Film festivals: history and theory of a European phenomenon that became a global network

de Valck, M.

Citation for published version (APA):

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: http://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.
Notes

Introduction
Sites of Passage: Film Festivals, Europe and the Network of International Film Festivals

As an adult it is funny to realise that everything we considered boring at the time concerned adult love: Lisa sneaking out of the house to meet Rolf; the tedious long scene in the garden where the Baroness cancels the wedding with the Captain and he finally declares his love to Maria; only the glamorous wedding scene in the Convent’s Church could hold our attention.

The use of the term “successful” in the research objective is preliminary. On the lowest, neutral level it refers to the fact that the number of film festivals has increased (explosively) over the years and that the international film festival circuit has become a prominent cinema network. In the conclusion to this dissertation I will address the question whether these developments really justify the adjective “successful.”

Comparable to my treatment of these labels as part of the strategic discourse of festival is Elsaesser’s description of “second order” qualities.

The concluding conference of the “Cinema Europe/Media Europe” research project (Amsterdam June 23-25 2005), of which I was one of the organisers, was called “Cinema in Europe: Networks in Progress” in order to represent both the heterogeneity of European cinemas and highlight the fact that cinema – in its broader understanding – is not limited to national production, but includes transnational influences and international presences.


The second festival in Mar del Plata was organised in 1959 and immediately recognized by the FIAPF. In 1967 and 1969 no festivals were organised, because it alternated with the new festival in Rio de Janeiro. For 25 years, from 1970 onward, the festival was suspended. The period of military government and the difficult economic situation prohibited the festival from being reinstated. The Mar del Plata Festival was revived in 1996.

Moscow and Karlovy Vary alternated with each other between 1959 and 1994.
The Cairo International Film Festival was non-competitive until 1991 when the FIAPF allowed the festival to organise a competition. In 1990 the festival had been evaluated the second best non-competitive festival after the London Film Festival.

See appendix I.

Idem.

Idem.


"Thick description" was introduced by the anthropologist Clifford Geertz. He used it to refer to an interpretation of culture that deals not merely with the behaviours (thin description), but with the social understanding of these behaviours (thick description); with the symbolic meaning of the behaviour in the social relations of a community. See Geertz, Clifford. "Chapter 1: Thick Description: Towards an Interpretative Theory of Culture." The Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basic Books, 1973: 3-30.

As many have pointed out, silent film was not really silent. Films were accompanied by orchestra, organ or piano, a lecturer, sound effects or even, occasionally, actors speaking lines behind the screen. See, for example, Miller Marks, Martin. Music and the Silent Film: Context and Case Studies, 1895-1924. New York [etc.]: Oxford University Press, 1997.
For a critique of technological determinism behind these types of historiography and a fuller account of the European Avant-garde in the period 1919-1939, see dissertation by Malte Hagener: *Avant-garde Culture and Reproductive Media. The Networks and Discourses of the European Film Avant-garde, 1919-1939*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam, 2005.


Hagener: *Avant-garde Culture and Reproductive Media*: 310.


Rees. *A History of Experimental Film and Video*: 57.


Iris Barry, the first curator of MoMA’s Film Library, was the first to establish professional standards and practices for film preservation. She acknowledged cinema as an art form and recognised the importance of preserving films for future exhibition and study. Her pioneer methods receive praise and attention and would serve as a model to others.


Idem.


The words “network” and “system,” however, can create confusion because they are used to refer to a broad variety of phenomena. The Oxford English Dictionary lists no less than seven definitions for the noun “system,” of which the first one – “a set of things working together as a mechanism or interconnecting network” – is most relevant to the film festival circuit. According to the same dictionary a “network” may stand for
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“a group of people who interact together” (fifth definition) or “a complex system of railways, roads, etc” (second definition). These dictionary definitions tell us little about what festivals mean to cinema culture. The theoretical challenge, therefore, is to find out how to proceed and analyse this network or system of the international film festival circuit. What conceptual tools are needed to understand the routine of its mechanism and the limits of the interactions? In this research I will draw on the work of various network theorists to provide precisely these answers.


System: noun 1 a set of things working together as a mechanism or interconnecting network. 2 a person's body or mind. 3 Computing a group of related hardware units or programs or both, especially when dedicated to a single application. 4 an organized scheme or method. 5 orderliness; method. 6 the prevailing political or social order, especially when regarded as oppressive. 7 Geology a major range of strata corresponding to a period in time — ORIGIN Greek s...
Notes


A Soul for Europe Conference was held in Berlin on 26-27 November 2004 and had a one-day seminar spin-off in Amsterdam on 28 November 2004.

Among the models subjected to such assessments were 1) Euro-MP Frits Bolkenstein’s (1933) “multi-ethnic melting pot” of the Austrian-Hungarian empire, a model that opposed the Franco-German super-state model; 2) Slavoj Zizek (1949), in his turn, considers the “multicultural fantasy” inept as a political concept; 3) Robert Cooper’s “mutual interference model.” Cooper, a senior British diplomat who helped shape British Prime Minister Tony Blair international policy, proclaims the end of world order and liberal democracy. He argues that we have left the idea of Westphalian sovereignty – in which nation states were allowed to decide what religion would be adhered to and no church or other countries could interfere – behind and now have a bi/tri-polar model in which the US holds the hegemony (empire); postmodern states have institutionalised the interference of countries in member states’ domestic affairs (EU, UN, NAVO); and pre-modern states are powerless because they have governments that lack credibility and authority within the global arena; and 4) Michael Hardt (1960) and Antonio Negri (1933), who counter Cooper’s model by providing a neo-Marxist vision of “empire” that allows more agency to the people, the powerless masses (what they call “multitude”).


Latour, Bruno. We Have Never Been Modern. New York [etc.]: Harvey Wheatsheaf, 1993: 3.

