Dennison,S & Lim, S.H.

Introduction: Situating world cinema as a theoretical problem

INTRODUCTION

Situating world cinema as a theoretical problem

Stephanie Dennison and Song Hwee Lim

'What is world cinema?' This is a deceptively simple question that has proved to be a challenging theoretical problem. In his book *Cinemas of the World*, James Chapman wonders 'whether any general model can adequately account for the many different filmmaking practices, genres, styles and traditions that have arisen in the global context' (2003: 33). In a volume entitled *Remapping World Cinema*, it might be expected of us, the editors, to provide a definition, if not a definitive answer, to the question. However, perhaps that is not the right question to ask in the first place. In an article entitled 'Discourse', Paul A. Bové argues that an essay like his 'not only does not but *cannot* provide definitions, nor can it answer what come down to essentialising questions about the "meaning" or "identity" of some "concept" named "discourse"' (1995: 53; emphasis in original). For Bové, questions such as 'what is discourse?' or 'what does discourse mean?' 'imply a norm of judgement: meaning and essence are better and more important than a discussion of "how things work" or "where they come from"' (ibid.). Whilst the questions 'What is world cinema?' and 'What is discourse?' may not share an entirely similar epistemological premise, we do agree with the post-structuralists in Bové's essay that 'these essentialising questions emerge from the very interpretive models of thought which the new focus on "discourse" [and in our case, "world cinema"] as a material practice aims to examine and trace' (ibid.).

What we will attempt to do below, therefore, is not so much to provide an answer to the question 'what is world cinema?' but to trace the processes by which it has been discussed and conceptualised, to examine how these conceptualisations work and where they come from, to account for their embedded contradictions and tensions, and, perhaps most importantly, to underscore the situatedness of each discourse in its specific context, including that of our own. It is futile, if not hypocritical, to pretend that a loaded phrase such as 'world cinema' can be value free, and it is in bringing into play the power structures inherent in discourses on 'world cinema' that one could paradoxically begin to throw light, however elliptically, on the question 'what is world cinema?'

Situating analogies: world cinema, world music, world literature

The first thing to note about the concept of world cinema is its situatedness: it is, in this book at least, the world as viewed from the West. In this sense, world cinema is analogous to 'world music' and 'world literature' in that they are categories created in the Western world to refer to cultural products and practices that are mainly non-Western. While the historical trajectories of their origins and developments may not have been

totally identical, their relationships to non-Western cultural products and practices in terms of consumption and reception of the latter in the Western world bear striking similarities that lend themselves to a comparative study. On the most mundane level, in music and video shops (and in the public library in Leeds), world cinema and world music occupy separate sections from mainstream film and music, with both signifying non-English-language products. In an academic institutional context, world cinema (if it exists at all) is peripheral to film and cinema studies whilst world literature often resides within English departments, with both sharing an investment in the Third World and the postcolonial. The politics embedded in the concepts of world literature and world music can thus be illuminating to our understanding of world cinema.

Definitions of world literature have traditionally been influenced by Goethe's formulation of the term *Weltliteratur*, which concerns itself with the discussion of literature in a global context at least since the 1820s. Central to Goethe's early fascination with obscure literatures is the notion that these works offer the (Western) reader a window into foreign worlds. In an essay entitled 'What is World Literature?', David Damrosch writes:

> World literature is ... always as much about the host culture's values and needs as it is about a work's source culture: hence it is a double refraction, one that can de described through the figure of the ellipse ... A work changes in nature when it moves from a national sphere to a new worldly context; works become world literature by being received into the space of a foreign culture, a space defined in many ways by the host culture's national tradition and the present needs of its own writers. Even a single work of world literature is the locus of a negotiation between two different cultures. (2003: 14)

What is missing from the above account is the acknowledgement that, for the literary work to attain any meaningful cultural capital, the host culture's ability to confer prestige and recognition is paramount: an obscure world literature might as well be non-existent. In his discussion on 'the formation of a creature that never existed before: "world poetry"', Stephen Owen illustrates the role of the Nobel Prize in shaping 'world poetry', particularly the poetry of the Third World. For Owen, the lure of the Prize 'can sometimes be immense: it is "international" (that is, Western) recognition that casts glory on one's nation and promises a moment when the provincial can stand in the global centre of attention' (1990: 28). The negotiation between two different cultures in Damrosch's account is, of course, an unequal one as, according to Owen, 'to write in the dominant language of the age [English] is to have the luxury of writing with unshaken faith in the permanence of a culture's hegemony', whereas world poetry 'turns out, unsurprisingly, to be a version of Anglo-American modernism or French modernism, depending on which wave of colonial culture first washed over the intellectuals of the country in question' (ibid.).[1]

Whilst highlighting the continuing effects of colonialism in an age of globalisation, Owen also shores up the implications for the production and reception of non-Western cultural products – and thus questions about authorship/auteurship and reader-

ship/spectatorship (as well as the site of exhibition) – with a 'world' label. In world cinema, for example, it has already become quite ubiquitous to suggest that non-Western cinemas are sought out and selected to be viewed beyond their home markets only when they defy the notion of cultural uniformity implied by globalisation.[2] On the other hand, filmmakers from non-Western cultures are often accused – by critics both at home and abroad – of self-exoticisation and courting controversy in their bids to attain global recognition.[3] Complicate these with issues of marketing and distribution attending the site of exhibition, the forces of demand and supply, the politics of multiculturalism in the Western world – to name just a few – and what we are faced with is a web of power relations and at times conflicting ideologies that defy any simplistic account on the definition or meaning of world cinema.

