This article was downloaded by: *10.2.97.136*
On: 22 Mar 2023
Access details: *subscription number*
Publisher: *Routledge*
Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: 5 Howick Place, London SW1P 1WG, UK

Edited by Rob Stone, Paul Cooke, Stephanie Dennison and Alex Marlow-Mann

The Routledge Companion to World Cinema

Rob Stone, Paul Cooke, Stephanie Dennison, Alex Marlow-Mann

The non/industries of film and the Palestinian emergent film economy

Publication details
https://test.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9781315688251.ch15
Viviane Saglier
Published online on: 27 Sep 2017

How to cite :- Viviane Saglier. 27 Sep 2017, *The non/industries of film and the Palestinian emergent film economy from:* The Routledge Companion to World Cinema Routledge
Accessed on: 22 Mar 2023
https://test.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9781315688251.ch15

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR DOCUMENT

Full terms and conditions of use: https://test.routledgehandbooks.com/legal-notices/terms

This Document PDF may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproductions, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The publisher shall not be liable for an loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Downloaded By: 10.2.97.136 At: 05:41 22 Mar 2023; For: 9781315688251, chapter15, 10.4324/9781315688251.ch15

15

THE NON/INDUSTRIES OF FILM AND THE PALESTINIAN EMERGENT FILM ECONOMY

Viviane Saglier

World cinema's binaries

This chapter seeks to position the framework of World Cinema with respect to film productions that are not understood as forming a cohesive film industry—despite efforts at organising film-making practices—because they are not supported by a strong state. I argue for an epistemology of world cinema that would bypass state powers as the primary lens to read industrial formations, and for a critical study of top-down processes of legitimisation. In his general introduction to *Critical Approaches to World Cinema* (Hill 2000), John Hill reasserts the worldwide economic predominance of the US film industry (here condensed to Hollywood), which to him explains the emphasis of critical writings on the topic. From this observation derives Hill's definitional focus of his co-edited volume on World Cinema with Church Gibson, which "is devoted to non-Hollywood cinemas, both in the sense of films that are made geographically outside Hollywood and films which have adopted a different aesthetic model of filmmaking from Hollywood" (Hill 2000: xiv). The conceptualisation of World Cinema within this binary tends to perpetuate power relations already in place by directly deducing the theoretical importance of an object of study from the latter's economic, political and diplomatic influence. Moreover, the emphasis falls on Hollywood to set a standard for what constitutes a proper film industry. The developing film industries in the Global South, small nations, and beyond have, however, defended a variety of positions in regards to Hollywood films and their strong presence locally. These industries in the making have also crafted their own strategies with respect to their particular needs and economic contexts. To echo Lúcia Nagib, instead of arguing for an oppositional definition of World Cinema, how can we theorise World Cinema from within—from the point of view of these film productions and more largely from film economies that have been described as World Cinema (Nagib 2006)?

Placing World Cinema at the centre of our study poses yet another fundamental problem. Going back to the history of the term reveals that it constitutes the basis for another hegemony, with its own production of legitimising discourses. Marijke de Valck reminds us that European international film festivals started establishing the economic and aesthetic category of World Cinema in the late 1960s, as they were undergoing a restructuration and increasingly included films from all around the globe. These festivals (Cannes, Berlin, Venice among others) offered Third World film productions better visibility in the European market, which was more lucrative for them than distribution in Third World networks. In turn, from the 1980s onwards, film

Downloaded By: 10.2.97.136 At: 05:41 22 Mar 2023; For: 9781315688251, chapter15, 10.4324/9781315688251.ch15

festivals systematically promoted Third World film productions, the "discovery of new talents", and "New Waves", through the term "World Cinema" in order to enhance their own prestige and distinguish themselves from other festivals, a process that was backed by the economy of prizes and awards (de Valck 2007: 94). This new focus led some film festivals to become actively involved in the production of Global South films and thus contribute to the formation of these new waves of art cinema that feed the festival circuit and appeal to a transnational market, as has, for example, been the case with the renowned Hubert Bals Fund at the International Film Festival Rotterdam since 1988 (Ostrowska 2010: 145; Chan 2011: 254), now supported by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Similarly, the Berlinale's World Cinema Fund (WCF, est. 2004) provides production and distribution aid to what, in the organisers' phrase, are "countries with a weak production infrastructure" (World Cinema Fund 2016). European film festivals' cinema funds, very often backed by national financial support, are part of Europe's larger effort to develop co-productions with Global South countries through initiatives such as the European Union's MEDIA program.

