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Chapter 1

Berlin and the Spatial Reconfiguration of Festivals: From European Showcases to International Film Festival Circuit
"The practice of organising special screenings for East Berliners on the border ended with the construction of the Wall..." p. 65

Figure 3: *The last Berlinale before the city was divided.* © 1961, Internationale Filmfestspiele Berlin, Press Office.
Chapter 1

Berlin and the Spatial Reconfiguration of Festivals: From European Showcases to International Film Festival Circuit

1.1 Introduction

It is Wednesday 2 pm on 12 February 2003 when an audience of young film talents and cinephiles expectantly await the arrival of Thomas Vinterberg in the theatre of the Haus der Kulturen der Welt (House of World Cultures) in Berlin. The occasion is the first edition of the Berlinale Talent Campus; for five days the campus offers 500 selected up-and-coming film talents the opportunity to exchange experiences with each other and professionals, meet various organisations and institutions, and show and watch films. Thomas Vinterberg, director of FESTEN/THE CELEBRATION (Denmark/Sweden: 1998), will speak about the process involved in developing his new international feature IT’S ALL ABOUT LOVE (USA/Japan/Sweden/UK/Denmark/Germany/Netherlands: 2003) in one of the Script Factory Masterclasses. He is joined by co-writer Mogen Rukov, with whom he also collaborated on FESTEN. When they enter the auditorium at 2:20 pm, the audience gives them an overwhelming applause. Vinterberg performs a Chaplin bow.

IT’S ALL ABOUT LOVE is not a Dogme film. Instead, the Dogme rules are reversed. Vinterberg explains how the Dogme rules, which he drew up with Lars von Trier in 1995, provided him with the necessary creative energy for writing and directing FESTEN. In order to maintain this type of inspiration he felt the need to make another courageous move: to the extreme opposite side of the manifesto that had made him successful. As a result, the movie is set in the near future (the year 2021); the visual style is inspired by Technicolor and old Hitchcock movies; its setting New York was recreated in the film studios in Trollhättan, Sweden, at various locations in Copenhagen, and with the support of digital techniques; Polish-born composer Zbigniew Preisner, internationally acclaimed for his work with Krzysztof Kieslowski, was attracted to compose the musical score; and Vinterberg travelled from Scandinavia to Uganda in pursuit of the appropriate location. The story follows John (Joaquin Phoenix) and world-famous ice-skater Elena (Claire Danes), a married couple who, on the verge of a divorce, discover that they
are still in love. In the Script Factory Masterclass the first couple of minutes of
the film are shown. We see John travel to a New York airport to meet his wife
and sign divorce papers before embarking on a transfer flight, which will
bring him to his business destination. Instead of meeting Elena, John is met by
Arthur and George, who inform him that she insists on meeting him at her
hotel in the city. John agrees and follows the two men. Descending an
escalator towards the airport exit, he sees a dead man lying at the bottom. He
is even more astonished when Arthur and George tell him to ignore the man
and just step over the body.

*IT'S ALL ABOUT LOVE* is a report on the state of the world. Vinterberg
and Rukov started writing the script in 2000 and finished it one-and-a-half
years later. The major inspiration for the script was formed by Vinterberg’s
experiences in the period after the world-wide success of *FESTEN*. Vinterberg
explains: “I got to observe the cosmopolitan club that seems to live in the sky,
and realised that you could be in Budapest in the morning, have lunch in
London, and go to bed in Venice. I saw a world in motion, a world in which
individuals moved this way and that without belonging anywhere in
particular at all. It is a whole new way of life, which increasingly applies to
the everyday life of modern man. People are constantly on the move. They
have meetings. They go to see their boyfriends or girlfriends with whom they
don’t live. They drop their children off at kindergartens and nurseries and
pick them up later. They have conference calls and express their love in text
messages over cell phones. I particularly felt this constant motion after *FESTEN*
when I was away from my children and my wife. That experience was both
fantastic and disheartening.”* FESTEN was a major film festival discovery and
a world-wide hit. When it won the Prix Spécial du Jury in Cannes in 1998, the
Dogme95 movement acquired world-wide recognition and Thomas
Vinterberg established his name as new auteur. Subsequently, he travelled the
world, visited festivals, and promoted the film, Dogme and himself. In his
new feature, Vinterberg expresses the dangers of living this kind of modern
life in motion. His world of 2021 is out of balance. Bizarre natural disasters
take place. People die on the street from lack of proximate love. The choice for
art-deco-styled interiors is a conscious statement about the future: it indicates
that for a true understanding of love we should remember the glorious days
of genuine articles and individual artisanship instead of focusing on the
coming age of clones and worldwide branding. The airport at the opening
sequence is used as ultimate metaphor for the nomadic existence of
(post)modern man. Vinterberg accompanies his new feature to several
festivals, including Berlin, and thereby returns to the platform that inspired
him to tell this particular love story: the international film festival circuit.

This chapter will reconstruct the development of the international film
festival circuit from its origin on the European mainland. I will start by
locating the first initiatives to found film festivals within the heart of
European geopolitical power play as exercised in the periods anticipating and
directly following World War II, and distinguish between three key phases in
festival history. In what follows, the International Film Festival Berlin will
assume a central position. With its peculiar context of being located in the solaris plexus of the Cold War, the Berlinale provides us with an excellent case study of the geopolitical influences on the transformation of the film festival phenomenon from the early European cultural showcases to the contemporary international film festival circuit. The chapter will revolve around three important threads. The leading argumentation concerns the spatial reconfiguration of film festivals and deals with the effects of the declining role of nation states in favour of new global networks of power. The second thread picks up on the discourse of cities gaining in importance in terms of the globalisation of the world market. The mutually-beneficial relation between the Berlinale and the city of Berlin will be explored. In addition, the chapter gives a foretaste of the economic perspective of chapter two by drawing the condition of the post-war German film industry. Throughout all threads, the emphasis is largely on the festival organisation. I will investigate how festival decisions relate and respond to the larger geopolitical agendas that are played out through the Berlinale. Other actors on the festival scene – journalists, film professionals, filmmakers and visitors – will take more dominant roles in later chapters.

1.2 Founding the First Festivals: hidden agendas

Film festivals started as a European phenomenon. The first festival was organised on New Year’s Day 1898 in Monaco. Other festivals followed in Torino, Milan and Palermo (Italy), Hamburg (Germany) and Prague (Czechoslovakia). The first prize-winning festival was an Italian movie contest in 1907, organised by the Lumière brothers. On 6 August 1932, at 9:15 pm, Rouben Mamoulian’s DR. JEKYLL AND MR. HYDE (USA: 1931) opened a major festival on the terrace of Hotel Excelsior in Venice. “La Mostra Internazionale d’Arte Cinematographico” was the first film festival to be organised on a regular basis (biannually until 1935). The film festival was established as part of the Arts Biënnale, which had been created in 1885. Initially the international film community reacted enthusiastically to the initiative. Louis Lumière graciously accepted a position in the Committee of Honour of the festival. Soon, however, the darker sides of the event came to the fore. Politically, the foundation of the Mostra had strong support from the fascist government – from Mussolini’s brother, who was head of the Italian film industry since 1926, and from Mussolini himself. Mussolini believed that, with the film festival, he would have a powerful international instrument for the legitimisation of the national identity of Fascism at his disposal. His finance minister and personal friend Count Giuseppe Volpi Di Misurate had been appointed president of the Biennale in 1930 by the government. As Francesco Bono argues: “Conseguentemente – come nota Enzo Scotto Lavina – la Biennale venne a perdere quell’autonomia di cui prima godeva e il potere di controllo su essa slittò da Venezia a Roma – e di questo sarà necessario tenere cotto nella valutazione dei rapporti tra la Mostra del cinema e la politica fascista –, ma in contropartita il governo assicurava all’esposizione
During the first festival edition, the fascist influence was not yet apparent. However, when Goebbels attended the festival in 1936 as an honoured guest, the role of the Venice film festival as consolidator of the ideological and cultural position of the Fascist party was unmistakable. In 1938, the great prize, the Mussolini cup, was awarded ex aequo to OLYMPIA (Germany: Leni Riefenstahl 1938) and LUCIANO SERRA, PILOT/ LUCIANO SERRA, PILOT (Italy: Goffredo Allessandrini 1938), which had been produced by Mussolini’s son Vittorio. The American favourite, the first feature animation SNOW WHITE AND THE SEVEN DWARFS (USA: 1937), merely received a consolidation prize. This display of loyalty towards Hitler’s Germany and Mussolini’s Italy pushed the dissatisfaction of other participating countries to a climax and led the French, British and Americans to join forces and found a counter-festival in Cannes.

In an interview for the MoMA exhibition “Cannes 45 Years: Festival International du Film,” Gilles Jacob, Cannes president at the time, recalls the course of history leading to the establishment of the film festival in Cannes:

On the night train back from Venice to Paris on September 3rd, 1938, critic René Jeanne and Philippe Erlanger, a young civil servant and future historian, hatched the idea of a truly international film exhibition that would serve as more than just propaganda for dictators. Back in Paris, Jeanne and Erlanger, who had gone to Venice as representatives of Jean Zay, the French Minister of Public Education and Fine Arts, spoke with Georges Huisman, Executive Director of Fine Arts. Huisman submitted the proposal to the Cabinet of Ministers, who approved it. Harold Smith, the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America representative in Paris, and Neville Kearney, a British cinema emissary, were contracted and signed on immediately. On June 24, 1939, the establishment of the first film festival at Cannes, to be held between September 1st and 20th at the Municipal Casino, was announced in Paris. Other locations - Biarritz, Vichy and Algiers - had been rejected and Cannes ultimately chosen for its sunshine and “enchanting milieu.”

The first festival in Cannes was scheduled to take place between 1 - 20 September 1939. On September 1st, however, Hitler invaded Poland and France called for a general mobilisation. Though one of the American entries

---

1 "As a result – as Enzo Scotto Lavina has remarked – the Biennale lost its former autonomy, and the control power over it shifted from Venice to Rome – one will have to keep it in mind when evaluating the relations between the Venice Cinema Festival and Fascist politics – but in return the government ensured the exhibition official character, stability and consensus within the cultural framework of Fascist regime". Bono, Francesco. “La Mostra del cinema di Venezia: nascita e sviluppo nell’anteguerre (1932-1939).” Storia Contemporanea, vol. Xxii, no. 3 (August 1991): 513-549; 514.
for the festival – THE HUNCHBACK OF NOTRE DAME (USA: William Dieterle 1939) – was screened, the festival as a whole was cancelled due to the outbreak of World War II. The first true festival in Cannes took place after the war in 1946, from 20 September - 5 October, at the Municipal Casino. The French government and film industry had invited nineteen countries to participate. It became one of the most festive immediate post-war events. American productions from the six previous years – prevented from getting a European release because of the war – were triumphantly shown. There were gala events, receptions, and grand parties organised alongside the film programme. Even the French Premier-President George Bidault threw a party at Cannes. Moreover, in a strong contrast with the future development of the festival, competition was not at the core of Cannes in 1946. It was a rendezvous. Almost every participating country received a prize of some kind. In retrospect, it is not surprising that, in the midst of vehement post-war sentiments, the revelation of the 1946 festival was the anti-fascist ROMA, CITTÀ APERTA (Italy: Roberto Rossellini 1946).

The immediate post-war period offers Europe its first festival boom. Film festivals are a purely European phenomenon in this period and more and more countries decide to follow the example of Venice and Cannes, and found their own festival. Events are organised, among others, in Locarno (1946), Karlovy Vary (1946), Edinburgh (1946), Brussels (1947), Berlin (1951), and Oberhausen (1954). Like the first festival in Venice, all these festivals were established for a combination of economic, political and cultural reasons. After World War II, the domination of the American motion picture industry had grown even stronger. The film festivals in Europe offered opportunities to show movies from other countries than the United States and payed special attention to the national production of the country where the festival was organised. The foundation of the Berlinale in 1951 provides us with an interesting case study. It can be seen, on the one hand, as a reaction to the crisis in the German film industry, and, on the other, as a result of the strategic American involvement in Germany’s cultural affairs after World War II. In the next two subchapters I will first discuss the economic, and then the geopolitical agenda behind the foundation of the international film festival in Berlin.