He explains the crisis in the critical stance as follows: “The [modern] critics have developed three distinct approaches to talking about our world: naturalization, socialization and deconstruction. Let us use E.O. Wilson, Pierre Bourdieu, and Jacques Derrida – a bit unfairly – as emblematic figures of these three tacks. When the first
speaks of naturalized phenomena, then societies, subjects, and all forms of discourse vanish. When the second speaks of fields of power, then science, technology, texts, and the contents of activities disappear. When the third speaks of truth effects, then to believe in the real existence of brain neurons or power plays would betray enormous naiveté. Each of these forms of criticism is powerful in itself but impossible to combine with the other two.” Idem: 5-6.


With more than 4,000 media representatives, the Cannes Film Festival is the third-biggest media event of the world. Only the Olympic Games and the World Championship Soccer attract more media attention.

The separation between objects (nonhumans) and subjects (humans) and between the natural world and the social world (what Latour calls the “practices of purification”) has created various forms of criticism – naturalisation, socialisation and deconstruction – that are, indeed, very powerful critical stances in themselves, but fail to be combined with one another. His thinking is a thorough philosophical revision of what the base of science should be and distinguishes beneath the conspicuous “practices of purification” the hidden, but equally important “practices of translation” that, instead, concentrate on relations, also between nature and culture. The “theoretical mission statement” of ANT is most clearly formulated in We Have Never Been Modern: “The hypothesis of this essay is that the word ‘modern’ designates two sets of entirely different practices which must remain distinct if they are to remain effective, but have recently begun to be confused. The first set of practices, by ‘translation’, creates mixtures between entirely new types of beings, hybrids of nature and culture. The second, by ‘purification’, creates two entirely distinct ontological zones: that of human beings on the one hand; that of nonhumans on the other. Without the first set, the practices of purification would be fruitless or pointless. Without the second, the work of translation would be slowed down, limited, or even ruled out. The first set corresponds to what I have called networks; the second to what I shall call the modern critical stance. […] So long as we consider these two practices of translation and purification separately, we are truly modern – that is we willingly subscribe to the critical project, even though that project is developed only through the proliferation of hybrids down below.” Latour. We Have Never Been Modern: 10-11.

“Autopoiesis” is a term from Luhmann’s later period. It is derived from cognitivist biology, where it originally referred to the self-creation of organic cells. The purpose of the organic cells is to preserve the system, which they are capable of doing because they can produce the parts of which they consist. See, for example, Luhmann, Niklas. Essays on Self-Reference. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.


See for a discussion: Deflem, Mathieu. “Ritual, Anti-Structure, and Religion: A Discussion of Victor Turner’s Processual Symbolic Analysis.” *Journal of Scientific Study of Religion*, Vol. 30, no. 1 (1991): 1-25. “Turner also offered a fruitful set of tools to discover the meanings of ritual performances, and he suggested a useful complement to French structuralism in which ritual analyses are dominated by myth, speech, and thought analysis. Tuner’s approach takes into account not only what is said about ritual, but also the relationships among ritual performances, myth and religious belief; the manner is which ritual symbols are manipulated and handled by the ritual subjects; the meaning and efficacy of single ritual symbols as well as their relation to other symbols at all ritual stages; and the field context, both social and cultural, in which symbols appear.” 14.


It should, however, be recalled that I have, contrary to Latour, not done away with concepts altogether, as was shown in the section on this thesis’ theoretical framework. That I prefer descriptions over definitions in this study therefore does not imply that I shun theoretical (and conceptual) analysis.

Media Studies has always been interdisciplinary. Its object of study (the media) constitutes the centripetal force. At the same time various disciplines (ranging from philosophy and sociology to linguistics and art history) provide different theories and methodologies for research, which results in strong centrifugal influences on the field as a whole. As in any interdisciplinary field, the question of methodology is pressing in Media Studies. How do we do research? What counts as evidence? What is “our” methodology? On the one hand, a media scientist runs the risk of being caught in the current of easy-fitting associations and drift to a conclusion without being able to maintain the necessary academic control. On the other hand, he/she can benefit from the encouragement to move beyond canonized research methodologies, make productive new combinations; and put a spotlight on new themes that are excluded by institutionalised disciplines. I hope my research on film festivals will belong to the latter category.
Ethnomethodology was developed in anthropology and therefore usually based on fieldwork over an extended period of time, in which the ethnographer immerses him/herself in the social relations of a community. This method is also known as participant observation. Globalization and the increased mobility of both researcher and research subjects have led to revisions of traditional conceptions of participant observation. Communities can exist in dispersed form over various locations. Communications and transportation technologies play a larger role. The ethnographer thus has to be more active in keeping the contacts viable. Although the objectives of Media Studies research are different from anthropological ones, the method of participant observation, especially in revised form, can be useful in analysing networks and events. In anthropology, participant observation focuses on the agency and performances of people rather than disembodied cultural categories or language. The practices through which cultural models are embodied involve values, emotions and motives as much as the words through which these are expressed. The strength of participant observation, therefore, is the access it provides to lived experiences which incorporate yet transcend language. It enables the festival researcher, for example, to consider the common fear among journalists of missing, neglecting or misjudging a film that will prove to be very influential or successful as an element in the cultural process of adding value. To this traditional ethnomethodology, Latour adds the role of non-humans. With his neo-material approach in hand I not only consider people, but also various types of objects. For more information on contemporary ethnographic fieldwork see, for example, Amit, Vered, ed. Constructing the Field: Ethnographic Fieldwork in the Contemporary World. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.

**Chapter 1**

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

The Berlinale Talent Campus is a cooperation of the International Berlin Film Festival, the Filmboard Berlin-Brandenburg, UK Film Council, House of World Cultures and MEDIA Promotion. It, in addition, has the support of over thirty other partners. The first edition takes place from 10 - 14 February 2003. In the editorial of the Campus Magazine, festival director Dieter Kosslick writes: “The Berlinale Talent Campus is a unique place for international and multicultural exchange between up-and-coming film filmmakers and established professionals. Here, you can learn how the business really works, you can discuss with directors, producers, and other professionals. At the same time the Campus is a platform which allows various organizations and institutions from all over the world to present themselves and a place to show and watch films.” Kosslick, Dieter. Berlinale Talent Campus Magazine. Berlin: Berlinale: 2003: 2.

See appendix II.


