

CINEMA COMPARAT/IVE CINEMA



VOLUME II · No. 5 · 2014

Editor: Gonzalo de Lucas (Universitat Pompeu Fabra).

Associate Editor: Núria Bou (Universitat Pompeu Fabra), Xavier Pérez (Universitat Pompeu Fabra).

Fifth Issue Guest Co-Editor: Núria Aidelman (Universitat Pompeu Fabra).

Advisory Board: Dudley Andrew (Yale University, USA), Jordi Balló (Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Spain), Raymond Bellour (Université Sorbonne-Paris III, France), Nicole Brenez (Université Paris 1-Panthéon-Sorbonne, France), Maeve Connolly (Dun Laoghaire Institut of Art, Design and Technology, Ireland), Thomas Elsaesser (University of Amsterdam, Netherlands), Gino Frezza (Università de Salerno, Italy), Chris Fujiwara (Edinburgh International Film Festival, United Kingdom), Jane Gaines (Columbia University, USA), Haden Guest (Harvard University, USA), Tom Gunning (University of Chicago, USA), John MacKay (Yale University, USA), Adrian Martin (Monash University, Australia), Cezar Migliorin (Universidade Federal Fluminense, Brasil), Meaghan Morris (University of Sidney, Australia and Lignan University, Hong Kong), Gilberto Perez (Sarah Lawrence College, USA), Àngel Quintana (Universitat de Girona, Spain), Joan Ramon Resina (Stanford University, USA), Eduardo A.Russo (Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Argentina), Yuri Tsvian (University of Chicago, USA), Vicente Sánchez Biosca (Universitat de València, Spain), Jenaro Talens (Université de Genève, Switzerland and Universitat de València, Spain), Michael Witt (Roehampton University, United Kingdom).

Editorial Team: Francisco Javier Benavente (Universitat Pompeu Fabra), Alejandro Montiel (Universitat de València), Raffaele Pinto (Universitat de Barcelona), Ivan Pintor (Universitat Pompeu Fabra), Glòria Salvadó (Universitat Pompeu Fabra).

Editorial Assistants: Margarida Carnicé (Universitat Pompeu Fabra), Ana Aitana Fernández Moreno (Universitat Pompeu Fabra).

Contributors: Núria Aidelman, Alain Bergala, Marga Carnicé, Laia Colell, José Luis Guerin, Carles Guerra, Gonzalo de Lucas, Carlos Muguero, Endika Rey, Carolina Sourdis, Jonás Trueba.

Translators: Marga Carnicé, Albert Elduque, Alasdair Gillon, Alex Reynolds, Alejandra Rosenberg, Carolina Sourdis, Milena Suárez, Francisco Valente.

Original design and layout: Gerard Garcia Marginedas, Pau Masaló, Marta Verheyen.

Special Thanks: Alain Bergala, José Luis Guerin, Alexandra Jordana, Pau Masaló.

Manager: Aitor Martos.

Publisher: Colectivo de Investigación Estética de los Medios Audiovisuales (CINEMA), Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF). This issue has been funded with the economic support of the Departamento de Comunicación (Universitat Pompeu Fabra).

Place of publication: Universitat Pompeu Fabra. Departamento de Comunicación. Campus de la Comunicación – Poblenou. Roc Boronat, 138 08018, Barcelona (Spain).

E-mail: comparativecinema@upf.edu.

Website: www.upf.edu/comparativecinema

Cinema Comparatlive Cinema, Volume 2, No. 5, «Pedagogies of the Creative Process», Barcelona, 2014.

Legal Deposit: B.29702-2012.

ISSN: 2014-8933.

Some rights are reserved. Published by Universitat Pompeu Fabra and the Observatory of European Contemporary Cinema under a Creative Commons License (Attribution – NonCommercial – ShareAlike 3.0 Unported)



Cover photo: *Au hazard Balthazar* (Robert Bresson, 1966)

Introduction

Cinema Comparative Cinema is a biannual publication founded in 2012. It is edited by Colectivo de Investigación Estética de los Medios Audiovisuales (CINEMA) at the Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF), and focuses on comparative cinema and the reception and interpretation of film in different social and political contexts. Each issue investigates the conceptual and formal relationships between films, material processes and production and exhibition practices, the history of ideas and film criticism.

Cinema Comparative Cinema addresses an original area of research, developing a series of methodologies for a comparative study of cinema. With this aim, it also explores the relationship between cinema and comparative literature as well as other contemporary arts such as painting, photography, music or dance, and audio-visual media.

Cinema Comparative Cinema is published in three languages: Catalan, Spanish and English. The journal is biannual and the numbers are published in summer and winter. At least half of the articles included in the journal are original texts, of which at least 50% are written by authors external to the publishing organisation. The journal is peer-reviewed and uses internal and external evaluation committees.

Finally, each issue of the journal is complemented by documentary materials and texts published online, which facilitate and enrich the topics studied in each volume, thus establishing links between longer research projects and monographic focuses throughout this process.

Summary

Pedagogies of the Creative Process by Gonzalo de Lucas / 7

DOCUMENTS

The Goodwill for a Meeting: That's Cinema excerpts by Henri Langlois, Jean-Louis Comolli, Nicholas Ray / 9

FILMS UNDER DISCUSSION. INTERVIEWS

Sharing the Gestures of the Creative Process by Alain Bergala / 12

Filmmaker-spectator, Spectator-filmmaker: José Luis Guerín's Thoughts on his Experience as a Teacher by Carolina Sourdís / 18

ARTICLES

In Praise of Love. Cinema en Curs by Núria Aidelman, Laia Colell / 24

A Daring Hypothesis by Jonás Trueba / 31

To Shoot through Emotion, to Show Thought processes. The Montage of Film Fragments in the Creative Process by Gonzalo de Lucas / 36

The Transmission of the Secret. Mikhail Romm in the VGIK by Carlos Muguiro / 41

The Biopolitical Militancy of Joaquín Jordá by Carles Guerra / 50

REVIEWS

VV.AA. *Poéticas del gesto en el cine europeo contemporáneo* by Marga Carnicé Mur / 56

Jacques Aumont. *Materia de imágenes, redux* by Endika Rey / 58

Editorial. *Pedagogies of the Creative Process*

Gonzalo de Lucas

I

Susan Ray: 'I believe Nick loved teaching, especially at this time. Teaching provided a laboratory in which he could research his craft and fellow humans. Teaching helped him to clarify his thinking and draw some conclusions. Teaching allowed him to guide and nurture young people as he himself had been guided and nurtured and had missed being guided and nurtured. Nick wholly gave himself to his students as mostly they gave themselves to him. I believe he felt a new peace at this time. This time had the tenderness of a seedling just before the first frost' (RAY, 1995: 34).

II

An important activity among many filmmakers is teaching in film schools, universities and other educational contexts, often linked to the support of creative processes. However, with the exception of some books that have left evidence of the classes, for example, by Nicholas Ray, Jean-Luc Godard, Jerry Lewis, Sergei Eisenstein or Raúl Ruiz, these actions are much less documented than desirable.

This issue is organized as three connected parts. The first two collect some reflections on experiences and methodologies of the

transmission of viewing and filming. From primary schools to universities, they all have in common the comparative approach to the forms of film through the viewings of excerpts projected in class, and the ability to generate aesthetic experiences among students –as spectators and filmmakers–, avoiding the risks of academicism and making the film a living and lived story.

In the two initial conversations, José Luis Guerin and Alain Bergala present, through some of their training practices, the way in which they articulate the viewing as a creation experience, and the constant dialogs between being a spectator-filmmaker and a filmmaker-spectator. The second part expands on the way in which this and other issues are discussed in *Cinema en curs*, a film pedagogy program in primary and secondary schools. The third and last part adds the study of the specific cases of two filmmakers, Mikhail Romm –and his teaching in the VGIK–, and Joaquín Jordá, who generated political affiliations or collaborative practices in different political contexts. •

Translated from the Spanish by Milena Suárez

BIBLIOGRAPHY

RAY, Nicholas (1995), *I was interrupted. Nicholas Ray on making movies*. RAY, Susan (ed.). Berkeley and Los Angeles. University of California Press.

The Goodwill for a Meeting: That's cinema¹

Excerpts by Henri Langlois / Jean-Louis Comolli / Nicholas Ray

Henri Langlois

Silent cinema is the image. And what is the image? It is a diamond. A diamond which men learned to cut, polish and set off to advantage, but which always retains its irreducible nature. The sound film is an alloy. It is a ceramic. How can one fuse these two things ?

[...]

When I lecture, I sometimes take the liberty of cutting off a film's soundtrack. If you do this to *M* (Fritz Lang, 1931), the images become flat; switch it on again, and they regain their tone. This shows that *M* is a true talking picture. Deprived of sound, *The Most Dangerous Game* (Ernest B. Schoedsack and Irving Pichel, 1932) reveals what its soundtrack conceals. You see people whose lips move but whose eyes and faces are expressionless. They are in effect people talking, but saying what? They make a pretence of speaking, they imitate people talking. Do you see what I mean? It was through experimenting like this that I realised Gabin was nothing without sound. Why? Because he wanted to seem natural, and since the stress was laid on the dialogue, the result was naturalism.

There is one man, just one, who succeeded in making a homogeneous whole out of talking

pictures, and he is dead. Vigo. He took sound, image, music and dialogue and merged them –and I mean merged, not mixed. The result was *L'Atalante* (1934). Seeing this film you see why the cinema is dying from a horrible disease: naturalism. By naturalism I mean a servile imitation of reality. No film seems more naturalistic than *L'Atalante*. But only seems: in fact it is a stained glass window.

[...]

The cinema is a means towards the acquisition of knowledge in the manner of St. Thomas: by touch. Read all you like about love, but if you haven't made love your idea of it will be totally false.

Referring to the Méliès exhibition I arranged at the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, a film-maker's wife paid me the most wonderful compliment imaginable: 'You guide people into a book which is no book. You have re-created an ambience which enables them, by plunging into it, to understand everything through a sort of osmosis.' I would like the Musée du Cinéma to serve the same purpose. I do not believe in education in the form which we call education. True education is osmosis. Latin, mathematics and so on are useful as mental gymnastics, but art is a subject that cannot be taught. It is learned through osmosis.

1. Jean-Luc Godard in: BACHMAN, Gideon (1984). *The Carrots Are Cooked: A Conversation with Jean-Luc Godard*. *Film Quarterly*, vol. 27, n° 3, p.132.

Among the Eskimos, all his games prepare the child for living. He plays, but in fact he is preparing himself for the hunt, for fishing. He imitates his father and gradually, through his play, he learns. This is the opposite of a university education. Whether one likes it or not, moreover, education is still a master of class. Someone whose borne contains an extensive library, or who grows up in artistic surroundings, is enriched even if he rejects the environment which formed him. He is already a step ahead of a poor boy who learns everything he knows at school. Dumas did more for History than all the teachers put together.

For years, all exhibitions have been based on the idiotic system of education by explanation, because people like to learn what they should think. But art cannot be explained, it is felt. If there is to be a bond between art and man, we must re-create umbilical cord. [1]

Jean-Louis Comolli

Does what stated under the name 'cinema' propose a different logic from that of the spectacle at any cost; not the logic of rejection of any spectacular dimension, but rather its rigorous control through the *mise-en-scène*, a writing system, which hides to better show, instead of showing more to 'fill the eyes'? To suppose cinema is an 'art' means only that: an active space for the spectator. The cinematographic gesture do not pretend to merely be in accordance with its time, but to shed lights on it; to make the keys, rather than to drive the short euphoric drunkenness which wants to 'force to forget' the common alienations. In such an old debate, as old as cinema itself, which would be, which should be the place for a film school?

Renounce to cinema? Lessen its relevance? The question is stated. Already from the first

insignia (IDHEC, Institute for Advanced Cinematographic Studies) to the second (La Fémis, European Foundation for Image and Sound Professionals), what disappears is the word 'cinema'². What a pity! Teaching technical professions never fulfilled anyone. Starting from the technicians themselves, who generally are eager to make artistic work or to collaborate with it, and expect issues such as sense, pertinence, historicity, and exemplarity to work strongly, way beyond the issue of the 'craft' to be achieved or transmitted. Craft? What for? Whom for? Whom with? Whom against? Professionalism is not morals, further less a reason of being. Regarding technicians, they are not robots. Gifted with a head to think and a body to feel, they love and desire. Nothing will make them renounce to the aesthetic dimension of cinema to settle for a technological training from which they see, better than anyone else, the final inanity. Once the excitement is over, a terrible absence of thought finds its way.

Learning, therefore, starts from experimenting in the difficult exercise of the artistic practice (to write a film, to stage, to construct, to edit), with its zones of doubts and shadows, the validity of the theoretical and historical facts, which without this practical confrontation would be dead word. Whatever his grounding might be, no filmmaker apprentice stays out of cinema as it has been elaborated until him. To verify that in the practice is to discover his own relationship with one cinematographic family or another. It is as well to understand that filming has nothing –truly– innocent. Is it not within the educational background, protected from blackmailing and immediate profitability, where learning can be centred on what matters: the place of the subject –the student, the technician, the instructor, the artist– in the creation of sense, the sense of a work that will confront society, that will venture into the world? [2]

2. The Institut des hautes études cinématographiques (IDHEC) was founded in 1943 and restructured in 1986 to

become, the Foundation européenne des métiers de l'image et du son (La Fémis).

Nicholas Ray

The cinémathèques, the archives around the world, are the places where you as film buffs, as serious students, as participants in the art of making films, can go to attach yourselves to films, to reject or revolt against other films, or to contradict that process. Thanks to cinémathèques and archives, works that you feel attached to are preserved, so that you can exploit the opportunities they offer for your own artistic growth.

[...]

I would like to help create a new concept of film as a living, continuously breathing thing, so you see the molecules of thought and emotion and experience working all the time, and in a kind of wonderful disorder that permits the audience to participate in creating its own order and drawing their own conclusions from what they experience.

[...]

I long for the day when I can be certain there's a filmmaker in every family, when the form of communication is not limited to the word or the page, when each kid can have a crack at giving a full expression to something of himself.

How much richer the neighborhood would be, just one square block. We should be equipped and surrounded with the materials that creative activity calls for.

[...]

I'm very happy teaching. I love the process of discovery in other people, and when it happens to me I feel I've had a great big gift. And I want to make films, desperately. But not any film. I don't want to make a film that looks like all-weather paint splashed against a barn wall. [3] •

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- [1] Excerpt from 'Entretien avec Henri Langlois', by Rui Nogueira, interview made in 1972, originally published in *Sight and Sound* (Fall, 1972). The French version in *Zoom* (n°25, June-July 1974). Extracted from: LANGLOIS, Henri (1986). *Henri Langlois. Trois cent ans de cinéma. Écrits*. Paris. Cahiers du cinéma, Cinémathèque Française, FEMIS, pp. 96-99.
- [2] Excerpt from 'Should La Fémis Be the School of Conformity?', published in *Libération*, May 31st, 1996. Compiled in: COMOLLI, Jean-Louis (2004). *Voir et*

pouvoir. L'innocence perdue : cinéma, télévision, fiction, documentaire. Paris: Verdier, pp. 347-350. Spanish translation in: COMOLLI, Jean-Louis (2007). *Ver y poder. La inocencia perdida: cine, televisión, ficción, documental*. Buenos Aires. Aurelia Rivera: Nueva Librería, pp. 338-339.

- [3] RAY, Nicholas (1995), *I was interrupted. Nicholas Ray on making movies*. RAY, Susan (ed.). Berkeley and Los Angeles. University of California Press, pp.152-155.

Sharing the Gestures of the Creative Process

Alain Bergala

Statements compiled by Núria Aidelman

ABSTRACT

The article considers key issues in order to develop an analysis of creation in different formative fields. It bases the approach on empathy with the creative process of the filmmaker, the comparative viewing of excerpts, and rejection of the scholarly and academic deconstruction of films for analysis. Based on experience, the author presents some of the methodologies that he has developed for the training of teachers and as professor at La Fémis. For those teachers to transmit cinema from the heart of the cinematographic creative process, he considers it fundamental that they experience practice. In the case of the cinema school and its students, it is essential that they are able to consider cinematographic issues through the comparative viewing of a range of films, the first-hand and in-depth accounts of filmmakers and the analysis of their own practices. The author ends by outlining the risks posed by academicism in cinema schools as opposed to the experience of artistic creation.

KEYWORDS

Pedagogy, transmission, creative process, film excerpts, cinema school, comparative method, cinematographic analysis, teacher training.

Transmitting the Creative Process

If we are to transmit cinematographic issues to students then we must get to the heart of those issues. If we do not formulate our questions from the point of view of the creative work, then we perform a task that is formal, partial and insignificant. To speak of how the shot scales are used is not worthwhile or at all useful, even if it is comforting. On the other hand, to approach cinema by positioning oneself at the heart of the cinematic process requires bold teachers who are disposed to do this and who are not afraid. We must encourage them and enable them to reach an understanding of certain issues through their own experience. That may sound obvious, but in fact there are few examples of the transmission of the creative process, even in the Fine Arts.

When I gave training sessions for teachers, during the ministry of Jack Lang,¹ I would give them a camera on the first day and one rule for the game. They were completely lost. I suggested an exercise that involved shooting and editing in-camera in two hours, for example. Then we watched Mekas and other films shot in that way. It came as a real shock. It didn't help at all if I explained the pedagogical theory, but on the other hand, carrying out a practical experience, however small, changed everything. If I instructed them to go out one afternoon and record three shots, then they would learn a thousand things about the cinema. That is where we must always begin in

education: by proposing to teachers that they begin with creative experience.

Sharing the Gestures of the Creative Process

A film is not pure enunciation. The relationship between the filmmaker and his characters is fundamental. To demonstrate this, it is enough to choose some good examples. If we take *Summer with Monika*, for example (*Sommaren med Monika*, Ingmar Bergman, 1953) it is not difficult to see that there are scenes in which what is at play is not the relationship between the characters, but the way Bergman relates to his characters. The choice of excerpts is crucial.

But for the most part, nobody makes this clear either to the teachers or the students. Especially in France, due to our tradition, films are studied as closed objects. We tell ourselves that we are performing objective analyses. Many people get uncomfortable when I tell them that it is possible to perform an analysis of the creative process. I always cite that great Renoir quotation, which says that to love cinema you have to make it, even if it means doing it in your head, imagining the film². Then there is Nabokov, when he tells his students that he has not spent a year teaching them literature so that they can talk about or identify with the characters; he has taught them literature so that they can share in the emotion of the author who wrote the book³.