For some people, the label 'world' has become almost a derogatory term in light of the power dynamics delineated above. David Byrne, the well-known American singer-songwriter and promoter of 'other musics', took umbrage at the use of the term in an article entitled 'I Hate World Music'. For Byrne, 'the term is a catchall that commonly refers to non-Western music of any and all sorts, popular music, traditional music and even classical music. It's a marketing as well as a pseudo-musical term – and a name for a bin in the record store signifying stuff that doesn't belong anywhere else in the store' (1999). Byrne continues: 'In my experience, the use of the term world music is a way of dismissing artists or their music as irrelevant to one's own life … It groups everything and anything that isn't "us" into "them" … It's a none too subtle way of reasserting the hegemony of Western pop culture. It ghettoises most of the world's music' (ibid.).

What Byrne forgets, however, is that the reasons for the hegemony of Western pop culture (and by analogy, the Hollywood film industry) and the ghettoising of world music (or cinema) are more numerous and complex than the use of a specific terminology. What he also fails to recognise is the potential of using such marketing tools in the goal of increasing interest and exposure of these other cultural forms, as ghettos can also provide opportunities. In an article entitled '*Baraka*: World Cinema and the Global Culture Industry', Martin Roberts notes the 'break-up of the domination of First World movie screens by Hollywood and the European cinemas' to include more global (which he uses interchangeably with 'world') varieties:

> For consumers in such [First World] cities, going to the movies and eating out have become more or less equivalent activities, with choosing a movie, like choosing a restaurant, a matter of selecting from a repertoire of available ethnic options. While the audience for these multicultural cinemas is no doubt in large part white and middle class, it would be mistaken to assume that they cater solely to Euro-American exoticism. Indeed … the audiences for multicultural films may be as transnational as the films themselves, and watching them may be as much a way of reconnecting with one's own culture as of indulging a touristic curiosity about someone else's. (1998: 66)

The mechanics of consumerism and identification are arguably more subtle than Byrne's account as the mere availability of non-Western cultural products does not guarantee greater cross-cultural understanding. Indeed, one could question if these

film-viewing experiences only serve to reinforce one's identity vis-à-vis, or one's stereotypical image of, an Other by virtue of the latter's pre-packaged, ready-to-consume, exotic quality. However, what is significant about Roberts' account is the revelation that the film-viewing subject is not homogenous. In an age of globalisation and increased migration, spaces ranging from the geographical (such as national boundaries) to sites of cinematic exhibition (such as international film festivals) are invariably hybrid and plural, and distinctions between dichotomies such as Western and non-Western, self and other, although entrenched in the popular imagination, are beginning to dissolve.

Perhaps as a result of the legacies of Britain's history of splendid isolation and US non-alignment, and of the global reach of the English language, both nations have a habit of locating themselves beyond the boundaries of geographical groupings, whereby Britain refers to Europe as 'the continent' and both countries see 'the world' as the rest of the planet. There is clearly a need in the UK and the US (and other English-speaking countries) to encourage a greater interest in and consumption of music, literature and cinema from other parts of the world, with a certain notion of 'education for the English-speaking audience'.[4] This, nevertheless, should not obscure the fact that such instincts are not unique to the English-speaking world, its cultural hegemony notwithstanding.[5] Indeed, one could argue that where there is Orientalism, there is also Occidentalism, even though the latter is only beginning to gain recognition in the Western world and may still be stubbornly denied elsewhere.[6] This is particularly important because any account of Western hegemony can unwittingly confine non-Western cultures only to ghettos (as seen above) and relegate their position to one merely of resistance,[7] while there needs to be a concomitant acknowledgement that, precisely because of the legacy of colonialism and neo-imperialism, essentialised notions of both the West and the non-West have become increasingly untenable as their histories, cultures and peoples become inextricably intertwined.

Resisting resistance: world cinema and Third Cinema

Rey Chow has argued persuasively on the blind spots embedded in the discourse of resistance:

> If there is a metanarrative that continues to thrive in these times of metanarrative bashing, it is that of 'resistance' … As an imaginary appealing especially to intellectuals, 'resistance' would have to come from somewhere. It follows that resistance is often lodged in something called 'the people' or one of its variants, such as 'the masses', 'the folk', or, at times, 'the subalterns'. What is implicitly set up, then, is a dichotomy between the pernicious power on top and the innocent, suffering masses at the bottom, whose voices await being heard in what is imagined as a corrective to the abuses of political power. (1998: 113)[8]

Chow's account does not serve to deny the existence of actual forces of oppression and resistance in the world; rather, she wishes to highlight the 'crucial notion of a

mediating apparatus, a specifically defined public space, that would serve to regulate the relationship between those who have political power and those who do not' (ibid.). Chow's reconceptualisation of the political relationship between the powerful and the powerless can illuminate issues in world cinema, especially those pertaining to the notion of Third Cinema.