1.2.1 Crisis in the German Film Industry
The German film industry was in a deep crisis when the decision to found a film festival in Berlin was made in 1950. The situation in Berlin, in particular, was not very promising. To understand the gravity and impact of the condition of the post-war German film industry I will begin by drawing a quick overview of its previous prosperous position in Europe during the Weimar Republic (1919-1933) and the Nazi era (1933-1945). Although Weimar cinema is best remembered for its artistic heritage of German Expressionism (e.g. DAS KABINET DES DR. CALIGARI (Germany: Robert Wiene 1920)), it also continued the tradition of Wilhelmine cinema (1895-1919), with popular genre-productions. Popular Weimar cinema included the genres of historical
dramas, the mountain film, chamber film play and street film. It is important to remark that not only popular cinema, but also art cinema was commercially viable at that time: while the popular cinema topped box offices at home (especially with revenues from the big budget costume dramas) and led to product differentiation at UFA (Universumfilm Aktiengesellschaft, founded in 1917) and other major film studios, the art cinema scored international successes and contributed to the artistic reputation of German cinema abroad. UFA’s strategy was based on two pillars: as Sabine Hake writes, “to protect its domestic interests against the growing influx of American films and to contribute to the development of a European alternative to the feared American cultural hegemony. This strategy included building the elaborate distribution and exhibition networks that, by the mid-1920s, made UFA the only serious competitor for the Hollywood majors on European markets.”

In addition to building distribution and exhibition networks, UFA consolidated its position in Germany by means of acquisitions (e.g. Messter and Union studios in Berlin), mergers (e.g. DECLA-Bioscop) and expanding its business to publishing film books and magazines. In Europe, the German film industry acquired a leading position with its successful UFA Babelsberg studios in Berlin, which, under the management of producer Erich Pommer, provided a strong model for European film production that was based on creative freedom, innovative set design, high technical standards and artistic excellence (e.g. METROPOLIS (Germany: Fritz Lang 1927)). Talents from all over Europe wanted to participate in this successful model and help realise the European dream of a common international film language (Film Europe). They all flocked to Babelsberg. In the 1920s, the UFA studios were frequently let out to French and British production companies. With the introduction of sound, co-productions and border crossings received a first blow. The rise to power of National Socialism in 1933, at the time put a definitive end to the practices of collaboration and replaced them with strategies of nationalist propaganda. Berlin’s position changed from Europe’s cinematic meeting point and melting pot of talents to the headquarters of a politics of cultural isolationism and national expansionism. In March 1933 the film industry fell under the control of the new Minister for Popular Enlightenment and Propaganda, Joseph Goebbels. He exercised complete influence by means of employment policy, censorship rules and economic control mechanisms. Both production and consumption of German movies under the Third Reich was immense. The average cost for making movies doubled between 1933 (RM 250,000) and 1937 (RM 537,000). The severe losses of UFA were simply solved by acquisition of UFA stock by the state, consolidating state control even further. Initially, the export of German films dropped, but as more territories were conquered by Hitler’s army, cinema followed in its footsteps. By the early 1940s the German film industry had become the country’s fourth-largest industry.

After the capitulation in 1945, the flourishing period of the German film industry came to an abrupt end. The allied forces strongly opposed the vertical organisation of UFA Film, which – realised in 1942 – had meant a
transformation of the German film industrial landscape into one governmental monopoly controlled by Goebbels’ Ministry of Propaganda. The Americans followed a double strategy. On the one hand, “[t]he Information Control Division (ICD) of the US Army [...] treated the rebuilding of cinema as a project of political re-education.” There were obligatory screenings of DIE TODESMÜHLEN/DEATH MILLS (USA: Hans Burger 1945) about the Nazi concentration camps and, in addition, lots of old 1930s Hollywood films were imported. On the other hand, the Americans strove for discontinuance of the Nazi industrial-political cartel. Instead, they wanted to introduce their own institutional structures and practices. This was a time-consuming process. The Soviets, on the contrary, had already approved the foundation of the Deutsche Film AG (DEFA) in May 1946. DEFA was the first German film studio to resume production in Babelsberg under close supervision of the Soviet cultural officers. With the beginning of the Cold War, the tensions between the ideological visions for rebuilding Germany culminated in the Berlin Blockade in 1948 and the founding of two separate German states in 1949. From then on, the project of rebuilding the German film industry followed two distinct models: whereas the Soviets transformed DEFA in East Germany to a state-owned company, the UFA Liquidation Committee set out to dismantle the hierarchically-organised production facilities, distribution companies and cinema theatres in the West. As a result, the old studio facilities in the West were initially only used rarely. The process of implementing the American model in Germany started with the foundation of the German Motion Picture Association, the SPIO (Spitzenorganisation der deutschen Filmindustrie/-wirtschaft) in 1949. The SPIO initiated an agency for voluntary self-control, modelled after the strict practices of the MPPDA (Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America) and was in charge of the selection of German entries for national and international film festivals. Throughout the 1950s, federal laws and agencies were introduced in order to streamline the German cinema along the lines of the political anti-Communism project. Film distribution companies acquired market dominance by showing Hollywood films and UFA film classics that were recoded as innocent entertainment. For the German film production companies, however, the crisis was more persistent. Especially in Berlin, the situation remained difficult for a long time. Many Berlin studios had been destroyed, severely damaged or plundered. There was a severe lack of material and facilities. Film professionals were unaware of new techniques and styles. In addition, the Berlin Blockade had been in favour of the cultural and film industries in Munich, Hamburg, Wiesbaden and Düsseldorf. In this situation of film-industrial crisis, the geopolitical decision to found an international film festival in Berlin was a welcome opportunity for the Berlin government and artists to rejuvenate their rich cinema traditions and once more turn Berlin into a cinema capital. For the German film industry, the reestablishment of international cultural prestige also offered a chance to regain some of its leading position in the European cinema scene. However, as we shall see in subchapter 1.3, the various nationalist agendas of European
film festivals prohibited a return to the productive combination of economic viability, cultural experimentation and cosmopolitan co-operation that had characterised the Weimar model in the 1920s.

1.2.2 The Berlinale: the Western cultural showcase in the East
The Berlinale was more than welcome as a cultural injection to help the German professionals (and in particular the Berliners) to re-build a film industry. The most important reason, however, to found an international film festival in Berlin was not economic, but geopolitical. The festival can be seen as one of America’s pawns in the great Cold War battle against the Russians and Communism. Most historic sources credit the American film officer Oscar Martay (from the Information Services Branch of the Office of the US High Commissioner for Germany) for taking the decisive initiative behind the Berlin film festival. In 1950 he appointed a preliminary committee to conduct research on the possibility of a festival and then make preparations for a film event in the Western part of the city of Berlin. The festival organisation was to collaborate with the Bonn government, American officials; and other allies in occupied Berlin. The choice for West Berlin as location for the festival, encapsulated in the Soviet dominated Deutsche Demokratische Republik (DDR), revealed the initiative as a strategic move. According to Heidi Fehrenbach: “Berlin became an important symbol of West Germany’s democratic renewal. The festival was conceived as a way to revive the former capital’s interwar reputation as an important European cultural centre; and ultimately American and West German officials expected the image of a revitalized Berlin to serve as proof of Western economic superiority and cultural dynamism.” The first festival in Berlin took place from 6 - 18 June 1951. The festival functioned in several ways as an American instrument in the Cold War. Firstly there was the exclusion of movies from socialist countries. The Berlinale had started – as all festivals of the period – as showcase of national cinemas and used conventional diplomatic channels to invite nations. In the Cold War, the diplomatic channels to Eastern European countries and the Soviet Union were cut off. It was a deliberate choice not to make exceptions for festival invitations. The following example of political forces at work is symptomatic of the first two decades of the festival. The preliminary committee, assembled by Martay, conferred in 1950 on the topic of invitation and representation and decided to exclude Eastern European countries from invitation with a majority vote of seven (out of nine). At the same time, the representation was limited to one or two movies per invited country. There were, however, two exceptions for this: America and England, who could each send in three movies. Not surprisingly, both allied film officers were part of the committee that suggested the exception. The second way in which the festival manifested itself as Western cultural showcase in the East was the use of border theatres. On the border with the Soviet section and East Germany, twenty-one cinema theatres were selected as extra locations for festival screenings. Prices were low and border areas were covered with posters advertising the festival.
Proximity, price and promotion had to make a festival visit for the East Berliners easy and attractive. All these measures were taken to promote the Western world and Western values in the East. In addition, the month of June was deliberately chosen for the festival, because, in the same month, an International Youth Festival would be held in East Berlin (1951). The Berlin festival was intended both as counterweight to this manifestation and as alternative attraction for the East Berliners. The practice of organising special screenings for East Berliners on the border ended with the construction of the Wall on 13 August 1961. In order to restore the connection with the East – Berliners, the festival decided, in 1963, to broadcast a festival film six evenings in a row. With the militaristic name for this series - TV bridge- their political function was underlined.

In the 1950s and early 1960s, the festival in Berlin stood clearly apart from its predecessors in the South. Whereas Venice – restarted in 1946 – and Cannes relied partly on their quality as a sun and fun tourist destination to attract visitors, the bombed city of Berlin and its peculiar position as former capital of the now divided Germany could not use such light-hearted characteristics for its promotion. Instead, the political and ideological message was placed in the spotlights. Dr. Alfred Bauer, a film historian and film consultant to the British military government in the immediate post-war period (and Reichsfilmintendanz in Hitler Germany), was appointed festival director.\(^90\) He explicitly refers to the political importance of the event when applying for additional funding in a letter to Oscar Martay: ‘Für die Finanzierung der Filmfestspiele Berlin 1951, denen als kulturpolitischen wichtige Schaufensterveranstaltung des westlichen Films gegenüber dem Osten eine besondere Bedeutung zukommt, stehen lediglich 40.000.—DM zur Verfügung, die aus Mitteln der Stadt Berlin gegeben wurden. Wenn die Filmfestspiele ein Erfolg werden und ihren politischen Zweck erfüllen sollen, muss noch eine Subvention von mindestens 100.000.—DM zur Verfügung gestellt werden.”\(^91\) The Berlinale began as propaganda under American occupation. Or, in the words of Fehrenbach, the Berlin Film Festival was “the epicenter of Cold War topography”, “a celebration of Western values” and “the Western cultural showcase in the East.\(^91\)

1.3 Post-war Europe and Theories of the Nation

Le Secrétariat Général du FESTIVAL INTERNATIONAL DU FILM tient à préciser que la participation de tous les pays au Festival de

\(^{90}\) “For the financing of the Film Festival Berlin 1951 – as an important cultural-political event to showcase Western films to the East of special significance – only DM 40,000 are available, provided from funds by the city of Berlin. If the festival is to become a success to fulfill its political objective, a subsidy of at least DM 100,000 must be made available.” Fehrenbach.

The first festival boom in the immediate post-war period was confined to the European continent. Although each film festival was founded for specific local and national interests, the question remains why all these initiatives were concentrated in Europe. Why was the European ground so fertile for the birth and development of the film festival phenomenon? Which incentives were shared between the European countries to cause this simultaneous turn to international festivals? And how did this affect the structure of the first international festivals? To answer these questions it is necessary to consider the general condition and organisation of Europe as well as the specific circumstances of European cinemas. The former perspective will bring me to the concept of the nation-state in 1.3.1. The second will lead me, in 1.3.2, to discuss the American domination of the global film market and its relation to European cinemas and various film-theoretical reflections on the matter. I want to use both perspectives to explain why the first international film festivals emerged in Europe and assumed the form of showcases of national cinemas.