1. Between 2000 and 2003 Alain Bergala was cinema adviser for the 'Five Year Plan for the Development of Art and Culture in Schools' overseen by Jack Lang, then Minister for Culture, together with Catherine Tasca, then Minister for Education.

2. 'Pour aimer un tableau, il faut être un peintre en puissance, sinon on ne peut pas l'aimer; et en réalité, pour aimer un film, il faut être un cinéaste en puissance; il faut se dire: mais moi, j'aurais fait comme ci, j'aurais fait comme ça; il faut soi-même faire des films, peut-être seulement dans son imagination, mais il faut les faire, sinon, on n'est pas digne d'aller au cinéma' (RENOIR, 1979: 27).

3. 'I have tried to make of you good readers who read books not for the infantile purpose of identifying oneself with the characters, and not for the adolescent purpose of learning to live, and not for the academic purpose of indulging in generalizations. I have tried to teach you to read books for the sake of their form, their visions, their art. I have tried to teach you to feel a shiver of artistic satisfaction, to share not the emotions of the people in the book but the emotions of its author – the joys and difficulties of creation. We did not talk around books, about books; we went to the center of this or that masterpiece, to the live heart of the matter' (NABOKOV, 1997: 542).

As far as this approach goes, I do not have many followers. It irritates the academics because it casts doubt on all their certitudes, the certitudes of academic knowledge. But other types of knowledge exist, and these are accessed in other ways. There are many objective elements in a filmmaker's thinking and creative stance: in certain shots and sequences we may analyse the choices and decisions that testify to the process, to how they have come to be filmed or edited in that way. With the sequence of the paintings in *Passion* (*Passion*, 1982) for example, that I often invoke, this is exactly what Godard does: he starts with the paintings and shows how he works with them, one after the other. In the film we have the marks of Godard's process. We see it.

The best way to approach the cinematic work is through very good and well chosen excerpts. To linger over them, over the details and to compare them. But the academy recoils in horror from this type of contemplation, which, seen properly, is really a test of intelligence and empathy.

Instead of saying, 'this is the sequence, and we are going to reveal the structure', we can try to comprehend how this sequence was reached. It is a fascinating process, a constructive experience and at the same time, a source of pleasure. The deliberation, based on the analysis of the elements of the sequence, brings one's relationship with the film to life. The viewer or analyst's pleasure consists not only in taking on board the film, but also in empathising with the processes and choices by which the film we are watching has come into being, in perceiving the emotions of the filmmaker. Certain films that are very well made and that I can appreciate as wonderfully filmed, leave no room and instil no empathy for the process that has made them. For me, a very important part of the viewer's pleasure derives from the potential to empathise with the filmmaker, with their doubts, fears and working process. This approach multiplies. And it has nothing to do with the delirium of interpretation, but rather involves taking as a starting point the film just as it is.

One way of performing this type of analysis consists in comparing excerpts from films in which a similar situation is presented, and noticing that the creative processes and choices are not the same. For example, if we take the pool scene in *Three Times* (Hou Hsiao-hsien, 2005) and the corresponding table tennis scene in *Match Point* (Woody Allen, 2005) we see that the creative gesture is different and there is a different way of thinking about the cinema. We learn through making this comparison. If we see only one approach, then it seems to us that this is the only way it can be done, and this makes it difficult to put ourselves in the position of the filmmaker who has travelled along a certain path to reach that point and make the film the way it is. If we compare, we see how each filmmaker has found their *way* of filming.

We can make comparisons between scenes that serve an equivalent function in different films by different filmmakers, or compare scenes by the same filmmaker. In the second case, we may sometimes find that there is an impulse that drives this filmmaker that is independent of the motifs and themes that he films. For example, in his first films, Hou Hsiao-Hsien is always distant, out of place or in the wrong place, with a strange point of view. After he explained to Olivier Assayas that at a young age he would look at the world from up a tree, that he was far removed, then we understood it, we grasp why he makes films in this way⁴. One statement allows us to discover the origins and determine which roots of creativity are developed over the course of various films.

Sense and the Sensible [*le sens et le sensible*]

I do not believe it is necessary to separate the meaning of a film from how it appears to the senses. To do so would involve betraying and distorting the film, reducing it. To speak of the sense of a film, we must always begin with that which is sensible, what we see and hear. If we set up dichotomies, we kill the object. It is about being able to describe something that

belongs simultaneously to the realms of sense and sensibility. We should never depart from the meaning, but nor should we establish separate categories. The greater the degree to which all categories are mixed, the richer the analysis: the meaning, the sensible and the creative gesture. It is not easy and teachers are afraid that they are not able to do it.

You Cannot Encounter Art by Breaking it Down

The only way of getting close to art is to take an artistic work or an excerpt that contains everything, with all the contradictions. I continue to believe that approaching art ought to be an encounter. And you cannot encounter art by breaking it down. That would be like visiting the Louvre and saying: today we will see only blue, or only the picture frames. We are before a painting with all that entails for the viewer and stirs within them. We should leave the speeches for later.

I have never believed, nor will I ever believe, in analytically breaking things down for the sake of learning. It is all very generalised. The lecturer arrives and says, 'I'm going to explain the scale of shots'. But the scale of shots is not a thinking-through of the shot; it is the opposite of a thinking-through of the shot.

The idea that the cinema can be broken down is false. It is a product of fear. It has been imposed because it reassures everyone, including the institutions. To break something down in order to understand it sounds reasonable and it is comforting. But it is simply false. We do not learn anything in life this way. We learn of everything mixed together, confused and in a block. It is much more complicated but also fascinating.

Watching Cinema in a Cinema School

There exists the lazy and out-moded belief that in a cinema school 'doing' is sufficient. And a fundamental problem in all the schools is precisely that: that too often, the students take into account only their own ideas, their own genius, and they

feel that they are sufficient in and of themselves without the need to watch films. This is my battle at La Fémis, to tell them that if they count only on their own ideas and on what they already know, they suffocate themselves and their films will be minor in status. If they count only on their own energies, they will not make good filmmakers. Little by little, this idea –I would almost say, this battle– ends up taking root, and they end up discovering that the cinema of yesterday and the different cinema of today can help them to think through *their* cinema.

The programme at La Fémis is so tight, the training so intense, that they have no time: they go to cinemas less than the 'normal' students. Because of this, we have to bring the cinema to the school. In addition to the excerpts and films convened by the filmmakers-teachers, the viewing develops by other means.

In the first place, inviting filmmakers. Recently the Dardenne brothers came and in their reflections they revealed themselves as the great filmmakers that they are. Over two days we watched excerpts from their films, we talked about how they work, so the students understand. Direct contact with a filmmaker who honestly explains his work is something precious. We try to organise two-day seminars or, when that is not possible due to the schedules of the filmmakers, short meetings of two or three hours, and it is always revealing.

I also give a course to the first and second year students. I select a theme and taking it as a starting point I work with many excerpts and a number of films in their entirety. The analyses focus on the relationships between excerpts. The comparative method remains the best way to think, to give them ideas and motivation.

This year we are working on 'the shot'. Everyone will shoot, but it is necessary to watch films in order to arrive at a concept of the shot. I started with something very simple. I took episode 4A of *Histoire(s) du cinéma* (Jean-Luc Godard, 1998) about which I have a theory: in the first ten

minutes there is a typology of all the shots possible. It permits the students to see and think.

We also watched either the whole of the first part of *Three Times* or *Miss Oyu* (*Oyû-sama*, Kenji Mizoguchi, 1951), also in its entirety. After viewing the film I carry out an in-depth study of specific excerpts and shots. This year I have discovered something that works and that I ought to have discovered a long time ago. Once the viewing is over, I leave fifteen minutes so that each person can think. After that, they have things to say.

Finally, each month we invite a filmmaker to choose a film from a list that I propose to the students; they come to present and discuss the film.

Accompanying the Creative Process

In La Fémis, we undertake comparative analysis alongside the students' exercises. I highlight the key issues for a filmmaker, the genuine problems of the cinema, and we see how they have resolved them. It is a means of indirectly analysing films. The last session considered how to film a body getting up to dance or getting undressed. It was an exercise in *mise-en-scène* whose starting point was the script for a scene from *Blow-Up* (Michelangelo Antonioni, 1966). Taking the problems of cinema,

we applied the comparative method. It works because they see who is thinking about the cinema and thinking cinematically.

In their own creative processes, the students at La Fémis are closely accompanied by the diverse range of film professionals. These teachers are always present at shootings in the first and second years. There is a double team, that of the students and that of the teaching film professionals. The teachers being there does not necessarily mean that they will intervene, but the students have the option of making recourse to them, with all the dangers that this brings. A professional screenwriter may run the risk of introducing conformity, or causing them to submit to the norms of script-writing, and the same occurs in all areas. In a cinema school, the 'rules' and what is 'professional' are threats. I often ask my students why their film is so flat, or why the sound is mixed in a certain way, and they respond, 'because we want to do it right,' everyone wants to 'be good'. The filmmaker may ask for an unattractive image, but the director of photography resists it. The permanent danger is academicism. Creativity is an entirely different thing. •

Translated from the Spanish by Alasdair Gillon

BIBLIOGRAPHY

RENOIR, Jean (1979). *Jean Renoir. Entretiens et propos*. NARBONI, Jean (ed.). Paris. Cahiers du Cinéma.

NABOKOV, Vladimir (1997). *Curso de literatura europea*. Barcelona. Ediciones B.

ALAIN BERGALA SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

BERGALA, Alain (ed.) (1985a). *Jean-Luc Godard par Jean-Luc Godard* (Tome 1). Paris. Cahiers du cinéma.

BERGALA, Alain (1985b). *Roberto Rossellini. Le cinéma révélé*. Paris. Cahiers du cinéma.

BERGALA, Alain (1990). *Voyage en Italie de Roberto*

Rossellini. Crisnée. Yellow Now.

BERGALA, Alain (1992). *Le cinéma en jeu*. Aix-en-Provence. Institut de l'Image.

BERGALA, Alain (ed.) (1998). *Jean-Luc Godard par Jean-Luc Godard* (Tome 2). Paris. Cahiers du cinéma.

BERGALA, Alain (1999). *Nul mieux que Godard*. Paris. Cahiers du cinéma.

BERGALA, Alain (2002). *L'hypothèse cinéma (Petit traité de transmission du cinéma à l'école et ailleurs)*. Paris. Cahiers du cinéma.

BERGALA, Alain (2004). *Abbas Kiarostami*. Paris. Cahiers du cinéma.

BERGALA, Alain (2005). *Monika de Ingmar Bergman (du rapport créateur créature au cinéma)*. Crisnée. Yellow Now.

BERGALA, Alain (2006). *Godard au travail, les années 1960*. Paris. Cahiers du cinéma.

ALAIN BERGALA

Director of the Department of Film Studies at La Fémis and Emeritus Professor at Paris III. He was editor-in-chief of *Cahiers du Cinéma* and he has directed films for both cinema and television. He is the author of numerous books and articles, including *Roberto Rossellini: Le cinéma révèle* (1984), *Voyage en Italie* (1990), *L'hypothèse cinéma* (2002) and the following books on Jean-Luc Godard:

Godard par Godard (1985-1988), *Nul mieux que Godard* (1999) and *Godard au travail* (2006). Between 2000 and 2003 he was the cinema adviser for the 'Plan for the Development of Art and Culture in Schools' run by the Ministries of Education and Culture. He has also curated numerous exhibitions, including 'Eric/Kiarostami Correspondances' and 'Pasolini Roma'.

Filmmaker-spectator, Spectator-filmmaker: José Luis Guerin's Thoughts on his Experience as a Teacher

Carolina Sourdis

(in collaboration with Núria Aidelman and Gonzalo de Lucas)

ABSTRACT

José Luis Guerin reflects on his teaching experience in relation to his filmmaker work. Firstly, in order to show the forms of a film, to transmit the desire, the emotion related to cinema and its processes of implication, he contextualizes the choice of the film fragments thus encouraging his students to the experience as spectators within the classroom. Furthermore, regarding the documentary workshops he imparts, and particularly based on the one held in The Escuela de Cine de San Antonio de los Baños (EICTV), he points out the benefits of establishing restrictions to stimulate and to accompany the creative processes. Lastly, through his painting workshop, he reflects on the reversible look of painting and cinema.

KEYWORDS

Film excerpts, transmission of desire, spectator experience, creative processes, film workshop, documentary, look, painting through cinema.

Choosing the Fragments

The ideal class for me would consist on replacing my role as an orator to become a sort of disk jockey that would simply relate a series of film fragments. In fact, when I prepare a class, the first thing I always do is to think in front of the DVDs: Which ones should I put in the bag? It is like packing the luggage and choosing which books to take, you know they will determine and modify the journey. For me, the class is like that: the chosen materials would define the outline. It would be a brief itinerary through the excerpts. And I think the core is there, in creating an itinerary based on the fragments. If I do not do so, it is because I lack courage; it would seem I am not honestly gaining my salary. But I would rather simply be a guide, an instigator of those fragments. It would be ideal.

The access to cinema is gained directly confronting the films. Besides, we have this incredible tool that is the DVD, which makes possible to keep an image, slow it down, make relations between one frame and another; be able to see how a shot is illuminated, discover the film's guts, its intimacy. When I was a young boy and I wanted to make films, I could not have imagined something like that. What book can replace this experience that let you watch the film with such intimacy? And nevertheless I feel it is not used well enough. Film lessons can be terribly speculative in a foreign way to the filmmaker's thought. The direct confrontation with the movie is the best text for me. Like the first Protestants: What do we need the church for? We have the Bible. We don't need any priests.

Certainly I always rediscover the fragments. For instance, some time ago I decided not to take to class films by Flaherty or Vertov anymore, because I thought everybody already knew them. But it is not like this. And I hate to take them for granted while talking about them. I show them again and again, and it turns out exciting each time. The merit is on the images and the implication while you watch them.

This is why I do not know how to begin without watching the images. They are the ones that restore the primary emotion, that fill you with admiration and awake the desire to talk about Flaherty again. Due to that reason I am not used to do it the other way around. I am always very stunned if the projector presents a breakdown and I have to start without having been able to project. Besides, the images always lead me to the idea, and never the opposite way around. Later, that idea will be the connection to other images. It is often the same while I'm making a movie: I discover what the class is about in the class itself.

Before, I honestly thought that my experience as a teacher had nothing to do with my experience as a filmmaker, because generally, I forbid myself to use my own examples in my workshops and my classes. But although I am using other's excerpts, I realize that it is inseparable from my thought as a filmmaker, this is to say that the classes are modified accordingly to the things I discover or I start to question when I am preparing or thinking a new film. The workshops I gave while I was making *Under Construction* (*En construcción*, 2001) had Flaherty as the main axis. Whereas when I was making *Guest* (2008) I used more examples of direct cinema. I have started to discover this relationship that I formerly had not considered; I used to believe I left home the filmmaker when I gave a class.

The Transmission of Desire

Teaching, as almost everything, is a matter of implication. The school used to be very boring to me because the teachers were not implicated. It consisted, we all know, in learning by heart a list of Goths and Visigoths kings, the literature classes were about memorizing authors and works, even with qualitative adjectives: 'Moratín is a naturalist and a colourist'. One time I asked what that of being a colourist should mean, and the teacher did not want to answer me. But against it, I remember a teacher that made an analysis of *To a Dry Elm* (*A un olmo seco*) by Machado, with such a beauty

and an implication that it extraordinarily lead me towards a reading of Edgar Allan Poe. You can really feel it. And I have realized imposture is not valid in teaching, that desire is transmitted. This is the most important thing. In the first workshops I gave in Latin America, I first thought I should adapt the classes to their reality. I thought I might avoid experimental European films because they would feel them somehow foreign. It is a mistake. You should show the same. Everything is a matter of implication. Desire is transmitted, much easier and better than I thought.

On the contrary, it is very easy to astonish the students and gain their attention with some exclamatory scenes. There are teachers who do this in ignoble ways, who misuse the fragments looking for crashes, easy revelations, pleasing techniques, astonishing things. The academic analysis of Odessa steps, for instance, made the sequence become an absolute stereotype: it was always used to teach cinematographic montage. Not only all the students had seen it, but they had also examined it, without having watched, in fact, *Battleship Potemkin* (*Bronenosets Potyomkin*, Sergei M. Eisenstein, 1925). And what is worse, without having experienced what it feels to watch that sequence... It is the same that happens with the bath sequence in *Psycho* (Alfred Hitchcock, 1960): many people are not scared because they have rather studied it, dissect it and observe the horizontal lines against the verticals, the volumes. They have a completely sterile knowledge because they do not know what that series of procedures used by Eisenstein or Hitchcock, actually produce. They have not experienced it, and if they have not lived it, they are completely unaware about the reasons of its examination.

A film makes you feel different sensations, reflections and then, in a natural way you get interested in how it has been accomplished, in how the cinematographic forms have been worked to be able to arise those reactions. But in the academic analysis, any possibility of emotion is mummified: the forms are studied without comparing them to what they produce, or even

without knowing it. This is why in praise for the fragment we get the risk of failing into the pathologies of the fragment, of converting it in a source of ignorance or manipulation, executed by the figure of the teacher-hustler.

Because of that, it is very important as well, to create the context of the fragment: what perspective do you choose, how do you place it? Sometimes you try to create the context of the film, some others of a decade, or of Soviet cinema in the twenties...and from there you are going to create a synecdoche of this decade and this revolutionary spirit that implied in such a way the cinematographic form, by choosing an emblematic moment that goes even beyond the film. It is our duty to create that background.

The Experience as Spectator

I find a paradox everywhere: people do not watch films, but they study them. Cinema is practically an unknown object of study. Even sometimes I question if the people that come to my workshops have actually seen my movies. And it is the exact opposite process that I lived when I was a boy. There were almost no films schools, not even books on cinema in Spain at the time. But there were a lot of cinema theatres and cine-clubs in all the neighbourhoods. Everybody went to the movies, but nobody studied cinema, today everybody studies cinema, but no one goes to the movies. It is curious.

Many times when I give my courses, I get the proposal to make practices as well. In one hand, time is barely enough, because normally a workshop is between one and tow weeks long, and I think practices will result very banal in such a reduced amount of time. But above all, I perceive a flagrant scarcity: that of the student as spectator. And I see it in the movies as well. When I see a movie or a practice, the first impression I get is very often the same: They have not been good spectators. The most flagrant scarcity is the absence of spectators, at all levels, because

nowadays in a certain way we can all make movies. What we are lacking are spectators, I would say.