World Cinema thus responds to an economic model whereby European funding typically supports small projects coming from contexts that are not considered to be driven by proper industries, and for the benefit and the expansion of the European market, by setting conditions around working techniques, crew members, shooting locations, targeted audiences, representational politics and style. Tamara Falicov rightfully observes that, although film festivals' funding:

> has helped further cultural production in countries with medium, small or non-existent film industries, there have been persistent cultural politics stemming from colonial legacies that continue to plague the film-funding dynamic, especially in countries in Africa and other former colonial territories.
>
> *(Falicov 2010: 3)*

A more acute curiosity about those postcolonial contexts, as well as new industrial formations, which include the rise of global film festivals outside of Europe (in East Asia or the Gulf, for example), ask us to expand the category of World Cinema to indeed understand the workings of world cinema economies outside of the Hollywood/non-Hollywood binary on the one hand, and the European/non-European binary on the other.

Towards non/industries of film

To refer back to the World Cinema Fund's quotation, what does a "weak production infrastructure" mean? How can we unpack the complexity of emerging or alternative film economies beyond such definitive statements? By privileging the European perspective, World Cinema has obscured the historical mechanisms by which film cultures and developing film industries are shaped within small nations, proto-states and other undermined political and economic formations in the Global South and beyond. This chapter focuses on the term "non/industry" to attend to a non-normative definition of film industries that does not rely on the legitimacy of political, economic and diplomatic structures; "non/industry" describes both this indecisive moment that sees the formation of multiple independent groups and enterprises, and the underlying aims of such groups to eventually consolidate a film industry whose future shape is still to be determined. The agency of the various actors invested in building film economies lies in the space between the "non" and the "industry". Emergent film economies are temporal objects as much as spatial ones, and they demand a theorisation and a methodology that acknowledge the negotiations, uncertainties and failures that contribute to shaping them.

Downloaded By: 10.2.97.136 At: 05:41 22 Mar 2023; For: 9781315688251, chapter15, 10.4324/9781315688251.ch15

For example, Rasha Salti's investigation of Syrian cinema results in listing paradoxes, the main one being that "if, objectively, Syrian cinema does not bear any of the attributes associated with [. . .] an industry, [. . .] it is nonetheless very difficult to discount the cogent body of work produced by Syrian filmmakers as a mere collection of 'Syrian films and Syrian filmmakers'" (Salti 2006: 1). Since 1963, Syria's scarce film production has been almost entirely funded by the state from a non-commercial perspective and has relied upon a dysfunctional network of film theatres. This cinema is traditionally highly experimental and sophisticated, critical of the state, and very successful abroad, although not so much seen at home. How to describe this in-between economy? Questioning the field of media industry studies, Nitin Govil comes to the conclusion that the term "film industry" has for too long been considered to be obvious, and has therefore remained unchallenged. He takes the example of the Mumbai film industry, which the Indian state did not recognise as such before 1998, although it had the capacity for production and distribution of one, as well as a division of cultural labour. Govil adds, "however, industry status always seemed elusive, relegating Indian cinema to a kind of 'not-yet' Hollywood" (Govil 2013: 176). How can we then study and theorise these film economies that are "not-yet Hollywood" (or not-yet European)? Govil proposes to examine the Indian commercial cinema industry as "re-cognised: not as a pre-existing structure of calculation but as a way of figuring things out" (Govil 2013: 176). Similarly, Tesjawini Ganti insists that no assumption can guide the study of media industries. Stemming from her ethnographic work on the production aspect of the same recognised post-1998 Mumbai industry, she asserts that "we must expand our understanding of what an 'industry' is and not presume certain organisational structures, division of labour, or financial arrangements from the outset" (Ganti 2014: 17). The study of non/industries challenges World Cinema's assumptions of what counts as industry, but it also reflects on how the economic structure of the category World Cinema has been negotiated within non/industries.

