The cheetah of cinema

Paalman, F.

Published in:
Mind the screen: media concepts according to Thomas Elsaesser

The Cheetah of Cinema

Floris Paalman

Bochum, 10 December 2004. Evening. We took the same train back to Amsterdam after we had attended a workshop on industrial films. This is how I *went* home, while Thomas Elsaesser *was* already at home. When we got on the train he apologized for taking a separate seat, as he had to prepare something. However, after a while he approached me, to discuss something of "strategic importance." He asked me if I was still interested in swarms, emergence, and systems, as I had indicated when I applied for the position of PhD candidate. When I joined the Cinema Europe research project at the end of 2002, the group was working on new methodologies. Much attention was being paid to "cutting edge" insights from other scientific disciplines. We got to explore "big theory," concerning such issues as globalization and network theory.[1] In this perspective Elsaesser handed me some print-outs from the website of an organization called Calresco, which deals with complexity theory. I said that I did not yet know how to connect it to my work on film and architecture. Think about it, he said, and if it seemed interesting, I could use the material for a presentation at the PhD seminar.

Complexity and Systems

Calresco turned out to be an international think tank and platform for the promotion of complexity theory as a multidisciplinary concern, directed by the British physicist and computer scientist Chris Lucas. Complexity theory emerged partly from system theory, which was first developed within the natural sciences, but to some extent within the social sciences as well, as, for instance, in the work of Niklas Luhmann.[2] According to Luhmann, societies are systems, with various subsystems, which regulate their input and output through preconceived channels. As such, Luhmann also frames media. The function of media is to provide knowledge about the world. Observations are checked and channeled through protocols and routines, in order to become news, entertainment or advertisement. However, media do not merely (re)present, but actually *create* their own world. At the center of Luhmann's theory is the issue of *autopoiesis* (i.e. self-creation), which is at stake when a system functions as a black-box, that is, blind to its own environment. Its output is its input. Luhmann offers a way out of subject-centeredness and representation, into the domain of functions. This escape en-

compasses functions within the system and functions of media within larger environments (i.e. other systems). In one of his last articles, written in 1997, Luhmann describes the world as an autopoietic system as follows:

> [A] re-entry leads to an unresolvable indeterminacy. The system cannot match its internal observations with its reality, nor can external observers compute the system. Such systems need a memory function (i.e. culture) that presents the present as an outcome of the past. But memory means forgetting and highly selective remembering, it means constructing identities for re-impregnating recurring events. In addition, such systems need an oscillator function to be able to cross the boundaries of all distinctions they use, such as, being/not-being, inside/outside, good/bad, male/female, true/false etc.[3]

Culture is for society what memory is for an individual. To be able to remember, identities need to be made, which means images and forms, in other words, cultural expressions such as cinema and architecture among many others. To create these forms, the (collective) mind needs the oscillator function. Luhmann continues:

> To be able to separate memory and oscillation, the system constructs time, that is, a difference of past and future states, by which the past becomes the realm of memory and the future the realm of oscillation. This distinction is an evolutionary universal. It is actualized by every operation of the system and thus gives time the appearance of a dimension of the 'world'. And if there are sufficient cultural guarantees for conceptualizing time, the distinction of time re-enters itself with the effect that past and future presents, too, have their own temporal horizons, their own pasts and futures.[4]

Luhmann's view seems to correspond to the ideas of physicists like Julian Barbour who argue that time basically does not exist[5]. According to Luhmann, it is simply created by the system, and ultimately by the human mind, which becomes manifested through culture. Luhmann did not really emphasize this argument, but it seems to be of crucial importance. It differs from a mere functionalist understanding of society, of which system theory has often been accused, offering latitude to a theory of change. Luhmann died shortly after writing this article, so he was unable to elaborate on his own thoughts. The idea of the oscillator function actually allows for elaboration in terms of complexity theory.

Attractors, Bifurcations, and Iterations

Some of the premises of complexity theory are very different from system theory. Whereas system theory frames preconceived channels to regulate the operations within a system, almost mechanistically, complexity theory, on the contrary, deals with issues of adaptation, change, and chaos. Random events and "noise" stimulate the emergence and development of things, and consequently complex organizational forms come into being. Moreover, the behavior of individual actors can have major effects on the entire system.[6] These things together create certain development paths, which are irreversible, leading to entropy, which in turn generates its own sense of time.