In other hand, my cinema experience is inseparable of my experience as spectator. I do not know another one. I did not go to film school, therefore film theatres have been my only school and it is the only thing I know. In fact, to watch and to film are two completely reversible tasks, as to read and to write. It is unthinkable to imagine a writer that has not read. However, the technological access has encouraged a generation of people that film without having watched or read. For that reason I almost never consider the practices, because there is always a preliminary scarcity. I would like to think the practice, practicing first as spectator.

A key experience for learning is watching the film more than once, because usually when you just watch it once you only get some intuitions. But this is in a certain way very spontaneous: you have seen a movie over and over again, but not to learn a thing, just by pure desire, for the need of going back to it because you love it. In a very natural way you start to discover its structure, its forms... 'This is said here so it is later related to this, this is the space that had not been shown from that other angle'... It should not be studied; you get to deduce it in a very natural and organic way.

Accompanying the Creative Process

The experience of my workshops in Cuba is beautiful because I am not supposed to give lectures there. I mentor the design and execution of the final film projects of the documentary course. Besides, it allows me to experience Cuba in a different way, as I work in seven projects each year and if possible, I go and see the settings where the students will shoot; places that would be impossible to access otherwise. The mentoring allows you to dream the movies as well, to appropriate them, keeping the respect towards

the author so it becomes an autonomous work. But it allows you to think very different problems, exercise as a filmmaker, and think how issues that have not directly concern you in your own films can be solved. This is very interesting.

For these mentoring sessions I first ask them to send me a short synopsis. And so, I have established a pedagogical method: we are eight, and each day of the week we deeply address one of the projects. Sometimes they have barely a sheet or half a sheet written, but we try to deeply address it anyway. At the beginning of the session I ask the responsible of the project to go and sit apart from the rest. They cannot talk. They can only listen for an hour or two. I think I am Samuel Bronston, the film producer, with his crew, talking, speculating, and pointing out features of the film. Afterwards, the one that has been suffering in silence has the right to join us. This came out once randomly, and it gave such good results that I have schematised it.

Thus, in the workshops we start on paper and I only use the images for time to time, when I feel the need or if I can evoke a moment in a screen to visualize an idea that would be harder to nail down orally. We try to keep a conversation about the project. Finally to go deep into a single project reverts in that of others; everyone results changing their own project at the end of the day.

I truly like the model of San Antonio de los Baños. For instance, in the first year of documentary they have an experience called *One to one*. It consists on isolating the group of eight documentary makers in the farthest place in the mountain, a place that is reached by donkeys. There is a small camping of a regional television where they have the basic equipment. In this setting they have to choose a character to make a portrait –called *One to One*. They make it individually, but they collaborate with each other: they make their own portrait, and either collaborate with the sound or the image of others.

They go with a teacher, and the experience changes them all. Here, experience is prioritized over the technological knowledge, which unfortunately is what for many film schools comes first. Not even a technical knowledge, but a technological matter: The lens goes like this, or this other way, the axis, the jumping of the line... As if cinema could be read in a leaflet.

The Documentary Space

I find more interesting people, more promises, in the documentary field rather than in fiction. I filled in those *Sight and Sound's* surveys, both in documentary and fiction, and I realized—although these are completely random lists, and I could make a different one from week to week and still feel absolutely represented—that in fiction my newest title was from 1973, *The Mother and the Whore* (*La maman et la putain*, Jean Eustache). Even out of twenty, I think I would neither have included a latter fiction. In contrast, in the documentary list there were, in fact, recent tittles. I feel it like a more fertile space of exploration, with such filmmakers as Wang Bing or Dvortsevov.

I think documentary generates a sensibility that precedes learning, and the student feels that this space—as I always say documentary is rather a space than a genre—shelters them with a freedom and a new flexibility that fiction do not provide. They can speculate with time, with the points of view...

Restrictions in Creative Processes

However, I think we are wrong when we think that the student should have absolute freedom. The boundaries work quite well; you should learn how to be free within these limits. The kite flies because it is tied, if it is not, it will not. Creative thought is aroused through restrictions.

Many times the choice of the topic is a pernicious idea for the students. They always make

their gamble on the topic, and I try to dismantle this idea. According to my theory, the importance lays on the perspective of the look and the choices they make regarding that matter; because in fact, the topic is something they should find through their look. That is why it would seem much more pedagogical to me to delimit the concept, even to interchange the student's projects: 'you are going to make this one, you are going to make that one'... Because then, regarding the choices that let them appropriate that material, a clearer cinematic thought is aroused. That is too, one of the best legacies of documentary. Often terribly dull commissions as might had been the one given to Alain Resains about the National Library of France, end up being appropriated in such a personal way that it was possible to create there, a space as intimate as the one created in Mareinbad Hotel.

This is why, facing conditions is precisely where an authorship can truly be liberated and visualized. Painters give us some lessons on that matter. Some time ago, I have been studying the clauses of the contracts that determined the commission that was made to the painter. The first one who made that inquiry was André Delvaux with his medium-length film *Met Dieric Bouts* (1975). Afterwards, in some art books I have punctually found some specific contracts. It would be a wonderful lesson regarding any painting, to be able to confront it to the contract that generated it in the first place. Unfortunately very few contracts are preserved, but it is really helpful to know the restraints when trying to discover the skills of the painter.

Cinema Trough Painting or Painting Through Cinema

I give a one-week workshop on painting. We talk about cinema without watching any film. For me it is wonderful, because sometimes a certain distance must be found to think cinema. There are a lot of contaminated ideas, spoiled images by the endogamy; by what is

euphemistically called the world of cinema, so closed within itself. Painting is exactly the clarity of another distance from which you can discover with more excitement your own medium: cinema. This is precious to me, I have always thought about it. When I go to a museum, the criteria I have for the analysis and

pleasure in relation to the paintings are the same of my experience with cinema, that which has structured my relationship with everything else. With literature and painting. •

Translated from the Spanish by Carolina Sourdis

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

GODARD, Jean-Luc (1980). *Introducción a una verdadera historia del cine. Tomo 1*. Madrid. Alphaville.

LANGLOIS, Henri (1986). *Trois cent ans de cinéma*. Paris. Cahiers du cinéma/ Cinémathèque Française/ Fondation Européenne des Métiers de l'Image et du son.

MEKAS, Jonas (1972). *Diario de cine*. Madrid. Fundamentos.

VVAA. *José Luis Guerin, Images documentaires*, n°73/74, junio de 2012, Paris.

CAROLINA SOURDIS

B.A in filmmaking by Colombian National University, M.A. in Film Studies and currently a PhD researcher in the Department of Communication at Pompeu Fabra University in Barcelona. She is member of the Latin-American Observatory of Film History and

Theory. She won the Colombian Culture Ministry National Scholarship on film and audiovisual investigation in 2010. Her investigations have primarily approached montage and film archives in Colombian documentary, as well as film-essay in European Cinema.

In Praise of Love. Cinema en Curs

Núria Aidelman, Laia Colell

ABSTRACT

The article exposes some of the methodologies of *Cinema en curs*, a film pedagogy program developed in schools and high schools with students between ages 3 and 18. The first part of the article argues two of the program's main principles: 1) the importance that the discovery of cinema lies in a creative approach, and, therefore, as a means and mode of knowledge, thought, emotion; 2) the commitment for a film transmission that awakens the joy and love for cinema. The second part of the article describes some of the processes and approaches that *Cinema en curs* practices to stimulate the students in this approximation and appreciation towards film: 1) the approach to cinema from the place of the filmmaker, considering the different issues of creation and enjoying the cinematographic emotions; 2) the importance of 'learning to see'; 3) discovering cinema through film excerpts of important filmmakers, organizing this discovery through different cinematographic concerns; 4) the close relation between the viewing and the practice. The text concludes by highlighting the value of cinema as a way of being in the world.

KEYWORDS

Cinema en curs, pedagogy, transmission, methodology, learning to see, screenings and creative experience, creative process, film excerpts, school, Alain Bergala.

Introduction

*Cinema en curs*¹ is defined as a film pedagogy program in primary and secondary schools². The program is conceived from the desire and the need to encourage children and young people to discover, in a profound and active way, cinema as an art and as a creative process. A kind of cinema which they wouldn't have any access to or to which they might never know anything about (as many adults also don't know) if it is not introduced in school. An unknown cinema, which many believe to be far away from their interests but which can precisely be the nearest to them.

Cinema en curs is carried out with groups of students between ages 3 and 18, during the school's hours, all year round and with the participation of teachers and filmmakers. Although entering the education system causes some friction and intricacies, it creates important opportunities: to be able to work and create the project together with the teachers, to give cinema a central role in the school and to develop the extraordinary pedagogic potential of cinema. In *Cinema en curs* cinema is transmitted through a methodology that generates a way of seeing and of making films that forms, that transforms; that is able to make us grow and to make us better (not only students, but to everybody in the process).

Film as Creation

One of the fundamental principles of *Cinema en curs* is the conception of cinema as creation, as a poetic process in the etymologic sense of the word. José Angel Valente, in one of his first essays, *Conocimiento y comunicación [Knowledge and communication]* (1956), with a brief and beautiful statement disagrees with the period's thoughts which comprehended poetry and communication: 'A change of perspective that would radically understand poetry as something nearer the nature of the creation process, could reveal that poetry is, essentially, a way of comprehending

reality' (VALENTE, 2008: 39). In *Cinema en curs*, cinema is understood as poetics and, such as *poiesis*, as a way of knowledge, of thought, emotion, amazement, interrogation of ourselves, the others and the world. This principle structures all the processes and methodologies. Thus, it specially is a base for the workshops, where there is a tight relationship between the viewings and the creative experience, between watching and making films.

In his essential essay *L'Hypothèse cinéma [The Hypothesis of Film]* Alain Bergala explains his idea on the 'pedagogy of creation': 'The idea is to push our logic and imagination to an earlier time in the creation process, to the moment in which the filmmaker has to choose between different options' (BERGALA, 2007: 128).

The purpose, thus, is to see cinema through the eyes of the filmmaker, to feel ourselves as the creator by being conscious of his gestures and his choices, to share his emotions. It is the same reconstruction of the process that Paul Valéry stated in his *Introduction à la méthode de Leonardo de Vinci [Introduction to the Method of Leonardo Da Vinci]* (1894); the same look that Vladimir Nabokov required to his students in the lecture on European literature; the same that Jean Renoir expects from spectators:

'The qualities, gifts and education that make a painter are the same as the gifts, education and qualities that make an art lover. In other words, to love a painting, you must be a potential painter. There is no other way to love. And, truthfully, to love a film, you must be a potential filmmaker [...]. Even if it only is through imagination, one must make films; if not, he doesn't deserve going to the movies' (RENOIR, 1979: 27).

They all share the idea that real comprehension and authentic pleasure need participation. Stefan Zweig develops this idea in *The Secret of Artistic Creation* (1938):

1. *Cinema en curs* proposes a triple game of the Catalan/Spanish term *en curs/en curso*: it means in progress, a course and a school year.

2. *Cinema en curs* started in Catalonia in 2005, and is also currently being implemented in Galicia, Madrid, Argentina and Chile

'[...] I don't believe in a purely passive pleasure. I also don't think that anybody who enters a museum for the first time, or who listens one of Beethoven's symphonies for the first time, could easily appreciate the masterpiece. A piece of art should not be impacted directly on anyone [...]. To be able to feel it, we should feel again what the artist has felt. [...] We should feel his soul in ours, because a real pleasure is not only sensed by receiving it, it comes from working in collaboration. [...] Therefore, we learn and assist the artistic process while living the act of creation through all of its phases' (ZWEIG, 2004:: 217-219).

It is not casual that this small but significant list of authors that have been defending for decades an approximation to art as a creative process for spectators or readers, is formed, precisely, by creators.

To discover and comprehend art, and cinema in our case, is not related with the simple acquisition of technical terms, which usually is the starting point (and ending point) of most 'lessons on cinema'. An example of this kind of teaching, and probably the greatest exponent, is the description of the different shot scales; another could be the different ways to edit or the analysis of the structure of a script. 'Equipped' with these terms, students 'analyze' film sequences and 'identify' these notions while they 'interpret their meaning'. In this logic, if the 'correct' words have identified the correct aspects of the sequence, the student shows his knowledge on the matter. ¿But what has he actually seen? ¿What has been learned? To identify something means to reduce it to an established term, to close it in a limited meaning, to impose what we already know over what we have seen.

Therefore, in *Cinema en curs* we avoid the idea of 'literacy'. Amongst everyone who is literate, who is actually able to enjoy the words of a poem or the sentences of a character's description? Or, furthermore, does an alphabet for film, for paintings or poetry even exist?

We are, precisely, searching for the kind of knowledge related to our senses and our pleasure; that knowledge which reminds us of the origin of the word *saepere*, which is also associated with flavor, with taste.

In Zweig's text, the words and expressions that appear together with pleasure and joy are those related to work, difficulty, to the impossibility of comprehending from a passive state. Love and the ability of enjoyment are also learned. And for this learning process, to have the opportunity to pass through the creative experience is certainly an exceptional path. Experiencing the creative process –that is, to a conduct creative practice in a reflexive manner– allows students to place themselves in the creators side in a much intense way; it allows them to experience doubts, difficulties and the emotions that come with creation.

The Screenings: Watching Creation from Nearby

Watching film excerpts is a central activity in the discovery of cinema that we develop in *Cinema en curs*. These are fragments that last between 2 and 10 minutes and that are arranged in different categories³.

Without a doubt, watching excerpts cannot substitute the absolutely irreplaceable experience of watching a whole film at the cinema. Therefore, we also undertake many activities in which we go watch films at the theatre, we assist film festivals, etc. But, to comprehend film, working with excerpts has a great potential. It allows students to learn about different filmmakers from completely different periods and styles such as Jean Vigo, Johan van der Keuken, Chantal Akerman, José Luis Guerin, Ermanno Olmi, Robert Bresson, Yasujiro Ozu, Hou Hsiao-hsien, Roberto Rossellini, Jean-Pierre and Luc Dardenne, Isaki Lacuesta... It allows students to become interested or feel addressed by different filmmakers and, specially, it allows them, without the need of any imposed lecture or a historic itinerary, to understand the many ways of thinking and making cinema. The

3. Please see Gonzalo de Lucas' article in this same issue.

students can comprehend, thus, that any truthful filmmaker offers different ways of creation and of approaching the world; that the universe of film offers thousands of adventures where, each and every one of us, with our own sensibility and individual taste, can find their own place.

Excerpts grant a broadness and openness that doesn't endanger a deep view on the subject. To view excerpts implies to re-view⁴. At *Cinema en curs* screenings imply a sense of ritual: we always start with a first projection, with the lights off and in complete silence; later, the students have a time to individually take notes or to think on their first impressions of what they have seen; then, different screenings of the same fragment take place, stopping in shots, going back, remembering, discussing, watching (and listening!) again. Discussing a 3 minute excerpt can take from 20 or 30 minutes until almost an hour. This will depend in what the fragment generates in the students and their interest in the discussing. Finally, in their film notebooks, the students take notes on what they have thought is more relevant of the shared discussion, writing down, always, the name of the filmmaker and the title of the film.

The main focus of the screenings is to discuss about what we see and what we hear; our main objective is not knowledge but attention: to be able to observe and recognize the filmmaker's decisions and gestures in both image and sound. Therefore, questions and observations are very important during the process: How does the filmmaker film his character in an emotionally intense moment? What happens in the interval between the camera and the character? Are the sound and the image linked together? Have we taken a look at the light? And at the color palette? What are the editing decisions?

4. In his lecture on european literature, Vladimir Nabokov said that 'one cannot *read* a book: one can only reread it. A good reader, a major reader, an active and creative reader is a rereader. [...] The element of time does not really enter in a first contact with a painting. In reading a book, we must have time to acquaint ourselves with it. We have no physical organ (as we have the eye in regard to a painting) that takes in the whole

One of the filmmaker's main functions at the workshop is to ask questions. It also becomes one of the functions of the teachers who, year after year, have learned the gestures of cinema and come to be the best allies in the students' discovery of film.

To ask and to call attention, thus, to make attention possible: sensibility and the capacity of perception are sharpened, value is given to things that could initially seem unimportant, the filmmakers decisions are emphasized and relations are created between the excerpts. Discovery happens during the same process of looking and describing. What is learned through fragments doesn't come from some external knowledge nor need any other validation. It is an evident knowledge.

Another of the filmmaker's main functions during the screenings is to share his passion, his wonder while watching a film, the love and admiration, the emotion, he feels towards films and their creators.

The Practice: Creating in Partnership with the Screenings

We make films with the same attention, openness, gentleness and requirements as we watch films. During the creative process, students situate themselves in the same dialogue space as the filmmakers, feeling very touched when they discover that they share with them the same gestures⁵, from their first experiences until their final documentary or fiction short film which marks the end of the workshops.

The first experiences introduce two aspects: the direct dialogue with cinema and the filmmakers, and the discovery of their surroundings through film. The initiation value

picture and then can enjoy its details' (NABOKOV, 1997: 26).

5. Serge Daney praises it in relation to filmmakers: 'La beauté du cinéma, c'est que c'est un art où Garrel fait les mêmes gestes que Griffith, il y a une sorte de mémoire anthropologique des gestes, celui d'Eisenstein déroulant à la main un morceau de pellicule pour regarder...' (DANEY, 1994: 163-164).

of these experiences, thus, is the ability of transforming the students' gaze.

During the first nine editions of *Cinema en curs*, the workshops started with Lumière Minutes. After looking carefully and with enjoyment different Lumière films, the students explore their town or neighborhood through the demanding look of the Lumière Minutes: one-minute documentary shot conceived as the first filmmakers and that intend to have the same intensity. Goats coming out of a farm, a panoramic view of Montserrat's cable car, workers disinfecting themselves at the meat factory, workers from the recycling factory dismantling televisions, dolphins dancing, the land mower coming towards the camera... This search encourages students –and, with them, also teachers and filmmakers– to investigate their near surroundings, to visit unknown places of their environment (a factory, a farm, a garage...) or places that, reviewed through cinema, obtain a new value.

In the tenth edition, we've introduced an experience that had been already tested during the processes of creating films. We've call it 'Shots of the world' and it proposes students to film their surroundings in three ways: 'Space diaries', 'Travellings' and 'Portraits'. The dialogue with the filmmakers is an intimate conversation. Many students start filming from their windows, following David Perlov's first shots of his *Diary* (1973-83): 'I want to approach the everyday. It takes time to learn how to do it'. Others, impressed by the night shots of *News from home* (Chantal Akerman, 1977), have explored their neighborhood by night. Dana expresses it with a clear and intense voice over her shot ('Nine o'clock at night. I film from my balcony inspired by Chantal Akerman'). Some, after filming from a car a night scene, remember the excerpt they saw of *Les mains négatives* (1978), by Marguerite Duras. And, as in *Daguérrotypes* (1975) by Agnès Varda, others have portrayed their grandfathers or other people of their daily life presenting themselves to the camera.