The case of Palestinian cinema

Palestinian cinema offers a perfect example to illustrate these debates because it is representative of the rise of World Cinema, while the conditions of its very existence and definition challenge any fixed categorisation. With films such as *Yadon ilaheyya* (Divine Intervention, 2002, France/Morocco/Germany/Occupied Palestinian Territory, Elia Suleiman), *Paradise Now* (2007, Occupied Palestinian Territory/France/Germany/Netherlands/Israel, Hany Abu-Assad), *Milh Hadha al-Bahr* (The Salt of This Sea, 2008, Occupied Palestinian Territory/Belgium/France/Spain/Switzerland, Annemarie Jacir), *Lamma shoftak* (When I Saw You, 2013, Occupied Palestinian Territory/Jordan/Greece/United Arab Emirates, Annemarie Jacir) (Figure 15.1), *Omar* (2013, Occupied Palestinian Territory, Hany Abu-Assad), Palestinian cinema has been very successful abroad in the global art cinema circuit, particularly since the early 2000s, but it has more often than not relied upon foreign aid to support pre-production, production and post-production. It is however not so popular at home in the proto-state of Palestine, established by the widely contested Oslo peace process in 1993. While officially meant to lay the basis for national institutions, the peace process eventually allowed the perpetuation of the occupation through the fragmentation of the remaining Palestinian territory into various zones of governance and increased Israel's control over the local economy (Turner 2014). Film culture and its accessibility in Palestine have thus been consistent with the economic, political and geographic landscape shaped by the various stages of Israeli occupation. National cultural funds are insignificant; commercial film theatres exist in limited numbers but they all tend to privilege American blockbuster productions; and film education is still marginal despite private attempts

Figure 15.1 *Lamma shoftak* (When I Saw You, 2013, Occupied Palestinian Territory/Jordan/Greece/United Arab Emirates, Annemarie Jacir) was one of a number of Palestinian films to find success on the global festival circuit. ©Philistine Films/Faliro House Productions.

such as filmmaker Rashid Masharawi's Cinema Production Centre (active from the mid-1990s to the early 2000s), the A.M. Qattan Foundation (founded 1993), and programs in development in various universities. Many of the most celebrated Palestinian filmmakers of recent years were educated in the diaspora, such as Elia Suleiman, Annemarie Jacir (both in the US), and Hany Abu-Assad (in the Netherlands), whose films were mentioned above. Palestinian cinema thus needs to be comprehended within various geographical spaces that transcend the current borders, and extend to wherever Palestinians are. The violent history of this people has seen them displaced within and outside the West Bank and Gaza, within and outside present-day Israel, also referred to as historic Palestine, and in exile with or without refugee status and within and outside the region.

Despite their dispersion, Palestinian filmmakers have made a point of shooting their films in occupied Palestine, thus contributing to building a community there, where the fragmentation of the territory, the submission of the local economy to Israeli rule, the lack of independent institutions and daily military violence have made such initiatives very difficult. George Khleifi and Nurith Gertz situate the emergence of Palestinian art cinema in the 1980s with the symptomatic return of Belgium-exiled filmmaker Michel Khleifi to historic Palestine in order to shoot his first film *Al Dhakira al Khasba* (Fertile Memory, 1980 Belgium/France/Occupied Palestinian Territory) (Gertz and Khleifi 2008), an intimate documentary about two Palestinian women of different generations and their struggle with both the occupation and their place in Palestinian society. This periodisation coincides with the rise of World Cinema in the A-list festival circuit. As was typical of that time and now, in the absence of any possible support from the then-sole representative of the Palestinian people, the Palestinian Liberation Organisation (PLO), *Fertile Memory* was coproduced by the Belgian Ministry of the French-Speaking Community, the German television channel ZDF and the French National Centre for Cinema (Centre National de la Cinématographie, CNC). Khleifi's next film, *Urs al-jalil* (Wedding in Galilee, 1987 France/Belgium/Occupied Palestinian Territory), received similar financial support and achieved great recognition, as it was awarded the International Critics Prize in Cannes in 1987.