Initially it was common for festivals to invite nations for participation in showcases and competitions, upon which the national committees would select the films to be entered. Festivals could exercise some influence, for example by imposing a quota on the number of movies to be entered according to numbers of national production (Festival de Cannes), or by excluding certain countries from participation (Berlinale). The form of various showcases existing next to each other was, however, neither uncontested nor unproblematic. The international organisation of national film producer associations, FIAPF (Fédération Internationale des Producteurs des Films) was displeased with the unorganised growth of film festivals in Europe. In 1951 it designed a plan that involved the replacement of the expanding group of national and regional film festivals with one global contest. The intention was to create an annual “Olympics of Film.” Officials in Cannes and Venice, however, vetoed the proposal, which would take away the cultural and economic benefits of their respective festivals. They proposed an alternative system of classification based on hierarchy. This system would give the FIAPF members clarity on which festivals were most worth visiting. As only Cannes and Venice received the highest recognition in the early 1950s, their position was strengthened even further. Being in category “A” granted them the right to form an international jury for their prestigious awards. The power of these major festivals was far-reaching. For the first Berlinale edition in 1951, both

---

iii “The General Secretary of the International Film Festival would like to specify that the participation of all countries in the Festival of Cannes will be based on the production volume of each of these countries, and similar to all.” Quoted from the festival press release in 1949 in: Billard, Pierre, Le Festival de Cannes: D’or et de palmes, Découvertes Gallimard: Paris, 1997: 27.
France and Italy had refused to participate in any event that resembled their official programme. Festival director Bauer yielded and formed a German instead of an international jury to judge over categories distinctive from the ones used in the “A” festivals. In the midst of the discussion of creating an “Olympics of Film,” the FIAPF held its general assembly at the Biennale on 4 September 1951. During the meeting it was ordained that all members should request their governments and interest groups to join forces and prevent new film festivals from starting any new international film competitions. Only Cannes – to be held in April – and Venice – to be held in August – were recognised by the organisation. Furthermore, the members were instructed to refrain from participation in events that would violate the FIAPF regulations and offer an international competition. Having been put under pressure by this, the Berlinale resorted to awarding audience awards in 1952. The German representative in the FIAPF, Dr. Günter Schwarz, lobbied in favour of the festival in Berlin and, by foregrounding its distinct status as both a democratic and “serious” or “working” festival in contrast to the glitter of Venice and Cannes, he was able to receive FIAPF approval for the Berlinale (provided that it was organised without jury and without official prizes). In 1956 the festival was granted the “A” status and, for the first time, formed an international jury to award the Golden and Silver Bears.

The decision not to replace the existing format with various film festivals in different countries with one big international event laid the foundation for one of the most defining elements in the competition between film festivals: the festival calendar. In what period a festival is organised and how these dates position the festival in relation to other events on the festival calendar is of decisive importance for the festival’s success, ranking and profile. Initially, the FIAPF prohibited festivals from succeeding one another too rapidly. When Cannes decided to hold its 1955 edition from 25 April to 10 May, the Berlin Filmfestspiele was forced to change its dates (planned for 18-29 June) without approaching Venice too closely. An agreement was reached for the period from 24 June till 5 July. Throughout the 1950s, 1960s and most of the 1970s, this time slot was respected, but heavily debated. Especially the festival’s positioning just after Cannes fed arguments in favour of moving the event forward on the festival calendar; in winter the festival would have a better supply of movies at its disposal. Whereas a proposal by Bauer to reschedule the festival to March had been voted down in 1974, a similar plan by the new festival director Wolf Donner (1976-1979) was approved in 1978. Donner argued that the expansion of the Film Market (Filmmesse) would benefit from the earlier time slot. If positioned outside of the influence of the other major film markets in Cannes (May) and Milan (MIFED - October), film professionals would be drawn to Berlin and able to release newly purchased features directly (without having to consider a summer stop). It was the repositioning of the Berlinale as a significant player on the global film industry scene that acquired the necessary consent for a repositioning on the festival calendar. From 1978 onwards, the Berlinale took place in winter, first
in late February / beginning March, but soon – under pressure of Cannes and the FIAPF – in the beginning of February.

In the next section I will show that the decision of 1951, which allowed different countries to organise their own international film festival as a showcase for national cinemas, was routed in the European ideal of national sovereignty. The decision was followed by the constitution of a set of FIAPF rules and regulations, but the dominant role for national committees in the selection procedures for festival films in competition continued to be a potential source of conflict between participating nations.

1.3.1 Festivals and the Sovereign Nations: international relations and regulations

Numerous theories have dealt with the construction of the nation-state in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century as a determining factor in the structure and development of European modernity. After centuries of royal, feudal and ecclesiastical rule it was the turn of the nation-state to provide coherence and maintain order both in the European countries and their colonised territories. International relations were formalised, legal conventions were established and the number of agencies concerned with international and transnational regulation and communication increased rapidly. The distinction between nationalism and internationalism settled in the second half of the eighteenth century. As some critically argued, the concept of the nation completed the notion of sovereignty by claiming to precede it. Likewise, the concept of the people completed the notion of the nation by making the identity of the people appear natural.6 From the late eighteenth century onwards, European nations displayed various activities in order to construct such “natural” acceptance of their nations and its peoples. All nations emphasised their sovereignty by creating currencies, writing legislations, organising constitutions, and profiling their nation whenever possible. International expositions, great exhibitions and world fairs, as well as the Olympic Games and the Nobel prizes were important occasions where nations could present themselves as unified bodies clearly distinguished from other nations. The greater the nations’ showcased achievements, the better their position in the new European constellation of power was served. Culture proved an excellent area to be appropriated by nationalist agendas. The competitions between national products and representatives created a reservoir filled with examples of national distinction and heritage. Cinema, too, became an object for international competition and, thus, film festivals can be seen as part of the modern project in which European nations used the concept of the nation to guard their sovereignty. The most important incentive that was shared between the European nations, and which generated the first boom in film festivals in the immediate post-war period, concerns the devastating effects of World War II: the traumatised European nations were eager to develop initiatives that would help them to regain a proud national identity. Nation-states would continue to play a dominant role
until the reorganisation of the film festival format at the end of the 1960s and beginning of 1970s.

Because film festivals were discovered as effective means of national distinction, they also provided ample opportunity for diplomatic disputes. Maintaining good international relations was one of the objectives of the FIAPF regulations, so one of their rules prohibited the screening of films that were harmful to the feelings of other nations. Indeed, nations did not only control the entries of their own country, they also anxiously kept an eye on the entries from other nations. The festivals were often sites for diplomatic considerations and disputes. For the 1951 edition in Cannes, the USSR tried to boycott DIE VIER IM JEEP/FOUR IN A JEEP (Switzerland: Leopold Lindtberg and Elizabeth Montagu 1951). The United States protested in 1953 against the Japanese competition entry GEMBAKU NO KO/THE CHILDREN OF HIRSOHIMA (Japan: Kaneto Shindō 1952). Both protests were in vain. In 1956 diplomatic disputes reached another height when the festival in Cannes refused to accept HIMMEL OHNE STERNE (West Germany: Helmut Käutner 1955) and the German government, in its turn, blocked the screening of Alain Resnais' Auschwitz documentary NUIT ET BROUILLARD (France: 1956). In the same year, Japan demanded the retreat of TOWN LIKE ALICE (UK: Jack Lee 1956), a British caricature on Japanese soldiers in Malaysia.

Besides putting diplomatic pressure on festivals to refuse unflattering films or films with unwelcome messages, nations had other tools to foreground favoured visions. One way was to support the presence of a national cinema at the festival with receptions, dinners, parties or other pr activities. Especially in Cannes – pr centre of the film world – nations would splash out with lavish events. A second way to safeguard sufficient attention for favoured visions or specific national cinemas was to found a new festival. As explained earlier, the festivals of Cannes and Berlin were founded with clear ideological agendas and concern for national interests. Another interesting example is Karlovy Vary. Karlovy Vary – located in the beautiful spa environment of the former state of Czechoslovakia – is the oldest film festival in Eastern Europe. The main motivation for founding the festival was the nationalization of the Czechoslovakian film industry in 1946. The first festival in 1946 had entries from the nationalised industry and countries with a strong filmmaking tradition, such as America, France, England, and Sweden. When the communists took over the Czechoslovakian government in February 1948, the festival underwent a political and ideological makeover, which would dominate the organisation until the great social and political changes that followed after November 1989. The festival recalls this period on the website as follows: “[T]he changeable political climate, closely tied to the international situation and political developments in society, was reflected each year in the festival program, in the conferral of awards, and in the selection of the guests. The program was put together with an awareness of the propagandistic strength of film and the importance of this medium as a tool in the ideological struggle against the West.” The conferral of awards was a most efficient mechanism in confirming the hierarchy in the communist
world. The Grand Prix would mostly be awarded to a movie from the USSR or Czechoslovakia. Because this practice did not correspond with the communist doctrine of equality, there was an abundance of special awards at Karlovy Vary, which ensured that no movie from a socialist or developing country would go home empty-handed. These awards carried names like “the peace and work award,” “the award for the struggle for freedom or social progress,” “the award for friendship between nations,” and “the award for the struggle towards a better world.” When, in 1959, an international film festival was established in Moscow, the Soviet diplomatic dominance became apparent once more. The Moscow International Film Festival was granted the FIAPF category “A” straight away. The political decision to have only one “A” festival every year among the socialist countries soon followed. Therefore, Karlovy Vary and Moscow IFF became biannual events, each taking turns in organising a film festival between 1959 and 1993.

1.3.2 European Cinemas and Hollywood
The nationalist projects of the European nation-states were not the only raison d'etre behind the first international film festivals. A second explanation for why Europe was the cradle of the film festival phenomenon can be found in the American domination of the global film market, both in the economic and cultural sense, and Europe’s subsequent struggle to protect its film industries and cultures. The American domination of European cinemas is heavily debated and frequently analysed. I agree with Geoffrey Nowell-Smith when he writes that “American films have dominated the European market since the end of the First World War. They have done so for a variety of reasons, ranging from more efficient business practices to sheer popular appeal.”

Since the mid-1920s, various European nations reacted with measures for protection and stimulation of their own national film industries. The German Weimar model was a successful attempt at resisting the American hegemony. The introduction of sound to the cinema, however, weakened the European cinemas. After World War II, they were even more vulnerable. American productions, including the ones held back during the war, flooded European cinemas. The combination of aggressive business strategies and the attraction of the new, promising and uncontaminated culture of the continent’s liberator caused a deep penetration of the European film market that could not be overcome by traditional measures. Film festivals emerged at a moment when the European film industries were in no position to stand up to the American cartels. What they did was side-step the system by offering their European films a chance for prestigious exposure outside of the commercial chain of distribution companies and exhibition venues. Inadvertently, the seed was sown for an alternative network that could challenge the hegemony of the American studio system on the global film market.

The first European film festivals, however, did not merely use the festivals as a platform for their oppressed national cinemas, but also imported Hollywood techniques to enhance their profile. They relied heavily on the glamour and presence of American (studio system) stars to make the events
more attractive, prestigious and popular. As I have argued in the introduction chapter, the success of the international film festivals has benefited from its ambiguous relation with Hollywood, both countering and emulating its practices. The Berlinale was glamorised with visits by Gary Cooper, Billy Wilder, Bob Hope, Trevor Howard, Errol Flynn and Patricia Wymore in the 1950s. In 1958 Walt Disney received the porcelain Bear from major Willy Brandt. During festivals many enthusiastic Berliners would gather in the streets to catch a glimpse of their idols and try to secure autographs. Until today a major festival like Berlin makes great efforts to attract movie celebrities, because the media that follow in their wake provide essential media coverage (see chapter three). By highlighting some trivia from the 2003 festival edition, the intricate relationship between the Berlinale and Hollywood becomes clear. In 2003 the Berlinale was visited by stars such as Nicole Kidman – THE HOURS (USA: Stephen Daldry 2002), Richard Gere, Renée Zelwegger, Catherina Zeta-Jones – CHICAGO (USA/Germany: Rob Marshall 2002), Edward Norton, Spike Lee – THE 25TH HOUR (USA: Spike Lee 2002), Daniel D. Lewis GANGS OF NEW YORK (USA/Germany/Italy/UK/Netherlands: Martin Scorsese 2002) and George Clooney SOLARIS (USA: Steven Soderbergh 2002). The presence of these stars was not only beneficial to the festival, but also suited the marketing strategies of the movies these stars carried. CHICAGO was the opening movie in Berlin and had its European première at the festival. GANGS OF NEW YORK, the closing film, was a German première. The competition film THE HOURS (European première) was allotted the Silver Bear for Best Actress for the ensemble of Nicole Kidman, Julianne Moore and Meryl Streep. The prestige of the festival enhanced these movies’ profile for the Oscars, to be held approximately one month later. At the Oscars, Nicole Kidman walked away with the Oscar for Actress in a Leading Role and CHICAGO was that year’s big winner with six Oscars, including Best Picture, Art Direction and Actress in Supporting Role for Catherina Zeta-Jones.