6. More about the creation process of *Cinema en curs* can be read in Jonás Trueba's article in this same issue and in *Cine en curso. La transmisión del cine como creación y la creación como*

Therefore, students discover cinema accompanied by the mentioned filmmakers and many others. It is, thus, a very strong discovery: to be able to frame the world, the vertigo when facing infinite choices, the wonder and the trust in film and in the world when we truly look at it. At the same time, the intensity of experiencing creation influences the way in which they approach new films and excerpts, they are able to do it with the emotion of perceiving the beat of a shot.

The dialogue with filmmakers and their films also continues, in other ways and through other paths, during the process of creating a short film, which finalizes the workshops. The whole process is complex, it has many steps –from documentation, writing the script and editing the film–, and, since we wish to develop it with a cinematographic accuracy and with a pedagogic value, it makes us questions ourselves many things. How to get children and young people, without any previous vocation to cinema, start thinking *about* cinema *from* cinema itself? How should we develop the process so that students become the real subjects of the creation, so that cinema could be for them a medium to understand the world?

Parting from the students' reflection and analyzing the experience of the team, integrated by teachers and filmmakers, we have developed during these years different methodologies that answer these and other questions. In this article, we will explain the ones related to the screenings⁶.

In both the fiction and the documentary workshops we work with DVDs that include film excerpts divided in categories. As an example, lets quote some of the sections of the DVDs for the fiction workshop. The section dedicated to *The Face Value* is structured in the following categories: 'Showing emotion while hiding the face', 'Shooting from behind to intensify the close-up', 'Close-ups', 'Persistences'. The section *Passages between the character*

experiencia (AIDELMAN and COLELL, 2012). All the films can be seen in the website: www.cinemaencurs.org/en

and the world contains: 'Passage through movement', 'Passage by cut', 'Relay shots', 'Digressions' or 'The world between sequences'. Although it is not a formal or technical approach, these categories allow us to approach cinema from deep cinematographic matters. Emotion is another fundamental aspect while selecting and organizing the excerpts: the change of distances between the character and the camera during a traveling that accompanies him or the city traffic between the camera and the character, are emotion bearers. Just as it is also very moving to watch a take that stays for a while on a face or to enjoy the cut of a shot. We are not talking about the emotion of the story; it is the emotion of the shot itself, between the shots, of cinema.

Students, thus, search in their films a way to express emotions cinematographically. And this search is possible thanks to the viewings and the questions that have arisen: they provoke the students' desire to make a huge and complex panoramic shot from some trees to the main character who is crossing a path; it provokes students to decide to shot a sequence on a train so that in a downhearted moment of the character his face remains hidden by the darkness of the tunnel and overwhelmed by the sound; that the opening scene of a documentary is formed by traveling shots of their neighborhood and a voice over in the first person, and that portraits of people posing in front of the camera creates the closing scene.

This way of relating to film doesn't have anything to do with the imitation nor with the application of ready-made prescriptions. It comes from dealing with profound cinematographic matters, from exploring (through the screenings and the creative experience) the expressive capacity of the cinematographic gestures.

Other times, the relationship with the screenings passes through desire: Gus Van Sant's circular traveling in *Gerry* (2002) has awoken many times the desire of experimenting that gesture; Jean-Luc Godard's, Claire Denis' and Bela Tarr's night sequences have inspired many shots and sequences of illuminated buildings at night and of characters running through streets accompanied by the rhythm of the streetlights;

Depardon's long traveling that starts *Profils payasans: La vie moderne* (Raymond Depardon, 2008) has also inspired more than a group to start their documentary with a frontal traveling; Antoine Doinel's escape and look to camera at the end of *Les quatre cents coups* (François Truffaut, 1959) is repeated in Rocío's character who, trapped also as Antoine, runs towards the sea and ends up interrogating the spectator with her gaze.

Trust in Cinema and in the World

On the occasion of the Cinémathèque's retrospective of Louis Lumière in 1966, Godard, while thanking Langlois for discovering the true story of cinema, said that what really interested Lumière was the extraordinary of the ordinary, and that if Lumière didn't talk about the future it was because, at the beginning, cinema was an art of the present but, after all, it was the medium that approached art to life (GODARD, 1966: 281). This is the kind of cinema for which and with whom we work in *Cinema en curs*.

The children and young people that have entered the path of viewing and making cinema while having a profound dialogue with filmmakers, have discovered –because of their experience– that the initially awkward cinema has actually many things to tell them, to concern them, to communicate with them. This same kind of cinema allows them to talk, to express their experiences and concerns, to show their life and their places, to know themselves and get others to know them, to know their daily environment and to make it known to others.

During the workshops, cinema has entered their lives, it has made them grow. And cinema itself has also grown a little bit with them. In just some months, a deep and trustful relationship is created with cinema. On one hand, a trustful relationship is forged with the value of the duration of a shot, the emotion of a movement or with a change or rhythm or light. On the other hand, trust in the medium of cinema as a tool to show that a face can be infinite, that the neighborhood that seemed trivial actually hides marvelous changes of light; that the solitude we sometimes feel but we cannot understand can

actually be shared; that a movie about the frequently distressing emotion of growing up can even move those adults who appeared to be so faraway. These cinema strengths are not inherent, the filmmaker has to earn them: from Lumière, Renoir, Cassavetes or Mekas to the thousands of children and young people that have participated in *Cinema en curs* in these ten years. But, how do we earn them? Through expectations, by being demanding (with ourselves, with others and with cinema), and, most of all,

through trust: trusting cinema, trusting the world, others and ourselves.

Transformed by the experience of cinema, we no longer need a camera to be a filmmaker. To be a filmmaker is, above all, a way to be, a way of being in the world. •

Translated from the Spanish by Alejandra Rosenberg

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AIDELMAN, Núria and COLELL, Laia (2012). *Cine en curso. La transmisión del cine como creación y la creación como experiencia* (pp. 231-242). *Revista TOMA UNO*, 1. Córdoba (Argentina).
- BERGALA, Alain (2007). *La hipótesis del cine. Pequeño tratado sobre la transmisión del cine en la escuela y fuera de ella*. Barcelona. Laertes.
- DANEY, Serge (1994). *Persévérance. Entretien avec Serge Toubiana*. Paris. P.O.L.
- GODARD, Jean-Luc (1966). *Grace à Henri Langlois*. BERGALA, Alain (ed.), *Jean-Luc Godard par Jean-Luc Godard*. Paris: Éditions de l'Étoile-Cahiers du cinéma (1985).

- NABOKOV, Vladimir (1997). *Curso de literatura europea*. Barcelona. Ediciones B.
- RENOIR, Jean (1979). *Entretiens et propos*. NARBONI, Jean (ed.) Paris. Cahiers du Cinéma.
- VALENTE, José Ángel (2008). *Conocimiento y comunicación* (pp. 39-46). *Obras completas II*. Barcelona. Galaxia Gutenberg.
- VALÉRY, Paul (2010). *Introduction à la méthode de Léonard de Vinci*. Paris. Gallimard.
- ZWEIG, Stefan (2004). *El misterio de la creación artística*. (pp. 199-220). *Tiempo y mundo*. Barcelona. Editorial Juventud.

NÚRIA AIDELMAN

Lecturer in Audiovisual Communication at Pompeu Fabra University and a member of the CINEMA group. Together with Gonzalo de Lucas, she edited *Jean-Luc Godard: Pensar entre imágenes* (Intermedio, 2010) and she has written articles for a range of books and anthologies.

These include *Plossu Cinéma, Jean-Luc Godard: Documents and Erice-Kiarostami: Correspondances*. She was a programmer for Xcèntric and Gandules (Centre of Contemporary Culture of Barcelona) between 2003 and 2011.

LAIA COLELL

Graduated in Humanities at Pompeu Fabra University. She received her Advanced Studies Diploma (DEA) after carrying out scholarship-funded research into the Cahiers of Simone Weil in Paris. She is currently working on her doctoral

thesis. She has translated various books on philosophy and cinema and is a member of the Research Group 'Bibliotheca Mystica et Philosophica Alois M. Haas' at the University Institute of Culture of Pompeu Fabra University.

NÚRIA AIDELMAN AND LAIA COLELL

They are joint directors of A Bao A Qu, a non-profit cultural organization devoted to the conception and development of programmes and activities that link artistic creativity with schools. *Cinema en curs* (which started in 2005)

is the foundation project of the organization, while other notable projects include *Creators en residència als instituts de Barcelona (Creators in Residencia in Barcelona High Schools, 2009)*, *Fotografia en curs* (2012) and *Moving Cinema* (2014).

A Daring Hypothesis

Jonás Trueba

ABSTRACT

The author begins the article by reflecting on his involvement in film transmission based on his experience and commitment as a filmmaker. He then narrates about his experiences in his first *Cinema en curs* documentary workshop and exposes the workshop's development in all its phases. He highlights a few fundamental elements in each one of them, particular several discoveries throughout the creation process: documentation, by means of texts and photographs; screenings of excerpts and how to awaken sensibility, appreciation, and capture beauty; a script built by means of consensus; teamwork and the magical and revealing moments of shooting the film; editing and the infinite possibilities of film writing. Cinema becomes part of life and the experience is highly transforming for students and everyone involved in the project. In the article's final part, the author emphasizes in the importance of teamwork between filmmakers and teachers, and the value of the teachers in the project, highlighting their profound understanding of film and their decisive role in the transforming and revolutionary entrance of cinema in schools that *Cinema en curs* brings to play.

KEYWORDS

Cinema en curs, transmission, experience, creative process, screenings, documentary, teacher training, school, workshop, Alain Bergala.

*To have a vocation ourselves,
to know it, to love it and serve it passionately;
because love of life begets a love of life.*

Natalia Ginzburg, *The Little Virtues*

As time moves on, I'm becoming more aware of the responsibility one gains from life experience. I grew up in a family of filmmakers –our love for cinema was transmitted in a natural way. Only later did I become aware of how privileged I was, which is probably, in fact, my biggest inspiration when assuming the task of transmitting my experience in any educational context. I never dared to define myself as a teacher –I have too much respect for that profession. But I've increasingly realized how much we, filmmakers, are able to transmit and enrich the experience of teaching. It is not easy to find a word that is able to explain the idea of transmission between people. In France, people use the *'passeur'* figure. Some French dictionaries speak of rowers that cross rivers in small boats to explain the original meaning of the word; others use it to talk of people who help others cross borders illegally, which is maybe not that far away from the meaning we're looking for.

When Núria Aidelman and Laia Colell translated *La hipòtesis del cine* [*L'hypothèse cinéma*] by Alain Bergala, they used the word *'passer'* [*'pasador'*] to describe it, which is probably the best solution to refer an equation that is known to many filmmakers who are interested in film transmission, either inside or outside the educational context. I remember the impact Bergala's treaty had on me from the day I read it, not only when facing a class of film students, but also in my daily life, my development as a filmmaker, and my way of understanding film as such. *L'hypothèse cinéma* was about taking sides and find that other place that helps us build a distinctive initiation path, one that is more personal and assumes the art of cinema as something to be transmitted and experimented instead of being taught.

These translators turned into the best 'passers'. With this French legacy, they created *Cinema en curs* –first in Catalonia, then in several other places before coming to Madrid just over a year ago. I was then lucky enough to be invited to take part in this project and collaborate, as a filmmaker, in a school in Orcasitas, a Southern peripheral neighbourhood of the capital, something that turned out to be one of the most enriching experiences in my life.

This workshop developed throughout twenty sessions with students aged 15-16 in the last year of Compulsory Secondary Education [4th grade of ESO – *Educación Secundaria Obligatoria*], where teachers, educators and myself learned how to assimilate different methodologies that have been developing and expanding for the past eight years in different primary and secondary schools. The workshop was part of the Documentary modality in the *Cinema en curs* annual program, with the goal of making a short-film that would allow a better contact with the reality of a neighbourhood with a particularly rich historical and social context. One of the main ideas of the project is to encourage a stronger interest from students in their everyday environment through the fresh eyes of cinema. The documentary form certainly deepens this kind of approach.

The young students first documented different spaces and typical characters in the neighbourhood of Orcasitas with texts and photographs, thus renewing their connection with something that seemed too near or familiar to attract their attention. I realized that the filmmaker should face this first moment as a spectator caught in these initial images and other information compiled by his students,

for they are the ones who are responsible to transmit everything that is impossible for a newcomer to know first hand.

The students thus become the workshop's main figures, which creates an initial transmission that comes from their work and their confidence in us. It is important to stress the privilege for many filmmakers in the *Cinema en curs* program of contacting certain places and people that we wouldn't normally get to. In my case, I only knew Orcasitas through ordinary information that gives an extremely reductive image of it, usually focused in conflicts and problems caused by years of poverty and lack of basic resources. The workshop students, mostly composed of Orcasitas residents and, in some cases, sons and grandsons of their original inhabitants, didn't want to repeat this vision. They were clear enough in their efforts to show a different image of their neighbourhood –one that is truer and especially brighter.

I believe that their will to capture the beauty and many surprising shades of their daily environment came to them naturally after seeing excerpts of films shown to them in our first sessions, thus accompanying our first practical explorations: *Portraits* by Alain Cavalier, *Innisfree* (1990, José Luis Guerin), *Shoah* (1995, Claude Lanzmann), *Profils paysans, le quotidien* (2005, Raymond Depardon), *Amsterdam Global Village* (1995, Johan Van der Keuken), *Public Housing* (1997, Frederick Wiseman), or *News From Home* (1977, Chantal Akerman), just to cite a few of the most inspiring pieces to the students. These fragments were previously arranged and catalogued in DVD's and respectively shared with every fiction and documentary workshop

–titles that aren't usually available to a wider audience. I remember talking to a filmmaker colleague about films that I was watching in class with these students, and he'd look back at me as if I was crazy. But I would then answer back with simple facts: these young people weren't showing any kind of rejection or distance towards the kind of films they were discovering in our workshop. On the contrary, their lack of prejudice allowed them to watch these fragments with a clean perspective and without any preconceived idea.

These fragments were analyzed and discussed in class by the students, allowing them to be more perceptive and develop an insight that is more sensitive and too often concealed. It is all about becoming more familiar with the way different filmmakers have been successfully telling stories through images and sounds in order to emulate and adapt them to our own circumstances. We know there's nothing new about this, even Picasso started off by imitating his masters. But the important thing is to assimilate some initial references to begin with and later question ourselves under their perspective. With these excerpts and projections, we learned how to value the precision of a frame, the poetry of a camera movement, or even hundreds of ways to describe a light atmosphere, but also the research and hard work that lies behind every sensation that comes from it. Besides the old socratic method of obtaining reflexion and reasoning through questioning, we also had decisions and choices made by consensus between students in dialogue with teachers and the filmmaker. A shooting-script was then built to film and later edit into a short-film –one that was eventually called *Diary of a Neighbourhood* [*Diario de un barrio*, 2014¹].

1. Film directed by ESO 4º class (15-16 year-old students) of Colegio Montserrat-Orcasitas (Madrid): Raúl Álvarez, Christian Aranda, Alba Benítez, Yara Castellanos, Cristina Cercas, Javier David del Valle, Noelia Fayos, Héctor Gregorio, Jorge Gualda, Andrea Huertas, Laura de Leonardo, Alejandro Maurín, David Morán, Marcelo

Pinto, Raúl Plaza, Sergio Portalo, Teresa Quintana, Manuel Rodríguez, Daniel Solera, Rocío Vargas, Marina Villa, Iván Víñuelas. Mentored by Jonás Trueba (filmmaker) and Virginia González, José María Maestre, Arturo Marín, Jesús Muñoz, Montserrat del Olmo, Javier Rodríguez, M^a José Rodríguez, Margarita Romero (teachers).

Filmmaking in a school necessarily implies learning teamwork and many rich details that are hard to quantify. Technique and the global use of image and sound equipment are also important, like editing programs and devices, but we try to be concise and meticulous in their use to leave room for the students' instinct and intelligence, thus giving the material side of cinema no more than its essential space.

I remember the shooting and editing days as being particularly happy for everyone involved. Those were the moments where students felt as definite filmmakers: by materializing their own previous choices, taking decisions in the spur of the moment, or reacting to accidents and unforeseen situations through intuition. One would see a particular student's enthusiasm, like Laura's, while she'd hold a boom pole to create a sound panoramic from a faraway freeway to the voices of children playing in a park. The previous afternoon ended with a splendid magic hour that fascinated the eyes of several students, touched by a magic light that seemed to caress the buildings in their neighborhood's horizon. Every one of them knew how lucky they were to grab these precious moments on film. Another moment came through David and Yara, who decided to rise early in order to film the sunrise over the lake at Pradolongo Park. An unexpected fog covered the sunrise but gave them the possibility to grab a few shots of rare beauty. I also remember the revelation that other students had during the final edit when finally facing the material they had generated themselves, assuming their errors and finding infinite possibilities in film writing. The result is a lovely film that makes them feel proud and responsible, to which they look at with self-criticism but, at the same time, knowing how to recognize the huge amount of work behind it, for they're the ones who must first learn how to value it when seeing the film in different projections and contexts.

This first year experience was essential to understand the reach and potential of the *Cinema en curs* program, but I was already witnessing its

true essence and happily revolutionary side just a few months before. Then, just before school year started, the filmmakers involved in the workshops participated in its annual training in Catalonia, which I attended for the first time. We met in a huge house in Cantonigròs for a couple of days with the *Cinema en curs* team, including some thirty teachers from several educational establishments. Most teachers already had accumulated years of experience and commitment to the project—some of them since its first year—, others were also present for the first time, just before they'd start their first workshop. A teacher had recently retired but did not want to miss the formation and assumed all coordination and transmission tasks with newcomers.

We all shared our thoughts, debated and reflected together in order to build the new annual program, while commentating previously chosen film excerpts, worked on shooting and editing practices, but also gathered round to analyze different experiences and suggest new ways of working. It was a true laboratory of ideas where everyone participated. This exchange between teachers and filmmakers turned out to be fundamental.