Kennedy, Harlan. “...And God Created Film Fests.” *American Film*, vol. XVI no.2 (February 1991): 12.

In 1936, the Venice Film Festival received official recognition. The festival was separated from the Arts Biennale and scheduled as a yearly event. In this year the
decision was made to build the Palazzo della Mostra del Cinema at the Lido, which would remain the heart of the festival for the years to come.


Another Intriguing detail is that one of the screenwriters of this fascist film was Roberto Rosselini. Rosselini was to become the embodiment of anti-Fascism with his ROMA, CITTÀ APERTA (Italy: 1946).


Another Intriguing detail is that one of the screenwriters of this fascist film was Roberto Rosselini. Rosselini was to become the embodiment of anti-Fascism with his ROMA, CITTÀ APERTA (Italy: 1946).

In the first three years of its existence, the International Film Festival Berlin was not a permanent institution. According to the task division between state and federal states, the city of Berlin was responsible for prolongation. Every year the Berlin Senate decided whether or not the festival should continue and every year the House of Representatives was formally notified of this decision. In 1953 the Berlin Parliament decreed that the film festival would become a permanent yearly event, which would be organized with the “Berliner Festwochen” under a communal “Festspiele” budget.

The preliminary committee consisted of: Theodor Baensch, head of Sub-Department of Film, Department of Art (Senator für Volksbildung), Manfred Barthel, publicist and film editor for Berlin daily new paper “Der Abend”, Oswald Cammann, manager of SPIO, Dr. Hans Curlis, producer of art films and chairman of the Society for German Art Film Producers, Ernst Hasselbach, producer of feature films and chairman of the Society for Berlin Film Producers, Oscar Martay, American Film Officer, Schneider, Tourist Information Office of Berlin, and George Turner, British Press and Film Officer.

The International Film Festival Berlin has been led by four festival leaders: Alfred Bauer (1951-1976), Wolf Donner (1976-1979), Moritz de Hadeln (1979-2001) and Dieter Kosslick (since 2001).


Another example of the international power play round the “A” status concerns the developments in the socialist countries. In 1956 the Czechoslovakian festival Karlovy Vary’s received the “A” status as “non-specialized festival with a feature film competition.” When an international film festival was established in Moscow in 1959 it was immediately accredited with category A. The political decision was made to have only one “A” festival every year among the socialist countries. Therefore, Karlovy Vary and Moscow IFF became biannual events, each taking turns in organizing a film festival between 1958 and 1993.

Wolfgang Jacobsen argues that the competition between the festivals was complicated by the dismissal of both the 18 and 17 June as appropriate opening dates, because they were respectively a Saturday and new national anniversary. See: Jacobsen. 50 Jahre Berlinale: 58.

ShoWest is also held in March (started in 1975 in San Diego and from 1979 onwards in Las Vegas). But this is the motion picture industry convention and, as such, aimed at commercial cinema and not at art films, which Donner considered as the main focus of the Filmmesse in Berlin.


The first editions of the festival took place in Marienbad (Mariánské Lázně). The festival moved to Karlovy Vary in 1950.

That Hollywood was seen as the universal standard requires a twofold explanation. On the one hand, it refers to the economic reality of Hollywood's worldwide domination in exhibition venues. The mere fact that Hollywood films are omnipresent and watched almost everywhere, renders these products universal. On the other hand, Hollywood has proven capable of addressing a global audience, even with national-specific genres such as the Western. Thus, Hollywood films are also universal, because of their universal appeal. In other words, Hollywood's universal success should be seen as both a top-down and a bottom-up process; top-down, since the penetration of the global market with Hollywood products is reached by means of effective business strategies; and bottom-up, because audiences world-wide have been thoroughly and genuinely enchanted by these products and often cherish a strong preference for Hollywood films over their own national or other foreign cinemas.


Godard, Truffaut, Chabrol, Rohmer and Rivette met in the late 1940s at the Cinémathèque Française, established by Henry Langlois. They began their careers by working as film critics for Cahier du Cinéma, founded by André Bazin in 1950.


The Motion Picture Association of America sent a representative to Malraux to discuss matters diplomatically and quietly. Both public and private pressure forced the French government to restate Langlois. However, state funding was withdrawn. Idem: 75.


Idem: 174-175.


Jacobsen. 50 Jahre Berlinale: 181.

The description of the Forum as both revolutionary (barricades) and elitist (ivory tower) was first used by Bern Plagemann and subsequently adopted for the publication dedicated to the thirtieth anniversary of the Forum.

Hardt, and Negri. Empire: 142.


Idem.


Shohat, and Stam. Unthinking Eurocentrism; 248. Havana, Cuba is dedicated to New Latin American cinema; Carthage, Tunisia to Arab and African cinemas; and Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso to the African and Afro-diasporic cinemas.

Idem: 134.

Another problematic aspect of the term “national cinema” in the age of globalisation concerns the increasingly international funding of films. In particular films from developing countries depend on foreign investments. The critique on “successful” film festivals, in this respect, is that they do not contribute to the national film industry. FESPACO, for example, has not contributed to the development of national African film industries. One week in every two years the rue Marchande is bursting with activity, business and discussions on the future of African cinema, only to return to its normal quiet state and Western and Kung Fu movies in the cinemas when the festival


On May 23rd 1949 a new constitution came into force for the Bundes Republik Deutschland – the constitution of 1949 was intended to be temporary until the reunification of Germany. With the reunification of West and East Germany in 1990, however, the Western constitution was taken over with just a few adjustments, making the "temporary" constitution a permanent one after all. With the fascist history fresh in mind, the constitution was specifically designed to prevent a situation in which too much power could be exercised by a small group of people or the German national government. Modeled on the Weimar Republic, the chosen structure was federal. The division of power between a central government and federal states was, however, stronger and more balanced than in the Weimar period. After reunification, the model of the BRD was maintained. There was a central government in Bonn (since 2000 in Berlin) and sixteen federal states, which had a large degree of autonomy. The federal states formed their own government that made independent policy for education, milieu, water-balance, health, culture and media. Thus, the cultural policy (Kulturpolitik) which included the regulations regarding the International Film Festival Berlin, has always been a federal business in Germany. The city-conglomerate of Berlin formed and forms a separate federal government, which means that most decisions regarding the Berlin film festival are taken on a local instead of national level. Throughout the Berlinale history, state interest for the festival, however, has been persistent due to the festival’s importance for Cold War agendas.