Downloaded By: 10.2.97.136 At: 05:41 22 Mar 2023; For: 9781315688251, chapter15, 10.4324/9781315688251.ch15

Downloaded By: 10.2.97.136 At: 05:41 22 Mar 2023; For: 9781315688251, chapter15, 10.4324/9781315688251.ch15

Palestinian–British film producer, filmmaker and chairman of the eponymous foundation Omar al-Qattan explains how Khleifi's Europe-backed film projects in the West Bank generated new possibilities for making films that would be properly Palestinian, that is to say in this context, that would be made by a Palestinian film crew under the supervision of a Palestinian director (al-Qattan 2006). Until then, most Palestinian film workers were employed in Israeli crews as second- or third-tier technicians, and their skills were as a result limited. In fact, despite the lack of Palestinian funding, Khleifi qualified his first film as a "Belgian–French–Palestinian co-production" (Naficy 2000: 59). Such claims are significant in the face of Israel's constant efforts at erasing the Palestinian presence, history and culture, through sheer dismissal or co-optation. For example, Gertz and Khleifi recount how an Israeli distributor offered to promote Cannes-awarded *Wedding in Galilee*, but only under the condition that Galilee disappear from the title and the film be considered Israeli (Gertz and Khleifi 2008).

Sometimes, the process of defining Palestinian cinema according to the filmmaker's identity would come in direct tension with the source of funding. This would become apparent during the film's circulation in international film festival networks where the country of origin refers to the state from where the funding originates. In her attempt to anticipate another co-optation of Palestinian success in the World Cinema economy, Palestinian citizen of Israel Suha Arraf recently registered her film *Villa Touma* (2014) with the Venice Film Festival as Palestinian although she received financial support from the Israeli establishment, an institution that to her represents an occupying power. Her gesture ultimately questioned the prominence of funding and state formations over the artist's identity and other forms of political community in the classification of a film's origins in the particular context of the occupation (Anderson 2014). The Israeli government considered this an affront and threatened to demand that Arraf return the $580,000 she received for the film's production (Strickland 2014). Partly bending under pressure, Arraf resolved to list the film as "stateless" (Strickland 2014), thus reasserting the independence of Palestinians from the occupying state. This example asks how we can think of Palestinian production through state categories (which condition understandings of film industries) that do not reflect the Palestinian political reality on the ground. One of the biggest challenges posed to anyone ready to approach Palestinian production as more than "a mere collection of Palestinian films and filmmakers", as Rasha Salti put it with respect to Syrian cinema, is precisely the lack of national institutions to provide a clear-cut and predetermined understanding of the workings of the Palestinian film economy. More broadly, and as Kay Dickinson reminds us:

> As Hamid Dabashi argues, these conundrums provoke a serious ontological debate for film culture: "The very proposition of a Palestinian cinema points to the traumatic disposition of its origin and originality. The world of cinema does not know quite how to deal with Palestinian cinema precisely because it is emerging as a stateless cinema of the most serious national consequences."
>
> *(Dickinson 2010: 142)*

As a result, I want to point here to a paradox constitutive of World Cinema that the Palestinian example, with its multiple epistemological instabilities, reveals. On the one hand, the category of World Cinema allows Palestinian cinema to exist internationally as such despite the absence of financial support from the Palestinian proto-state. That is the reason why Michel Khleifi can claim to have directed Palestinian films. On the other hand, World Cinema constitutes the very discourse and economy that prevents Palestinian cinema from developing its own economic and industrial base by maintaining its dependence on European and external funding. Moreover, as Salah Mohsen, who promotes the rights of Palestinians in Israel, remarks in the

Downloaded By: 10.2.97.136 At: 05:41 22 Mar 2023; For: 9781315688251, chapter15, 10.4324/9781315688251.ch15

case of the *Villa Touma* controversy, "it is very common for Israeli films [here read 'any world cinema production'] to receive European funding, but no one demands that they be classified as European films" (cited in Strickland 2014). In other words, and to respond to concerns I raised in the introduction to this chapter, while World Cinema is fed by European funding and co-production agreements that seal economic power relations, it is its being promoted as "world" and non-European that guarantees its circulation in the international art cinema circuit and transnational markets, and success of the festivals that produce and screen it. In addition, this rather general tension is here superimposed onto the political framework of the occupation, which takes shape in parallel, and sometimes very closely so, with European policies and World Cinema's mechanisms. The challenge that awaits the Palestinian filmmaking community is thus to take advantage of its newly acquired visibility in order to gain some independence from the current networks of funding and their ascendency, within the conditions of possibility defined by the occupation.