In the chapter entitled 'Issues in World Cinema' in *The Oxford Guide to Film Studies*, Wimal Dissanayake suggests that we must see non-Western cinemas not as 'expressive of some unchanging "essence"' but instead as 'sites of discursive contestations, or representational spaces, in which changing social and cultural meanings are generated and fought over' (1998: 527–8). However, Dissanayake does not define what the 'World Cinema' in his title is and refers to 'non-Western cinemas' in the text throughout. More suggestively, he begins his interrogation via the concept of Third Cinema, which he claims 'addresses a number of issues related to non-Western cinemas' (1998: 528). While he goes on to show the limits of Third Cinema to provide a complete account of non-Western cinemas (presumably meaning world cinema), the boundary between the two cannot be clearly demarcated.

Coined in the late 1960s by Argentine filmmakers Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino and influenced by the revolutionary struggles against neo-colonialism, Third Cinema theory arose in Latin America in response to worldwide liberation struggles and decolonisation movements, and represented a tri-continental (Asia, Africa and Latin America) call to arms against social injustice and post-imperialism (Guneratne 2003: 3–4). It was thus revolutionary in origin, nature and intent. According to its theorists, First Cinema is cinema made in Hollywood, Second Cinema is the *auteur* cinema of the *nouvelle vague* or *cinema novo*, and Third Cinema is a cinema of liberation: films 'that the System cannot assimilate and which are foreign to its needs, or ... films that directly and explicitly set out to fight the system' (Solanas & Getino 1997: 42–3). With moves towards redemocratisation in Latin America in the 1970s and 1980s, and a recognition, perhaps, of the unrealistic demands made on filmmakers of the original definition afforded Third Cinema by its proponents, it is hardly surprising that it never really took off as a film theory or practice.

However, Teshome Gabriel returned to the concept in 1982 in *Third Cinema in the Third World*, which he redefined as films that contribute to a universal 'decolonisation' of the mind' (1982: 3). In the introduction to a recent study on the impact and legacy of Third Cinema, *Rethinking Third Cinema*, Anthony Guneratne denies a place in the ranks of Third Cinema for 'commercially-orientated postcolonial cinemas', which he sees as 'immature relics of imperialism and neo-colonialism' (2003: 1). At the same time, he authorises the entry of First World-based directors 'who address the very issues of First World dominance and Third World abjection which concern the more politically sensitive Third World filmmaker' (2003: 14). This inclusion of First World directors in Third World struggles echoes Chow's idea of mediating apparatus regulating the relationship between the powerful and the powerless. This idea is more fully formulated by Ella Shohat and Robert Stam in their excellent book, *Unthinking Eurocentrism*, which Dudley Andrew describes as a 'first and crucial "World Cinema" textbook' in his chapter in this volume. Calling for a polycentric filmmaking, Shohat

mediating apparatus, a specifically defined public space, that would serve to regulate the relationship between those who have political power and those who do not' (ibid.). Chow's reconceptualisation of the political relationship between the powerful and the powerless can illuminate issues in world cinema, especially those pertaining to the notion of Third Cinema.

In the chapter entitled 'Issues in World Cinema' in *The Oxford Guide to Film Studies*, Wimal Dissanayake suggests that we must see non-Western cinemas not as 'expressive of some unchanging "essence"' but instead as 'sites of discursive contestations, or representational spaces, in which changing social and cultural meanings are generated and fought over' (1998: 527–8). However, Dissanayake does not define what the 'World Cinema' in his title is and refers to 'non-Western cinemas' in the text throughout. More suggestively, he begins his interrogation via the concept of Third Cinema, which he claims 'addresses a number of issues related to non-Western cinemas' (1998: 528). While he goes on to show the limits of Third Cinema to provide a complete account of non-Western cinemas (presumably meaning world cinema), the boundary between the two cannot be clearly demarcated.

Coined in the late 1960s by Argentine filmmakers Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino and influenced by the revolutionary struggles against neo-colonialism, Third Cinema theory arose in Latin America in response to worldwide liberation struggles and decolonisation movements, and represented a tri-continental (Asia, Africa and Latin America) call to arms against social injustice and post-imperialism (Guneratne 2003: 3–4). It was thus revolutionary in origin, nature and intent. According to its theorists, First Cinema is cinema made in Hollywood, Second Cinema is the *auteur* cinema of the *nouvelle vague* or *cinema novo*, and Third Cinema is a cinema of liberation: films 'that the System cannot assimilate and which are foreign to its needs, or ... films that directly and explicitly set out to fight the system' (Solanas & Getino 1997: 42–3). With moves towards redemocratisation in Latin America in the 1970s and 1980s, and a recognition, perhaps, of the unrealistic demands made on filmmakers of the original definition afforded Third Cinema by its proponents, it is hardly surprising that it never really took off as a film theory or practice.