Idem: 139.

The airport is the embodiment of Virilio’s concept of speed distance. In the airport metaphor two technologies come together: the air traffic and the advanced surveillance technologies. These transportation and telecommunication technologies alter the perception of space and time. They cause a new configuration of space-time, which Virilio calls speed distance. Speed distance means that the distinction between “here” and “there” is surpassed by the speed of transportation and transmission. For Virilio the temporal element in speed distance is more important than the spatial element. Thus, he sees urban development as highly influenced by imperceptible organisation of time. Imperceptible organisation of time is linked to the overexposure of screens: computer consoles, video monitors, cinema screens etc. In the article “The Overexposed City,” Virilio argues that the physical city disappears into the aesthetics and temporality of these advanced technologies. They control time through three logistics

In Virilio's attention for control we see the influence of Foucault. The important difference between Virilio and Foucault is that Foucault wrote a theory on the control of space and the body, whereas Virilio focuses on the control of pace - time. Accordingly, Virilio rejects the concept of geopolitics as outdated. He argues that it refers to a period in which wars were about territories, about conquering sites and cities. Instead, he introduced the concept of chronopolitics, in which the struggle is not over place but over time, or, more specifically, over speed distance. One of his famous (and criticised) examples is the first Gulf War. According to Virilio, this war was about the superiority of long-distance technologies of destruction. This meant that the important battle was fought in the air and no longer on the ground or at sea. Most important, however, is the creation of a fourth front: that of communication. Virilio has been criticised for minimising the gravity of war victims.

For a photocopy of this letter see: Idem, 390-391.


Jacobsen. 50 Jahre Berlinale: 535.

Chapter 2
Cannes and the "Alternative" Cinema Network: Festivals, Film Business and Hollywood
The continuing influence of politics in Cannes becomes visible in another way in 2004. The French government regards the Festival de Cannes as a highly prestigious cultural event that must be protected from disruption by dissonant forces against all costs. Since the successful 1968 upheaval and the foundation of the parallel Quinzaine des Réalisateurs, strikers have realised that protests in Cannes are a guarantee for both media and government attention. In 2004 a disgruntled group of employees with a temporary contract in the cultural sector seeks this attention by threatening to undermine the festival in response to economic measures. The government opens up negotiations to prevent worse disruptions and allows the intermittents some exposure. However, when they prepare for an occupation of the Palais du Cinéma, the French government draws the line and sends in troops to lock the festival’s central icon, which was, coincidentally or not, already given the nickname “bunker,” because of its uninviting architecture.


Idem.

Idem: 50.

The transition in America had been initiated a couple of years earlier, around 1902/03.


Idem: 363.


The 1976 revision of the Copyright Act offered four tests for fair use: 1) the purpose and character of the use; 2) the nature of the copyrighted work; 3) the amount of the work that was copied; and 4) the economic impact of copying. See Wasser, Frederick. *Veni, Vidi, Video: The Hollywood Empire and the VCR*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2001: 85.

Idem: 91.


For an accurate (though fictive) example of such business practices see *FESTIVAL DE CANNES* (USA: Henry Jaglom 2001).


For more theoretical reflection and historical detail on the contemporary cinema economy see, for example: Creton, Lauren. *Cinéma et Marché*. Paris: Armand Colin /
Film Festivals


Idem: 33.


Idem: 221.


MYSTERIOUS OBJECT AT NOON was nominated for the Dragons and Tigers Award and won the Dragons and Tigers Award - Special Citation at the Vancouver International Film Festival in 2000.

BLISFULLY YOURS subsequently won the Un Certain Regard Award at the Cannes Film Festival in May 2002; the Golden Alexander at the Thessaloniki International Film Festival in November 2002; the KNF awards (Association of Dutch Film Critics) at the International Rotterdam Film Festival in February 2003; Best Director and FIPRESCI Prize at the Buenos Aires International Film Festival in April 2003; and the Young Cinema Award at the Singapore International Film Festival in May 2003. The film was, moreover, nominated for the Grand Jury Prize of the AFI Fest – The Annual AFI Los Angeles International Film Festival – in November 2002.

The other jury prize was given to actress Irma P. Hall for her performance in THE LADYKILLERS by Joel & Ethan Coen (United States, 2004).


For a discussion of the relationship between Hollywood and European cinema, film policy and the effect of globalisation see, for example: Elsaesser, Thomas. “Hyper-


Idem: 36.


Also see the festival publication on the Hubert Bals Fund: Fallaux, Emile, Malu Halasa, and Nupu Press, eds. True Variety: Funding the Art of World Cinema. Rotterdam: International Film Festival Rotterdam, 2003.


The other CineMart projects in Cannes 2004 were: LA NIÑA SANTA (Argentina/Italy/Netherlands/Spain: Lucrecia Martel 2004), NOBODY KNOWS (Japan: Kore-Eda Hirokazu 2004), CRONICAS (Mexico/Ecuador: Sebastián Cordero 2004), HOTEL (Austria/Germany: Jessica Hausner 2004), WHISKEY (Uruguay/Argentina/Germany/Spain: Juan-Pablo Rebbella, Pablo Stoll 2004), and LOS MUERTOS (Argentina/France/Netherlands/Switzerland: Lisandro Alonso 2004).

Filmmakers from Albania, Bosnia, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, FYROM, Greece, Rumania, Serbia, Slovenia and Turkey can apply with a full fiction film project to the Balkan Fund. City and Festival Guide, Thessaloniki International Film Festival 2003: 18.


