us. No film (painting, poem) can liberate a member of an audience if it doesn't bring this relief to the artist himself. Everything else is a thing of "general subjectivity." Art as permanent liberation.

10. Always give priority to creativity, to the continuity of the inner model or psychological automation over an idea. An idea, even the most poignant, cannot be a sufficient motive to sit behind a camera. Art isn't about stumbling from one idea to another. An idea has its place in art only at the moment when you have a fully digested topic which you wish to express. Only then will the right ideas come to the surface. An idea is part of a creative process, not an impulse towards it.

Never work, always improvise. The script is important for the producer but not for you. It's a non-binding document which you turn to only in moments when inspiration fails you. If it happens to you more than three times during the shooting of a film then it means: either you are making a "bad" film or you're finished.

Just because I've formulated The Decalogue doesn't necessarily mean I have consciously abided by it. These rules have somehow emerged from my work, they haven't preceded it. In fact, all rules are there to be broken (not circumvented). But there exists one more rule which if broken (or circumvented) is devastating for an artist: Never allow your work of art to pass into the service of anything but freedom.

YOUR FILM FARM MANIFESTO ON PROCESS CINEMA (Canada, 2012)

Philip Hoffman

[Distributed annually to participants at the beginning of the Independent Imaging Retreat.]

artful. Babylon because of Kenneth Anger's indelible linking of the word to the sordid side of Hollywood, which is the only side we'd want to see. Babylon because we can go from Michael Snow to Guy Debord to *Forbidden Zone* to secrets from the Prelinger Archives, to Vaginal Davis videos.

Formats accepted: Super-8, Regular 8, 16mm, VHS and 3/4 video, filmstrips, slide shows, performance incorporating film or video. Submit VHS preview tapes with some sort of description or statement to: P.O. Box 20900, Tompkins Sq. Station, NY, NY 10009.

We prefer queer work, experimental work, political/progressive docs, works about alternative music. We also have concerts; it's always all ages and usually \$5. Sometimes we can pay fees, but visiting makers will get a homecooked meal and can crash at the space.

Friday November 6th, 1998, 8:00 p.m., \$5

DON'T THROW FILM AWAY: THE FIAF 70th ANNIVERSARY MANIFESTO (France, 2008)

Hisashi Okajima and La *fédération internationale des archives du film* Manifesto Working Group

[First adopted by La *fédération internationale des archives du film* at its General Assembly in Paris, April 2008. Final version released September 2008, adopting recommendations from the General Assembly. First published in *Journal of Film Preservation* 77/78 (2008): 5–6.]

The FIAF manifesto is in many ways the antithesis to the pragmatism underlying Paolo Cherchi Usai's "Lindgren Manifesto," which follows. A full-throated defense of analog film in the face of the digital revolution, the FIAF manifesto makes the case that any and all film, no matter its aesthetic, political, or historical significance, ought to be saved. If Cherchi Usai is channeling the pragmatism of Ernest Lindgren, the FIAF manifesto is much more in the tradition of Henri Langlois.

Motion picture film forms an indispensable part of our cultural heritage and a unique record of our history and our daily lives. Film archives, both public and private, are the organizations responsible for acquiring, safeguarding, documenting and making films available to current and future generations for study and pleasure. The International Federation of Film Archives (FIAF) and its affiliates comprising more than 150 archives in over 77 countries have rescued over two million films in the last seventy years. However for some genres, geographical regions and periods of film history the survival rate is known

to be considerably less than 10% of the titles produced. On the occasion of its 70th anniversary, FIAF offers the world a new slogan: “DON’T THROW FILM AWAY.” If you are not sufficiently equipped to keep film yourself, then FIAF and its members will gladly help you locate an archive that is. Film is culturally irreplaceable, and can last a long time, especially in expert hands. While fully recognizing that moving image technology is currently driven by the progress achieved in the digital field, the members of FIAF are determined to *continue to acquire film and preserve it as film*. This strategy is complementary to the development of efficient methods for the preservation of the digital-born heritage. FIAF affiliates urge all those who make and look after films, whether they be professionals or amateurs, and the government officials in all nations responsible for safeguarding the world cinema heritage, to help pursue this mission. The slogan “DON’T THROW FILM AWAY” means that film must not be discarded, even though those who hold it may think they have adequately secured the content by transferring it onto a more stable film carrier or by scanning it into the digital domain at a resolution which apparently does not entail any significant loss of data. Film archives and museums are committed to preserve film on film because:

- A film is either created under the direct supervision of a filmmaker or is the record of an historical moment captured by a cameraman. Both types are potentially important artifacts and part of the world’s cultural heritage. Film is a tangible and “human-eye readable” entity which needs to be treated with great care, like other museum or historic objects.
- Although film can be physically and chemically fragile, it is a stable material that can survive for centuries, as long as it is stored and cared for appropriately. Its life expectancy has already proved much longer than moving image carriers like videotape that were developed after film. Digital information has value only if it can be interpreted, and digital information carriers are also vulnerable to physical and chemical deterioration while the hardware and software needed for interpretation are liable to obsolescence.
- Film is currently the optimal archival storage medium for moving images. It is one of the most standardized and international products available and it remains a medium with high resolution potential. The data it contains does not need regular migration nor does its operating system require frequent updating.
- The film elements held in archive vaults are the original materials from which all copies are derived. One can determine from them whether a copy is complete or not. The more digital technology is developed, the easier it will be to change or even arbitrarily alter content. Unjustified alteration or unfair distortion, however, can always be detected by comparison with the original film provided it has been properly stored.