However, Teshome Gabriel returned to the concept in 1982 in *Third Cinema in the Third World*, which he redefined as films that contribute to a universal 'decolonisation of the mind' (1982: 3). In the introduction to a recent study on the impact and legacy of Third Cinema, *Rethinking Third Cinema*, Anthony Guneratne denies a place in the ranks of Third Cinema for 'commercially-orientated postcolonial cinemas', which he sees as 'immature relics of imperialism and neo-colonialism' (2003: 1). At the same time, he authorises the entry of First World-based directors 'who address the very issues of First World dominance and Third World abjection which concern the more politically sensitive Third World filmmaker' (2003: 14). This inclusion of First World directors in Third World struggles echoes Chow's idea of mediating apparatus regulating the relationship between the powerful and the powerless. This idea is more fully formulated by Ella Shohat and Robert Stam in their excellent book, *Unthinking Eurocentrism*, which Dudley Andrew describes as a 'first and crucial "World Cinema" textbook' in his chapter in this volume. Calling for a polycentric filmmaking, Shohat

and Stam envision overlapping circles of denotation, whereby the core circle is occupied by Third Cinema produced by and for the Third World, the next wider circle by Third World films in general, the third circle by Third Cinema made by First or Second World people and the final circle by diasporic hybrid films imbued with Third Cinema properties (1994: 28).

While Shohat and Stam's book is undoubtedly one of the most useful texts produced on the subject, Andrew raises a valuable point which reminds us of why Third Cinema as theory and practice failed in the first place: he charges Shohat and Stam's approach with being 'moralistic' which 'upholds a set of smart, politically correct films standing against Eurocentric global media forces' but does not account for 'popular genres and failed heritage films as well as critical successes'. For example, Shohat and Stam might not have envisaged that, at the turn of the twenty-first century, Mexican cinema was going to be so popular both at home and abroad, and that Alfonso Cuarón, the director of *Y tu mama también* (*And Your Mother Too*, 2001) would also direct a Harry Potter film. Indeed, one of the problems with definitions of Third Cinema, and to a certain extent this also applies to world cinema, is the denial of pleasure, particularly for the home audiences. The implicit dichotomy set up between popularity and integrity often goes unquestioned, as does the one between oppression and resistance.

Hence, the discourse of resistance should not be one of empty slogans but an examination of actual processes of resistance, the forces at work, the aim and the realistic prospect of achieving it. Shohat and Stam's call to unthink Eurocentrism acts as a starting point in recognising that crucial cinematic issues such as point of view can vary from nation to nation, and from culture to culture,[9] and that not all cinematic influences and referents can be traced back to Hollywood and post-war Europe.[10] On the other hand, it is also important to move beyond the discourse of resistance to place more focus on the interconnectedness of cinematic practices and cultures in the age of globalisation, particularly in terms of the conditions of production and consumption, and theorise world cinema not in terms of 'the West vs. the rest' but in relation to notions such as hybridity, transculturation, border crossing, transnationalism and translation. These concepts should be subjected to the same process of interrogation about 'how they work' and 'where they come from', so that they may hopefully provide invigorating ways of reconceptualising 'world cinema'.

World cinema: discipline, methodology, perspective

There are currently two popular ways of understanding world cinema. The first regards it as the sum total of all the national cinemas in the world, and the second posits it against US or Hollywood cinema. Both are problematic in different ways, and they also raise different sets of questions.

In the former case, to regard world cinema as the sum total of national cinemas is to presuppose and privilege an entity known as the nation or the nation-state. To view the world as a collection of nations (as in the United Nations) is to marginalise if not deny the possibilities of other ways of organising the world, whether by economic power, gender, sexuality, and in a more general sense, other identities or formations

that cannot be defined by a geopolitical boundary or by race and ethnicity. In terms of cinema, this take on world cinema risks overlooking modes of film practices that include, among others, Third Cinema, women's or feminist cinema, queer cinema, and many regional, sub-state, transnational, diasporic and nomadic cinemas. One therefore cannot but challenge the foregrounding of nation, ethnicity and race in this construction, and question at what cost it imposes upon identities based on gender, sexuality, class, (dis)ability and others.

In the latter case, the imperative to oppose world cinema against US or Hollywood cinema is perhaps understandable given the often unquestioned and at times unspoken US-centrism even within works on world cinema. For example, in the organisation of Geoffrey Nowell-Smith's *The Oxford History of World Cinema*, US cinema does not feature as a 'national cinema' but occupies a central position against which all national cinemas must somehow define themselves. Whilst it may be 'a fact that, from the end of the First World War onwards, one film industry – the American – has played a dominant role, to such an extent that much of the history of cinema in other countries has consisted of attempts by the indigenous industries to thwart, compete with, or distinguish themselves from American ("Hollywood") competition' (Nowell-Smith 1998: xx–xxi), some questions remain unasked: to what extent is this narrative accounted from a US-centric perspective, and would it be possible, the 'fact' notwithstanding, to construct a narrative that de-centres US domination, challenges its hegemony, and uncovers examples of cinemas that have developed in total oblivion to Hollywood?[11]

However, to posit world cinema as an antithesis of US or Hollywood cinema is also to disregard the diversity and complexity within both cinema in the US as well as cinemas from the rest of the world. Whilst this opposition is often premised upon the reaction against US or Hollywood film aesthetics or modes of production and distribution, it tends to gloss over the independent, underground and avant-garde cinemas with the US itself, and fails to give adequate recognition to cinemas from other parts of the world which share similar film aesthetics or modes of production and distribution as Hollywood. As Chapman eloquently argues, the tendency to describe other modes of film practices as 'alternatives' to Hollywood implies that, in the study of world cinema, those cinemas 'which set out to differentiate themselves from Hollywood have been privileged' and the fact that some of these so-called 'alternatives' are actually dominant modes of film practices in their own cultures has been ignored (2003: 35, 37).