The complete series of 2004 conferences was:
May 14th: “Around the world in 7 days; on world-wide Hollywood hits”
May 15th: “Fest toppers tout tips; on the current state of the festival marketplace”; and “The American directors; discussion between American directors screening at Cannes”
May 16th: “The producers; on the scoop behind films premiering at Cannes”; and “One-on-one with Peter Bart: Michael Moore; on the heat surrounding FAHRENHEIT 9/11”

May 17th: “One-on-one with Jack Valenti; on the piracy issue and other challenges to the film Industry”; and “Financing independent film; on the world of film finance”

May 18th: “International buy & sell: the world is your market; on the complex dynamics of financing, preselling and distributing films around the world”; and “One-on-one with Peter Bart: Colin Callender and Stephen Hopkins; on THE LIFE AND DEATH OF PETER SELLERS”

May 19th: “D-cinema: the digital solution?; on the impact of digital cinema on piracy, asset management and film distribution”

May 20th: “DVD – riding the wave; on DVD marketing and DVD as alternative distribution”; and “A class apart: the Cary Grant legacy at 100; on the career and movies of Cary Grant.”


Hans Weingartner was born in Austria, but lives in Germany. Germans and Austrian consequently quarreled over the “ownership” of the production and the nationality of the competing film.


The Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America (MPPDA), led by president Will H. Hays handled the film industry domestic and foreign policy from Manhattan from 1922 to 1945, keeping close contact with the federal government.


This first Palais des Festival, also known as “Palais Croisette,” was demolished in 1989.
The festival was rescheduled from autumn to spring in 1951.

Six luxurious hotels in Cannes are specifically linked to the festival: the Carlton, Grand Hotel, Gray d’Albion, Majestic, Martinez and Noga Hilton. Many film stars stay in these hotels or, if they need more privacy, withdraw to the Hotel du Cap at the Gap D’Antibes, from where they can take a speedboat to ceremonies and parties without having to mingle with the masses on the Croisette.

Alternatively, you can secure a personalized Kodak moment by using the services of the commercial photographers that, also dressed in black tie, re-enact the ritual and give you a star treatment.


*KILL BILL, VOL. 2.* screened out of competition at the 2004 Cannes Film Festival. In the film Bill, Carradine’s character, replies to the Bride when she asks him how he found her with a simple “I’m the man.”

Also in terms of a geopolitical perspective, Cannes can be argued to resemble the Bride in Tarantino’s *KILL BILL*, standing up against Venice. The initiative to found a festival in Cannes in 1939 was a vengeful act of the French, Americans and Brits to counter the Fascist hegemony over the Mostra in Venice, the only international film festival at the time. Due to the outbreak of World War II, the execution of revenge was kept comatose until the allied victory allowed the festival to re-emerge in 1946. Cannes was an instant success.

Chapter 3

Venice and the Value-Adding Process: Segregation and Agenda Setting on the Lido


Precondition for being allowed into one of these interview junkets is typically that the movie concerned must have distribution in the country where the applying journalist will publish his/her report.


The idea of art and the idea of a hierarchy of the arts are relatively new. In the seventeenth century, the French educational system separated art and science for the first time. In the mid-eighteenth century, Abbé Batteau presented a system of the arts, in which he defined the fine arts by their communal goal of pleasure: music, poetry, painting, sculpture, and dance.

pre-planning by the media; 5) presentation with reverence and ceremony; 6) hegemonic and historic; 7) electrification of very large audiences; and 8) norm of viewing.


221 Idem.


223 Only in 2001 was the British Academy Film Awards moved to before the Oscars. The rescheduling of the Oscars prior to the early BAFTA’s should be placed in relation to this earlier move. Likewise, the rescheduling of the American Film Market from late February - early March to November is not only related to competition with MIFED, but also with the prior Oscar ceremony.

224 On the distinction between place and non-place, Marc Augé writes: “[B]y place and non-place I mean to designate both real spaces and the relations that their users have with them. A place is defined as identity, in the sense that a certain number of individuals recognize themselves in it and define themselves by means of it; relational, in the sense that the same individuals read within that space the relation that unites them with each other; and historical, in the sense that the occupants of the place find in it various traces of an old, former presence, the sign of affiliation. Place, then, is triply symbolic (in the sense that the symbol establishes a tradition of complementarity between two beings or realities): it symbolizes the relation that each of its inhabitants has to him – or herself, to the other occupants, and to their common history. A space where neither identity, relation, or history are symbolized is a non-place...They are spaces where people coexist or cohabit without living together, where the status of consumer or solitary passenger implies a contractual relation with society. These empirical non-places, and the mental attitudes and relations to the world that they give rise to, are characteristic of the state of supermodernity, defined in opposition to modernity. As explained, supermodernity corresponds to an acceleration of history, a shrinking of space, and an individualizing of references, all of which subvert the cumulative processes of modernity.” In: Augé, Marc. *An Anthropology for Contemporaneous Worlds.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999: 109-110.


226 Idem: 444.

227 For a historical and insider overview of the Sundance Film Festival, see, among others, Smith, Lory. *Party in a Box: The Story of the Sundance Film Festival.* Salt Lake City: Gibbs-Smith Publisher, 2001.

Castells’ theory of spaces shows similarities with Hardt and Negri’s concept of non-place. In *Empire* they explain how the space of Empire is characterised by an absence of place for power. Power is both everywhere and nowhere. Empire is a non-place. After the continuous dialectics between outside and inside during Imperialism, there is no outside left in Empire. There are no more borders, as everything has been included in the global arena. Moreover, there is no more nature. The modern dialectics of outside and inside have been replaced by a postmodern play with hybridity and artificiality. Guy Debord’s society of spectacle is an early concept for the virtual place that cannot be divided into inside/outside or private/public. According to Hardt and Negri, the Left localist position and resistance against globalisation should be rejected, because the local/global dichotomy is fallacious. The important element in the distinction between the local and the global for Hardt and Negri is the vision that locality is produced. “[T]he social machines ... create and recreate the identities and differences that are understood as the local. The differences of locality are neither preexisting nor natural but rather the effects of a regime of production” (Hardt, and Negri, 2000: 45). City marketing is a good example of the production of locality. For Hardt and Negri, production is the key to understanding the move from modernity to postmodernity. Networks of production, the transnational corporations, undermined the role of the nation-state. Production also offers the opportunity for resisting and creating a Counter-Empire.