Independent cinema and the non/industry

For Gertz and Khleifi, today's Palestinian cinema results from the development of Palestinian art cinema in the 1980s. Along with most Palestinian filmmakers and scholars, they claim that there is still no Palestinian film industry because there is no fully fledged Palestinian state despite the 1993 Oslo Accords. The ensemble of Palestinian film productions has therefore been designated through various appellations that the two scholars list as follows: "'Independent Cinema,' 'Palestinian Cinema from the Occupied Lands' (Farid no date; Mdanat 1990) 'Post-Revolution Cinema,' or 'Individualistic Cinema' (Shafik, 2001)" (Gertz and Khleifi 2008: 33). In turn, filmmaker and scholar Sobhi al-Zobaidi writes in 2008, after the second Intifada, about a "new and independent cinema, [. . .] independent from the authorities of state, religion and commerce [. . .] which is best understood as individual cinema" (al-Zobaidi 2008). Al-Zobaidi's conflation of independence and individualism highlights the consequences of working almost completely outside the nation-state framework. On the one hand, the absence of Palestinian state supervision and thus control gives the freedom for filmmakers to operate without compromising their views; on the other hand, there is no structure to help local artistic collaboration and each cultural worker is individually competing for funding, technical resources, and visibility. This independence from the state only hides another dependence, namely on external funders. Looking at the evolution of Palestinian World Cinema and the kinds of pressure exercised by this funding model in the late 1980s and 1990s, al-Qattan for example laments "the emergence of a simple (simplistic) aesthetics and preference for individual(istic), harmless and generally apolitical and sanitised subject matters" (al-Qattan 2006: 117).

How can we reconcile this understanding of independent cinema with the first signs of increased collaboration between Palestinian film workers that underlie the project that some members of the local film community (including Omar al-Qattan) openly claim will build a film industry in the long term? From the mid-2000s onwards, individual or groups of filmmakers started establishing their own production companies, such as Idiom Films, Collage Productions, Odeh Films, Philistine Films, or Pal Cine productions. Some individuals (although very few) have also made successful attempts at minimising European involvement in their films' production, by counting on Arab solidarity networks and the Palestinian diaspora. In 1993, Rashid Masharawi's *Hatta Ishaar Akhar* (Curfew, 1993, Israel/France/Occupied Palestinian Territory/Germany/Netherlands) was called "the first truly Palestinian film" because it was made with a Palestine-based production company (Gertz 2004: 24). More recently, Hany Abu Assad's *Omar* (2013) has benefited from the large support of Palestinian businessman Waleed Zuaiter, who

Downloaded By: 10.2.97.136 At: 05:41 22 Mar 2023; For: 9781315688251, chapter15, 10.4324/9781315688251.ch15

provided 95 per cent of the necessary budget for the film while Enjaaz, Dubai Film Festival's post-production fund, supplied the remaining 5 per cent. The framework of independent cinema tends to ignore that Palestinian cinema was also supported, particularly during and after the Second Intifada, by the international news industry and the NGO economy, both of which directly took part in the crafting of the Palestinian proto-institutions after 1993. Moreover, a significant number of film festivals simultaneously started to emerge in Palestine at this time, stemming from various local collectives that negotiated in different ways their involvement with a multiplicity of foreign funding sources. Examining Palestinian cinema as a non/industry of film allows us to reflect upon independent cinema's modes of production. The latter must be situated within a broader industrial context, as well as an affective history in which "Palestinian [. . .] memory is mostly composed of an uninterrupted flow of uncertainties, insecurities, wars, and a general and detailed sense of destruction" (al-Zobaidi 2008).

Second Intifada cinema

During the Second Intifada (roughly 2000–2005), negotiations and making-do were at the heart of filmmaking tactics. This constituted a mode of production in itself, despite a weak infrastructure. This is worth acknowledging especially since other, more urban, infrastructures were so central to both the control of the population under occupation and the possibilities available for filmmaking. Kay Dickinson highlights the importance of roads and cars in cinema at a moment when flying and permanent checkpoints were multiplying, curfews were being reinforced, and the construction of the Separation Wall was moving forward. USAID-funded roads became an integral part of the landscapes Palestinians filmed but also defined the conditions of film production under the economy of the occupation. As for cars, Amahl Bishara reminds us in her analysis of Hany Abu-Assad's *Ford Transit* (2003 Occupied Palestinian Territory/Israel) that the shared taxis (*servees*) used as public transportation were given by the Israeli authorities to collaborators, who re-sold them to taxi drivers (Bishara 2015).