In our attempt to venture beyond the two existing models, we propose to rethink world cinema in three ways: as a discipline, a methodology and a perspective. This is not, however, an attempt to fix disciplinary boundaries, dictate research methodologies or to impose politically correct perspectives. Rather, using the three as tools, we hope to articulate the complexities embedded in the process of such a theorisation, and to highlight issues that have troubled us and should continue to cause us unrest even as we seek to problematise and establish world cinema as a theoretical concept.

Firstly, what does it mean to think of 'World Cinema' as a discipline? As an academic discipline, film and cinema studies are still primarily Euro- and US-centric in their orientation, often with scant attention paid to other forms of cinemas, and even if so,

the latter only occupy a peripheral position. The study of other cinemas, if defined by nation, chiefly resides in area studies departments, where it also assumes an emerging but still marginal role. While both claim a common interest in film and cinema studies, in practice there is a lack of interaction and cross-fertilisation between scholars in both disciplines. More importantly, the establishment of World Cinema as a discipline promotes a truly global perspective upon a seemingly universal one (film studies) and a decidedly regional one (area studies). This will hopefully lead to a rethinking of how film and cinema studies may be studied, taught and researched within academia.

Take, for example, the MA programme in World Cinemas at the University of Leeds, which rather than being taught exclusively by staff in Communication Studies, taps into the expertise in film and cultural studies of academics from a large number of language and area studies departments, such as Middle Eastern and East Asian Studies as well as Francophone and Hispanic Studies. Such departments in Leeds and elsewhere have been steadily incorporating the study of cinema into their programmes in response to an increased interest shown by both staff and students, and have begun to challenge the hegemony of Film and Communication Studies departments in terms of offering programmes on cinema. As departments gradually become subsumed into Schools and Faculties, and as pressure mounts to create ever more interesting, cutting-edge and financially viable undergraduate and postgraduate programmes, the trend is to move towards greater interdisciplinarity in terms of programmes and courses.

Interdisciplinarity, however, seems only to be paid lip service as a buzzword in institutional policy statements but seldom practised – and more importantly, recognised – in research terms. Whilst academics working in English departments may have conventionally encompassed topics in their research that can be variously identified as 'belonging' to the disciplines of comparative literature, cultural studies and film studies, such a luxury is not usually afforded to those working in disciplines whose boundaries remain rather strait-jacketed. The implication and effect of outmoded disciplinary divides is that certain kinds of intellectual inquiry, such as that epitomised by and germane to world cinema, are precluded, discouraged or unrewarded. Until and unless the processes of research assessment to which departments are subjected in the United Kingdom catch up with these developments along the road to interdisciplinarity, scholars will be disinclined to look beyond their disciplinary boundaries, and the development of World Cinemas as a discipline will be impeded as a result. Reversing this logic, we want instead to promote World Cinema as a vital way of challenging – and hopefully, in time, of breaking down – disciplinary divides so that new and interdisciplinary kinds of research can begin to flourish.

The relationship between film studies and area studies invariably impinges upon the second question, that of World Cinema as methodology. Whilst it may be too generalised to describe film and cinema studies scholars as paying more attention to text and area studies scholars to context, and whilst scholars in both disciplines have always employed diverse methodologies, fostering an interaction between the two under the umbrella of World Cinema can undoubtedly produce exciting and imaginative ways of studying films and cinemas that are at once sensitive to the operation of the cinematic apparatus as well as the milieu in which it operates.

In the past few decades in Western academia, the rise of critical theory – a body of work originating from continental Europe and which can be described broadly as post-structuralist in outlook – has forged a common language among scholars in the fields of humanities and the social sciences.[12] More importantly, the challenge and modification to this body of work, whether from a postcolonial, feminist, subaltern or queer perspective, have revitalised critical theory. By bringing the specific historical, socio-political and cultural conditions to bear on the common currency of theory, the discipline of World Cinema can provide innumerable illuminations to the processes of negotiation at the site of cinematic practices. The contribution of scholars such as Robert Stam, Hamid Naficy and Rey Chow – and we hope also the chapters in this volume – attest to the potential that World Cinema can bring to research methodologies and critical approaches.

These new research methodologies will bring to the fore the third and final question, that of perspective. From whence do we view, visualise and theorise world cinema, and what impact does this have on cinematic discourses and practices around the world? How does one's perspective limit one's view, and is it possible to develop a multifarious perspective that takes into account concerns of our own as well as that of the others? Is it possible for one to adopt a different or even multiple perspectives, and if so, how, and what does it take to do so? We might even ask: why is it important to not only lay bare one's perspective but also attempt to assume another?