The Midnight Sun Film Festival Website. 8 March 2004 <http://www.msfilmfestival.fi>

The Sarajevo Film Festival Website. 8 March 2004, <http://www.sff.ba>.

Another early example of a festival that moves location to influence its position on the circuit is the Atlanta International Film Festival. See the article “Atlanta International Film Festival Transfers its Total Operation to the U.S. Virgin Islands.” *American Cinematographer*, vol. LVI no. 7 (July 1975): 822-823.


Whereby the organisation of *Open* makes an explicit statement against the closed structure of national pavilions that continues to dominate the Biennale.

Also see chapter 1: 27.

See appendix III.

Lazzarin, Michela. Personal interview, 1 September 2003.


For listing the various programmes the order of appearance in the festival catalogue is used.

See appendix IV.

The list of allotted awards is distributed among press and media representatives during a press conference in the morning/early afternoon of the night of the closing ceremony to give them the opportunity to write their closing reports with embargo knowledge of the official winners.


The other jury members for Venezia 60 are: Stefano Accorsi (actor, Italy), Michael Ballhaus (cinematographer, Germany/U.S), Ann Hui (director, Hong Kong), Pierre Jolivet (director, France), Monty Montgomery (director, scriptwriter, producer, U.S) and Assumpta Serna (actress, Spain).

The complete selection of the Competition Venezia 60 is:

- Marco Bellocchio, *Buongiorno, notte* (Goodmorning, Night)
- Paolo Benvenuti, *Segreti di Stato* (Secret File)
- Randa Chahal Sabbag, *Le Cerf-Volant* (The Kite)
- Jacques Doillon, *Raja*
- Bruno Dumont, *Twenty-nine Palms*
- Amos Gitai, *Alila*
- Alejandro Gonzaláles Inárritu, *21 Grams*
- Christopher Hampton, *Imagining Argentina*
- Im Sangsoo, *Baram-Nan Gajok* (A Good Lawyer’s Wife)
- Srdjan Karanovič, *Staj u ocima* (Loving Glances)
- Takeshi Kitano, *Zatoichi*
- Jan Jako Kolski, *Pornografia* (Pornography)
- Carol Lai Miu Suet, *The Floating Landscape*
- Noémie Lvosky, *Les sentiments* (Feelings)
- Manoel de Oliveira, *Un film falado* (A talking picture)
- Margarethe von Trotta, *Rosenstrasse*
- Tsai Ming-Liang, *Bu-San* (Good Bye, Dragon Inn)
- Edoardo Winspeare, *Il miracolo* (The Miracle)
- Michael Winterbottom, *Code 46*
- Andrey Zvyagintsev, *Vosvrachenie* (The Return)

60. *Mostra Internazionale d’Arte Cinematografica*: 16.

60. *Mostra Internazionale d’Arte Cinematografica*: 74.


Pierluigi Celli was head of the Rai, the state network (1998-2001). Piera Detassis was chief editor of a cinema magazine published by Berlusconi’s publishing company.

Ciment, Michael and Klaus Eder. E-mail to the FIPRESCI mailing list. 22 December 2003. The email continues as follows: FIPRESCI indicates its total support of Carlo Lizzani, Gillo Pontecorvo, Felice Laudadio and Alberto Barbera, past directors of the Mostra Internazionale d’Arte Cinematografica of the Biennale di Venezia. They
declared their availability to direct an alternative event jointly during the Mostra, on the model of the 1972-73 "Giornate del Cinema", in case the current director Moritz de Hadeln would not be confirmed in his position, or a new director would not possess the professional and cultural attributes required for such an important and prestigious festival. The alternative event, which will be organized only if the situation makes it necessary, will take place at the exact same dates as the Mostra, with the support of the major national and international bodies representing filmmakers, film critics and all the categories involved in cinema throughout the world. Munich/Paris, December 22, 2003. Michel Ciment, President & Klaus Eder, General Secretary. FIPRESCI (Federation Internationale de la Presse Cinematographique).


Idem. The complete list of distributors per country is:
Croatia: Megacom D.O.O.
France: Ocean Films
Israel: United King Video Ltd.
Italy: Orion
Japan: Bitters End, Inc.
Luxemburg, Les Film de l’Elysee, 04/02/2004
Mexico: Constellation Pictures Inc.
Poland: Gutek Film Ltd.
Portugal: Atalanta Filmes Lda
Russia & CIS: Maywin Media AB
Spain: Vertigo Filmes
Sweden: Folkets Bio A.B.
Switzerland: Agora Films 10/03/2004
Yugoslavia: Megacom D.O.O.

and nominations for THE RETURN are: 60th Venice IFF, Italy, Golden Lion for the best Film, Golden Lion for Best Debut (Lion of the Future), SIGNIS – Catholic Jury Prize, Students' Jury Prize for Best Debut, Prize of Revista del Cinematografo – Sergio Trasatti – Venezia Cinema, Cottbus IFF, Germany, Best Director, Ljubljana IFF, Slovenia, Grand Prix, Zagreb IFF, Serbia, Grand Prix, Gijon IFF, Spain, Best Actors, Best Script, Special Jury Prize, Thessaloniki IFF, Greece, FIPRESCI Special Mention “For its delicate balance between subject and style, its excellence in the direction of the actors and for telling a strong story without special effects and with minimal means.” Belgrade IFF, Serbia, Best Film (Alexandre Sasha Petrovich Award), Best Cinematographer (Alexandre Petrovich Award), Moscow, Russia, Russian Film Press Awards “Taurus” for 2003 – Best Film, Best Debut, Best Cinematographer, Stalker FF - Best Debut, Berlin, European Film Academy Discovery 2003 – Prix Fassbinder, Riga, Latvia, Don Quijote Prize - Award of FICC (Federation International de Cine Clubs), USA, Nomination for HFPA Prix “Golden Globe” in the category “Best Foreign Film”, Palm Springs IFF, FIPRESCI Award for Best Official Foreign Language Film of 2003, France, Nomination for Cesar in the category “Best Foreign Film”, Fajr IFF, Iran, Crystal Simorgh - Best Film Award.