The relationship between Hollywood and Europe has always been dual. Until the 1980s, however, cinema studies regarded the relation between Hollywood and European cinemas, in particular, as an opposition. Hollywood movies were studied as representations of the standard universal film style. European films, on the contrary, were categorised and studied as belonging to the canon of national cinemas. For Europe, cinema studies restricted itself to the production of film texts in national territories. Stephen Crofts writes:

Prior to the 1980s critical writings on cinema adopted commonsense notions of national cinema. The idea of national cinema has long informed the promotion of non-Hollywood cinemas. Along with the name of the director-auteur, it has served as a means by which non-Hollywood films – most commonly art films – have been labelled, distributed, and reviewed. As a marketing strategy, these national labels have promised varieties of “otherness” – of
what is culturally different from both Hollywood and the films of other importing countries. The heyday of art cinema’s “new waves” coincided with the rise of Anglophone film-book publishing in the mid-1960s. Later, 1960s radical politics extended the range of territories covered to those engaged in postcolonial struggles. The idea of a national cinema underpinning most of these studies remained largely unproblematic until the 1980s, since which time they have grown markedly more complex.\textsuperscript{101}

Andrew Higson’s article “The Concept of National Cinema” (1989) was among the first to criticise the conventional mode of national film analysis.\textsuperscript{102} He argued that “it is inadequate to reduce the study of national cinemas only to consideration of the films produced by and within a particular nation state. It is important to take into account the film culture as a whole. And the overall institution of cinema.”\textsuperscript{103} Higson emphasised national film culture instead of film production and subsequently argued for the inclusion of exhibition and circulation (intertextuality), audience use of particular film exhibition circumstances, and both critical and cultural discourses in the study of national cinemas. From this vantage point Hollywood should, in fact, be seen as an integral part of most nations' film culture. “Hollywood has become one of those cultural traditions which feed into the so-called national cinemas of, for instance, western European nations,” Higson writes.\textsuperscript{104} European audiences are accustomed to the imaginary and values of Hollywood movies. European filmmakers are influenced by American film genres and styles. In addition, Hollywood has welcomed European influences: many famous Hollywood directors and stars were and are European immigrants (e.g. Alfred Hitchcock and Greta Garbo). Hollywood films have also been inspired by European films, culture and heritage (e.g. Shakespearean films and costume dramas). In the 1990s, a large number of studies and articles were published that complicated the relationship between Hollywood and European cinemas, among which the quoted anthology *Hollywood & Europe: Economics, Culture, National Identity 1945-1995*, edited by Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (1998).\textsuperscript{105}

My interest in these discussions concerns the theorisation of film festivals, or, more precisely, the general lack of theory on this point. Until the 1990s, there was little explicit attention for the role of (European) film festivals. In the new perspectives on the construction of European cinema, however, the topic of film festivals does make a modest entrée. In his *New German Cinema: A History* (1989) Thomas Elsaesser observed how the new German films (1970s/1980s) had to receive international recognition before they could become part of the national canon.\textsuperscript{106} Elsaesser showed that national cinemas are not collections of autonomous texts, but that they are heavily depended on international aesthetic forums such as film festivals. Wenders, Herzog, Fassbinder and other New German directors were celebrated auteurs on the international film festival circuit, which elevated their works to the level of art cinema, which, in turn, was required for
receiving the privilege of representing Germany's new cinematic identity. Dimitris Eleftheriouitis reiterates the argument in 2001 as follows: "In this sense, the national canon is determined by judgements based on universal values and often pronounced outside the geographical boundaries of the nation."107 From the opposite direction, the critique on the neglect of popular cinemas in the studies of European cinemas, similar conclusions were drawn. Richard Dyer and Ginette Vincendeau argue that the agenda of European governments to position art cinema as the dominant national culture caused popular traditions to be undervalued and ignored:

[Art cinema] is a solution to the problem of the small domestic market for national European films, since “art films” are shown at film festivals and on international distribution/exhibition circuits dedicated to them...; it is also the cinema that most national European governments have been prepared to subsidize. To gain this position, art cinema required high cultural prestige. This was achieved by constructing it through the discourses of European culture discussed above, traditions which, for socio-historical reasons, are accepted as the dominant national cultures in most European countries in a way that is certainly not true in the USA or Australia. Art cinema fed into the resistance to two filmic “bad others”: US cultural influence, including television...; and the despised indigenous low traditions.108

It is important to acknowledge that these new perspectives on the “national cinema” in Film Theory already pointed towards a central role for international distribution and exhibition circuits, and, more specifically, film festivals, in the legitimisation of European cinema as art cinema. By moving beyond the narrow interpretation of “national cinema,” these studies tried to explain why new waves were canonised (as “art”) and popular cinema overlooked. However, since neither “national” nor “art” seemed to have offered Film Studies fully appropriate concepts for analysing European cinemas, I will continue and investigate what can be learnt by studying international film festivals as sites where national interests are played out and cultural recognition can be acquired. In the next subchapter, I will elaborate on the second important historical phase that began in 1968 and during which film festivals’ attention was shifted away from national concerns towards artistic criteria.

1.4 From Showcases of National Cinemas to Independent Festivals

Film festivals also raised interests other than nationalist or ideological. Many film festivals not only started as economic stimulus for the local tourist industry, the economic potential of film festivals for the movie industry itself was also soon discovered. The Cannes Market, for instance, opened in 1961. The gathering of so many film professionals in one location for a short time-
span facilitated efficient business. Moreover, the competition programme, the stars and the scandals accumulated the value of films being shown during the festival and the market. The growing attention for economy and glamour, however, also created feelings of discontent. In France, the film critics of the Nouvelle Vague, Godard, Truffaut, Chabrol, Rohmer and Rivette, criticised the film industry and film festival in Cannes for not paying enough attention to the medium as art in general and to young, new and alternative auteurs in particular.\textsuperscript{109} Deeply dissatisfied with the state of French cinema, the film critics started to direct movies themselves. Françoise Giroud was the first to use the term "New Wave" in L'Express in 1958 to refer to the new youthful spirit of these films.\textsuperscript{110} Although Truffaut was still banned from the Cannes Film Festival in 1958 for attacking the domination of commercial and political interests at the festival, he returned the year after to win the Palme d'Or for \textit{LES QUATRE CENTS COUPS/ THE 400 BLOWS} (France: 1959), ensuring the official recognition of the Nouvelle Vague. However, the general dissatisfaction with French cinema and the role of film festivals did not disappear.

In 1968 the bomb burst. America and Europe were in turmoil with left-wing demonstrations. In the US, the Vietnam War was the main reason for the public's inflammation. In France, cinema played an important role in the riots.\textsuperscript{111} In February of that year the minister of culture, André Malraux, dismissed Henri Langlois, head of the Cinémathèque Française. Founded by Langlois, the Cinémathèque archived the largest collection of films in the world. Many acclaimed filmmakers, including the Nouvelle Vague generation, were passionately engaged with the Cinémathèque as meeting-place and source of education. The dismissal of Langlois was seen as a repressive act of the state, curtailing artistic freedom. Hearing the news, Godard, Truffaut and other filmmakers gathered in the streets for a protest march. They formed the Committee for the Defense of the Cinémathèque, and filmmakers from around the world – among whom Orson Welles, Ingmar Bergman and Akira Kurosawa – sent telegrams in support of the old administration.\textsuperscript{112} When the Cannes Film Festival opened on 10 May 1968, the situation was still very unstable. In the first weekend of the festival three million French workers were on strike. The Committee for the Defense of the Cinémathèque was also in full swing. They went to the film festival to open an office and give support from there. Truffaut, Godard, Alain Resnais, Claude Beri, and Claude Lelouch organised a meeting in protest of Langlois' dismissal in the Palais. Soon the aim of the protest not only was the reinstatement of Langlois, but also reformation of the festival, which was criticised for being too focused on the stars and prizes. The crowd gathering to listen to the vehement discussions grew to such proportions that the meeting had to be replaced from the Salle Jean Cocteau to the larger Grand Salle. Shouts were heard to act in solidarity with the striking workers and shut the festival down. Initially, Robert Favre Le Bret (president between 1952 and 1972) reached a compromise in the continuation of the festival without awarding prizes. When fights broke out during the screening of Carlos Saura's \textit{PEPPERMINT FRAPPÉ} (Spain: 1967) and caused its premature ending,
the jury, led by Roman Polanski, gathered to discuss the situation. The next day the festival was officially declared closed. As John Stapleton and David Robinson argue the upheaval in Cannes in 1968 marked the end of an area in which fun and glamour were top priorities of the festivals:

Spurred by the revolutionary situation in Paris, the Cannes militants, including Truffaut and Godard, occupied the Festival Palace, and announced that the establishment must yield its power and cease to corrupt the Seventh Art. All day long the Palace was held. Anybody could speak, and did. Most of the time there were more people on the stage than in the auditorium. Godard (or was it Truffaut?) kept getting knocked down in the intermittent skirmishes. Film festivals were never the same again. Out of the events of 1968 grew the important parallel events of Cannes and Berlin, the Quinzaine des Réalisateurs and the Young Film Forum. Prized remained, for several years, disreputable. Venice foundered, never wholly to regain its old glories.

Les événements of 1968 left deep imprints on film festivals world-wide. One effect was the global reconsideration of the role of film festivals now that the status of cinema and film directors had changed. Belief in cinema as high art and the director as auteur led to the use of festivals as a platform for these voices (by some criticised as appropriation). The second effect concerned the shift in selection procedures. With the contemporary emphasis on individual achievements of auteurs and the task of the film festival to show great works of art, the format of festivals as showcases of national cinemas was out of date. Consequently, steps were taken to change selection procedures. Ulrich Gregor, Forum director until 2002, explains why the Berlinale format was ready for revision:

Cannes director Gilles Jacob expresses a similar view:

[I]t was felt the best films were not always selected, and that often the criteria used for selection (such as personal, political, or professional connections) had nothing to do with art or the intrinsic qualities of the films. Gradually, the Festival [de Cannes] added its own selections to those of the various countries as a means of compensating for certain perceived errors or injustices. [From] 1972...films, not countries, would be represented....Moreover, it would be the Festival Director and not national committees who would decide which films would be invited from around the world; thus nationalist biases could no longer hold sway.\(^{114}\)

Formerly, the various national governments selected the movies to be entered. Now, the festivals themselves drew the selection procedures to their organisations. When the Cannes Film Festival was resumed in 1969, its structure had changed fundamentally. The Quinzaine des Réalisateurs was established parallel to and independent from the festival for films deemed too radical, marginal or young for the official selection.\(^{115}\) These films would not compete for the Palme d’Or. In Venice – where there had been passionate fights in the Cannes spirit between directors and protestors urging them not to send in their movies for the festival – director Prof. Luigi Chiarini reacted by moving the festival towards the left and in opposition to the capitalism of Hollywood. He also abandoned the tradition of awarding prizes. After its own scandal in 1971 Berlin followed with the foundation of the Forum des Jungen Films, comparable with the Quinzaine.\(^{116}\) Mostly it was the festival director or president who took the responsibility for selection on himself. The festivals were no longer showcases for national cinemas, but institutions for the promotion of cinema as art. Just like the auteur was accredited with the creative force behind the cinematic product, the festival director became the embodiment of the festival’s image in the international film festival circuit. Because the international competitions were no longer restricted by the prefixed numbers for national entries, he was free to put more emphasis on criteria for artistic quality.

\(^{114}\) Formerly, the various national governments selected the movies to be entered. Now, the festivals themselves drew the selection procedures to their organisations. When the Cannes Film Festival was resumed in 1969, its structure had changed fundamentally. The Quinzaine des Réalisateurs was established parallel to and independent from the festival for films deemed too radical, marginal or young for the official selection. These films would not compete for the Palme d’Or. In Venice – where there had been passionate fights in the Cannes spirit between directors and protestors urging them not to send in their movies for the festival – director Prof. Luigi Chiarini reacted by moving the festival towards the left and in opposition to the capitalism of Hollywood. He also abandoned the tradition of awarding prizes. After its own scandal in 1971 Berlin followed with the foundation of the Forum des Jungen Films, comparable with the Quinzaine. Mostly it was the festival director or president who took the responsibility for selection on himself. The festivals were no longer showcases for national cinemas, but institutions for the promotion of cinema as art. Just like the auteur was accredited with the creative force behind the cinematic product, the festival director became the embodiment of the festival’s image in the international film festival circuit. Because the international competitions were no longer restricted by the prefixed numbers for national entries, he was free to put more emphasis on criteria for artistic quality.