A crucial notion within complexity theory is that of "attractor." It is a "preferred position for the system, such that if the system is started from another state it will evolve until it arrives at the attractor, and will then stay there in the absence of other factors."[7] A major risk of "borrowing" conceptual tools from other disciplines is that it remains simply a matter of translation, and so does not develop insights or elaborate new concepts. However, to some extent, the act of translation is necessary to recognize certain patterns and to be able to connect certain phenomena to others. To that purpose, one could call the convention of classical Hollywood cinema the main attractor of American filmmaking. A film follows a narrative format, based on individual desire and an oppositional force that is overcome (the protagonist – antagonist structure). It usually goes together with continuity editing that respects the axis of action. Foreign filmmakers that come to Hollywood will most likely adapt to these conventions. Similarly, the primary attractor of Bollywood, to give another example, is the convention of Masala, which is the mix of at least one star, six songs, three dances, action and comedy based on a love story following a protagonist-antagonist structure. Film genres are also systems with their own attractors, like thrillers with their obligatory suspense.

In the development of a system, attractors change, which in their turn change the whole system. Again, we face the risk of translation, which may simply result in a confirmation of existing paradigms by dressing them in new conceptual cloths. We should therefore wonder what it means to speak of a "phase" and a "phase change." Could we say that experimentation and technological innovation were the attractors of early cinema, as a system,[8] and that a phase change occurred when narrative cinema became the new attractor? We should also consider what it means that different kinds of systems developed next to that of narrative cinema, like that in the Soviet Union. In this case, we might identify the Kuleshov montage principle as an "attractor" to generate meaning by association rather than by narrative. After the definitive establishment of sound film in 1929, the entire system of cinema, including that of the Soviet Union, gradually evolved. Different systems developed in the USA, Europe, India, Japan, and elsewhere. We could also indicate other moments of "phase change," for example, when television was introduced. In such cases, we could possibly also use other

complexity theory concepts , like "bifurcation," which is the ongoing splitting of a system. This leads to chaos in "terms of entropy, where chaos and complexity are hard to distinguish."[9] Bifurcation is fundamental for the emergence of complexity. In the case of the introduction of television, several types of production that had previously been the realm of cinema, such as news reports, travelogues and city impressions, educative and informational films, among others, became the realm of television.

Bifurcation also seems to be at stake when considering the various kinds of audiovisual programs, genres and styles that have appeared and which have deliberately used the various audiovisual media that became available over time. This continued when video was introduced, ranging from home videos to art video production and video installations to new distributional modes for feature films. Cable television should be mentioned here as well. Nowadays, with the availability of digital media, cinema has, above all, become "home cinema." However, movie theaters will also continue to exist, for the release of new films, for social events and festivals, and as an alternative distribution circuit (the reverse of what it had once been). Cinema has become more diverse in format and reception, and so have its form and language. It allows new visual cultures to emerge, for example, the popular cinema of West Africa (on video/DVD), with Lagos as its epicenter.[10]

Several transitions that can be observed here are the so-called "iterations" that cycle "between the available behaviors," which is a phenomenon associated with bifurcation. If we take the documentary, for example, we can clearly see that it has continued to move between cinema and television. But also feature filmmaking has shown this type of pattern. It might be through these concepts that we are able to frame cinema in a different way than we used to do, by looking at the relationship between different media and between different kinds of productions, by taking into account different ways to address audiences and for different purposes. By looking at these connections we can consider the way that television stations support cinema by showing films and co-producing them. Television also sponsors film festivals; the Dutch VPRO, for example, has been one of the main sponsors of the International Film Festival Rotterdam for many years now, as well as the daily newspaper *De Volkskrant*, among others. From the perspective of complexity theory, we should consider whether this situation of television supporting cinema could not have ended up the other way round, historically, with the development of television being supported by cinema, if the system had developed according to other attractors. What kinds of perspectives can be generated via complexity theory, as an alternative to the linear evolution that relies on technological, economic, or even political determinism? Is it possible to consider other histories that could also have happened, but just did not happen – by coincidence, or for structural reasons?