The other participant of the 60th Mostra with famous family ties is the fourteen-year-old Hana Makhmalbaf. Her JOY OF MADNESS is a making-of her older sister Samira's AT FIVE IN THE AFTERNOON, which was presented and awarded in Cannes a couple of months before. Hana is the daughter of acclaimed Iranian director Mohsen Makhmalbaf and Marzieh Meshini (“The Day I Became A Woman”). Hana is the youngest filmmaker to enter the Venice International Film Festival ever.


De Hadeln even changed the programme so as to mix Upstream and Competition and stimulate press coverage for both sections. Journalists complained about these changes, because they disturbed their accustomed rhythm.

According to the distinctions of the Venice film festival, it is the reviews and reports in major national newspapers that constitutes the most important press coverage. I followed this distinction and selected a number of major European newspapers for analysis of their festival reports of the 60th Mostra, namely: NRC Handelsblad, De Volkskrant, Trouw, (The Netherlands); Sueddeutsche Zeitung, Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, Die Welt (Germany); Le Monde, La Libération (France); The Times, The Guardian, The International Herald Tribune (UK); The Independent (Ireland); Corriere della Sera (Italy); and El Pais (Spain). The aim of this selection is clearly not to form a representative section of the sum of press and media coverage of the 60th Venice film festival, but to zoom in on the reviews and reports that are considered most valuable to the festival. The concentration on European newspapers is not only based on practical
limitations, but also follows from the focus of my research on European film festivals in general.


265 See, for example, the interviews by Susan Vahabzadeh: “Ich Versuche, Meine Sache so Durchzuziehen, Wie es ein Mann Tun Würde.” Sueddeutsche Zeitung. 7 January 2004; and by Ella Taylor: “I Don’t Like Being Told What to Do.” The Guardian. 13 October 2003.

266 See, for example, the interview by Polly Vernon: “Scarlett Fever.” The Observer. 28 December 2003.


270 During the Viennale, a retrospective was dedicated to Vincent Gallo.

271 Filmkrant, January 30, 2004: 7; Jos van der Burg (Het Parool, Netherlands) – 4 stars; Matthieu Darras (Positif, France) – 4 stars; Pieter van Lierop (GPD, Netherlands) – 2 stars; Dana Linssen (Filmkrant, Netherlands) – 3 stars; Ronald Ockhuysen (de Volkskrant, Netherlands) 4 stars; Ruth Pombo (Levante, Spain) – 1 star; Jonathan Rosenbaum (Chicago Reader, US) – 3 stars.


275 Shrum. Fringe and Fortune: 117.

Chapter 4
Rotterdam and the Rise of Specialised Festivals: From Cinephile Initiatives to Popular Events


The 2004 festival was held between January 21 and February 2 and equalled the highest number of admissions of the 2003 edition: 355,000. The biggest audience festival is the Berlinale.

The IFFR holds first position in the national events top-100 (with admission charge) and keeps the 15th place in the top-100 for all events (free and with admission charge).

This evaluation of the admission number by Ido Abram is recorded as expressed on the occasion of the 2004 film festival in Cannes.

In 1983 the record number of 44,680 visitors was reached. By 1996 this number had exceeded the 200,000 mark. The exponential increase after 1996 is related to the new location – the Pathé Multiplex on the Schouwburgplein – that was inaugurated for festival purposes in 1997. Also see 4.4.3 Debating the New Festival Audiences.

De Volkskrant of October 14th 2004 indeed announces that the film festival in Rotterdam has decided to change its format for the 34th edition (26/01-06/02/2005). The new format is divided into three new parts with around one hundred features and documentaries, and replaces the Main Program and the Hubert Bals Fonds Harvest.


In the original Dutch expression the word used is “buik” (belly) which carries the connotation of “onderbuik” (gut) which, in its turn, is also used when referring to feelings of agitation emanating from within society and flourishing irrespective of empirical evidence or political correctness.

Camera/Studio, City, Palace and Scala.

Heijs, and Westra. Que le Tigre Danse: 29.

The other Dutch film festival of the time was the film week organised in Arnhem. This event was also biannual, so, with the addition of the Cinemanifestatie in Utrecht, the Netherlands had one film festival each year.

Heijs, and Westra. Que le Tigre Danse: 93.
In 1340 the expanding settlement known as Rotterdam, located approximately forty kilometres inland on the waterside of the river Nieuwe Maas, received full city rights. The harbour activities played an important role in the urban development of Rotterdam throughout the centuries. At the end of the sixteenth century, Rotterdam was the first city in the Northern Netherlands where an Exchange was built. In the Dutch Golden Age (seventeenth century) both the national naval forces and the successful seafaring trade organisation "Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie" opened office branches in Rotterdam. The city and its harbour consequently developed into the second most important centre of the Dutch Batavian Republic (1795-1813). The city was well-faring but did not experience a significant growth of population until the modern transportation inventions, in particular the steam train, opened the Dutch and German hinterland up to overland trade. At the end of the nineteenth century, the transfer of goods such as coal, ore and grain became a key activity in the Rotterdam harbour. The wide availability of jobs attracted labour forces to the city for which new residential districts were developed. At the same time large communities (especially from Eastern Europe) used Rotterdam as a last stop on the European mainland before migrating to the United States. The Holland-America Line (HAL) transported around 400,000 immigrants from Rotterdam to New York in the last quarter of the nineteenth century alone.


"New" refers here to the modern and/or contemporary cultural practice. Thus whereas Amsterdam was known for its historical buildings, Rotterdam would concentrate on modern and contemporary architecture.

Before the final film paper was completed, the first film festival in Rotterdam had already been held.

At the time the Ministry of Culture, Recreation and Welfare – Cultuur, Recreatie en Maatschappelijk werk (CRM).


For example by understanding his development as starting with a series of films that drew inspiration from Hollywood genre pictures, such as AU BOUT DE SOUFFLE (France: 1964), moving to his “radical political period” in 1968, and towards a more and more meta-cinematic and historical-reflexive style from there on.