It was particularly moving to hear more experienced teachers discover how much they had assimilated the philosophy of *Cinema en curs* and made it their own by applying it, year after year, to the circumstances of their own classes, thus earning an idea of film that is difficult to attain by the majority of industry professionals. These teachers had understood, in a complete, organic, and experimental way, that cinema is not something to be orchestrated in the development of curricular activities, but an art that serves people and is able to maximize our better side. This is what seemed to be truly revolutionary: that cinema may find a place in schools like it never had managed to, taking an active part in the life of students and teachers to nurture their sensibility, their look, their capacity to listen, think and reflect, or even the way they relate to each other and organize themselves.

Those teachers understood the transversal force of this project while overcoming any sort of fear or temptation to resist. We know that it is not easy to penetrate the educational system and pretend to transform the ideas that were instituted in it, or mandate what education should be like in schools. But what I also know is that this is a revolution I want to belong to. •

Translated from the Spanish by Francisco Valente

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BERGALA, Alain (2007). *La hipótesis del cine. Pequeño tratado sobre la transmisión del cine en la escuela y fuera de ella*. Barcelona. Laertes.

GINZBURG, Natalia (2002). *Las pequeñas virtudes*. Barcelona. El Acantilado.

JONÁS TRUEBA

He wrote and directed the feature-length films *Every Song is About Me* (Todas las canciones hablan de mí, 2010) and *The Wishful Thinkers* (Los ilusos, 2013) along with the medium-length film *Miniaturas* (2011). He was co-screenwriter for the films *Más pena que gloria* (2000) and *Vete de mí* (2005), directed by Victor García León, as well as *El baile de la victoria* (2009),

directed by Fernando Trueba. He is the author of the book *Las ilusiones* (Periférica, 2013) and he writes about the cinema for the newspaper *El Mundo* on the blog *El viento sopla donde quiere*. He combines his cinema work with his role as lecturer at TAI College of Arts and Entertainment (Madrid). In 2013 he joined the *Cinema en curs* team.

To Shoot through Emotion, to Show Thought processes. The Montage of Film Fragments in the Creative Process

Gonzalo de Lucas

ABSTRACT

In the project *Cinema en curs*, viewings of film fragments, selected and interrelated to stimulate students creative processes, generate a methodology of comparative film revolving around ideas of how to film an emotion and through a cinematic emotion. The choice of shots through which an aesthetic tension is created between the camera and what is being filmed brings about a recognition and montage of common gestures running through the creative process that don't compartmentalize eras, styles, or places. The student's increased awareness, his opening up to the world, and his aesthetic experience, is encouraged through the viewing of fragments without the cultural filter that are usually activated in film schools. In this way, they are taken in as artistic events, reflecting upon the external and internal thoughts materialised through them in hindsight. The last section of the article uses the comparative commentary of three specific fragments from *To Our Loves* (*À nos amours*, Maurice Pialat, 1983), *Badlands* (Terrence Malick, 1973) and *They Live by Night* (Nicholas Ray, 1949) to talk about how emotions are created through the editing of a shot.

KEYWORDS

Cine en curso, film excerpts, comparative montage, creative process, transmission, experience of the student, emotion of the filmmaker and of the character, cutting of shot, external thought of the shot, interior thought of the shot.

In 1989, Jean Rouch located the instant that gave origin to his films in the emotion he had felt while shooting for the first time, fifty years earlier, some children in Niger: 'I had five rolls of Kodachrome, that is to say, fifteen minutes to shoot a ritual I had never seen before. We were as excited as those children were scared. And this emotion saved the film, to look at them through the camera, with their anguish, their pain, and the happiness of not having cried. By setting up my camera again every twenty seconds, I was editing: changing the angle and the framing, solely inspired by that emotion'. (ROUCH, 2009: 118)

Perhaps emotion, together with experience, is the most complicated and unusual thing to convey in film schools, it is the least academic and the most elusive. And yet, in its educational project, *Cinema en curs* has taken on the challenge of presenting it as a crucial gesture for creativity. The film fragments selected by the students to make the DVDs which they then screen in the classroom, generates their first steps towards the transition –and meeting– from the emotion they want to show to the emotion of creating the shot; between the characters' feelings –the experience within the shot or the story– and the enthusiasm of translating reality into film through framing, rhythm, light. How do you film an emotion through an emotion?

It seems fitting not to apply this first encounter to the work done on shoot, but to place it instead on the experience of the viewer, on the screening inside the classroom, just where the grammar of film is usually dissected or used as an illustration for analytical discourse. The screening here becomes an experience, pieces of memorable and immeasurable time... The fundamental idea is that every shot exists (and is chosen) because it creates an aesthetic tension between the camera and what is being filmed: the story, the plot, the emotion, is that of the shot itself, creating itself and transforming, generating things that were unseen a second before, or the astonishment of what appears all of a sudden, or the desire for the instant to remain and not get lost, or the sudden

gasp due to an unexpected change of image or rhythm... This specific criterion leaves out the scenes or moments that are so common in cinema where shots are functional or utilitarian, the transitions or narrative links. It's not a historicist or technical criteria, nor one that claims that cinema changes or evolves, but a recognition, a demonstration, a putting together of common gestures that run through the creative process, which doesn't define eras, styles, or places.

This comparative understanding of cinema is usually composed, in the DVDs of *Cinema en curs*, through a cinematic relation, such as that of 'character, world, emotions', which then affects the students' exercises and films. In the DVD itself, the extracts are organised under categories and subcategories that group them together, for example, 'space between camera and character', which itself is structured into 'movement of approach or distancing', 'elastic threads', 'interposed elements'; or 'the value of the face', which is split into 'showing emotions by hiding the gaze', 'filming from behind to intensify the foreground', 'close ups', 'insistence'.

The first effect is that between cinema, the world, and emotion, any estrangement, frontier, or distance that the student may feel before, let's say, an excerpt from Shimizu, Hsiao-Hsien, Sissako, Olmi, or Cassavetes, disappears. Names that, unknown to some students, turn into recognisable filmmakers after just a few sequences. Through these excerpts, film is not situated within film, but in its opening up to the world, according to a process of increased awareness and of a broadening of perceptive knowledge which will then stimulate desire or rigour in the filming of the kids' surroundings, where aesthetic possibilities, hypotheses of shots and films are discovered; they will see and manifest everything in a different, unexpected way, using their camera to turn a fragment of the world into images and sounds, into other aesthetic worlds.

When Henri Langlois was asked what the Cinémathèque Française's main contribution to

the formation of the *nouvelle vague* had been, he replied that it was the lack of subtitles on the copies they screened, due to a shortage of money (LANGLOIS, 1986: 94-96). At the time, the theatre at the *Cinémathèque* had a seating capacity of sixty, but many of those viewers were to generate new forms and methods of filmmaking. If they managed to do it, it was partly because when they watched the films they probably paid attention to the images and sounds, unaffected by the meaning of the dialogue and of narrative plots. In an article about Mizoguchi, Jacques Rivette wrote his famous sentence: 'If music is a universal idiom, so too is *mise en scène*: it is this language, and not Japanese, that has to be learned to understand "Mizoguchi"' (RIVETTE, 1995: 95).

Although the selected extracts do include subtitles, the principles of choice and grouping are the same: to preserve the mystery, musicality, and attraction of the visual and aural forms over explanatory discourse or literal meaning, to privilege rhythm over words. External discourses, embedded into films at many film schools before *watching* the films, are not incorporated or translated here: solidified points of view, clichés, prejudices, grammar rules, trends. The student's experience emerges out of watching the fragment without this cultural filter, and taking it in as an artistic event, reflecting upon the external and internal thoughts materialised through it in hindsight. The former deals with the decisions taken by filmmakers to compose the sensitive and meaningful aspects of the shot; the latter, with the way the shots are linked to a character who (often off-centre, or not in a hierarchical composition) is located in a space that will be *subjectivised* (or lived) by the his affective state and for what he is thinking. This is where the student, in the midst of growing up, will turn to his intimate, immediate experience, to his being in the world, to find cinema; that which at the beginning of the course surely seemed far removed from him, a screen that deals only with the life of others, that he would have never associated with his own body and experience.

And so we return to the beginning of this article: how can we transmit the emotion that Jean Rouch found to be at the origin of his filmmaking practice? When Walter Murch defined his editing *rule of six*, he clearly pointed out: 'At the top of the list is Emotion, the thing you come to last, if at all, at film school largely because it's the hardest thing to define and deal with' (MURCH, 2001: 18). It would be enough, for example, to simply select three fragments out of those presented in former editions of *Cinema en curs* to think about how an emotion may emerge out of the way a shot has been cut.

In *To Our Loves* (*À nos amours*, 1983), Maurice Pialat films Suzanne (Sandrine Bonnaire) sitting on a bench at a bus stop; we see her through the bus shelter, on a rainy afternoon, in an image that captures the feeling of unease and emotional disillusionment, solitude, and interiority immersed in a city; the way the shots of her body are edited seem to insist on the *duration* of experience, unquantifiable, of when we learn to live with our emotions, to carry them without yet knowing what to do with them or how to measure their weight; and just then we cut to a shot where we see her standing in the street, a few hours later. It has stopped raining and it's night time already, but if we look closely, we'll that there are some frames where the girl, before looking up and starting to walk, appears to be waiting to hear the word *action* –she touches her nose, one would say she is cold and tired–, before she begins to act, and moves. Pialat has included these initial frames, which are usually discarded and that belong to the actress more than to her character, leftover instants of the shoot before the acting begins, but which contain a physical and emotional liveliness where actress and character coexist. It has probably been a long shoot, the teenager Sandrine Bonnaire – in her first film role– is tired, and Pialat takes advantage of her real experience to inject it into the aesthetic experience of the film, and into the truth of the character, intertwining life and film.

In *Badlands* (Terrence Malick, 1973), Kit (Martin Sheen) and Holly (Sissy Spacek), two young fugitive lovers, travel by car at night towards ‘a magical land beyond the reach of the law’, but have stopped sharing the experience: he is still thinking about crossing the border and continuing with his adventure, she has drawn into herself (‘I’d stopped even paying attention to him’), she no longer believes in or shares Kit’s trip or his showing off; their love and their rhythms have gone *out of sync*. And right then, a song by Nat King Cole plays on the radio. While sustaining the sound continuity, a cut takes us from the interior of the car to their bodies coming out of the darkness, dancing in each others arms, as if they were floating in some other space. Kit half whispers to himself, ‘if I could sing a song about the way I feel right now’, and the viewer says to himself how he wishes that moment would last, that cinema is made to make us wish for things to last a little longer, and to feel the pain of their passing without being able to hold onto them. Kit and Holly’s bodies, in the darkness, are lit by a strip of light created by the headlights which cuts across the composition like a horizontal line, in a poetic image that rhymes with ‘the very edge of the horizon’, which opened the scene (the cloud of dust made by the car, creating a sort of ‘frontier’), and with the next shot, a horizon at daybreak, a dawning interpreted perhaps as a twilight, a dying light.

Finally, the famous editing of the final sequence in *They Live By Night* (Nicholas Ray, 1949), when Keechie contemplates Bowie’s lifeless body. In a fairly aesthetic action, which conventional cinema would have only granted a single shot, maybe two –Keechie’s head and back leaning down, and her gestures while getting up–, Nicholas Ray, perhaps due to a technical defect in one of the shots, dedicates four, of varying scales, in a sort of energetic insistence, in an emotion that bursts through, leaving no time to think, as if there wasn’t enough time to focus on it or frame it correctly; Keechie picks up the letter that Bowie has written to her, and the cut leads to a shot where we follow her from behind, walking slowly, in a

change of rhythm and cadence that suddenly fills the emotion with sweetness and introspection, as if we had gone from the exterior (of her energy, of her action) to the interior of the body, to the thoughts of the girl who finally turns towards the camera, finishes reading the letter, repeats the last words in silence, whose voice wanes as the light fades and darkness offers the sparkle of her cheek bones, wet with tears. Here darkness has allowed us to *see better*, or to see something that remained unseen. The gesture of emotion has led us towards the thinking. Thus ends the first film by Nicholas Ray, who, at the end of his life, over twenty years later, would make his last film in collaboration with his students at Harpur College in New York, where ‘we are learners, doers, teachers’. (RAY, 1993: 7). •

Translated from the Spanish by Alex Reynolds

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BERGALA, Alain (2007). *La hipótesis del cine. Pequeño tratado sobre la transmisión del cine en la escuela y fuera de ella*. Barcelona. Laertes.
- COMOLLI, Jean-Louis (2004). *Voir et pouvoir. L'innocence perdue : cinéma, télévision, fiction, documentaire*. Paris. Verdier.
- LANGLOIS, Henri (1986). *Trois cent ans de cinéma*. Paris. Cahiers du cinéma/ Cinémathèque Française/Fondation Européenne des Métiers de l'Image et du son.
- MURCH, Walter (2001). *In the Blink of an Eye. A perspective on film editing*. Los Angeles. Silman-Jess Press.
- RAY, Nicholas (1993). *I Was Interrupted. Nicholas Ray on Making Movies*. RAY, Susan (Ed.). Berkeley. University of California Press.
- RIVETTE, Jacques (1958). *Mizoguchi vu d'ici*. BAECQUE, Antoine (ed.), *La politique des auteurs*. Paris: Cahiers du Cinéma, pp. 94-96.
- ROUCH, Jean (2009). *Cinéma et anthropologie*. COLLEYN, Jean-Paul (Ed.). Paris. Cahiers du Cinéma.

GONZALO DE LUCAS

Lecturer in Audiovisual Communication at Pompeu Fabra University. Film programmer for Xcèntric, Centre of Contemporary Culture of Barcelona. Director of the post-graduate programme *Audiovisual Editing* at IDEC/ Pompeu Fabra University. He has written the books *Vida secreta de las sombras* (Ed. Paidós) and *El blanco de los*

origenes (Festival de Cine de Gijón) and co-edited *Jean-Luc Godard. Pensar entre imágenes* with Núria Aidelman (ed. Intermedio, 2010). He has written articles for 20 anthologies and publications such as *Cahiers du Cinéma-España*, *Sight and Sound* and the supplement *Culturals* in *La Vanguardia*.

La transmisión del secreto. Mikhail Romm en el VGIK

Carlos Muguero

ABSTRACT

This paper describes a particular episode of the VGIK school –the oldest filmmakers training centre of the world– to study the soviet cinematographic tradition based on the figure of Mikhail Romm, his direction workshop held in the fifties and sixties, and the disconcerting and cyclonic encounter with his students. Furthermore, the long and interrupted process that implied the articulation of the subjectivity of the filmmaker in Soviet cinema, and which connects the work of Romm with that of Tarkovski, is outlined here through the analysis of the montage of *Ordinary Fascism* (*Obyknovennii fashizm*, 1965), where Romm inscribes his reflexive voice in first person. Finally, the history of the VGIK is read both as a chain of transmission and tradition between generations of filmmakers, and a place to confront the political and personal positions great filmmakers such as Eisenstein, assumed when they were mentors at the Institution.

KEYWORDS

VGI, self's voice, filmmaker's subjectivity, Mikhail Romm, pedagogical system, transmission, diagonal pedagogy, Andréi Tarkovski, Eisenstein, nuclear image.

1.

The VGIK¹ survives today as the oldest filmmaking training centre of the world, almost 100 years after its opening. Nevertheless, it was not the first film school of post-revolutionary Russia. Early in 1918, the Education Commission (Narkompros), directed by Anatoli Lunacharski, strategically decided to activate dozens of new pedagogical experiments sustained in the practice and the resolution of concrete and quotidian problems. Urged by the need to assign loyal and committed specialists heading the modernization and socialization plans of the country, they required to complete the professional staff in diverse areas such as engineering, finances, administration and cinema; naturally, in cinema as well, due to, among others reasons, the professional *vacuum* generated by the exile of some of the most distinguished technicians and directors.

The project was first developed with local centres, such as the School of Screen Arts in Petrograd (SEI) and the Odessa State College of Cinematography. Later, in 1919, it continued through the foundation of the State College of Cinematography (GTK), as the VGIK was formerly named. Narkompros commissioned the design of the curriculum to the veteran filmmaker Vladímir Gardin. The veteran director imagined down to the last detail, a four year itinerary based on practical workshops guided by a mentor, inspired by the 'work and learn simultaneously' slogan, and the line of 'learning-by-doing', proclaimed by Lunacharsky as general guideline to Soviet film education (KEPLEY, 1987: 5-7). The first course started in autumn 1919 with 25 students.

1. In 1934 already under Soiuzhino's control, the Central Cinematographic administration, held by Boris Shumiatskii, adopted that name. The letters VGIK stand for Russian denomination *Vsesoiuznii Gosudarstvenii Institut Kinematografii* (All-Union State Institute of Cinematography). In 1939 the centre accomplished the VUZ category (higher educational institute). In 2008 the Institute became the Panrusa Guarasimov University of Cinematography.

This fundamentally *teknikum* and *non-artistic* approach, helps to explain the two hypotheses of film education, assumed as obvious today, over which the first film school was founded upon. The first one, presupposed that following a more or less regulated and methodical pedagogy, was as well possible to create *filmmakers*, like engineers or topographers. The second one, presumed that, who could better provide this technical training were the filmmakers² themselves, precisely because it was intended to create filmmakers, as engineers and topographers³.

Undoubtedly, there are many VGIK in the hundred years of the VGIK; however the decision to make the filmmakers –the great masters– the ones who comprised cyclically the teacher staff, granted to the institution, from its early beginnings, the power to construct the Soviet cinematography as *tradition*, this is to say, as a great intergenerational tale of custody and transmission of the *secret*. The *famous secret* the master whispers to his apprentice in his deathbed for art not to be ruined or distorted⁴. Without an exhaustively intent, the object of this paper is to describe a concrete episode of the paradigm of the school as narrator of the Soviet cinematographic tradition based on the figure of Mikhail Romm, his direction workshop held in the fifties and sixties, and the disconcerting and cyclonic encounter with his students.

2.

During 1963, Mikhail Romm started the overly postponed and monumental process of reviewing the never-ending footage confiscated from the *Reichfilmarchiv* by the Red Army. In

2. It was not until 1934 that a *non-filmmaker*, Nikolái Lobedev, was in charge of the Institution. Exactly in the time the centre changed its status from Vocational School to Superior Institute.