Environment and Interconnected Media

At this point, we should establish a connection with the concept of *Medienverbund*, which Elsaesser developed with respect to the cinema and architecture of Frankfurt in the 1920s and 1930s.[11] In addition to manifestations of architecture and urbanism, city planner Ernst May used media like film, photography, and graphic design to promote the ideas of *Das Neue Frankfurt*. Instead of merely dealing with specific avant-garde expressions, it encompassed an avant-garde strategy in which different media fulfilled complementary or additional functions, serving a similar purpose and reinforcing each other. We could learn about their common agenda if we took one medium and analyzed its connections, to discover its relationship to the built environment and to the social institutions that inhabit it. To that end, Elsaesser has argued in favor of researching "AAA": *Auftraggeber* (commissioner), *Anlass* (reason), *Anwendung* (use). This strategy allows networks come to the fore, instead of just the aesthetic virtues of avant-garde cinema and architecture. These networks cross various media, genres, and categories. Hence an "ecology" that encompasses cinema and urbanism is drawn. This ecology, one can imagine, is itself a kind of *Medienverbund*. Eventually, as Lev Manovich has argued, there may even be a "convergence" of various media, and of media and space, which he has called "augmented space,"[12] which could be considered a radical instance of *Medienverbund*.

To some extent, this relies upon ideas from "media ecology," but instead of drawing a media landscape, I would explore the promises of complexity theory by linking the content of media productions to their conditions, that is, to consider functions of media within a broader socio-cultural environment. To that end, we should consider the more specific notion of complexity theory, that of "stigmergy," which, according to Calresco, is:

> The use of the environment to enable agents to communicate and interact, facilitating self-organization. This can be by deliberate storage of information (e.g. the WWW) or by physical alterations to the landscape made as a result of the actions of the lifeforms operating there (e.g. pheromone trails, termite hills). The future choices made by the agents are thus constrained or stimulated dynamically by the random changes encountered.[13]

Stigmergy is first and foremost about random changes, but self-organization occurs when "stigmergic local knowledge" is used to coordinate the behavior of a

collection of agents, which is the definition of a swarm.[14] This means that self-organization takes place when the environment is molded to accommodate cooperation. This can also be understood as an infrastructure that is created by and under the control of the system itself.

We can compare it to approaches based on the notion of "habitat." According to Ulf Hannerz:

> The habitat offers both resources and constraints; it is defined with reference to particular agents, so that the habitats of different agents may overlap either more or less, within the landscape as a whole; and the habitat is emergent and transitory. It is not by definition linked to a particular territory. To what degree it actually turns out to be so depends on the conduct of the agents concerned. In more sociological terms, the habitat of an agent could be said to consist of a network of direct and indirect relationships, stretching out wherever they may, within or across national boundaries.[15]

Hannerz, in elaborating on habitat, frames the global society by employing the concept of "global ecumene" as "an open fairly densely networked landscape."[16] This notion is based on the work of the anthropologist Alfred Kroeber, who referred to the ancient Greek term "ecumene" (*oikoumene*), which means "the entire inhabited world as the Greeks then understood it."[17] Through the notion of "global ecumene" it is possible to frame various kinds of networks, each with its own scale and features, while cross-connections between them are not excluded.

Cultural Ecology

The link between Ulf Hannerz and Alfred Kroeber could be elaborated through the notion of "cultural ecology" that was coined by the anthropologist Julian Steward in 1955.[18] Steward had been a student of Alfred Kroeber. In a similar way, he took the environment into consideration as a major factor in the emergence and development of culture. Although it was an important current until the 1980s, it disappeared as soon as global issues came to the fore. It is, however, akin to complexity theory, and it makes it possible to link the work of social scientists like John Urry and those working in the field of media ecology to a firm tradition within cultural anthropology.[19] This is not only to anchor socio-cultural development in spatial practices and to emphasize the role of the environment, but above all to establish the interrelationship between different institutions and other kinds of actors, within a system, and between different systems.