This is where our earlier suggestion pointing towards notions such as hybridity, transculturation and border crossing may fulfil its promise. In the age of globalisation and increased migration, not only do people physically travel more, but both theory (to recall Edward Said's idea of 'travelling theory') and perspective also interpenetrate. It can be argued that subjectivity and identity in the twenty-first century are inescapably hybrid and multiple, so that one invariably embodies at once knowledge and perspectives from multifarious sources, which lend themselves easily to the study, and benefit from the insights of World Cinema.

In the final analysis, World Cinema as a theoretical concept is destined not to definition and closure but to ceaseless problematisation, always a work-in-progress, its ground beneath one's feet forever shifting even as one attempts to pin it down. To situate World Cinema as a theoretical problem is to question not just what world cinema is but also to/for whom it is a problem, in what contexts, how and why; to interrogate to what purposes does it serve, under what kinds of mechanisms of power does it operate, and what audiences does it seek to address or perhaps empower. Indeed, why theorise, problematise, or even promote World Cinema as a theoretical concept? We hope we have begun the process of answering these questions by raising the right ones.

Remapping world cinema

This volume represents an attempt to remap the concept of World Cinema for an Anglophone readership. Part One, 'Remapping World Cinema in a Post-World Order', redraws the theoretical terrain of World Cinema by radically reorienting the map away from the hegemony of the world system that privileges Hollywood. Dudley Andrew's

chapter provides an atlas of world cinema that highlights the political, demographic, linguistic, orientation and topographical aspects of mapping. Written with American students of film studies in mind, Andrew stresses that world cinema is not about coverage but displacement, and that it should place students in unfamiliar conditions of viewing while providing them with coordinates for navigating the world of world cinema. Lúcia Nagib's chapter calls for a positive definition of World Cinema, one that is not defined negatively as 'non-Hollywood' and that moves away from the iron grip of hierarchised binarism. Rather, echoing Ella Shohat and Robert Stam's idea of polycentric multiculturalism, Nagib calls for an understanding of world cinema as a way of cutting across film history according to waves of relevant films and movements that create flexible geographies with no particular cinema occupying a central position. Michael Chanan's chapter offers an illustration, by way of Latin American cinema, of how a renewed concept of World Cinema would acknowledge the plurality and diversity of film products and their conditions of production not just across the globe but also within seemingly homogenous continents. Using Latin American theories of underdevelopment, Chanan demonstrates that filmmaking in the region has been motivated more by political rather than economic forces, and yet, manifested as postmodernism, Latin American cinema is contemporaneous with rather than 'behind' Europe, despite the asymmetrical relation between the two.

'Remapping' world cinema also entails the acknowledgement of the interconnection of cinematic practices beyond the national boundary. The chapters in Part Two, 'Crossing boundaries', draw our attention to the politics of representation in such attempts at cinematic travelling in the postcolonial world. Citing filmic projects by Pier Paolo Pasolini, Dennis Hopper and Werner Herzog, Keith Richards' chapter serves as a reminder of the pitfalls and tension in such cross-cultural representation, in which mythology is (re)produced and exported, however unwittingly, in neo-colonial terms. Rob Stone's chapter compares two propaganda films and shows that, in both postrevolution Cuba and the Basque Country during the Francoist dictatorship, film was central to reclaiming each nation's identity, while invariably producing national myths that lent themselves to revolutionary aims. In contrast to Stone's chapter exploring the imagining of national identities with the aid of a foreign model, Rosanna Maule's chapter illustrates that identities are necessarily transnational in a context where the legacies of colonialism traverse to postcolonial spaces. Maule argues that Claire Denis' gendered position as a female director and the multicultural perspectives in her films complicate the master/servant dialectics underlying cinematic representation in the West. Precisely because we live in transnational and postcolonial times, spaces within national boundaries are already hybridised and crossed, though this does not in any way undercut the imperative to continue crossing boundaries of all kinds, including national, political and gender. Insofar as cinematic practices and representations are interpenetrable, the study of World Cinema has to be remapped to fully recognise this hybridity and boundary crossing.

Popular film genres are often omitted from the canon of World Cinema, as we have suggested, because they are traditionally understood to offer no real form of ideological resistance, and for the belief that they are rarely viewed outside their place of

origin because they do not travel well. The three chapters in Part Three, 'Carnival and Transgression', bring together scholarship on popular film from four different regions (Hollywood, the Weimar Republic, East Germany and Italy), and consider in particular the extent to which each set of films discussed makes use of a carnival aesthetic to engage with issues relating to modernity. David Robb's chapter offers a comparison of the films of two comedic performers, the German Karl Valentine and British-born Hollywood legend Charlie Chaplin. Here, Robb avoids the all-too-pervasive tendency to judge the less familiar performer Valentine, whose work is barely known outside of Germany, by the standards set by the more famous, Hollywood-based Chaplin, arguably the first international screen star. Like Robb, Evelyn Preuss reveals in her chapter, through her detailed study of East German cinema of the 1960s and 1970s, how cinema has translated and re-established the carnivalesque in modern society because cinema, as a medium of the modern era, operates against a background of political ideologies that borrow heavily from the carnival spirit. Both Robb and Preuss show us that within a remapped world cinema, there is also space for discussion of films whose challenge to dominant ideology is much more covert than, say, the overt challenges presented by Third Cinema filmmaking. To complete this section Mark Goodall's chapter offers an analysis of the woefully neglected 'mondo cycle', a series of hugely popular 'perverse' documentaries produced in Italy in the 1960s. The transgressive nature of mondo films, Goodall argues, has resulted in their almost complete absence from film histories, given the traditional film canon's insistence in dismissing commercial films that jar with political and cultural climates. But the extent to which the mondo films can be read as harbingers of many aspects of globalising media production and consumption justifies their re-evaluation in the context of World Cinema today.