Never throw film away, even after you think something better comes along. No matter what technologies emerge for moving images in the future, existing film copies

connect us to the achievements and certainties of the past. FILM PRINTS WILL LAST—DON'T THROW FILM AWAY.

THE LINDGREN MANIFESTO: THE FILM CURATOR OF THE FUTURE (Italy, 2010)

Paolo Cherchi Usai

[First delivered at the Ernest Lindgren Memorial Lecture, South Bank, London, 24 August 2010. First published in *Journal of Film Preservation* 84 (2011): 4. Slightly revised by the author for this publication.]

Film archivist Paolo Cherchi Usai is the senior curator of the Motion Picture Department at George Eastman House and cofounder and codirector of the Pordenone Silent Film Festival. In this manifesto, named after the founding curator of the BFI National Archive, Cherchi Usai challenges many of the sacred cows of film archiving, arguing that a pragmatic approach to archiving must develop in the face of both the *realpolitik* of contemporary State funding and the chemical and chimerical state of film stock.

1. Restoration is not possible and it is not desirable, regardless of its object or purpose. Obedience to this principle is the most responsible approach to film preservation.
2. Preserve everything is a curse to posterity. Posterity won't be grateful for sheer accumulation. Posterity wants us to make choices. It is therefore immoral to preserve everything; selecting is a virtue.
3. If film had been treated properly from the very beginning, there would be less of a need for film preservation today and citizens would have had access to a history of cinema of their choice.
4. The end of film is a good thing for cinema, both as an art and as an artifact. Stop whining.
5. If you work for a cultural institution, make knowledge with money. If you work for an industry, make money with knowledge. If you work for yourself, make both, in the order that's right for you. Decide what you want, and then say it. But don't lie.
6. A good curator will never claim to act as such. Curatorship is a pledge of unselfishness.

Choose your team carefully and honour them (never speak negatively about your colleagues)

Ban the word “compromise” (or the phrase “it will do”) (the disappointment in yourself will haunt you later)

Be prepared to work harder than anyone you are employing

Be ruthless—be ready to throw away your favourite bits (you may well be attached to what is familiar rather than what is good)

Aim beyond your limits (and help others to go beyond theirs) (the thrill of the learning curve)

When in doubt, project yourself ten years into the future and look back—what will you be proud of having done? (indecision is a lack of the longer view or wider perspective)

Practice no waste—psychic ecology—prevent brain pollution (don’t add to the proliferation of junk)

Be an anorak—keep your sense of wonder and enthusiasm (cynicism will kill your joy and motivation)

Get some sleep when you can (you wont get much later)

DIRTY DIARIES MANIFESTO (Sweden, 2009)

Mia Engberg

[First published online on the website for the film: dirtydiaries.se]

Mia Engberg’s omnibus film *Dirty Diaries* (Sweden, 2009) brings together thirteen short straight and queer porn films made by Swedish feminists. The film led to some controversy over the use of public funds to produce pornography after the Swedish Film Institute funded the film to a total of 500,000 kr. In a similar manner to “Puzzy Power,” all of the *Dirty Diaries* shorts follow a series of statements of principles. Unlike Dogme ’95 the *Dirty Diaries* manifesto does not dictate a style so much as a feminist, queer positive philosophy of sexual representation.

1. BEAUTIFUL THE WAY WE ARE

To hell with the sick beauty ideals! Deep self-hatred keeps a lot of women's energy and creativity sapped. The energy that could be focused into exploring our own sexuality and power is being drained off into diets and cosmetics. Don't let the commercial powers control your needs and desires.

2. FIGHT FOR YOUR RIGHT TO BE HORNY

Male sexuality is seen as a force of nature that has to be satisfied at all costs while women's sexuality is accepted only if it adapts to men's needs. Be horny on your own terms.

3. A GOOD GIRL IS A BAD GIRL

We are fed up with the cultural cliché that sexually active and independent women are either crazy or lesbian and therefore crazy. We want to see and make movies where Betty Blue, Ophelia and Thelma & Louise don't have to die in the end.

4. SMASH CAPITALISM AND PATRIARCHY

The porn industry is sexist because we live in a patriarchal capitalist society. It makes profit out of people's needs for sex and erotica and women get exploited in the process. To fight sexist porn you have to smash capitalism and patriarchy.

5. AS NASTY AS WE WANNA BE

Enjoy, take charge or let go. Say NO when you want, to be able to say YES when YOU want.

6. LEGAL AND FREE ABORTION IS A HUMAN RIGHT!

Everyone has the right to control their own body. Millions of women suffer from unwanted pregnancies and die from illegal abortions every year. Fuck the moral right for preaching against birth control and sex information.

7. FIGHT THE REAL ENEMY!

Censorship cannot liberate sexuality. It is impossible to change the image of women's sexuality if sexual images in themselves are taboo. Don't attack women for displaying sex. Attack sexism for trying to control our sexuality.

8. STAY QUEER

A lot of opposition to erotica is homophobic and even more transphobic. We don't believe in the fight between the sexes but in the fight against sexes. Identify as any gender you want and make love to whoever you want. Sexuality is diverse.

9. USE PROTECTION

"I'm not saying go out an' do it, but if you do, strap it up before you smack it up." (Missy Elliott)

10. DO IT YOURSELF

Erotica is good and we need it. We truly believe that it is possible to create an alternative to the mainstream porn industry by making sexy films we like.