To understand cinema as a global phenomenon, it is not enough to merely identify the attractors of each system separately. It would be more fruitful to think in terms of interdependencies and co-evolution. To that end, we should look at

ecosystems. At the beginning of the 20th century, for example, the Polish started to reduce the number of lynxes in the forests of Bialowieza because they thought that lynxes were too harmful for the rest of the wildlife. The consequence was that too many herbivores now survived, so that much of the vegetation was destroyed, and animals such as the deer began to degenerate.[20] Another example is the cheetah and the Thomson's gazelle in East Africa, which are two of the world's fastest animals only because of co-evolution.[21] As the gazelle became faster, so did the cheetah. In comparison, Hollywood can also be considered a predator. It eats Europe's talent, but in order to do so it also has to invest in it. This creates a relationship that is both competitive and cooperative. However, a cheetah has to rest for about twenty minutes after it has chased its prey at top speed, and it is during this time that a lion or hyena might come along and steal its prey. If Hollywood is the lion, who would be the cheetah? Film theory? Or should we keep it to the lynx, which has upon occasion been spotted in the Netherlands since the 1990s. Is it coming from Germany?

The example of the lynx has revealed its function in a larger environment. We could similarly identify the functions of cinema as a cultural system within society at large. A common point, following Walter Benjamin in the 1930s, is the assumption that cinema has provided a model for modern life. Moreover, it has been a catalyst of modernization through the modes of perception.[22] It links up with a vast discourse on cinema in relationship to aesthetics as well as cognitive functions. One of the most radical theories in this respect is that of Fredric Jameson, who framed cinema as a geopolitical aesthetic mapping of the political unconscious.[23] Here economic functions come to the fore as well; cinema is a factor in the development strategies of cities and countries, and a factor within globalization as well.[24] Recalling Luhmann, cinema is also a matter of collective structural coupling. In comparison, a more orthodox view within film studies frames cinema as an alternative for reality, but Arjun Appadurai has, probably unintentionally, refreshed it by connecting it to the reality of migration.[25] While cinema may lead to new life patterns, Appadurai has addressed the notion of the media informing daily life, to simultaneously control and to redress it. This is related to the notion of "monitoring,"[26] which can be applied to understand where we are going and how. This brings us back to Luhmann; like culture in general, cinema has both a memory function and an oscillator function. This allows us to live in a timeless universe to explore irreversible destinies, to understand that humans get older, revolving around the sun, while we try to make sense of the innumerable other turns we make in life.

Social and Material Factors

The functions of cinema in society at large are interrelated with the attractors of that society. In fact, there might be a complex set of different interconnected attractors and functions; since a "complex system can have many attractors and these can alter with changes to the system interconnections (mutations) or parameters."[27] Hence, it is also necessary to find the cultural equivalent of ecological parameters. It seems problematic to maintain the biotic-abiotic dichotomy, since the abiotic usually also implies human involvement. It could, however, serve as a starting point by replacing the dichotomy with "social" and "material" factors. Some of the social factors may include: population density, the labor force, age, education, cooperation, competition, incorporation, and migration. Some material factors may include: source material, capital, facilities, technology, environment (city), and infrastructure. If one of these factors changes, it affects the cultural ecology as a whole. This is merely a preliminary outline of a possible direction, and to make these factors conceptually productive they should be tested and refined. Nevertheless, we should, by way of hypothesis, think of the possible implications of such a theoretical perspective.

With regard to social factors, density usually guarantees a high level of interaction, but connectivity may be the actual factor involved here. Population numbers nevertheless have an effect on the level of the labor force. A very important demographic factor in cultural ecology is age. Youth, for example, can provoke the emergence of important new movements within cinema. After age comes education, which implies different kinds of (output) values and interactions. Is it true that Hollywood produces mostly films for average audiences in both the USA and Europe, and elsewhere, while European cinema produces relatively more films for the elite among them? Would Hollywood begin producing more art films if European cinema stopped?

After that we have professional education and professional exchange. This concerns both cooperation and competition. Competition seems an important stimulant, but only to cause more cooperation in the next phase, which could eventually lead to incorporation. These dynamics are, at least to some degree, at work in the relationship between Hollywood and Europe, as Elsaesser has suggested in different terms in his book *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood*. Here he has problematized the paradigm of "national cinema." As a notion, it is challenged by international (co)productions, but also by shared markets for distribution. According to Elsaesser, European cinema is usually defined in contradistinction to Hollywood, with the latter being framed as an antagonistic entity with mainly commercial aims, which seeks to monopolize the market and spreads bad taste, whereas European cinema is often considered to be "art."[28] This, according to Elsaesser, obscures the dynamics between the systems of European and American cinema. Rather than thinking in terms of "national cinema," Elsaesser proposes the notion of "double occupancy": belonging to two entities or powers at the same time.[29] "Double occupancy" not only clarifies the interactions between systems, but also the particular phenomena related to these systems, such as migration.