3. The words of Antón Makarenko, one of the foundational figures of the new post-revolutionary Russian pedagogy, must be recalled in this point. He said that the purpose of the Soviet educational system was rather to provoke the socialization of the individual than to create artists (1955:40).

large sacks in Mosfilm since 1945, among other materials, the *Deutsche Wochenschau*, *kultur-films*, the Goebbels funds, and collections of images from Hitler's personal photographer, Heinrich Hoffman, besides others from the SS that had operated in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia and Belarus, had been kept in custody. «We watched around two million and a half metres of film, which is more than half of what was preserved: we stopped there, we couldn't go any further» (HAUDIQUET, 1966). Romm started to organize the material according to 120 possible topics, and later combined the images based on 16 chapters that would finally structure his movie *Ordinary Fascism*⁵ (*Obyknovennii fashizm*, 1965) (ROMM, 1965: 4). Through decontextualization, hyperbole and contrast achieved by montage, those historical documents began to acquire an intriguing ironic twofoldness; and purely by friction (not fiction⁶), they started to dismantle the processes of construction of the public discourse from power, the Soviet power⁷, by extension.

Following the standardized guidelines of compilation documentary, Mosfilm suggested the text to be read by a neutral and disembodied voice: either Iurii Levitán, the official radio announcer, the actor Innokentii Smoktunovskii, or the German actor and singer Erns Busch (TUROVSKAJA, 2003: 198). However, throughout the previous months, Romm had imagined the possibility of incorporating himself to *Ordinary Fascism*, a movie he had always considered, not at all capriciously, a personal legacy to younger people who had not known the war. Encouraged by his closest collaborators, Romm finally decided to make

himself present in the film as voice transmuted to filmic matter; transposing to the film, the testimonial courage he had practiced for over a decade in the classrooms of the VGIK.

Not he only assumed to put his *thoroughly human* voice to the film, or address the spectator in first person –both consequences of a radical heterodoxy in Soviet film–, but he permitted his reflections to flourish, in certain way spontaneously, facing the projection of the film: like if he was improvising a class with his students or having a conversation with the spectator. After all, the intention was not to project the voice as images are projected, with that same clarity and that emphatic luminosity of a powerful spotlight; rather it was to incorporate to the images that dubitative and intermittent quality in search of the exact word that characterizes the process of thought itself. Romm explained:

We assembled the work as a silent film. I improvised the comments section by section, without thinking of synchronization, or pursuing standardized 'documentary' effects. It was like a monologue where I was verbalizing the ideas that came to my mind as I watched the material. And at the same time, I was claiming for the attention of the spectator, so they would think, as well, about what they had in front. (ROMM, 1975: 279).

Based on the usages of voice Gonzalo de Lucas details, it can be concluded that through these choices, Romm articulated the voice as *ars poetica*⁸; because it moved between the aesthetic treatise and

4. Let us remember the episode of Andréi Rublev, where the Young Boriska, in a desperate moment, affirms having received from his father, Nikolka, the secret of the construction of the bells; episode he would later recognize as unreal. The *secret of creation* seems to cross from one generation to another more as a gift than as knowledge.

5. Romm developed the screenplay with the critics Maia Turovskaia and Yuri Khaniutin (BILENHOF & HÄNSEN, 2008: 142).

6. Romm expressively rejected the inclusion of fiction footage. Confronting the faces of the documentary reels, he would say: 'Drama seems ridiculous to me. I simply can't take it seriously' (ROMM, 1981: 301).

7. 'As most of my friends, I perfectly understood that the hidden design of the director was to prove the terrible, unconditional and harrowing connection between the two regimes' (cit. WOLL, 2008: 229).

the critical revision of history, art and cinema, all three undifferentiated in a whole cinematographic body. (DE LUCAS, 2013: 54).

The first person singular had never before acquire such importance in Soviet cinema, not only because of the malleability of the voice, but also because of the organic dimension of the spoken word, being both voice and breath of the already sexagenarian and tired Romm. Facing the screen, he doubts, whispers, searches for the word from an undetermined somewhere, yet earthly. Romm is so close to the spectator that they can even guess the mouthfuls of smoke that calmly, were accompanying each one of his phrases. Furthermore, the *self* of Romm, gains a disconcerting metaphorical power through the film, especially in chapter VIII entitled 'About myself'. Specifically dedicated to the cult of personality around the Führer, in this chapter Romm speaks as if he was Hitler himself, in first person. The Faustic effect that this feature generates with the appropriation of the body of *Satan himself*, making Hitler say platitudes to portrait him in his patheticism, not only produces a disconcerting and liberating effect for the observers of such demonic ritual, but also makes the spectator notice the ancestrally magical power of voice, capable of possessing any image and bewitching it until the loss of its will. Regarding this point, *Romm's voice*, even makes reference to Russian literary tradition of demonic farce cultivated by such authors as Andreiev, Bielei or Bulgakov, who already suspected about the schizophrenic division of subjectivity, about the *selves of the self*.

The emergence of the voice –the voice itself, the voice of the absolute self– accomplished by *Ordinary Fascism* supposes a turning point in

8. Although De Lucas's analysis is based on works by Mekas, Godard, Cocteau, Van der Keuken and Rouch, many of his conclusions about the 'usages of the voice' could be applied to *Ordinary Fascism*. It is difficult to determine until what point Romm actually knew the essayist forms that were being explored by such authors. Whatsoever, we know about the polemic encounter he had with Godard, from which Romm concluded: 'Western artists, writers, and filmmakers are going

the rotational axis of Russian cinema, though its effect can only be fully appreciated at distance⁹. Ten years after this film, Romm's beloved disciple Andréi Tarkovski, included at the beginning of *The mirror* (*Zerkalo*, 1975) a sequence that indicated, by way of a buoy, the deepness of the waters from which it emerged: an equally hybrid and original film about the articulation of the most extreme subjectivity. In that first scene, a young man with a speech dysfunction undergoes the healing of his stammering by hypnosis. 'I will remove the tension now, and you will speak clearly and effortlessly– he is told–. You will speak loudly and clearly for all your life. Look at me. I will remove the tension from your hands and your speech. One, two, three. Say: 'I can speak''. Even ten years after *Ordinary Fascism*, to conjugate a film from the subjectivity of the author that can not be shared (I CAN SPEAK), meant such a sin of the bourgeoisie and formalist egomania that Tarkovski ended up condemned to exile.

The articulation of the filmmaker's subjectivity in Soviet cinema was a long and interrupted process that correlates the works of Romm and Tarkovski, and simultaneously takes us to the preceding time, the begging of the Thaw, when Mikhail Romm started to impart his direction workshop at VGIK. Something happened in those classrooms, between introspective therapy and magical ritual, as staged in Tarkovski's film, which transformed the 'I CAN TALK' into a collective and generational need. Now it is time to go to its classes.

3.

In autumn 1955, One year after the 20th Congress of the CPSU where the critic to Stalin and the beginning of the Thaw were officialised,

through a deep spiritual crisis: some of them are looking a way out from the ideological mire; the others are taking very strange alleys. I noticed that in my interview with filmmaker Jean-Luc Godard' (ROMM, 1972: 11).

9. For a detailed analysis of the articulation of voice in *Ordinary Fascism* refer to BEILENHOFF & HÄNSEN (2008).

Mikhail Romm accepted the entry of Andrei Tarkovski to the VGIK, against the opinion of the rest of the examiners. Tarkovski was incorporated to his workshop, together with Vasilli Shukshin, Alexánder Mittá and Iulii Fait. During the four years of the Degree, Romm protected under his authority this first generation of filmmakers of the Thaw, who were called to transform cinema in the Union. 'He has an interesting group – Serguéi Soloviov recalled the words of the Ministry of Culture–, although there are two people that obliterate the class: the schizophrenic named Tarkovski, and that imbecilic named Shukshin, who came from somewhere in Altai'. Some years later, Tarkovski would compare master Romm to a King who governed without exerting power or imposing his opinion, even without teaching the craft, because Romm's invitation was rather to journey through one's own darkness and to identify one's individual singularity (GIANVITO, 2006: 66).

In the thirties, through movies such as *Lenin in October* (*Lenin v oktiabre*, 1937) and *Lenin in 1918* (*Lenin v 1918 godu*, 1939), Romm had contributed to construct the idea of Lenin as an idealized embodiment of Soviet justice. This icon of the leader, risen up with certain innocence, was rescued and incorporated to the political discourse Nikita Krushchev pretended to restore in the late fifties, following the idea that the critics to Stalinism simultaneously led to the mandatory restoration of the foundational myth. This rare braid through which 'cinema had created an image that had transmuted to reality' (EISENSCHITZ, 2000: 142), as explained by Naum Kleiman, undoubtedly provoked in Romm an intense disconcert regarding his responsibility as a filmmaker in the construction of the past. For a figure like Romm the new time was time for reflection. 'Those who knew and know the director –Pogozheva wrote– at least could realize

the internal change he was going through in the course of this period' (POGOZHEVA, 1962). In addition, a great intergenerational change was taking place in Soviet Cinema in these years. Once again, the veteran filmmaker was placed against the contradictions between the individual memory and the historical record¹⁰. According to Kleiman, who attended the school in 1956, 'Romm plunged into crisis. He assumed Khrushchev's discourse very painfully. He did not work for two years in order to understand what was going on. Thus he devoted to carpentry, and later he decided to help young people', some others came after him, 'but Romm took the first step' (EISENSCHITZ, 2000: 142). It was in this particular state of reflection where the classrooms of the VGIK were transformed into scenery for *the talking cure*.

Romm discovers almost at the same time his hands as a carpenter and his voice as a master. It was usual to see him with a little dictation machine he carried everywhere during these years, as Klímov would later remember. (MUGUIRO, 2005: 46). He kept recording indistinctly some unimportant notes and merciless confessions. Romm confesses to himself: 'Can one leave behind one's customs, detach from the skin of one's habits, remake oneself, be reborn? In the midst of this torrent of doubts I decided to settle some of the points of my path to come. I made some promises, I even pronounced them loudly one night' (ROMM, 1989: 82-83). Concurrently in the classrooms of the VGIK, as an extension of this time of reflection, Romm continued to formulate questions, analyse his work, open himself to the critic, and incite contradiction. As his students would later remember, Romm did not teach anything apart from himself. Soloviov summarizes it: 'he must have been gifted with a truly greatness of spirit in order to stay there, in front of us, his students, giving explanations of his work on cinema' (MUGUIRO, 2005: 47). Therefore, the experience of the voice was not merely a conceptual

10. It must be taken into account that from 1955-56 to the end of the decade, almost simultaneously and in great influx, up to four different generations of filmmakers attended the VGIK and in general, were part of the

industry. Although they were barely separated by two or three years in age, each generation treasured experiences and demands impossible to be shared (EISENSCHITZ, 2000: 140).

exercise, restraint to the articulation of discourse, but rather, a form of personal embodiment radically physical. As opposed to the written word, for Romm, the voice included the possibility to mute, to inhale the smoke of the cigarette, to take a breath, a sigh. 'To breath is to create a whole in the attention that could be unfolded' (PARDO, 2002), reminds us Carmen Pardo. To go through those long silences was a form of self-alteration for the young apprentices.

Evgenii Margolit has explained that in the history of VGIK, as long as it took place, the exchange of experience and the dialogue between generations, provoked such extraordinary results as the encouragement of 'the artists to go deep beyond the canonical prescriptions and succeed over them' (MARGOLIT, 2012: 371). Something similar happened in Romm's workshop, producing an unusual fruitfulness in the history of the centre. Anyway, also according to Margolit, Romm's diagonal style had important precedents inside the institution, particularly in the unforgettable sessions by Igor Sávchenko, professor at VGIK between 1945 and 1950. Although Romm did not attend to his classes, in this classroom as well, the dialogue between peers became the essence of the relation between master and disciples. 'When we analysed something we had done –Danilov said–, something we had written, or something we had shot, he talked ceaselessly. Consciously or not, the work of Sávchenko with his students turned out to be a powerful way to confront the famine atmosphere of cinema and the absolute un-individualization of the students. It was a way to incite the consolidation of their singular points of view' (DANILOV, 2012: 371).

However, Romm's workshop was not a purely inductive system, rather it also implied disconcert and contradiction in the most orthodox sense of dialectical collision and synthesis. 'I considered you as serious people, authentic creators with their own personality –Savva Kulish reconstructed the exasperation of the master when they showed him some corrections they had made to their movie *The last letters* (*Posledniye pisma*, 1965), according

to the suggestions of the master himself–, why the hell you obey so blindly? What If I have misunderstood? Or if I am wrong?' (MUGUIRO, 2005: 44). This much more irascible and strategic version of the master, far from the spontaneity of Sávchenko, brought Romm closer to Eisenstein.

4.

To address the pedagogical system designed by Eisenstein exceeds the purposes of this paper, but it is convenient to briefly point out that, particularly between 1932 and 1935, Eisenstein tried to develop at VGIK his revolutionary ideas about film education with almost no political interference or administrative supervision (MILLER, 2007: 479). The student, with sometimes disconcerting cultural and artistic references, through certain Socratic guidance and the always limited interference of Eisenstein, should begin to unravel the idea or *nuclear image* (the *obraz* image) hidden in a determined representation (the *izobrahenie* image) whether literary, pictorial or theatrical, that nourished it from this background: like a hidden chord from which, mysteriously, a symphony could grow. To find or synthesize that *nuclear image* was the purpose of exercises such as filming the murder scene of *Crime and Punishment* in one single shot, or *editing* Leonardo Da Vinci's *The Last Supper*, until finding the piece that contained, concentrated, the idea of the whole painting. Vance Kopley Jr. summarizes:

According to Eisenstein, an author conceives a nuclear image (*obraz*) and later elaborates it through the act of representation (*izobrazhenie*). As opposed to the process of the author, who starts to create from the nuclear idea and works the representation formally, the spectator contemplates the finished work through the text as a representation until recognizing the central image (...) Eisenstein created [the session] as a ritual, provoking the students a reaction towards the master works of art he took to class. Students, as film spectators, should participate in the construction of the sense

of the text, identifying the nuclear image (KEPLEY, 1993: 10).

The director and the spectator went through the same relation of dependence and necessity as the teacher and his students. In the matter of fact, Eisenstein did not find any differences between what happened in the classroom and what happened in a projection room. The circuit of sense that was activated in both audiences was indeed a psychological laboratory, equivalent and interchangeable. Therefore, Eisenstein could formulate in class, like in a test range, experiments of some of the nuclear concepts of his thought, such as the correlation between the predictable response of a subject and expressivity, an aesthetical concept that was originally taken from Russian reflexology on which he relied in his early writings (KEPLEY, 1993: 4). Controverting Shaw's famous aphorism 'Those who can, do; those who don't teach', Eisenstein founded a pedagogical system based on the certainty that teaching was a form of creation as well, not very different from that of filming (KEPLEY, 1993: 14). Giving a class like one would make a movie.

Some years later, as we have seen, Romm went one step further than his admired Eisenstein, when sizing up the inverse procedure, this is to say, the creation of a film that emanated from his voice: to make a film as he would give a class. He locked himself inside Mosfilm in order to watch dozens of reels of Nazi propaganda. He assumed his absolute role of spectator (even of what he did not want to see). Only at the end, in the same emotional place as that of the spectator, he began to speak. This was how he assumed *Ordinary Fascism*: 'my voice should seem like a conversation destined to provoke reflection. It should give the impression that I am standing next to the spectator, and I tell him: Behold what fascism is, behold my own thought' (HAUDIQUET, 1966).

Alexánder Mittá, Elem Klímov and Vladímír Basov attended Romm's workshop; Serguéi Paradzhanov, Marlén Khutsiev and Vladímír Naumov that of Sávchenko; Grigorii

Alexandrov, Iván Piriev and Vladímír Vengerov attended Einsestein's; Stanislav Rostotskii and Eldar Riazanov, Kozintsev's; Teguíz Abuladze and Grigorii Chukhái, Serguéi Iutkevitch's ... A never ending chain of *tradition*. However, not only the reverential and dazzled encounter of the students with the master took place at VGIK, but also the disconcerting and stunned encounter of the master with the students: Sávchenko's, Eisenstein's and Romm's career, as that of many other eminent filmmakers, was irreversibly crossed by the presence of these so called *apprentices*, of whom Khutsiev, Venguerov y Klímov are only an example. VGIK did not produce series of *Romm's*, *Einsesteins* or *Sávchenkos*, it rather returned to Romm, Eisenstein and Sávchenko the reflections of their own needs, exterior fears and obsessions. Far from producing doubles, the institute, confronted those great masters with the enigmatic silhouette of their own shadow.

5.

The history of the VGIK as a paradigm of the great film schools can be read twofold. First, the chronological discourse sheds lights on the chain of transmission of knowledge that from one generation to another, for almost one hundred years of existence, constructed a certain cinematographic tradition in which all its protagonists have their necessary place. Second, when assembled against the grain, the history of the VGIK is not the history of the graduates, but the history of the great masters of Soviet cinematography, sheltered in the classroom for sometimes political or economical reasons, frequently confronted to their own talent and exposed against the unappealable look of a generation in search of explanations. Margolit has coined the concept of *diagonal pedagogy* to identify this form of horizontal relationship, which also explains VGIK's prestige. Lev Kulechov, for example, transposed to his classes in the mid twenties, the sense of adventure and discovery nailed down in his famous experiments of montage over the face of the actor Mozzhukhin or the *creative geography*. He incorporated his students to the artistic and technical crew of his movies, as in

The Death Ray (*Luch Smetri*, 1925) and *By the Law* (*Po Zakonu*, 1926) (KEPLEY, 1987: 14); From 1936 to 1938 in his laboratory, Dovzhenko delved along with his students into the adaptation of *Taras Bulba*, a project that was not only seen as an act of national reaffirmation in Ukraine, but which also had serious consequences for the students, who were hardly reprised during the Great Terror (MARGOLIT, 2012: 371). For Eisenstein, the school was an intellectual and artistic shelter in one of the most tragic periods of his life, when he faced the hostility of the regime and the public and gremial censure, and found a great difficulty to begin new projects after his return from North America. Like Vance Kepley has stated, it would be impossible to understand Eisenstein's evolution through the thirties and forties, particularly his organicist aesthetics and the associative montage, without understanding his role at the VGIK (KEPLEY, 1993: 2).

6.

In 1935 Eisenstein took his students to the shooting of *Bezhin Meadow* (*Bezhin Lug*, 1937). He proposed them to get involved in the staging, dialogues and montage of the film, to later compare their results. In 1948, Sávchenko and his students boarded the shooting of the artistic documentary *The Third Blow* (*Tetrii udar*, 1948), a project without precedents which required to substitute the whole course for eight months of outdoors shooting. Each of them received between 50 and 60 metres of movie, a camera and a topic. Some of those miniatures were included in the final montage of the film.