\(^{116}\) Mostly it was the festival director or president who took the responsibility for selection on himself. The festivals were no longer showcases for national cinemas, but institutions for the promotion of cinema as art. Just like the auteur was accredited with the creative force behind the cinematic product, the festival director became the embodiment of the festival’s image in the international film festival circuit. Because the international competitions were no longer restricted by the prefixed numbers for national entries, he was free to put more emphasis on criteria for artistic quality.
1.4.1 Upheaval in Berlin

In Berlin the festival format of a showcase for national cinemas and competition between nation-states remained undisputed until the early 1960s. In 1963 the Berlinale festival organisation questioned its selection procedure for the first time. Several options to change the format and stop inviting nation-states from sending in entries for the competition were debated. Although a breakthrough was not reached at this time, the door to change had been opened by means of some modest changes. Bauer reports: "Neben dem Recht der großen Filmländer, einen Film offiziell zu melden, hat die Festspieleleitung die Möglichkeit, künstlerisch besonders wertvolle Filme einzuladen und mit ihnen das Programm zu bereichern." Whereas for Cannes and Venice 1968 was the turning point, the Berlinale had to wait two more years before a conflict channelled the feelings of discontent with the festival format into significant change. That incentive for change was formed by the scandal surrounding Michael Verhoeven's film O.K. (West Germany: 1970), which was screened in competition in 1970. Aside from criticising the lack of artistic criteria and freedom in the festival, the conflict in Berlin was specifically directed towards its construction as a Western cultural showcase in the East and provided a critique of the American geopolitical influence on the festival programme. The experimental feature O.K., based on the true story of the little Vietnamese girl Mao who was raped and murdered by American soldiers in 1966, solicited strong reactions. The German movie replaced the historical events from the Vietnam War to an Easter Monday in Bavaria and relied heavily on techniques of alienation. After being shown in the competition in Berlin, the press reacted positively to the film, admiring its political provocation but being divided on the issue of artistic choices. The political content, however, was problematic for others who preferred the festival to continue to promote American values (and exclude productions from socialist countries from participation in the festival) instead of turning critical of the American involvement in the Vietnam War. The jury, headed by the American George Stevens, decided with a majority of six to three votes "den deutschen Wettbewerbsbeitrag von Michael Verhoeven zu neutralisieren, bevor die Auswahlkommission nicht erneut bestätigt, daß der Film dem internationalen Festivalreglement entspricht." Not only did the jury obstruct artistic freedom with this act of censorship, she also defended the festival's original role as geopolitical instrument in the Cold War by concealing herself behind a passage in the FIAPF regulations that stated that films entering international festival competitions should contribute to the rapprochement and friendship between nations. Moreover, the festival

v "Besides the right of large film countries to enter a film officially, the directorship of the festival has the possibility to invite films of artistic significance to enrich the programme." Wolfgang Jacobsen, 50 Jahre Berlinale: Internationale Filmfestspiele Berlin, Nicolai: Berlin, 2000: 118.

vi "...to neutralise the German competition entry by Michael Verhoeven as long as the selection committee has not re-confirmed that the film adheres to the rules of international festivals." Jacobsen. 50 Jahre Berlinale: 166.
regulations of the Berlinale did not allow for the jury to decide over festival entries. As the Yugoslavian jury member Dusan Makavejev, one of the contraversers, wrote: "Die Jury beurteilt den künstlerischen Wert eines Films, sie prüft nicht, ob eind Filme die Voraussetzung für die Zulassung zum Wettbewerb erfüllen. Diese Aufgabe obliegt der Festivaldirection und dem Auswahlkommittee." In the scandal that developed out of the incident the jury was summoned to resign because their position was considered untenable. Although Bauer tried to rescue the festival by claiming there was no legal ground for the jury's action and O.K. was still in competition, all attempts were in vain. The genie was out of the bottle. In the midst of anti-Vietnam demonstrations and following the footsteps of the festivals in Cannes and Venice, people in Berlin gathered to question the organisation and regulations of the festival. In an atmosphere of suspicions, accusations, gossip and slander, the lack of artistic freedom and prevalence of national geopolitical interests was recognised. Walter Schmieding, director of the Festival GmbH (Gesellschaft mit beschränkter Haftung), Bauer, and the jury resigned. The competition programme was abruptly stopped and the Berlinale had to contemplate on the question of if, and if so, how, the festival should resume the following year.

Although the 1970 edition of the Berlinale had not been very successful, everybody agreed that the festival should continue. Heinz Zellermayer, a member of the Berlin Parliament, argued on 9 July 1970, that "Berlin is mehr als jede andere Stadt auf seine Kongresse, Tagungen und auch auf ein funktionierendes Film-Festival angewiesen, weil wir zu unserer Lebensfähigkeit nicht nur eine breite industrielle Basis brauchen: ohne die vielfältigen kulturellen Attraktionen können wir den Anspruch auf Welstadtcharakter nicht aufrechterhalten." With political support guaranteed, the important question became how to improve the festival. Should the festival be thoroughly reformed? Should it assume a new active role of ballot commissions using independent aesthetic criteria in their selection of movies for the festival programmes? That would mean a renunciation of its A-status, abandoning the tradition of having an (international) jury to reward prizes, and focusing on new young artistic cinema, quality productions and retrospectives instead. Or was it, perhaps, better to maintain the old festival in a slightly adjusted format and establish a new parallel festival that could dedicate itself solely to the promotion of new young artistic cinema? The decision was made to go for the latter choice, thus

---

vii "The jury judges the artistic value of a film, it is not the jury's duty to examine if a film fulfils criteria for an admission to the competition. This task belongs to the organisation of the festival and the selection committee." In a letter to Alfred Bauer dated Thursday 2 July he refers explicitly to the jury regulations of the Berlinale. Jacobsen. 50 Jahre Berlinale: 167.

viii "Berlin is more than any other city dependent on its congresses, conferences and also on a functioning film festival because for our viability we not only need a broad industrial basis: without the manifold cultural attractions we could not maintain the claim to be a world city." Jacobsen. 50 Jahre Berlinale: 173, as quoted from a steno message on the 78th session of the Parliament, 9 July 1970.
following the example of Cannes (Quinzaine des réalisateurs) and Venice (Giornate del cinema italiano). The A-status was maintained for the competition programme of the festival. Regarding the selection procedure, however, the FIAFP would be pressured to change its regulations so that the right of presentation for the major film nations could, from then onwards, only be exercised in consultation with the German selection committee. Like Cannes and Venice, the Berlinale developed from a showcase for national cinemas towards an independent festival organisation. The second major change was the establishment of a parallel festival, to be called "das Internationales Forum des jungen Films," where progressive cinema and young experimental directors would find a platform. The Forum format was designed in the service of aesthetic criteria and new discoveries. The initial festival function of supporting the sovereignty of nation-states disappeared completely in this new type of festival; it was not the nation-states – represented by either governmental film associations or national film industries – that selected the festival entries for the Forum. Instead, the festival director assumed a central role. His skills in selecting movies, discovering new talents or movements, and designing programs would become more and more important for the competition between festivals, based on the creation of a distinctive festival image (see chapter four for a fuller account of the effect of the upheavals on festival programming). As I shall argue in paragraph 1.5.1, the national returns in these strategies in a different form.

1.4.2 The Forum: between barricades and ivory tower

Although the decision to found das Internationale Forum des Jungen Films was a direct result of the scandalous events of 1970, the discontent with the Berlin Film Festival in particular and German film culture in general had already previously prompted a group of cinephiles to organise counter-events. Die Freunde der Deutschen Kinemathek (friends of German film archive) organised their first film screening in May 1963. They operated according to a carefully selected motto: "Aufführen, Vermitteln, Zirkulieren, Verleihen, Archivieren (A.V.Z.V.A)," screen, support, circulate, distribute, and archive. The Friends criticised the Berlinale for its emphasis on stars and putting up barriers against independent productions. The festival was accused of becoming evermore a promotion machine for the Hollywood majors. The friends, on the contrary, focused on individual achievements, aesthetics criteria, innovative styles and engaged stories. These were the criteria they used to decide whether a movie, movement or cinema was, in fact, better, "bedeutungsvollers und aufschlussreicher...als [die]...Oscar-gekrönten Super-productionen." The films that met their criteria would be treated according to the ideology of a Co-op rather than commercial.

---

IX "...more significant and insightful than the super productions adorned with Oscars.” Schröder. Zwischen Barrikade und Elfenbeinturm: 8. From the 13 November 1963 declaration of Freunde der Deutschen Kinemathek.
company; the Kinemathek loaned copies of films kept in their archive to film festivals and sister institutions in other European countries; it also maintained close contact with filmmakers, producers, distributors, film clubs, archives and other exhibitors, which resulted in a close network and regular film donations to the German archive. In July 1970, the Friends organised a counter-festival to the Berlinale in their recently-opened art house Arsenal (January 1970): the “Woche des Jungen Films.” This precursor to the Forum included the first Fassbinder retrospective, films by Rosa von Praunheim, Cuban documentaries, films from Japan, films by Jonas Mekas and Robert Kramer as well as two early cinema classics by Feuillade.\(^\text{19}\)

When the decision to found a parallel festival was made, all heads naturally turned to the Freunde der Deutschen Kinemathek, among whom were Ulrich Gregor and his wife Erika, Gero Gandert, Heiner Roß, Manfred Salzgeber, Gerhard Schoenberner, Wilhelm Roth, Sylvia Andresen, Peter Schumann and Alf Bold. What these people shared was a strong belief in the necessity of promoting, supporting and creating more favourable conditions for what they believed was good cinema. They acknowledged the fact that the films and directors they favoured were in a weak position and decided to intervene. Even when the Forum was becoming a major institution, the revolutionary spirit prevailed. Metaphorically speaking, the Forum employees and many volunteers from the Friends circle mounted the barricades for a better cinema. In programming they did not shun from selecting films with explicit and/or controversial political content, such as NICHT DER HOMOSEXUELLE IST PERVERS, SONDERN DIE SITUATION IN DER ER LEBT (BRD: Rosa van Praunheim 1971) and COUP POUR COUP (France/BRD: Marin Karmitz 1972). As Ulrich Gregor explains: “Wir suchten schon Filme, die den richtigen ‘revolutionären Geist’ hatten.”\(^\text{x}\) Moreover, contrary to the Berlinale, the Forum did show films from the Soviet Union (for example classics by Dziga Vertov, Alexander Medwedkin and Abram Room). The Forum distinguished itself from the Berlinale in four important ways. Firstly, whereas the Berlinale only showed narrative-oriented features, the Forum offered an indiscriminate mix of documentaries, avant-garde productions, short films and features (usually with controversial content, innovative style or produced in neglected film nations). The smaller productions (from poor countries or avant-garde filmmakers) were treated with the same regard as the elaborate ones; all films were presented in the form of good copies and provided with subtitles. When the financial means to supply either one of these were insufficient, the Forum helped out. Moreover, there was no competition between films. Secondly, the Forum operated according to the A.V.Z.V.A motto. Its exertions did not end with the closing day of the festival. Of each movie shown in the Forum a copy was kept in the German Film Archive (Deutsche Kinemathek). In addition to the archived Forum films, the Kinemathek received film donations via befriended institutions and

\(^\text{x}\) “We were indeed looking for films that had the right ‘revolutionary spirit.” Schröder. Zwischen Barrikade und Elfenbeinturm: 36.
filmmakers. This collection enabled the reach of the Forum project to move far beyond the exclusive period and place of the festival; the films in the Kinemathek were rented out to other institutions and festivals. Thirdly, the Forum films were accompanied by extensive documentation and discussion. Whereas the information in the Berlinale catalogue was very concise and edited according to the sheet matrix, the size of the Forum documentation was not restricted to any format but dictated by the available information. Regarding the start of the tradition to have discussions after film screenings – often heated and often in presence of the director – Ulrich Gregor recalls:

> Damals wollte man es ja nicht nur mit Werken zu tun haben, sondern auch mit Denkprozessen, mit Utopie. Ein Film ist nicht nur ein Produkt, er ist ein Prozess. Zwischen den Filmen gibt es Gespräche, und manchmal haben wir auch gedacht, dass die Diskussionen, die wir nach den Filmen hatten, vielleicht ebenso so wichtig sind wie die Filme selbst.\(^\text{XI}\)

And fourthly, the Forum devoted special attention to film history. Michael Wedel writes:

> Im Gegensatz zum allzu oft nostalgisch geprägten Rückgriff anderer Festival-Retrospektiven vermittelten die Wieder-aufführungen des Forums Filmgeschichte als lebendigen, unabgeschlosstenen, in die Gegenwart nicht selten kontrovers fortwirkenden Prozess. Dadurch, dass die Wiederaufführungen im Forum nicht isoliert, sondern gleichberechtigt neben den neuen Filmen im Programm stattfanden, konnten die Begegnungen zwischen historischen and aktuellen Filmen immer wieder gesellschaftliche und ästhetische Zusammenhänge stiften, überraschend Perspectiven eröffnen und kulturelle Traditionen offen legen.\(^\text{xII}\)

The Forum proved to be a successful extension of the Berlinale: influential directors such as Theo Angelopoulos, Mrinal Sen, Chantal Akerman and Aki Kaurismäki were discovered; new national cinemas (especially Asian) were introduced to Western audiences; and ground-breaking works were shown,

\(^\text{XI}\) "Back then one not only wanted to come into contact with works (of art), but with thought processes, with utopia. A film is not only a product, it is a process. In between the films there are conversations and sometimes we thought that the discussions after the films were maybe as important as the films themselves." Schröder. \textit{Zwischen Barrikade und Elfenbeinturm}: 44.