The study of stars has until relatively recently centred around actors and actresses working within the so-called Hollywood star system, and even when foreign stars are afforded space in such discussions, these tend to concentrate on the trajectories of foreign actors in Hollywood. This is particularly noticeable in the case of Hollywood stars from the Hispanic world.[13] In an attempt to break with the tradition of privileging the study of stardom within the Hollywood context, in Part Four, 'Performing Stardom and Race', both Stephanie Dennison's and Guy Austin's chapters deal exclusively with the national star texts of two actresses with international profiles, concentrating on their 'problematic' whiteness, and how this was inflected in their public personae and the roles they played on screen. Austin exposes how the star text of Isabelle Adjani, *doyenne* of French cinema screens in the 1980s, underwent a (temporary) seismic shift and unleashed a wave of racist abuse when she revealed her own mixed-race origins. In contrast Dennison argues that Sônia Braga, of mixed race but perceived beyond question as white, at the height of her career in Brazilian cinema in the 1970s stood in for the mixed-race or black woman who was everywhere to be seen in popular culture but noticeable by her absence from the big screen. Both chapters highlight the dangers of reading star texts through an overly Anglo-Saxon prism, thus raising a question that is important in the study of World Cinema: whether theories of both race and stardom apply across all cultures.

Similarly, we must ask if theories of gender and sexuality are universal, a question central to the chapters in Part Five, 'Interrogating gender'. Echoing the performance of stars in the previous section, Hideaki Fujiki's chapter looks back historically at the performance of stardom in early Japanese cinema, in which the practice of male actors playing female roles was a mainstay until it was supplanted by the overflowing images of female actresses in American films. Replacing an indigenous form of (trans)gender performance with female actresses playing female roles in the name of 'naturalism', this shift was, for Fujiki, fundamentally concerned with the definition and management of gender and sexuality. Louise Williams' chapter interrogates the representation of gender and sexuality in a country where it remains highly charged and often taboo. Through her analysis of the protagonist in a mainland Chinese film, *Nannan nünü* (*Men and Women*), Williams sees the indeterminate sexuality of Xiao Bo as posing a challenge to established identity categories, including homosexuality and heterosexuality, masculinity and femininity, as well as men and women.

The final part, 'Hollywood's others', brings our remapping of world cinema full circle with its focus on the 'other' two powerhouses of film production: Japan and India. As Rachael Hutchinson clearly demonstrates, the popular reception of Akira Kurosawa as either a mostly universal or an essentially Japanese director betrays the dynamics of Orientalism and Occidentalism. Rather, Hutchinson proposes that Kurosawa appropriates elements from all kinds of sources, and that the intertextuality of his oeuvre offers new ways of overcoming problems of binarism and cultural essentialism in the study of World Cinema. Similarly, Kaushik Bhaumik argues that, rather than seeing Bollywood cinema as hermetically sealed, it in fact raises uncomfortable questions not just about Occidental Orientalist exoticisation but also about the place of genre and value within world cinema. Bollywood has become a sign mobilised by different agents for their own purposes, from reconfiguring the economic framework of the film industry in India to the stirring up of nationalistic sentiments by rejecting the term itself as a poor copy of Hollywood. As Bhaumik asks at the end of his chapter, Bollywood may become world cinema, but for which world(s)?

Notes

1   For a rebuttal of Owen's arguments, see Rey Chow (1993), chapter 1.

2   For example, Michael Chanan argues in his chapter in this volume that, in the case of Latin American cinema, nation-states are not individualised merely by the inclusion of background decoration but 'instead what you get is a continuing imperative to bear witness to local histories which takes us to the interstices, the margins and the peripheries'.

3   For example, Yingjin Zhang suggests that 'oriental *ars erotica* as a mythified entity is fixed or fixated at the very centre of Western fascination' with Chinese cinema and lists the 'essential' or 'magic' ingredients in the formula for satisfying Western aesthetic tastes: primitive landscape, repressed sexuality, gender performance and a mythical or cyclical time frame in which the protagonist's fate is predestined (1998: 116, 118). In his discussion of the Chinese filmmaker Zhang Yuan, Geremie Barmé also formulates

a detailed 'formula for success', suggesting that all Zhang needed to secure success for his films was an official ban in China (1999: 188–98).

4   Pamela A. Genova cites the example of the important journal *World Literature Today*, founded in 1927 (called *Books Abroad* until 1977) which tried 'to offer non-ideological commentary on a variety of foreign literatures as a means of aiding America to move away from what he [the founder] saw as a dangerous trend towards isolationism' (2003: xvii).