Identifying a trend of films under the umbrella appellation of "road (block) movies", Dickinson explains the tension prompted by relocating the road movie genre to the Palestinian context of the Intifada. While road movies generally champion freedom and resist the notion of "home", their Palestinian iteration reveals the many impediments to movement and reasserts Palestinians' claim to the land (Dickinson 2010: 139). In Mohanad Yaqubi's *Around* (2006, Occupied Palestinian Territory), a group of friends documents their ten-and-a-half hour journey from Jenin to Ramallah (only 63 km apart) to get their weekly pizza without going through checkpoints; conversely, Sobhi al-Zobaidi's *Obor kalandia* (Crossing Kalandia, 2002, Occupied Palestinian Territory) shows the ordeal people went through to cross checkpoints; while in Nahed Awwad's *Going for a Ride?* (2003, Occupied Palestinian Territory), still images of cars destroyed by Israeli tanks invading Ramallah are testament of forced immobilisation and revive the ghosts of past lives.

For Dickinson, Palestinian attempts at travelling around the occupied land also expose the guerrilla nature of Palestinian cinema (Dickinson 2010: 146). A film such as Annemarie Jacir's docu-fiction *Like Twenty Impossibles* (2003, Occupied Palestinian Territory), among many others, reveals how Palestinian filming and driving, the very documentation of movement, are perceived as a double threat by Israeli soldiers. In Nida Sinnokrot's *Palestine Blues* (2005, USA/Occupied Palestinian Territory), the filmmaker puts a hole in a bag to secretly film crossing through the Qalandiya checkpoint from Ramallah to Jerusalem. At that time and after, the journeys necessary to reach filming locations were also dependent on the drivers' skills in avoiding roadblocks. In an article in the monthly magazine *This Week in Palestine*, filmmaker

Downloaded By: 10.2.97.136 At: 05:41 22 Mar 2023; For: 9781315688251, chapter15, 10.4324/9781315688251.ch15

Najwa Najjar recounts the logistical nightmare of planning her feature film *Al-mor wa al rumman* (Pomegranates and Myrrh, 2008, Occupied Palestinian Territory), and how shooting in several locations required constant adaptation (Najjar 2008).

Taking guerrilla filmmaking seriously as a mode of production inscribes this reflection on non/industries into a double theoretical lineage that challenges in various ways the rhetorics of World Cinema. On the one hand, Ramon Lobato's study of what he coins "the shadow economies of cinema" expands phenomena that should be worthy of scholarly and economic attention beyond legal and legitimate forms of distribution, towards activities that are unmeasured, unregulated and extra-legal—which also conceptually applies to other forms of production and consumption. Lobato aims to "offer a different way of thinking about the innumerable practices of film viewing that are integral to everyday life around the world but marginal to film studies as a discipline" (Lobato 2012: 1). In contrast, World Cinema works both as an economic category that evens out the multiplicity of film production strategies in order to reassert an uncritical dependence on European and Western funding, and an epistemological category that defines this funding model as what makes these films legitimate objects of study, because they are recognised as art cinema, and as such, are supposedly politically neutral and universal.

On the other hand, the tradition of guerrilla cinema is rooted in the 1960s and 1970s struggles for decolonisation. For Argentine filmmakers and theoreticians Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino, guerrilla cinema is the shape that a proper anti-capitalist and anti-bourgeois third cinema takes when it adjusts the mode of film production to an economy of decolonisation. For them, the third cinema of liberation, which uses guerrilla tactics, should make "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 and Getino 1969). Auteur, or art cinema, which they call "second cinema" cannot fit these requirements. The Palestinian context of the Second Intifada responds to some of the features outlined by Solanas and Getino in their famous manifesto. However, the Palestinian economy of decolonisation is one that includes uprisings within broader financial and power networks that are in constant negotiation with each other.