Romm died in 1971 with no time to finish his upcoming movie. There were some notes and comments registered in his dictation machine that Elem Klímov and Marlen Khutsiev used to finish the film. They shaped it as a new personal essay in which Romm went across a century as old as him through his septuagenarian memory. Vasili Aksionov had written in one of his novels that history represents a chain of small apocalypses, until the final one. That was too, the diagnosis that seemed to emanate from the finished movie. It was logical, within the context of the artistic circularity we have described, that the movie was finished by those who had discussed with him so regularly, in the school and out of it. However, Klímov and Khutsiev decided to incorporate to the film the reflexive and disconcerting personality they associated to his master. To entitle the movie, they rescued a brief text found in his desk that even controverted the general effect of the montage: *And Still I Believe* (*I vse-taki ia veriu...*, 1974). The title remained like that. It was the last breakage of dialectics. It is a paradox that echoes in the mind of the spectator, in first person with no possibility of reply. Similar to one of those long and disconcerting silences, where Romm came to question everything that had been said until then. •

Translated from the Spanish by Carolina Sourdis

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BEILENHOF, Wolfgang y HÄNSGEN, Sabine (2014). *Speaking about images: the voice of the autor in Ordinary Fascism. Studies in Russian and Soviet Cinema*, 2:2, pp. 141-153.

BOWN, James (1965). *Soviet Education. Anton Makarenko*

and the Years of Experiment. Milwaukee/ Madison. University of Wisconsin Press.

CHUKHRAI, Grigorii (1971). *Mikhail Romm cumple 70 años. Hablemos del maestro. Films Soviéticos*, 1, p. 29.

- DE LUCAS, Gonzalo (2013). *Ars poetica. La voz del cineasta. Cinema Comparative Cinema*, Vol. 1, N° 3, pp. 49-59.
- DOBASHENKO, S. y SADCHIKOV, I. (1992). *The Main Tendencies of the Film Education System in Perestroika. Journal of Film and Video*, 44: 1/2, pp. 91-96.
- GIANVITO, John (ed.) (2006). *Andrei Tarkovsky: Interviews*. Jackson (MS). University Press of Mississippi.
- KEPLEY, Vance Jr. (1987). *Building a National Cinema: Soviet Film Education, 1918-1934. Wide Angle*, 9:3, pp. 4-20.
- KEPLEY, Vance Jr. (1993). *Eisenstein as Pedagogue. Quarterly Review of Film and Video*, 14:4, pp. 1-16.
- EISENSCHITZ, Bernard (2000). *Une histoire personnelle. Dialogue avec Naum Klejman 2. EISENSCHITZ, Bernard (ed.), Lignes d'ombre. Une autre histoire du cinéma soviétique (1926-1968)*. Milano. Edizione Gabriele Mazzotta, pp. 139-148.
- HAUDIQUET, Philippe (1966). *Rencontre avec Mikhaïl Romm à Paris. Lettres Françaises*, abril.
- HERLINGHAUS, Hermann (1981). *Stoff unserer Filme ist die Dialektik des Lebens. Film und Fernsehen*, 1, I-X.
- MAKARENKO, Anton (1955). *The Road to Life vol III*. Moscow. Foreign Languages Publishing House.
- MARGOLIT, Evgenii (2012). *A conglomeration of aggressive personalities: Savchenko's students at the All-Union State Institute of Cinematography (1945-1950) and the cinema of the Thaw. Studies in Russian and Soviet Cinema*, 6:3, pp. 365-372.
- MILLER, Jamie (2007). *Educating Filmmakers: The State Institute of Cinematography in the 1930's. The Slavonic and East European Review*, 85:3, pp. 462-490.
- MUGUIRO, Carlos (2005). *Reconstruyendo a Mijaíl Romm*. MUGUIRO, Carlos (ed.), *Ver sin Vertov* (pp. 43-47). Madrid: La casa encendida.
- NIZHNY, Vladimir (1962). *Lessons with Eisenstein*. New York. Hill&Wang.
- PARDO, Carmen (2002). *Las formas del silencio. Ólolo, enero-diciembre* (n°3). Recuperado el 12 de diciembre de 2014, de <https://www.uclm.es/artesonoro/ololo3/Carmen/Formas.html>
- POGOZHEVA, L. (1962). *Hora y media de reflexiones. Documento archivo Cinemateca de Cuba*. Carpeta Mijaíl Romm. Publicado originalmente en *Iskustvo Kino*, 4.
- ROMM, Mikhail (1965). *Das wahre Gesicht des Faschismus: Interview mit Michail Romm*. Sputnik Kinofestivalia, 4, 8, julio. Citado en BEILENFOFF & HÄNSGEN (2008), p. 142.
- ROMM, Mikhail (1965). *Fuego en el portal. Cine cubano*, 26, pp. 28-33. (Publicado originalmente en *Cinema 60*, 40 (octubre, 1963). Traducción Alejandro Saderman.
- ROMM, Mikhail (1971). *Habla Mijaíl Romm. Films Soviéticos*, 1, pp. 30-31.
- ROMM, Mikhail (1972). *Director Mikhaïl Romm. Films Soviéticos*, 9, pp.11-12.
- ROMM, Mikhail (1975). *Besedy o kinorezhissure*. Moscow. Iskustvo.
- ROMM, Mikhail (1989). *Cinco promesas. Sputkin*, 4, pp. 82-88. (Originalmente publicado en *Sovietski Ekran*).
- TUROVSKAYA, Maya (2008). *Some documents from the life of documentary film. Studies in Russian and Soviet Cinema*, 2:2, pp. 155-165.
- WOLL, Josephine (2008). *Mikhaïl Romm's Ordinary Fascism*. KIVELSON & NEUBERGER (ed.). *Picturing Russia, Explorations in Visual Culture* (pp. 224-229). New Haven/London. Yale University Press.

CARLOS MUGUIRO

Professor of Film Aesthetics at the Universidad de Navarra. He curated the retrospective 'Ver sin Vertov' ('To See Without Vertov') at La Casa Encendida in Madrid in 2005-06. He was also the curator of the first retrospective of Russian film-maker Alexánder Sokurov in Spain (Festival de Creación Audiovisual de Navarra, 1999) He founded the Festival Punto de Vista, and was

its Artistic Director until 2009. He has participated in numerous collective publications, such as *Una diagonale baltica. Ciquant'anni di produzione documentaria in Letonia, Lituania ed Estonia*, and edited books such as *Ver sin Vertov. Cincuenta años de no ficción en Rusia y la URSS (1955-2005)*.

The Biopolitical Militancy of Joaquín Jordá

Carles Guerra

ABSTRACT

Joaquín Jordá's work suffers from a material precariousness that contrasts with an exceptional reception by different collectives, which periodically reinforces the actuality of the films. Beyond its cinematographic qualities, the trajectory of this filmmaker represents the transit between a classic militancy and one of a biopolitical order. The paradigmatic case is *Numax presenta...* (1979). This militant film broke the patterns in which a labour strike should be narrated, to result as an example of a new productivity model according to postfordist ideas. The discursive intensity of the documentaries by Jordá, endorses a new category of the linguistic and dialogical event that would allow their identification as postmedia documentaries. This kind of documentary practice transforms the debates integrated to the film, into acts of biopolitical militancy. The critique to a social democracy governance regime –which has required the paradigm shift– will be held in further titles such as *Monkeys like Becky* (*Mones com la Becky*, 1999) and *De nens* (2003).

KEYWORDS

Autonomism, postfordism, biopolitics, social democracy governance, militant cinema, postmedia documentary, documentary practice, documentary device.

Joaquín Jordá's filmography suffers from an unusual heterogeneity of styles and formats. Despite documentary would be the most accurate classification for his films, a specific conflict and a singular process that challenges the genre dwells in each of his titles. Neither have the multiplicity of practices associated to his activity as a filmmaker contributed to facilitate a portrayal of his work. His last years as a teacher, the militancy in the beginning of his career, as well as a dilated screenplay production and some translations, constitute an intellectual profile that overreaches the notion of author. Despite the long time in between his first and his last movie (forty six years between 1960 and 2006), his filmography is rather scarce. Besides, there is an alarming precariousness in what refers to the preservation of some of his films and a general difficulty to their access. The proof relies on the fact that, even eight years after his death, we are still missing a critical analysis that encompasses his contributions¹. Nevertheless, Jordá's validity is undeniable. The effects of his work are perceived periodically.

Among his filmography, *Numax presenta...* (1979) stands out for being a documentary film with a significant series of revivals. The most recent one was that of Roger Bernat, who staged the dialogues of the movie regarding the current crisis². *Numax presenta...* does not even require to be projected in order to keep evoking its potential, and it gets to spread through other media, in this case, a theatrical device. The staging of the film achieves to revive the words of the workers, filmed in 1979, among the spectators of Roger Bernat's new play. Thus, despite the film is a militant document connected to a specific event, it suggests an extended use of value. The film has catalysed a succession of audiences from

the first projections until the last versions and reappropriations of the text. The specificity of the conflict represented in *Numax presenta...* has not been an obstacle for the film to unfold consecutive readings in different contexts. The strike and the self-management process leaded by the workers of the Numax enterprise during the transition to democracy, have found and explicit echo in following moments. The original document has been constantly reanimated: from the anti-globalisation mobilisation and the post-fordist background that criticized the production models of capitalism at the end of the 20th century, to the most recent breakdown of the financial crisis.

One of the main reasons to focus our attention on this film is the fact that it can represent the transition between a classical militancy –which is the base for *Numax presenta...*– and one of a biopolitical order that would be related to works such as *Monkeys like Becky* (*Mones com la Becky*, 1999) and *De nens* (2003). This transition will help to determine Joaquín Jordá's portrayal better than any periodization. Numax strike broke with the orthodoxy of labour and syndicalist militancy, to the point that its conclusion proclaimed the abolition of salaried work. Jordá resumed the self-management experience of the workers between 1977 and 1979, through the recreation of the assemblies that one after another fill the film with a strongly discursive feature. The *in extremis* incursion of a debate that declared the factory labour obsolete, were in tune with the aspirations of the Italian autonomism. Thus, *Numax presenta...* was articulating something bigger than the testimonies of some workers: the dismantling of that appliance factory in the Barcelonan Eixample would become a symbol of a new productive model³ with time. Nevertheless, *Numax presenta...* remained relegated to a limb

1. Some of the remarkable references that have intended a global approximation are: FERRER, J. M. and ROM, Martí (2001). *Joaquín Jordá*. Barcelona. Cineclub de l'Associació d'Enginyers Industrials de Catalunya; MANRESA, Laia (2006). *Joaquín Jordá. La mirada lliure*. Barcelona. Filmoteca de Catalunya, ICIC;

VIDAL, Núria (ed.) (2006). *Joaquín Jordá*. Torino. Museo Nazionale del cinema, Fondazione Maria Adriana Prolo and AAVV (2006). *Joaquín Jordá. Revista de Cine Nosferatu*. San Sebastián. Donostia Kultura.

2. <http://rogerbernat.info/en-gira/numax-fagor-plus/>

of misunderstanding until the end of the nineties, when the notion of immaterial labour appeared in the context of the economy of services. Two decades later the film would acquire a new capacity of significance that nobody could have anticipated.

During this interval of interpretative silence or *inactivity* (approximately between 1979 and 1999), the movie remained associated with an eccentric vision of the working class, hardly adjusted to the representations of labour mobilisations. The hegemonic militancy was deeply related to works by Helena Lumberras and the *Colectivo de cine de clase (Class Cinema Collective)*. These were the icons of syndicalism. As Jordá would later remember in an interview in 2004, that of the collective was ‘an apotheotic cinema which strengthened heroism. It had two origins: a caricature of Soviet cinema of the twenties, formally very different but copying their spirit; and some drops of a less critical Italian cinema’ (GUERRA, 2005). In contrast, ‘*Numax presenta...* did not have an apotheotic purpose. [...] It passed from the starting euphoria to a tale of dissent’ (Ídem). And according to the filmmaker, ‘at first, the workers start from a goal: they try to keep the worker’s power inside the factory, until a second reflection is imposed. At the end we abandon that simulacrum of power and we go to life’ (Ídem). From that point on, the political management starts to take charge of

something more than the economy, the schedules or the labour conditions. It will take charge of life, preparing the field for a militancy, that remembering the courses of the Philosopher Michel Foucault at the beginning of 1979 –just when *Numax presenta...* is shot –, will have a biopolitical nature.

Therefore, in a context where militancy was held in the same structures of the syndicates and the political parties⁴, the film opens a new scenario concerned for collective pedagogies and the establishment of a collective intelligence. The interests expressed by the workers in the last sequence at the dance, where Jordá with a microphone in his hands surveys each one of the labourers who participated in the movie, suppose a turning point in what a process of demotic deliberation would be, where opinion seemed not to be mediated by the orthodoxy of the political language settled in the agreements of the Pacts of Moncloa (1977) or the newly released constitution (approved in 1978). Until 2004, twenty-five years later, Jordá could not explore the significance of those declarations presented as a group of ideas that were closer to a definition of a lifestyle. As we will see, lifestyle is neither exempted of ideology nor of political agency. Due to the production of the film that resumes the biography of those workers so many years later, Jordá confirms the effects of time. When he finished this film he concluded: ‘they might have not done everything

3. See the notion of ‘social factory’ in GUERRA, C. (2003). *N for Negri: Antonio Negri in conversation with Carles Guerra in Grey Room. Architecture, Media, Arts, Politics. Primavera n. 11.* (p. 92). Massachusetts. The MIT Press.

4. Jordá declares in the previously referred interview: ‘There was almost no militant cinema here. If any, it was produced by structures close to the PSUC (Unified Social Party of Catalonia) and the CCOO (worker’s commission). It was an instructive, optimistic and triumphalist cinema. It sang glories from the struggle and victorious endings. In contrast, *Numax presenta...* was not considered an optimistic film, although I think it was, because finally all the characters of *Numax* were able to liberate themselves from a proletarian condition they had not assumed by will. This is how this movie gained the rejection of the unions, the CCOO and parties such as PSUC. I remember its

only screening on the 1st of May. All the people from *Numax* and the movement went. At the end a very polemic debate was held, there were protests from *Numax* workers, especially those related to Trotskyism. They did not say the film denigrated the working class, but they did consider the film exalted it somehow. They found the film defeatist. I remember one of the young women who appeared in the film and belonged to the structure of the LCR (Revolutionary Communist League), who is protagonist of the second part as well, using a very usual expression against me: ‘We will hang you with the guts of a bureaucrat’. It was a rhetorical sentence indeed, with no real intentions, but it was accusatory. Simultaneously, *Numax presenta* was supported by other more realistic sectors. We could say the film was made in a militant context, with a militant structure, but with no militant individuals.’

they wanted, but they have not done anything they did not want'. The radical nature of change implied to relinquish every notion of individual progress in favour of labour improvement. And although the camera seems to record minutes of very discrete achievements, Jordá would insist that 'from the vital point of view they are of an enormous opulence' (GUERRA, 2005).

Veinte años no es nada (2004) stages the recuperation of *Numax presenta...* through an authorial operation that could remind of other examples of the same genre such as *Reprise* (Hervé le Roux) which in 1997 resumed a film sequence from 1968⁵. However, the maturing conditions that allowed reactivating the original text of *Numax presenta...* refers to the social scenario of the early 21st century. The Seattle protests against the World Trade Organization radically transformed the language of classic militancy. The implication of the working class would be replaced by the notion of multitude, which implied a more explicit transversal implication among social classes. The scenario changed from events ruled by the mass media and the *media event*, to the possibility to catalyse the desired occurrence by the new online and connected multitude. Thus, in documentary practices terms, the participation and implication in the events dismantled the politics of truth sustained by the hegemonic mass media, breaking with the tradition of the objectivity based on the distinction between facts and opinion. These three features could be synthesized in the emergence of the postmedia documentary. Its performative character is embodied in Jordá's work starting from *Monkeys like Becky*, where the filmmaker's sickness is assumed as an unavoidable condition. The sick author will turn into a symbol of the perceptive limitations and the adaptation to a production

model considerably lessened. The contingency of the documental genre in Jordá's filmography will be usually determined by the fact that many of his projects were conceived as fictions which ended up as documentaries in response to lack of funding.

Among the new forms of biopolitical militancy, the critique to the psychiatric institution will encourage a series of projects that will question the welfare politics. Barcelona, the city where Jordá worked most of his life, was at the late nineties a case of study for the governance techniques of the social democracy. The urban condition acquired an incredible importance as scenario and reflection of the relations of those forms of power that aspired to control the population excluding the classical police methods. Social engineering and the reforms in the public space made out of Barcelona an improved scenario of the biopolitical government techniques. In this context social movements supported by neighbourhood councils and assemblies strongly emerged, and furthermore the documentary practices were articulated to the perception of certain urban deep transformations. Between the very acclaimed documentary *En construcción* (2001) by Jose Luis Guerin, and the very polemic *De nens* by Jordá, the urban matter was thoroughly identified with documentary genre. This documentary practice was understood as an extension of certain forms of activism. Therefore Barcelona accomplished an iconic statute as a city that fused the urban critique and the transformation processes. The biopolitical condition captures both the psychological and subjective aspects of the population, together with those apparently external aspects we consider an urban object. Hence, to practice militancy in this background means to break with this distinction.

5. The sequence of *La Reprise du travail aux usines Wonder* (IDHEC, 1968) was similarly reappropriated by the director Hervé le Roux in 1997.

6. *Maria Aurèlia Capmany parla d'Un lloc entre els morts* (1969) would be an example that anticipated the contingency of the documentary, as the film was intended

to be more than a preparation for an adaptation of the homonymous novel. For an excellent revision and inventory of Joaquín Jordá's unrealized projects see SALVADÓ, G. (2006). *Espectros y películas. Los proyectos truncados de Joaquín Jordá*. *Revista de Cine Nosferatu*, (52), pp. 31-39.

De nens departed from a pederasty case widely covered by the mass media. The Raval affair exploded in 2001 and implicitly a zone of the city turned out stigmatized by the news. In the midst of the urban regeneration of the old China Town, and in the 21st century, Barcelona revives the paradox of the modern hygienism. The moral and physical degradation corresponded to each other as in late 19th Century Paris novels by Émile Zola. To represent this perverse articulation Jordá recorded the trial of the alleged pederasty case. The concentration and assemblage of the police discourses, the psychiatric report and the advice of the departments in charge of childhood protection, produce the referential event for the documentary. The linguistic and communicative nature of this material allows to compare Numax workers with the participants of the trial of the Raval affair. In both cases what is filmed is a linguistic interchange with such a density that it substitutes other events. And although this comparison seems to be outrageous due to the incommensurable nature of the debates they present, the most effective qualities of documentary, as Jordá understood them, are found there. Documentary extrapolates ideological aspects to the point it configures itself as a radically unfinished event.