Dudley Andrew raised this issue in his paper “Waves and Islands in the Seas of World Cinema” which he presented at the Cinema in Europe: Networks in Progress Conference. University of Amsterdam, 21 June 2005.


Don Ranvaud in particular is recurrently lamenting the competition structure in his festival reports in Framework. He writes, for example: “I would go as far as to argue that of the festivals retaining a competitive structure Locarno is, perhaps, the only one that may be compared to the much improved Edinburgh or the ailing Pesaro as one of the most important and stimulating cinematographic events of the year.” And elsewhere: “Apart from the lamentable question of the prizes, which this year demonstrated the very serious reservation many people still feel about the purpose and value of preserving competitive structures...” Ranvaud, Don. “Berlin.” Framework, no. 6 (Autumn, 1977): 34. Also see Ranvaud, Don. “Locarno.” Framework, no. 2 (Autumn 1975): 30-33, 30.

At the time the Ministry of Science, Leisure time and Culture – Wetenschap, Vrije tijd en Cultuur (WVC).

For a full list of acquisitions see the appendix in Heijs and Westra. Que le Tigre Danse: 293-300. The appendix uses Dutch titles when the original title is not in English, French or German.

Stichting Film Festival Rotterdam. 33rd International Film Festival Rotterdam Jaarverslag 2003/4. Rotterdam: International Film Festival Rotterdam, 2004: 33.

The films supported by the Hubert Bals Funds appeared until 2004 in the special program “Hubert Bals Fund Harvest,” which disappeared as a separate programme with the 2005 festival.


Notes

Heijs, and Westra. *Que le Tigre Danse*: 97-98.


The publication is the result of a five-year period of correspondences and collaborations between “professional cinephiles” (film critics and filmmakers) of which the first round of letters was published in the French magazine *Trafic* in 1997. The project was started as “an exploration of what cinephiles (and in some cases, film-makers) around the planet have in common and what they can generate, activate and explore by linking up together in various ways. See Rosenbaum, Jonathan. “Preface.” *Movie Mutations. The Changing Face of World Cinephilia*. Eds. Rosenbaum, Jonathan, and Adrian Martin. London: British Film Institute, 2003: vi-x, vi.


Idem: 83.


Stichting Film Festival Rotterdam. 33rd *International Film Festival Rotterdam Jaarverslag 2003/4*: 22.
Nobuyoshi Otani, president of Shochiku Co., Ltd on the “The Yasujiro Ozu 100th Anniversary Project” in promotion material distributed at film festivals, collected by researcher at the Berlinale in 2003. He also comments: “This series of commemorative projects next year will include screenings at 16 theaters in Japan. Many of the prestigious International Film Festivals around the world will also be celebrating this occasion. All of the existing Shochiku films will be presented during and following Berlin and Hong Kong Film Festival. Kalrovy Vary, Istanbul, and Brisbane will dedicate it’s program in having a special screening of his films during the festival, and New York will hold a retrospective presenting all the 33 existing Ozu films from Shochiku at their festival. Also a series of screenings at the National Film Center at the National Museum of Modern Art in Tokyo, as well as special broadcasts on satellite channels at both NHK BS and Eisei-Gekijo. Indeed, there is an air of excitement spreading both in Japan and overseas as we prepare to commemorate the 100th anniversary of Ozu’s birth.” The brochure is also available online: January 2003, 13 September 2005, <http://www.shochikufilms.com/director/detail.php?director_code=39.>

Den Hamer, Sandra. Personal interview. 23 August 2005.

The 774 total screenings are divided as follows: 217 long films; 365 short films; 100 documentaries; 100 lectures, debates and talk shows; 40 performances and installations; and 22 websites and DVDs. Stichting Film Festival Rotterdam. 33rd International Film Festival Rotterdam Jaarverslag 2003/4: 15.


These are days with pre-selected screenings for which subscribers to De Volkskrant (newspaper) and VPRO (television/radio broadcaster) can buy a ticket.

Peranson, Mark. “Nothing Sells Better Than Sex:” 5. Consider for example 2004, when the public gave Tiger Award winner Kang-sheng Lee’s (also known as Tsai Ming-liang’s actor of choice) acclaimed debut BU JIAN / THE MISSING (Taiwan: 2003) an average score of 3.41 out of 5, not a bad score but one which nevertheless placed the film 109th out of 164.

Den Hamer, Sandra. Personal interview. 23 August 2005


Den Hamer, Sandra. Personal interview. 23 August 2005

Van der Giessen, René. Personal interview. 23 August 2005


Exploding Cinema was first organised during the 25th edition of the festival in 1996.
The attention for digital developments is also in line with the cultural strategy of the Rotterdam municipality to present the city as a centre for the new arts.

Den Hamer, Sandra. Personal interview. 23 August 2005.


62% of the visitors to the IFFR belong to the higher social classes, 26% to the middle class and 6% to the lower social classes. However, only 17% of these consider the festival to be elitist. Wemar Vrijetijds Onderzoek: 9, 11.


Rosenbaum. “Sampling in Rotterdam:” 54.


Idem.

See, for example, Wemar Vrijetijds Onderzoek: 42.


Fortuyn liked to contrast his mansion in the Rotterdam centre with the suburban and upscale housing that is the rule among politicians as proof of his proximity to the average citizen and understanding for their typical urban problems.

Conclusion
Successful or Safe? The Strengths and Weaknesses of the Film Festival Network


“This notion of translation has been developed by M. Callon (1986). M. Callon, J. Law, and A. Rip, eds. (1986), and B. Latour (1987) and applied to the study of science and technology in order to fuse the notions of interest and research program in a more subtle way. Firstly, translation means drift, betrayal, ambiguity […]. It thus means that we are staring from inequivalence between interests or language games and that the aim of the translation is to render two propositions equivalent. Second, translation has a strategic meaning. It defines a stronghold established in such a way that, whatever people do and wherever they go, they have to pass through the contender’s position and to help him further his own interests. Third, it has a linguistic sense, so that one
version of the language game translates all the others, replacing them all with 'whatever you wish, this is what you really mean.'” Idem: 253n16.