5   For example, there is a journal in China called *Shijie wenxue* (*World Literature*) and another in Taiwan called *Shijie dianying* (*World Cinema*), both serving a similar function of a window to the (rest of the) world.

6   On Occidentalism, see Xiaomei Chen (2002), and Ian Buruma and Avishai Margalit (2004).

7   As Lydia Liu notes, 'I am struck by the irony that, in the very act of criticising Western domination, one often ends up reifying the power of the dominator to a degree that the agency of non-Western cultures is reduced to a single possibility: resistance' (1995: xv–xvi).

8   See also Yuriko Furuhata (2004).

9   As Dudley Andrew argues in his chapter in this volume, 'in cinema something as technical as "point of view" asserts an ideological and political claim, literally orienting a culture to a surrounding world'.

10 Dissanayake, for example, has warned against judging melodramas produced in Latin America, Africa and Asia in terms of Western conceptualisations of melodrama (1998: 532).

11 For example, this 'fact' is disputed in Lúcia Nagib's chapter in this volume as she points out that both Japan and India have, at different periods in the twentieth century, produced more films than the US, thus debunking the myth of US cinematic domination.

12 It should be qualified, however, that the surge of critical theory has not gone uncontested in academia as not only has there been what Paul de Man terms 'the resistance to theory' (1986) but more recently, Terry Eagleton has published a book entitled *After Theory* (2004) while David Bordwell and Noël Carroll edited a film theory book entitled *Post-theory* (1996).

13 See, for example, López (1993), Ríos-Bustamante (1991) and Rodríguez (1998).

Works cited

Barmé, G. R. (1999) *In the Red: On Contemporary Chinese Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bordwell, D. and N. Carroll (eds) (1996) *Post-theory: Reconstructing Film Studies*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Bové, P. A. (1995) 'Discourse', in F. Lentricchia and T. McLaughlin (eds) *Critical Terms for Literary Study* (second edition). Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 50–65.

Buruma, I. and A. Margalit (2004) *Occidentalism: The West in the Eyes of Its Enemies*. London: Penguin Books.

Byrne, D. (1999) 'I Hate World Music', *The New York Times*, 3 October. Available online: http://www.luakabop.com/david_byrne/cmp/worldmusic.html (accessed: 30 October 2004).

Chapman, J. (2003) *Cinemas of the World: Film and Society from 1895 to the Present*. London: Reaktion.

Chen, X. (2002) *Occidentalism: A Theory of Counter-Discourse in Post-Mao China* (second edition). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Litterfield.

Chow, R. (1993) *Writing Diaspora: Tactics of Intervention in Contemporary Cultural Studies*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

_____ (1998) *Ethics after Idealism: Theory-Culture-Ethnicity-Reading*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Damrosch, D. (2003) 'What is World Literature', *World Literature Today*, 77, 1, 9–14.

de Man, P. (1986) *The Resistance to Theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Dissanayake, W. (1998) 'Issues in World Cinema', in J. Hill and P. Church Gibson (eds) *The Oxford Guide to Film Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 527–34.

Eagleton, T. (2004) *After Theory*. London: Penguin Books.

Furuhata Y. (2004) 'Desiring Resistance in the Age of Globalization', *New Cinemas*, 2, 2, 91–106.

Gabriel, T. H. (1982) *Third Cinema in the Third World: The Aesthetics of Liberation*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press.

Genova, P. A. (2003) 'Introduction' to P. A. Genova (ed.) *Twayne Companion to Contemporary World Literature: From the Editors of* World Literature Today. New York: Twayne Publishers, xvii–xxxiii.

Guneratne, A. R. (2003) 'Introduction: Rethinking Third Cinema', in A. R. Guneratne and W. Dissanayake (eds) *Rethinking Third Cinema*. London and New York: Routledge, 1–28.

Liu, L. H. (1995) *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity – China, 1900–1937*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

López, A. (1993) 'Are All Latins From Manhattan?: Hollywood, Ethnography and Cultural Colonialism', in J. King, A. López and M. Alvarado (eds) *Mediating Two Worlds: Cinematic Encounters in the Americas*. London: British Film Institute, 67–80.

Nowell-Smith, G. (ed.) (1997) *The Oxford History of World Cinema*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Owen, S. (1990) 'What is World Poetry?', *New Republic*, 19 November, 28–32.

Ríos-Bustamante, A. (1991) *Latinos in Hollywood*. Encino, CA: Floricanto Press.

Roberts, M. (1998) '*Baraka*: World Cinema and the Global Culture Industry', *Cinema Journal*, 37, 3, 62–82.

Rodríguez, C. (ed.) *Latin Looks: Images of Latinas and Latinos in the U.S. Media*. Boulder, CO and Oxford: Westview Press.

Shohat, E. and R. Stam (1994) *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media*. London and New York: Routledge.

Solanas, F. and O. Getino (1997) 'Towards a Third Cinema: Notes and Experiences for the Development of a Cinema of Liberation in the Third World', in M. T. Martin (ed.) *New Latin American Cinema, Vol. 1*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 33–58.

Zhang, Y. (1998) 'Chinese Cinema and Transnational Cultural Politics: Reflections on Film Festivals, Film Productions, and Film Studies', *Journal of Modern Literature in Chinese*, 2, 1, 105–32.