If what *De nens* presents can be described as a diffuse device of power supported by a constellation of institutions (urbanism, social services, education, police, medicine, even mass media repeating and spreading their statements), it could be suggested that Jordá's documentary accounts for that same model of organization. Therefore the documentary practice is constructed as a mirror of this composition. In the same way militant documentary film has been considered as the production of a common place that promotes a scenario for collaborations between producers and spectators (in the case of *Numax presenta...* the workers associated with the filmmaker in order to make public their experience), it can be understood as the mechanism to interrupt some of those connexions when necessary. Definitively, what is reflected through a documentary produced

from a biopolitical perspective is a regime that allows certain discourses to be mutually supported in order to circulate with another one that results being delegitimized. As an example, we find the accused from the Raval affair who could not even speak about themselves. Their voices are expropriated by the puzzle of the institutions of the welfare society. Their own life does not belong to them.

Consequently, and according to what has been said until this point, it is necessary to refer a documentary device to talk about Jordá's trajectory. The intersection of different specialities, languages and institutions is not confined to the reinforcement of a mechanism of power as revealed in *De nens*, but it can also make out of documentary a shared shelter for artistic practices, investigations and activism. Thus, documentary is not a synonym of a strictly visual production anymore. In contrast, it broadens its possibilities to the creation of devices, whether they are critical, theatrical, filmic or pedagogic. Let us remember that the work of Jordá has suffered from a certain anomie even inside the institutions that should accept it with no trace of a doubt. As a symptom we find the inclination of museistic institutions to integrate his work in its contents, both the Museu d'Art Contemporani de Barcelona and the Museo Nacional Centro de Arte Reina Sofia have integrated *Numax presenta...* to the context of their collections, one more example of the drifts of this film. The integration of a determined practice to a film context, the museum or any other place would be part of the capabilities associated with this device. However, the best efficacy of the device has been revealed in those cases where cinema is found, paraphrasing Jacques Rancière, 'where least expected'.

The relevance of *Numax presenta...* nowadays, as presented in the staging of Roger Bernat, is based exactly on this effect. Some dialogues pronounced thirty-five years ago sound completely pertinent to these critical moments. The suspicion towards the capital expressed by

those workers in the late seventies of the last century is not very different from the deception in which the financial capital has drowned us in the beginning of the 21st Century. The assistants to the representation *Numax-Fagor-plus* or any other version of this text feel possessed by the dialogues of people they don't know and they have never spoken to. This is how a historical collaboration between distant times and places that have never had contact is produced. As Bruno Latour would say in one of his latest proposals about new research models, this sense of collectiveness 'allows insisting on the collection or composition operation, highlighting the heterogeneity of the

beings gathered this way' (LATOURE, 2012: 298). The missions of the documentary device Jordá represents with his work have nothing to do with a strictly cinematographic production. Observing the usages of films such as *Numax presenta...* and *De nens*, often exhibited by collectives that find in those texts an expression of their common interests, we can affirm that Jordá produced common platforms of an incredible validity. His movies would not be the reflection of a debate, but rather the creation of common spaces for that debate to be held publicly. •

Translated from the Spanish by Carolina Sourdis

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- FOUCAULT, Michel (2004). *Naissance de la biopolitique. Cours au Collège de France 1978-1979*. Paris. Seuil.
- GUERRA, Carles. (2005). *Joaquín Jordá entrevistado por Carles Guerra*, september 2004. Agenda informativa del MACBA. Available at: <<http://www.macba.cat/es/numax-presenta-2779>>
- GUERRA, Carles. (2005). *Joaquín Jordá ou le cinema de situation*, in AA.VV. (2006). *Festival International du Documentaire, Marseille*. Marseille. FID. pp.129-139.
- HEBDIGE, Dick. (1979). *Subcultura. El significado del estilo*. Barcelona. Paidós.
- LATOURE, Bruno. (2012). *Enquête sur les modes d'existence. Une anthropologie des modernes*. Paris. La Découverte.
- LAZZARATO, Maurizio. (1997). *Lavoro immateriale. Forme de vitta e produzione de soggettività*. Verona. Ombre Corte.
- RIAMBAU, Esteve, TORREIRO, Casimiro. (1999). *La escuela de Barcelona. El cine de la gauche divine*. Barcelona. Anagrama.
- ZUNZUNEGUI, Santos. (2001). *Corregir y dirigir. Monos como Becky* en CATALÀ, J. M., CERDÁN, J., TORREIRO, C. (ed.), *Imagen, memoria y fascinación: notas sobre el documental en España*. Madrid: Ocho y medio, libros de cine, Festival de Cine Español de Málaga.

CARLES GUERRA

Carles Guerra is an Associate Professor at Pompeu Fabra University and has taught postmedia documentary practices in the Center for Curatorial Studies at Bard College. Between 2009 and 2011 he directed the Virreina Centre de la Imatge, where he presented projects such as *Antifotoperiodismo* and 1979. *Un monumento a instantes radicales*. Between 2011 and

2013 he was Chief Curator at the *Museu d'Art Contemporani de Barcelona (MACBA)*. He was a member of the editorial board of the *Cultura/s* supplement of *La Vanguardia* journal between 2002 and 2013. In 2006 he curated *Cine de situació*, a retrospective cycle of Joaquín Jordá in Artleku, MACBA and FID Marseille.

AA,VV. BENAVENTE, Fran y SALVADÓ, Glòria (ed.), *Poéticas del gesto en el cine europeo contemporáneo*.

Intermedio, Barcelona, 2013, 485 pp.

Marga Carnicé Mur

An unforgettable statement about cinema used to be echoed in the classroom by Domènec Font: Cinema is the largest body factory the figurative arts had known since the antique statuary art. A deduction burnt into the memory of his students, and which returns, as a tribute, in an operation commanded by his disciples of the group CINEMA. Edited by Fran Benavente and Glòria Salvadó Corretger, *Poéticas del gesto en el cine europeo contemporáneo*, arises as a question: 'Is cinema an art of gesture?' (2013: 13).

We find ourselves towards a pioneer initiative, which interprets film memory based on cinema's condition as a gesture creator, ambitious both in its spirit and its shape. Twenty-three authors are invited to address the research of an entity perpetuated by cinema from its very origins, which encouraged the multiplicity of forms the French school, from Godard to Daney, forever recognized in the *histoire(s) du cinéma*. This is highlighted in the book, through the collective desire of finding a common base, without relinquishing the personal seal of each of its contributors.

The pictorial gesture mediates between the complexity of its message and the limitations of an art that is still lacking movement and word (Xavier Antich), as in antique pottery, the desire of preserving the beloved's image foreshadows cinema (Maria Adell) and relates to David Wark

Griffith's desire to film the face of Lillian Gish, and that of Jean Renoir to get closer to Sylvia Bataille's elation. The erotics of filming which Alain Bergala identifies as the initiation rites of modernity in cinema, share the mystery and the poetics of gestures inscribed in antique art images. And those gestures, Gonzalo de Lucas points out, 'always bring to light the motives that led the filmmaker to roll the shot' (2013:140). The artist as an operator of gestures, Barthes would say, that cinema metabolizes into diverse forms or survivals: the eloquence of the iconographic gesture drifted into visual motif (Jordi Balló), the popular gestural tradition transmigrated to the recurring gesture in the art of a society (Ivan Pintor), and the imperial gestures of expression by which cinema becomes a landscape of the look (Alan Salvadó) and an art of the hands. (Violeta Kovacsis). The confrontation of the authors towards this gestural magma that transmigrates from art to cinema touches an important idea: every gesture implies the origin and the mutation of its previous representations, and all its reproductions generate, not only perpetuations but also 'transformations of the imaginary and metamorphosis of history' (2013:19), as Benavente and Salvadó Corretger, following Aby Warburg and Giorgio Agamben referential framework, point out.

Due to this capacity to mutate, but as well to the capacity to survive and withstand, it is

necessary that the study of non conventional or insignificant gestures –those which according to Oksana Bulgakova reveal how the figures communicate with the body, or ultimately, are present– coexist with the analysis of the recurrent gesture, its inquiring and open nature, and its mechanisms over the bodies and the film movements that constitute film history. This is the intention posed in the second part of the book (*To create the gesture. Politics and memory of the body*) through the study of concrete gestures by authors such as Núria Bou and Xavier Pèrez (the inhibitory gesture), Manuel Garin and Albert Elduque (the meaning of the leap), Adrian Martin (the scream), Gino Frezza (the slap), Alain Bergala (the political gesture), Pilar Pedraza (the child's gesture of evil) and Carlos Losilla (the gesture of the return to life). If the role of the gestures as mediators between the visible and the invisible reminds of the implications of their very essence, with the essence of the construction of cinematic image itself, as shown in the first part of the book; then, their role as meaning receptacles, as 'specially dense crystallisations of a particular moment of history' (2013:42), reminds of their nature as memorial artefacts, which often overflows cinema aesthetics towards its political dimension.

Furthermore, the creation of the gesture produces a resistance, a reconstruction of something that has been lost and which cinema struggles to restore, as Agamben affirms. And this resistance, concerning film history or the history of the authors, often finds a vehicle of perpetuation through the body of the actor. Therefore, the need to trace along its inheritance, the historical moment of Shakespeare or Brecht (Santiago Fillol), or that of the soviet cinema as receptacle of the social revolution (Oksana Bulgakova); or to discern among all these branches, the existence of a real and least discussed poetics of the actor, proposed by Nicole Brenez whilst approaching the interpreter himself as the creator and inventor of his own gestures. Finally, Sergi Sánchez concludes this route, with the reinvention of gesture in the digital era based on the inquiry of its disfiguration;

if the eloquence of the first moving images was anticipated by the gestural sunrise of the pictorial Renaissance shown by Xavier Antich, then the latest cinema, facing the capitalism of virtuality and the nostalgia of reality, shows the necessity to 'profane the body of the gesture, to restore its power as instrument of resistance' (2013: 485).

Each chapter is a possibility in *Poéticas del gesto en el cine europeo contemporáneo*. A window to the internal journey of a spectator pursuing for the particular memory of a concrete gestural poetic. However, the presentation of all these negotiations altogether, threads a path of encounters; places in common and desires that find each other, maybe for the first time in European film studies, to point to an alternative methodology, a new light to approach the research of an entity in which, as in no other field, like Carles Roche states following Gumbrecht's thesis, 'something very simple becomes very obvious: one of the great duties of cinema (...) is to *produce presence*' (2013: 162). •

Translated from the Spanish by Carolina Sourdis

Jaques Aumont. *Materia de imágenes, redux.*

Shangrila textos aparte, Santander, 2014, 304 pp.

Endika Rey

The Spanish edition of *Materia de Imágenes, redux*, written by Jacques Aumont, has been edited as part of the *Contracampo* collection by the Shangrila textos aparte association in Spain. The book, a revision of his *Matière d'images* (originally published in 2005 by Éditions Images Modernes¹), includes both substantial modifications of the original passages, and six new essays which based on matter, have broadened the scope of the author through the history of the cinematic image. Thus, the author himself declares about a transformed and rekindled edition: 'Now, I can truly call it a book' (AUMONT, 2014: 9).

Aumont defines the cinematic image in three times: the film, the light and the screen. The book goes through these three lines of inquiry to question if the cinematic matter can be found in either one or some of these units, or if it rather shuns them. For doing so, four different groups of texts are gathered together. The first group, comprised under the epigraph 'The Sieged Image', studies the traces in cinematic art, that have generally come from ideas or problems already widely suggested in different painting treatises. Therefore, in this section, matter is understood as the way in which cinema inscribes in the previous forms of history. According to Aumont, matter is not found in how cinema summons or quotes other arts, but in farthest principles that have to do with the migration of images, where the artist is a critic transformer regarding the already

existing works. Aumont favours the question over the assertion: How do these migrations affect –if they do– the canvas and the *mise-en-scène*? Are devices and symbolisms of the cultural history indispensable to understand contemporary cinematographic genre? In which ways do modern gestures –later unrepeatably– break art's itinerary? There is a thrilling idea through this whole first part: the necessity to keep drawing itineraries through these artistic migrations and get them to redo history. Or, in other words, Aumont tries to broaden the perspective and avoids the temptation of reading art history as a history of progress.

This first section studies different artistic devices (Aumont denominates them: vanities, annunciations, speculations and the black colour) that are complemented in the second part, entitled 'The Screen and the Film'. Here, the main dissertation is based on matter (the visible) and the filmic (the sensible). It is less about analysing what is onscreen or in the film, than to observe all the unlimited territories in between, where certain authenticity of the cinematic matter is aroused. Aumont identifies cinema as a scenery for interchanges in intensity comparable to dreams, as a field of separation between two imaginary worlds. This identification is achieved both through the description of a progression where the image has slowly separated itself from its background, and with the inquiry of some other elements such as the colour as matter that

1. AUMONT, Jacques (2009). *Matière d'images, redux*. Éditions de la Différence: Paris.

holds the light and which inscribes cinema to the history of images. The author also dedicates one chapter to shot transitions, specially the crossfade as an essentially and specific cinematic form. For the author, this editing resources work both as a trick to bring matter to first level, and a provocation that points out to the effect of what is thought over what is seen, an idea transversally found over the analysis of the book.

The third part of this *Materia de imágenes, redux* is composed by two brief studies about the forces that Aumont himself recognizes as the fundamental substances of cinema: light and shadow. In 'Ars lucis et umbrae' the author studies light in cinema form the classic standards –as a tool for the *mise-en-scène*– until the point it stops illuminating to become a plastic force itself. Although it is light, rather than shadow what models the image, this third section of the book, focuses as well on the fact that the cinematic spectacle always takes place in the shadow. Despite shadow is not exactly a spectre of the image matter, as Aumont develops in the first section of the book, in cinema, matter is not the shadow: it is rather 'the black'.

The author himself justifies these last groups of texts in the book, more as drafts intended to extend some notes of the first two, than as thorough and independent texts. However, the ideas that are formulated are tremendously suggestive and endow the whole with a completeness that, for the writer of these lines, seems to be essential. Although, this cannot be said about the fourth and last group of the book, constituted by three texts intended by way of 'intermission' or 'interlude'. Yet interesting, extremely didactic and even captivating, this three articles, dedicated to three filmmakers all passionate for painting (Alfred Hitchcock, Stanley Kubrick and Bruce Conner) and their perspectives on how they asserted image matter through their films, might remain somehow far from the other lines of inquiry.

However *Materia de imágenes, redux* is a revealing book, with an original approach to the

impact and history of images, and although it focuses on cinematic arts, it dissolves the borders between arts and devices tracing an analytic framework both wide and enriching. The author focuses on the 'light and shadow phenomenon, certain sceneries related to the film, its grain or its colour, and as well on the return of certain spectres of the history of images' (AUMONT, 2014: 28). Thus, it never has the intention to reduce film studies to a dissertation exclusively based on the characteristics of its matter; it rather makes a pleasant research trough territories usually unexplored. •

Translated from the Spanish by Carolina Sourdis

Guidelines for Submissions

1. SUBMISSION OF ARTICLES

Cinema Comparative Cinema accepts unpublished articles on comparative cinema. Articles that are not original will not be accepted. The maximum number of authors per article will be three.

The main research strands of the journal are:

- The interpretation of filmic forms and the relationships between films, images and sounds.
- The history of interpretation and cinematographic ideas, and the analysis of critical and political contexts.
- Comparative essays on processes and practices of creation, distribution and exhibition.
- The study of the methodologies of comparative cinema and its relationship to literature and visual arts.
- The revision of the history of cinema based on the investigation of forms and the aesthetic confluences between films and narrative videos, non-fiction, avant-garde, scientific, industrial and expanded cinema.
- The essay and visual thought.

Articles

The research articles will have a minimum length of 2,000 words and a maximum of 8,000 words, including footnotes. They will be related to thematic questions that will be published in the section Call for Papers of the website.

The section 'Films in Discussion' includes interviews and conversations, aimed at research, debate and documentation, and in relation to the monographic topics tackled in each issue. The minimum length is 2,000 words and the maximum is 12,000 words.

We are accepting submissions on a permanent basis.

The journal will also include certain documents that act as the conceptual basis for the themes and research strands proposed in each issue.

Reviews

The length of the reviews will be 800–1,000 words.

The information of the reviewed book shall include: full name of the author, publisher, city of publication, year of publication and number of pages.

The author of the review must indicate his or her name and email address.

We accept reviews of books whose first edition has been published over the last 8 years.

2. ASSESSMENT OF SUBMISSIONS

Cinema Comparative Cinema will only publish the articles after having received a positive feedback from two reviewers external to the publisher.

Once the article is submitted, the journal will confirm receipt of the text within 10 days. During the assessment process, the identity of the author/s and reviewer/s will remain anonymous. If there is a discrepancy between the assessment of both reviewers, the publisher will ask for a third reviewer.

The journal will give a response to the authors within two months, and this will include a report from the reviewers.

In the instance that the article is accepted for publication but changes and corrections are needed, the authors will have 20 days to re-submit the article.

3. GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSIONS

Submission: The texts shall be submitted in a Word file and via email to: comparativecinema@upf.edu. Images must be submitted separately, in a TIF format, numbered and their placement shall be indicated in the article. We recommend using the software Power DVD (version 9, for PC) or GrabMac (for MAC). The images shall not be included in the text. The author shall also submit a signed declaration.

CV: All articles must be accompanied by a brief CV of 150 words or less. In the instance of articles written by more than one author, their CVs will be published separately.

Abstract: Abstracts will be 300 words or less and only one paragraph. Abstracts must be submitted in Catalan or Spanish and English.

Keywords: Keywords will include 6–10 words, separated by comas. They must be submitted in Catalan or Spanish and English.

Funding: Authors are responsible for indicating funding and institutional support received for the research.

Typeset and font size: Articles must be submitted using Times New Roman, 12 points. Paragraphs must be justified; indents won't be used. Titles and subtitles must be indicated in bold.

Word processor tools: Please refrain from using tools such as tables, numbering, columns, headings, hyperlinks, footnotes, etc. Any numbering must be made manually.

Bibliography: The sources of both texts and ideas by other authors must be clearly identified. Sources must be indicated in the body of the text using the HARVARD style (LAST NAME, Year: Page number). Please list all the bibliography used at the end of the text.

4. STYLE GUIDELINES

Download at www.upf.edu/comparativecinema.