\(^\text{xII}\) "In contrast to the often nostalgically tinted retrospectives of other festivals the revivals of the Forum mediate film history as a living, unfinished process that often continues to have a controversial effect into the present. Because the revivals in the Forum were not isolated, but with equal rights as the new films in the main programme, the encounter between historical and actual films could show social and aesthetic connections, open up surprising perspectives and make obvious cultural traditions." Schröder. \textit{Zwischen Barrikade und Elfenbeinturm}: 39.
such as Claude Lanzmann’s *SHOAH* (France: 1974-1985). With the development and institutionalisation of the Forum, however, the once-revolutionary principles became subject to criticism themselves. It was argued that the exclusive attention for art cinema, avant-garde or experimental productions and new national cinemas led the Forum to be an elitist project – the metaphor of the ivory tower was added to the battle-cry of the barricades.  

“Between barricade and ivory tower” reflects the Forum’s ambiguous position of representing the alternative, innovative and small voices of world film cultures in opposition to the mainstream, established and dominant (festival) sounds of the Berlinale, while, at the same time, functioning itself as an established and world-wide respected institution for the promotion of high film culture. In the next subchapter I will show that institutionalisation was a general development of film festival history from the 1980s onwards.

### 1.5 The Passage to Postmodernity: embedded festivals

The film festival phenomenon entered a third historical phase in the 1980s. Film festivals started to spread across the globe. Nowadays, every day a film festival is organised somewhere in the world. Estimated numbers vary from 1200 to 1900 festivals each year. There are major international film festivals, regional film festivals, local film festivals, festivals for documentary, animation, education and many more retrospectives, film weeks, and specials. The fact that film festivals mushroomed world-wide, led to the establishment of the international film festival circuit. On this circuit there is fierce competition, distinction and emulation. Festivals cannot operate outside of the circuit and the programmes, development and organisation of each festival influences the position and versatility of others. The interrelational dependency between festivals means that festivals are embedded within the global system of the film festival circuit. Their embedding is visible in many written and unwritten rules, such as the circuit’s dogma to show world premières. Ulrich Gregor recalls how this situation was different in the early days of the Forum: Damals war der Druck noch nicht so stark, möglichts viele absolute Novitäten zu präsentieren. Das war nicht weiter wichtig, ob da nun eine Welturaufführung ist oder ob er schon hier und da zu sehen war. Heute, wo jeder fragt, »wie viele Welturaufführungen habt ihr denn?« ist das leider ganz anders. Jedes Festival prunkt mit seinen Erstaufführungen.”

Another example is the pressure to award prizes. Competition programmes have become one of the main focuses of press festival coverage, and festivals without prizes are less frequently visited and reported upon by journalists (see chapter four on the attitude towards prizes at the International Film

---

xiii “Back then the pressure was not as strong to show as many absolute novelties as possible. It was not very important if something was a world premiere or if the film had been shown here and there. Today when everybody asks, »How many world premieres do you have?« it is unfortunately different. Every festival makes a great show of their premieres.” Schröder. *Zwischen Barrikade und Elfenbeinturm*: 20.
Festival Rotterdam). In order to understand the development towards embedded festivals, it is helpful to move away from theories of national cinemas and, instead, take a look at theories of globalisation. In this subchapter I will draw in particular on Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri’s book Empire. Although their theory concerns the new political order in today’s context of globalisation, many insights can be used to explain the cultural order within the international film festival circuit. Both transformations are ultimately linked to the passage from modernity to postmodernity and both transformations cause a spatial reconfiguration of power. The creation of the international film festival circuit has evoked different reactions. One regrets the loss of exclusivity for the historical festivals, while the other celebrates the global spread of festivals as a justified break with the hegemony of European festivals. Hardt and Negri offer valuable insights because their work calls specific attention to the fact that globalisation does not interrupt old forms of power, but also establishes new ones. I will begin with an analysis of these new, global forms of power, using the framework of Hardt and Negri in order to approach the transnational dynamic of the international film world, and, then, explain how “the national” returns to the globalised festival platform. The neo-Marxist perspective advocated by Hardt and Negri will also give occasion to present a preview on the economic perspective in the next chapter. In the remaining part of the subchapter I will investigate how new spatial modalities can be used to study and understand the international film festival circuit. I will look into the local/global relations of festivals and discuss the festival site of the Berlinale in relation to city marketing and hierarchical strategies of accreditation.

1.5.1 New Power Relations and the Return of the National
Hardt and Negri argue that globalisation or the passage to postmodernity is characterised by a process of deterritorialisation. Whereas modernity was ruled by the territorialising forces of European nation-states – expanding the number of regions under their imperial Eurocentric influence – the spatial configuration of the world order in the 1980s and 1990s is fundamentally different. The world is deterritorialised. This means that the new political order (Empire) does not have rigid boundaries and no centre – although the US holds a privileged position within it. The globalised world and postmodernity are, instead, characterised as networks in which local elements are linked with global structures and heterogeneity and plurality are the preferred ideological projects. Hardt and Negri draw heavily on various postmodern theories in order to analyse this contemporary condition: the voices of Deleuze and Guattari, Foucault, and Castells are omnipresent in their elaborations on smooth space, biopower and networks. At the same time, they succeed in pinpointing the moment where many postcolonialist and postmodern theories fail to see the new form of domination. Hardt and Negri argue: “The structures and logics of power in the contemporary world are entirely immune to the ‘liberatory’ weapons of the postmodernist politics of difference. In fact, Empire too is bent on doing away with those modern
forms of sovereignty and on setting differences to play across boundaries.”¹²¹ The fact that homogeneous (European) structures are broken does not imply that power is equally distributed within the new heterogeneous flows (of Empire). For neo-Marxists like Hardt and Negri the usual suspect is, of course, the capitalist system. They argue that the ideology of the world market comes into full bloom when matched with postmodern and postcolonial convictions, because postmodern pet subjects such as circulation, mobility, diversity and mixture are profitable to global trade. The world market embraces the deconstruction of nation-states and promotes open global markets and product differentiation. The differences between people, in their turn, are seen as market opportunities that can each be targeted by means of a custom-made campaign. The point Hardt and Negri make, however, is a valuable one in that, even without pushing it to an anti-capitalist extreme, it is useful for the study of new power relations on the international film festival circuit. Hardt and Negri argue that the differences that appear after tearing down the binary boundaries of the nation-state do not move freely across global space, but, instead, are controlled in global networks of power with highly differentiated and mobile structures.¹²² Likewise, one can argue that the unequal geopolitical power relations between film festivals did not simply disappear when the festival phenomenon was subjected to a spatial reconfiguration in the 1980s and 1990s. The creation of the international film festival circuit was accomplished by a rapid increase in the number of festivals and their global spread, causing a loss of festivals’ natural claim of exclusivity and a definite end to the European monopoly. However, the development did not mean that all nations would have equal opportunities on the circuit. As Julian Stringer argues, the circuit is above all “a metaphor for the geographically uneven development that characterises the world of international film culture.”¹²³ He, therefore, consciously uses the term “the international film festival circuit” “to suggest the existence of a socially produced space unto itself, a unique cultural arena that acts as a contact zone for the working-through of unevenly differentiated power relationships – not so much a parliament of national film industries as a series of diverse, sometimes competing, sometimes cooperating, public spheres.”¹²⁴ Within these new power relations, the nationalist geopolitics that dominated the early European festivals is replaced with the influence of historicity, cities and sites (see chapter three for an elaboration on power relations and cultural value). “The national” returns as one of the major discourse strategies with which festivals profiled their programming (the other being “art cinema”).

When, in the early 1970s, the selection procedures of the major European festivals were opened up, this was not only followed by an emphasis on individual artistic achievements, but also by a passionate interest in unfamiliar cinematic cultures, especially the ones sprouting from the revolutions in Third World countries. Ella Shohat and Robert Stam argue that “[t]he late 1960s were heady days for revolutionary cinema. World-wide decolonisation seemed to suggest revolution everywhere in the Third World,
while First World revolutionary movements promised an overthrow of the imperial system from within ‘the belly of the beast.’ At the same time, dominant film form and Hollywood hegemony were being challenged virtually everywhere.” As I will argue in more detail in chapter four, the change in festival format gave rise to the emergence of “specialised” film festivals, which set out to intervene in cinema culture with themed programmes and debates, and support the political struggles around the world. The Forum is a good example of a festival that operated under such ideology. It was eager to explore the unknown, indigenous film cultures of the world and set out to discover new forms of cinematography and storytelling, searching for fascination and inspiration as well as the prestige of having discovered something valuable or influential first. Ulrich Gregor’s observation that at present “there are no white territories left, no new cinematic cultures to discover – Greenland being a possible exception” reminds one that the borderline between sincere support and neo-colonial attitude is a difficult one to draw. On the one hand, the interest in third cinema genuinely coincided with the concern for socio-political power struggles in the countries where the films were produced, but, on the other hand, films could be (and were) claimed as “discoveries” and “national cinemas” by the festival programmers (competing with other festivals on the circuit) and artistic choices could mistakenly be interpreted as “national” by festival audiences looking for intimate encounters with unfamiliar cultures. Thus, “the national” returned, not without its problems, in festival programming.

One of the most pressing complications concerns a discrepancy between the unproblematic presentations of the cream of various “national cinemas” at top festivals in the West, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the second-rate selections that are left for the newly founded festivals in Third World countries. The new film festivals in, for example, Havana, Carthage and Ouagadougou have a difficult time competing over films with the established festivals. As Hardt and Negri argue, on a political level, many colonised countries used the European project of nationalisation to gain independence, but failed to find true liberation and equality because they still suffered subordination in the global arena. In other words, colonialism was replaced by new forms of dominations that, instead, operated globally and under the guise of open (fair) competition. On a cultural level, a similar pattern can be distinguished for film festivals: the new Third World film festivals assumed subordinate positions in the global arena of the international film festival circuit. A good example is FESPACO. This Pan African Film and Television Festival in Ouagadougou was founded in 1969 and became the most important cultural event in Africa. Its subordinate position in the international film festival circuit, however, becomes clear when considering the fact that it is passed over for the all-important premiers. Film professionals prefer the old major festivals in Europe or new cosmopolitan festivals in North America over the festival in Ouagadougou as beginning of a festival tour. These Western festivals can offer more benefits in return for a
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premier (prestige, network opportunities etc.) and are therefore capable of attracting the most successful and established directors and films. In this way, indigenous festivals may remain subordinated, whereas “their” national cinema is “blossoming.” Comparing the presentation of African cinema at festivals in New York and Ouagadougou, Manthia Diawara writes: “African cinema exists in exile, with more African films seen in Europe and America than in Africa....Since the best African films are screened elsewhere – not to mention at Cannes, Venice, Berlin and London – film-makers no longer look to FESPACO for premieres. Such European and American festivals also contribute to the ghettoisation of African films, since they use them only for the purposes of promoting the degree of multiculturalism sanctioned by their own citizens.” The effect of the global spread of the film festival phenomenon and the increasing importance of distinction and marketing completed the detachment between “the national” and “the nation.” The national has become a free-floating signifying unit that is used in festival discourse to market new cinemas (also see chapter four). The situation, however, also has its advantages. For example, when national film boards censor the exhibition of controversial film productions, then the international film festival circuit nonetheless offers opportunities for global exposure. Ulrich Gregor specifies that after the disappearance of “white territories,” it has become the festival’s task to observe developments and trends, and report on contemporary film culture by showing these culturally relevant films to an international public, irrespective of distributors’ interest and governmental support. When national censorship is an issue for independent and critical productions, as it is, for instance, in China, international film festivals abroad may help – with the assistance of local experts – to find an audience for these films outside of the national borders.