Migration could be added here as a factor, either as a cause of competition or to encourage cooperation, whether we are dealing with migrating professionals or ethnic communities. Furthermore, migration also seems to be an important factor for the generation of "source material." This can be illustrated within contemporary European cinema by the relatively large numbers of successful filmmakers with a mixed background.[30] When we are dealing with source material we are already in the realm of material factors, which concerns not only images, ideas, and values, but also funding, as well as the provision of other facilities, which can also generate new developments. An example is the emergence of Rotterdam as a media city after the introduction of funding regulations and the establishment of accommodations in 1995. Technology is related to the factor of facilities. Technological changes are usually paralleled by other developments that may constitute either the reason or the result of these changes, or both. Finally there is the physical environment. Ideas emerging from different cultural and social realms may circulate within a given environment. Big cities usually serve in this capacity, but smaller cities and various different urban configurations, albeit ones with sufficient infrastructure, can also be included. While big cities remain centers of film production, the other smaller urban areas may cause a gradual shift, either by the forces of co-production or by organizing festivals, workshops and conferences – like we did in Amsterdam in June 2005 with the conference *Cinema in Europe: Networks in Progress*. Are there other significant factors that should be considered and does an approach like this offer a more profound understanding of cultural emergence and the role that media play in it? Furthermore, how do media-specific features relate to these factors?

The outline of cultural ecology should be further explored and tested, both conceptually and empirically. To that end we should continue to research film in connection with various kinds of institutions, with varying articulations of, for example, social institutions, economic exchanges, political strategies, or cultural values, that are somehow embedded in a certain environment, but with the option for the lynx to cross borders, and practice double occupancy. In my own research, I have first of all articulated the environment itself, in spatial terms, through the relationship between film and architecture and urbanism, in a specific location, which is Rotterdam. Other cities may come under consideration in this way as well, along with different geographical entities. Elsaesser has already

done this for Frankfurt, in connection with other nodes of a larger network. It now seems that he is interested in the Netherlands, not just as an empirical case, but as conceptual merchandise with a considerable value that allows space and image to converge into an "augmented medium."

Spring 2006. Elsaesser asked me to tape the television program TE KOOP: NEDERLAND / FOR SALE: THE NETHERLANDS, (Kees Brouwer, 2006), which was part of the VPRO series DE TOEKOMST / THE FUTURE.[31] The program focused on an imagined future in which cities are sold as a package deal of real estate objects – a matter of extrapolated current city marketing practices. I put the tape in his pigeonhole. After a month or so he wrote me back (2006/05/03): "Floris, // many thanks for the tape of the City for Sale! // Just discovered it in my huge pile of mail. // Thomas." I replied a couple of minutes later: "a nice sample of poetry you have sent me," to which he immediately reacted: "As to the rhyme, it's like Molière, but in reverse: I didn't know I spoke verse." By way of conclusion, let's subject this reverse (or re-*verse*) to a *subversive* close reading, in the tradition of ASCA and in the spirit of Molière.

In Molière's comedy *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme* (1670), a shopkeeper has made a fortune and wishes to seduce a pretty aristocratic woman. To cultivate his mind he has employed a professor of philosophy, who asks him what kind of letter he wants to write her – in prose or in verse. The shopkeeper, Monsieur Jourdain, wonders if there are any other options besides prose or verse; what is it called, for example, when we have ordinary conversations? It is prose, the professor answers. Monsieur Jourdain is astonished: "Upon my word, I have been speaking prose these forty years without being aware of it; and I am under the greatest obligation to you for informing me of it." In the reverse, Elsaesser is the shopkeeper. For his shop, he is interested in cities for sale, like Berlin, London, Amsterdam, Vienna, Stockholm, and New York. He has sold the old cinematic city and wants to buy new ones (after Frankfurt). Since he has made a fortune, he now flirts with the higher echelons of capitalism, which is to some extent of an anthropological nature. What actually ends up happening we will only know when the cheetah of cinema enters the city. (What about Amsterdam's zoo Artis, can we expect it there at a certain moment? The conditions are promising, with film producer Haig Balian being its current director...)

Notes

1. E.g. Manuel Castells, *The Rise of the Network Society* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000 [1996]); Bruno Latour, *We Have Never Been Modern* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993).

2. In February 2004, within the context of the PhD seminar, Malte Hagener gave a presentation on Niklas Luhmann's sociological system theory. One of the issues Hagener brought to the fore was that of *autopoiesis* (cf. infra).
3. Niklas Luhmann, "Globalization or World Society: How to Conceive of Modern Society?," *International Review of Sociology* 7.4 (March 1997): 67-79; <www.generation-online.org/p/fpluhmann2.htm>. Last visited 6 April 2008.
4. Luhmann.
5. Barbour explains his ideas in the documentary KILLING TIME (IJsbrand van Veelen, VPRO-television, 2002).
6. Calresco, "Self-Organizing Systems (SOS) FAQ," <www.Calresco.org/sos/sosfaq.htm>, version 2.95, September 2004, §7.2.
7. Calresco §2.8.
8. See Thomas Elsaesser, *Early Cinema: Space Frame Narrative* (London: BFI, 1990).
9. Calresco §6.5.
10. See Obododimma Oha, "Visual Rhetoric of the Ambivalent City in Nigerian Video Films," *Cinema and the City: Film and Urban Societies in a Global Context*, ed. Tony Fitzmaurice and Mark Shiel (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001) 195-205.
11. Thomas Elsaesser, "Die Stadt von Morgen: Filme zum Bauen und Wohnen in der Weimarer Republik," *Geschichte des dokumentarischen Films in Deutschland*, vol. 2: *Weimarer Republik (1918-1933)*, ed. Klaus Kreimeier, Antje Ehmann, and Jeanpaul Goergen (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2005) 381-409.
12. Lev Manovich, "The Poetics of Augmented Space," *Visual Communication* 5.2 (2006): 219-240; <http://vcj.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/5/2/219>.
13. Calresco §6.12.
14. Calresco §6.13.
15. Ulf Hannerz, *Transnational Connections, Culture, People, Places* (London: Routledge, 1996) 48.
16. Hannerz 50.
17. Hannerz 7.
18. Julian Steward, *Theory of Culture Change, the Methodology of Multilinear Evolution* (Urbana / Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1976 [1955]).
19. See, for instance, John Urry, *Global Complexity* (London: Polity, 2003) and "The Complexity Turn," *Complexity*, spec. issue of *Theory, Culture & Society* 22.5 (Oct. 2005): 2-14. For a historical overview of media ecology, see Lance Strate, "A Media Ecology Review," spec. issue of *Communication Research Trends* 23.2 (2004): 3-48.
20. Information from Artis Zoo, Amsterdam, 2005.
21. For a short explanation on co-evolution with the given example, see Thorsten Schnier, "Co-Evolution," 2002; <www.cs.bham.ac.uk/~txs/teaching/2002/evo-computation/13-CoEvolution/13-CoEvolution-4up.pdf>. Last visited 6 April 2008.
22. See, for instance, David Clarke, ed., *The Cinematic City* (London / New York: Routledge, 1997).
23. Fredric Jameson, *The Geopolitical Aesthetic, Cinema and Space in the World System* (Bloomington / London: Indiana University Press / BFI, 1992) 3.

24. Mark Shiel, "Cinema in the City in History and Theory," *Cinema and the City: Film and Urban Societies in A Global Context* 10; see also Allen J. Scott, *On Hollywood: The Place, The Industry* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).
25. Arjun Appadurai, "Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination," *Globalization*, ed. Arjun Appadurai (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001) 6.
26. See Urry, *Global Complexity*.
27. Calresco §2.10.
28. Thomas Elsaesser, *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005) 487.
29. Elsaesser, *European Cinema* 109.
30. For instance, Fatih Akin (Turkish-German), Ferzan Özpetek (Turkish-Italian), Alejandro Amenábar (Chilean-Spanish), Abdel Kechiche (Tunisian-French), and Hany Abu-Assad (Palestinian-Dutch).
31. Te Koop: Nederland can now be seen at <www.vpro.nl/programma/detoekomst/afleveringen/27521919/>. Last visited in February 2008.