Before I move away from the issue of unequal power relations and investigate the usefulness of other spatial modalities in festival research, I briefly want to consider how Hardt and Negri’s ideas on the passage to postmodernity may illuminate the economic perspective that I will discuss in chapter two. The success of the festival network has led to institutionalisation (established festivals), standardisation (premiers and prizes), but has also brought forth more economic opportunity for some festival films. Relying on Hardt and Negri’s view of the compatibility between postmodernity and capitalism, this “appropriation” of the festivals’ cultural agenda for economic strategies was a theoretical inevitability: in the late 1980s festival films were recognised as potentially profitable niche products, waiting to be exploited with specific targeting strategies. Harvey and Bob Weinstein’s company Miramax became extremely successful doing precisely that. In the next chapter, I will discuss, among others, what economic effects Miramax had on the development of film festivals and film markets when it started marketing films for the art house niche market with a balanced mix of festival prestige, provocations and straightforward promotion. Let me now return to my case study on Berlin.
1.5.2 Berlin Overexposed: the local and the global

As I have described in previous subchapters, the Berlinale has been firmly rooted within the geopolitical power play of the Cold War. The festival is closely related to the peculiar history of the city and, in addition, affected by the German governmental division between the Bund (state) and the Länder (federal states). Together, these influences add up to a variety of spatial modalities that can be used to analyse the film festival. Cities, in particular, offer an useful entry point to discuss how local practices are related to global network. Stringer, for example, identifies – with a reference to Saskia Sassen’s theory of the role of global cities in the financial market – the festival locations as the nodal points in the festival network. All major international film festivals have to compete on the terms of, what he calls, the global space economy. To do so they act in two directions, Stringer argues: “As local differences are being erased through globalization, festivals need to be similar to one another, but as novelty is also at a premium, the local and particular also becomes very valuable. Film festivals market both conceptual similarity and cultural difference.” Film festivals use marketing strategies to secure a “festival image” for themselves that will effectively position the festival both globally and locally. For him, the city is the most important node in this global network; it is, for example, the physical location of the festival that is crucial to the festival’s image of cultural difference. I will pick up on this argument in the next section. For now it is important to assert that the “local” and the “global” have already played a role in the organisation of the Berlin film festival since its inception in the immediate post-war period. Before they became manifestations of marketing necessities in a saturated festival environment they were already elements intrinsic to the festival organisation and imbued with geopolitical politics: the local festival event was strategically set up as global propaganda for the Western system and ideology. Another city metaphor, therefore, might be more appropriate to understand how the global relates to the local in the Berlinale of the Cold War period: the city as airport.

In 1983 Paul Virilio published the provocative article “The Overexposed City.” The article begins with a reference to the construction of the Berlin Wall. Virilio presents the construction of the Wall as one of the clearest examples of the global development towards an introversion of the city, a relocation of the frontiers of states to the interior of cities comparable to Stringer’s ideas on the festival circuit in its abandonment of centre/periphery structures in favour of nodal ones. In the text that follows, Virilio makes clear that, for him, it is not the physical boundaries such as the Berlin Wall, but the immaterial systems of electronic surveillance that ultimately characterise urban redevelopment from the 1970s onwards. Elaborating on the position of the city in wartime, he proposes replacing the metaphor of the physical gateway of the ancient city (e.g. arc de triomphe) with the electronic gateway of the airport for modern cities. The metaphor of the city as airport appoints a dominant role to urban locations in controlling exterior forces by means of advanced technologies. Nations are no longer primarily defended on the
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battlefield, but by administrative and technocratic practices of exclusion. This metaphor can shed light on the successful position of festivals. It brings their function as powerful media hubs to the fore. Film festivals can be seen as technologically-advanced gateways to an alternative film culture, controlling the power of exposure in global media (see chapter three). Festivals are places where movies are discovered, receive world-wide media attention, and are sold to cinema distributors or television. The selection of films is a process of inclusion in and exclusion from a promise of overexposure. The metaphor of the city as airport, therefore, expands the metaphor of the city as node, because it not only points to the power relations between festivals in the international film festival circuit, but also allows for an understanding of festival programming as politics. In Virilio’s metaphorical airport, the connection between the local and the global is imbued with geopolitical interests (security, economic protection, diplomacy etc.) and controlled by advanced technologies (transport and telecommunication). The airport metaphor, thus, helps us understand how the Berlin film festival has been used as an influential local tool for imposing political agendas on global film culture, using two main strategies: excluding socialist countries from the festival as a gateway to a global film culture and including East-Berliners as target audiences for the programmed western movies (see 1.2.2).

Let me elaborate a bit more on the spatial dimensions of this political programming practice. Throughout the Cold War era, the Berlin Senate and Berlinale organisation held more progressive attitudes towards politically-sensitive issues than did the Bundes government. The latter was persistent in its refusal to discuss the inclusion of movies from socialist countries even after the reorganisation that followed on the scandal of 1970. In this period the Berlin Senate (the administration of culture in particular) and the festival organisation slowly began to show interest in Eastern European productions and develop initiatives to break the impasse. The exclusion of Soviet films and films from socialist countries was finally resolved in 1974 when the Soviet Union participated (outside competition) in the Berlinale for the very first time. A Soviet delegation visited the festival. The Berlinale debut of a film from the DDR followed in 1975. Another key moment when festival initiatives and federal support preceded global developments and state approval concerns the Wende of 1989. In February 1989, the Berlin film festival was already in negotiation with the DDR to show its competition programme during the festival in East-Berlin theatres as well. Festival director Moritz de Hadeln discussed the topic with Horst Pehnert, deputy Minister of Culture in the DDR and leader of the DDR Film Committee during the festival. On 9 November 1989 – the day the Wall fell – he wrote Pehnert a letter in which he posed a detailed proposal for the realisation of such a plan. Nineteen days later, the Berlin mayor Walter Momper guaranteed De Hadeln the necessary extra financial means, because “es würde in diesem historischen Moment kaum jemand verstehen, daß Kontroversen zwischen der Bundesregierung und dem Land Berlin dazu führen könnten, daß Berlin nicht in der Lage ist,
den neuen Erwartungen entsprechend entgegenzukommen.”

The organisation of the Berlinale in East Berlin was a fact and simultaneously formed the introduction to a new phase in Berlinale history. From 1989 onwards, the festival would begin to redefine its relation to the East. Gradually more and more attention was given to the Eastern hinterland, and Berlin would develop into one of the most important festivals for films from Eastern and Central Europe. The festival, moreover, remained a powerful media event, where local issues could become global concerns and politics reappeared on the festival agenda, albeit with humanist and pacifist purposes. The media presence of the 2003 festival edition, for example, was seized as opportunity by visiting guests, reporters and festival organisers to criticise the – then pending – Gulf War II. The jury awarded the Golden Bear to Michael Winterbottom’s road movie IN THIS WORLD (UK: 2003), which told the story of two Afghan refugees trying to reach London. Many festival visitors interrupted their festival programme to join the mass demonstrations against the war on 15 Saturday February. Compared to the 1970s, the festival had undergone significant transformations: from showcasing merely Western cinema, it became a meeting point for East European talent, from being the epicentre of Cold War politics, it turned into a symbol for Germany’s unification. The festival, consequently, had to redefine its image on the festival circuit. Locally, the city of Berlin and its rich history were used by the festival as a means of cultural distinction from other festivals. The federal government, in its turn, deployed the festival for its city marketing. In the next section I will explain the move to the Potsdamer Platz as an example of city marketing that cuts both ways.

1.5.3 City Marketing: the move to the Potsdamer Platz

City marketing has become a key concept in describing world-wide municipal strategies for promotion of their cities since the 1980s. The use of the concept is related to the popularity of globalisation theories that convey the spatial reconfiguration of power spreading across the globe in the past decades. Much attention has been given to the role of world cities in the debates. Friedmann (1986) and Sassen (1991, 1996) identified a shift in the location of command and control functions of the global economy from residing with dominant nation-states to concentration in a handful of global cities; New York, London and Tokyo. World cities such as these are seen as the major nodes in a global network; they are leading in matters as diverse as transnational finance and business; international institutions; manufacturing and transportation; population and immigration; telecommunication; and culture. Globalisation theories induced widespread discussion and research on the topic of globalisation and the city. City marketing was recognised as an essential activity for cities wanting to compete in the global arena. The

xlv “...at this historical moment hardly anyone would understand that controversies between the federal government and the federal country Berlin could result in Berlin not being able to comply with the new expectancies.” Jacobsen. 50 Jahre Berlinale: 393.
construction of a positive image became one of the key elements in promotional strategies for attracting investments and tourism. Others pointed out that world cities are not the only places of influence in the global network. Other cities or urban conglomerates are equally affected by globalisation and may try to dominate on regional levels. Besides differing in their scope of influence, these cities distinguish themselves from world cities in scale of dominance. They might excel as centres for software developments (Seattle, US); geopolitical debates (Havana, Cuba);or culture tourism (Prague, Czech Republic); while remaining less influential in other areas.\textsuperscript{141}

Whereas city marketing is an excellent concept for explaining the contemporary popularity of festivals with local authorities and maybe even part of the reason why the phenomenon spread so quickly in the 1980s and 1990s, I want to emphasise that the idea of city marketing has been applied since the earliest festival history (when admittedly the concept itself was not yet introduced). One of the reasons behind the establishment of the first reoccurring festival of Venice in 1932 was tourism. The festival was carefully designed to attract as many visitors as possible to the city at a time when the tourist season was just coming to an end. The festival ran from late August to early September and thereby extended the tourist season from seven to ten days. Hotels, restaurants and other tourist businesses were eager to give the initiative their warm support. Moreover, the festival director, Count Giuseppe Volpi Di Misurate, was related to the CIGA (Compagnia Italiana Grandi Alberghi), an association of luxury hotels, among which two palaces on the Lido. The recession of the 1930s had diminished the elite clientele of these hotels and the choice to make the film festival in Venice a glamorous and international event should thus be seen as the result of successful lobby work with municipal authorities by the CIGA. For Berlin, too, the practice of city marketing was a reality prior to it receiving more attention through globalisation. Let me reiterate what Heinz Zellermayer, member of the Berlin Parliament, argued on 9 July 1970 in defense of the continuation of the Berlinale after the scandal round Michael Verhoeven’s film O.K.: “Berlin is mehr als jede andere Stadt auf seine Kongresse, Tagungen und auch auf ein funktionierendes Film-Festival angewiesen, weil wir zu unserer Lebensfähigkeit nicht nur eine breite industrielle Basis brauchen: ohne die vielfältigen kulturellen Attraktionen können wir den Anspruch auf Welstädtecharakter nicht aufrechterhalten.”\textsuperscript{xv} The move to the Potsdamer Platz provides another interesting example of city marketing.

After the reunification of Germany on 3 October 1990, the need for a mutual place of representation was strongly felt in both former West Germany and the earlier Democratic German Republic. The old capital Berlin, with its majestic lanes and parks, historical buildings, and unsurpassed

\textsuperscript{xv} “Berlin is more than any other city dependent on its congresses, conferences and also on a functioning film festival because for our viability we not only need a broad industrial basis: without the manifold cultural attractions we could not maintain the claim to be a world city.” Jacobsen. \textit{50 Jahre Berlinale}: 173, as quoted from a steno message on the 78th session of the Parliament, 9 July 1970.
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political and cultural heritage, regained the status of capital from Bonn after an eleven-hour debate in the Bundestag on 20 June 1991. The national government returned from Bonn to the Reichstag in Berlin in 1999. But what was needed besides the revival of old landmarks was an imaginary for the new Berlin. This became the Potsdamer Platz, which used to be the busiest intersection in the city before the Wall. Thanks to the erection of the wall, the space of the Potsdamer Platz was neither bound to BRD nor DDR history. The location was reopened in the summer of 1990. Major companies were attracted to sponsor the development of a new city centre that could provide the reappointed capital of an united Germany with a fresh identity in the former no-man's-land between the East and the West. The idea of the Potsdamer Platz' symbolic function as new centre of the reunited Berlin made the area a focal point in Berlin's city marketing. Acclaimed architects commissioned by Sony and Daimler-Chrysler designed a plaza with high, mirror-glazed buildings, evoking the image of American urban business districts of the 1980s (and arousing severe criticism by advocates of architectural novelty and distinction in the process). When it became clear, however, that most international corporations involved in the development of the Potsdamer Platz would not transfer their headquarters from former Western Germany, a solution was desirable. The officials reverted to the success of Berlin's cultural profile since reunification. Instead of marketing the area as the city’s business centre it was decided that the Potsdamer Platz would become the audio-visual and entertainment heart of Berlin. Cinema multiplexes and a modern establishment for the film museum were erected on the grounds. The relocation of the Berlinale guaranteed the required international attention and prestige.

The decision to move the film festival from the area surrounding the Zoo-Palast, the première cinema theatre in West Berlin, to the newly developed Potsdamer Platz, was a political one. Moritz de Hadeln, festival director from 1979 till 2001, recalls an encounter with Peter Radunski, minister of Culture at the time, during which the latter gestured towards heaven and said that this decision came from on high and nobody could do anything to prevent it, so it would be better to concentrate on making the move take place as smoothly as possible. De Hadeln' objections to the move were primarily supported by organisational obstacles. When the decision to relocate the Berlinale to the Potsdamer Platz finally came through, most of the planning had already been finished. Special requirements, facilities and preferences for the festival were not taken into consideration and had to be negotiated one by one, which made the process a strenuous experience for the festival organisation. Most people acquainted with the festival, however, did agree on the increasingly insufficient level of facilities at the old locations and, subsequently, the pressing need for change. Since 2000 the festival heart of the Berlinale is located at the Potsdamer Platz.
1.5.4 Spatial Movements and Accreditation
The move of the Berlinale to the Potsdamer Platz not only changed the image of the new city centre of Berlin, it also affected the festival itself. An historical examination of the use of cinema theatres and their spatial dispersal over/concentration in the city shows locations can be used to promote a certain (political) festival image and control visitor flows. Before the Wende, the Berlinale had always been located in West Berlin. In the first year (1951), there were festival screenings in the Titania Palast in Steglitz (also used for the opening), open air screenings in the Waldbühne and special screenings in 21 “Randkinos” on the border with East Berlin. Soon, however, the need was felt for a special festival theatre, preferably located in the area of the Kurfürstendam in close proximity to the festival office at the Budapester Straße 23. For the second festival edition in 1952, festival director Bauer selected the Delphi at the Kantstraße and the Capitol at the Lehniner Platz. It would not be until 1957 that the Berlinale was granted its own, new festival theatre, equipped with climate control, modern projection facilities and lush interior decoration: the Zoo Palast. The erection of this grand theatre guaranteed that, from then on, the festival heart would be firmly located in the centre of West Berlin. The smaller Delphi would become the main venue of the Internationales Forum des Jungen Films, founded in 1971. Over the years, the Berlin film festival continued to struggle with its locations in West Berlin as the number of visitors kept on growing. The events remained scattered over West Berlin, causing visitors to cover substantial distances between venues and programmes. In 1990, films from the festival were shown for the first time in East Berlin as well. In 1991 the press centre was relocated from the small CineCenter to the Haus der Kulturen der Welt in order to accommodate the multitudinous German and foreign journalists. Though the improvement in working conditions had been subject of repeated requests and complaints, the choice for the isolated location in the Tiergarten park was not applauded. Journalists felt they had been cut off from the festival heart.

The most important advantage of the new location at the Potsdamer Platz is its spatial concentration; during the festival the area is transformed into a condensed festival space. Although a handful of theatre venues in both West and East Berlin are employed, the majority of screenings takes place at the Postdamer Platz, as well as all competition premières, press screenings and ceremonies. Apart from the independent Forum (now called International Forum of New Cinema), which has its premières at the Delphi, the Kinderfilmfest, that screens its premières in the Zoo-Palast, and the Berlinale Talent Campus, which takes place in the Haus der Kulturen der Welt, all official activities were relocated to the new centre. The theatres in West Berlin (Zoo-Palast, Royal Palast, Delphi, and Filmtheater am Friedrichshain) and in East Berlin (International – the former première theatre in the East, and Filmkunsthaus Babylon) are used for repetitions and employed specifically to cater to the needs of the local Berlin residents; the nightly repetitions of competition films in the Zoo-Palast and International are regularly screened with German subtitles instead of the English standard in the Berlinale Palast.
at the Potsdamer Platz. The Postdamer Platz, on the contrary, caters to the international visitors and their needs: the Berlinale Palast, a (musical) theatre in off-festival periods, and the Grand Hyatt Hotel located next door, house the press facilities; festival headquarters of administration and organisation are spread over several buildings; guests are received at the Potsdamer Platz; accreditation is distributed from various counters; the European Film Market takes place in the DaimlerChrysler Atrium; the German film industry assembles in the Kollhoff-Haus; and various cafés, restaurants and shops are located within a couple of minutes walking distance for a quick snack or copious meal.

Despite the fact that most major facilities, programmes and events of the festival are now concentrated at the Potsdamer Platz, the festival location is not centred. The late political decision to move the Berlinale forward in an attempt to safeguard an attractive image for the city’s marketing prevented the festival organisation from exercising influence on the project development. As a result, the layout of the festival remains a provisional solution instead of a permanent structure. Moritz de Handeln criticised the persistent unwillingness of the national and federal government to invest in a festival centre. He writes: “Ich selbst habe eine Zeitlang davon geträumt, den ehemaligen Palast der Republik für ein Filmfestival umzugestalten, nur um völlig verrückt erklärt zu werden. So mussten wir uns schließlich – so ganz anders als die Festivals von Cannes oder Venedig mit ihren Palästen und großzügiger Finanzierung – mit dem begnügen, was uns angeboten wurde und versuchen, daraus das Beste zu machen.”

VI At the Potsdamer Platz, press facilities are separated; administrations and interest groups are located in different buildings; and there is no central festival lobby or cafeteria, which may serve as a pivotal centre for all activities and movements. The spread of facilities and activities leads to a decentralisation of the festival. But there is a second process at work: the application of a strict hierarchical accreditation system. There are 52 numbers for accreditation. The higher the number on a badge, the lower the privileges and the more effort needed to obtain entrance to secured areas and screenings. There are seven ticket counters spread over the Potsdamer Platz. People with badge number 51 or 52, for example, have to line up at the counter of the CineStar multiplex in order to get tickets for selected screenings the next day. Early each morning the queue grows far beyond the multiplex’ walls. Fortunately, the covered plaza of the Sony-Center offers shelter from the frequent February snowfalls. Competition premières, at which occasion the stars give act de présence, are beyond the reach of this group of people. In contrast, Forum premières, which are not aimed at media exposure or at creating exclusivity, can be entered without earlier purchase of a ticket merely by showing a festival badge. I argue that it is the accreditation system that functionalises the decenteredness of the
Berlinale into a system of segregation. People with similar badges are led to similar locations at similar times by the invisible hand of this system. The possible routes through the festival map are pre-defined by the baggage with which people start. The festival selects which baggage = badge visitors are entitled to. Although all visitors move through the relatively concentrated space of the festival, their movements are restricted and manipulated to the extent that completely segregated festival experiences are formed. I will return to the effects of such segregated spatial movements in festival spaces in chapter three.

1.6. Conclusions

When we return to the Haus der Kulturen der Welt for our Berlinale Talent Campus Masterclass, we find Thomas Vinterberg is still answering the many questions about his new feature IT'S ALL ABOUT LOVE asked by the up-and-coming talents who are infatuated with the star. It is the seventh day of the 53rd Internationale Filmfestspiele Berlin. Festival-goers from 101 countries travelled to Berlin and participants from 61 different nations joined the Berlinale Talent Campus. The festival offers all these different nationalities a chance to submerge themselves for eleven days in an exiting and strenuous event. For an international crowd, this festival is but one stop amongst the many that, together, constitute their global working environment. There are constant flows of films, reflection, criticism, and value-adding. Channels range from institutionalised and formal to personal and informal: the juries deliberate on films in competition; regular visitors standing in line for the central ticket counter in the Arkaden at the Potsdamer Platz chat about anything they find of interest; and the 3725 media representatives that attended the 53rd festival edition translate all these local flows of information and opinion into a global discourse. At the European Film Market (EFM), additional screenings and negotiations contribute to the global spread of both film products and professionals. In addition, there are organised breakfasts, lunches, dinners and parties, where people meet, mingle and network. For Vinterberg this international festival circus formed the inspiration for his new feature. He experienced its advantages and disadvantages when travelling the circuit with the successful feature FESTEN. The birth of IT'S ALL ABOUT LOVE was, however, nothing like the immaculate conception of FESTEN. Instead of three months, Vinterberg and Rukov worked on the script for one-and-a-half years. The movie was changed entirely in the editing room and Zbigniew Preisner was attracted to compose a unifying score for the narrative that failed to become coherent in the montage. The film was supposed to have its premier in the competition in Cannes, but it was not selected. It did not appear in Venice, Locarno or Toronto either. Instead, it premiered in Sundance, out of competition. As unanimously as the critics had declared FESTEN a masterpiece, so critically did they evaluate its eagerly awaited successor. After Sundance, Vinterberg embarked on a new tour, revisiting film festivals around the globe to promote - and defend - his new movie. By
now it is already 5:55 p.m. in the theatre of the Haus der Kulturen der Welt. The Scriptfactory Masterclass is coming to an end. Vinterberg asks, tongue-in-cheek, who has been persuaded to go and see his new movie. The audience of young film talents, aspiring to be the next Vinterberg, cheers in affirmation.

Vinterberg’s analysis of his embrace by the festival circuit is a picture of a world out of balance, where it freezes in July and people die of a strange disease (“It’s the heart. They say it’s the heart.”). It is also a classical love story and thriller. John is the only person who can rescue Elena, when she is about to be replaced by three clones that will guarantee and prolong her availability for top-ice skating performances until infinity. And there is the man in the plane, Marciello – Vinterberg’s alter-ego, played by Sean Penn – who spends his life in aeroplanes, in permanent transit, and who understands what is happening with the world. The world is moving towards its end. People work, travel and have success. They call each other on cell phones, but do not spend enough time with each other and forget what it is all about: love, so that they die of a curious illness of the heart. The seven days in the film are presented in the form of a countdown, captured by Zbigniew Preisner by means of a countdown of characteristic long tones, and by Vinterberg and Rukov in a song consisting of seven words: ira dei, chaos mundi, homo querem, amorem. The film ends in Uganda, where gravity has disappeared and people float in the sunbathed savannah. The image is hopeful and seems to offer the possibility of a future after the downfall of global urbanisations and fully-digitised civilisations. It’s ALL ABOUT LOVE, a film about a world out of balance, is based on the international film festival circuit, which, in its turn, is a successful reaction to a film world out of balance caused by the world-wide dominance of the Hollywood film industry. Maybe an Armageddon is held in store for the future development of the film festival phenomenon, but, so far, it has led to a global, influential, standardised and stable festival network that attempts to bring more balance into the distorted commercial relations. How the festival network does this will be the subject of the next chapter.

In this chapter I have conveyed the spatial reconfiguration of the film festival phenomenon by dividing it into three major historical phases: the incipient European phase of festivals as showcases for national cinemas; the turning-point after 1968 when festivals changed their selection procedures and became independent; and, finally, the boom of festivals world-wide in the 1980s and 1990s, when the international film festival circuit was created and festivals were firmly embedded in the system. I aligned the spatial reconfiguration to the transformation from the era of modernity, when the idea of the sovereign nation-state influenced both world order and festival structures, to the era of postmodernity, when processes of deterritorialisation dissolved boundaries and scattered the centre into a global network with local nodes that compete for influence and power. The case study on the International Film Festival Berlin shows how closely the festival was related to the geopolitical power play of the Cold War. Until 1989, Berlin had a peculiar position as Western safe haven in Eastern Europe. It is only after the
festival has abolished its discriminative programming practices and moved to the Potsdamer Platz, the pivotal symbolic centre of the reunited Berlin, that the ties to its Cold War past have been broken and the conditions have turned favourable for the Berlinale to reposition itself on the international festival circuit. The Berlinale Talent Campus should be considered as a part of such strategic repositioning, helping the Berlinale to elaborate on its function as network node for film professionals by moving into the field on international training. But it is already late, and most film talents have left the auditorium to pick up more tricks of the festival trade elsewhere. So will we. Our next stop is the Cannes Film Festival.