From the news industry to the non/industry of film

Many filmmakers active during the Second Intifada came from, or had been educated in, the diaspora, and they sought to found a film community in Palestine as much as build a local crew (Jacir 2008: 16). At the beginning of her self-reflexive documentary *Zaman al-akhbar* (News Time, 2002, Occupied Palestinian Territory), Lebanese-born Palestinian filmmaker Azza el-Hassan's voiceover reports that it is really hard to constitute a film crew during the Intifada because all the technicians are busy working with news agencies. Commenting on the predominance of the news as a mode of image-making, she summarises the situation as such in the film: "This is not the time to be doing films. This is news time." In fact, as scholar, filmmaker, and festival organiser Alia Arasoughly observes, many technicians as well as local filmmakers had previously been trained with the international TV crews established in the West Bank and Gaza to document the uprisings since the first Intifada in 1987. Their contracts were cheaper for these agencies, and provided the film training Palestinians could not find at home. For Arasoughly, the very understanding of film became subordinated to standards developed for TV. By the end of the Second Intifada, news had shaped both the Palestinians' relation to representations *of* themselves, and the production of these representations *by* themselves (Arasoughly 2013). Universities also perpetuated this logic by including audio-visual training within departments of media-journalism, as was the case at the prestigious Bir Zeit University in 2002 or the Institute of Modern Media at Al-Quds University as early as 1996.

The cinema of the second Intifada, and even more so the cinema that followed it, sought to reclaim the tools to narrate Palestinian stories beyond news-oriented documentary cinema, thus developing a trend that would be more experimental and/or interested in fiction, while also in negotiation with the guerrilla tactics mentioned above. Such projects, including the ones currently encouraged by the production company Idioms Films, tend to require a significant budget and subject filmmakers to a more ambitious mode of production and a distribution market closer to the demands of art cinema. However, the economy supposed to support this kind of production has not always empowered the community's narratives in the way some might have hoped. In 2004, a local team organised an ambitious festival, the Ramallah International Film Festival (RIFF), which aimed to attract the foreign community in order to give opportunities for exchange. At the time, the festival was criticised (including by the young team of Idioms Film in their short *Carnaval*, 2005, Mohanad Yaqub, Occupied Palestinian Territory) for highlighting Palestinian filmmakers who were already famous in international circuits and leaving younger generations in the shadow. Other festivals have evolved in parallel to the world cinema economy, targeting instead the human rights industry that has flourished since the Oslo Accords. Although such festivals are dependent on European funding in the same way the more industry-oriented festivals tend to be, these festivals have a range of relationships with the world cinema economy, from avoiding world cinema films in favour of local productions (Shashat Women's Film Festival) and encouraging partnerships with European Youth festivals active in the world cinema economy (International Young Filmmaker Festival), to attempts at using the resources that this economy offers to build opportunities for the local filmmakers (Gaza's Karama Human Rights festival).

Film festivals have thus worked as important proto-institutions in the reviving of a culture of cinema that had been interrupted by the forced closures of theatres during the first Intifada, and which had been complicated by a continuous lack of freedom of movement that limited social gatherings. Film festivals provide a good example of the non/industry of film in Palestine because they are unstable events that have adapted to an unstable environment. Cancellations, postponements, make-up screenings, changes of location, are only a few of the characteristics in the practice of film festivals in general that make them both precarious and flexible events. In many ways, due to this structural precariousness, film festivals are particularly adapted to the hostile environment of the occupation in Palestine, where, among other things, checkpoints, curfews, interruptions of screenings, confiscation of film material, and denial of guests' entry destabilise pre-set programs and constantly threaten such events' very existence.

In Palestine, however, these conditions tend to be imagined in tension with the standards set by global festivals. The type of industry-focused festivals one finds in Palestine (invariably industry focussed) tend to be heavily influenced by the notion of global art cinema and World Cinema. This is in large part due to the organisations that tend to preside over these events, organisations that are one of the only sources of funding available to Palestinian artists in the current post-Oslo and aid-driven economy. Moreover, local film festivals have become the dominant platform for the screening of Palestinian and art films because they have allowed the Palestinian non/industry to grow through a network that so many Palestinian filmmakers had already joined internationally. In addition to film screenings, most Palestine-based festivals include training roundtables, Q&As and workshops (scriptwriting, filming, editing, sound) that complement education given in the new film programs. At various levels, and in many different ways, these festivals have provided a hub for local and international film communities, and a forum for the various actors of the film industry (film distributors, TV buyers, foreign cultural institution representatives, producers, filmmakers, actors etc.) to meet. They often build partnerships with other foreign film festivals and local universities, putting representatives from

Downloaded By: 10.2.97.136 At: 05:41 22 Mar 2023; For: 9781315688251, chapter15, 10.4324/9781315688251.ch15

Downloaded By: 10.2.97.136 At: 05:41 22 Mar 2023; For: 9781315688251, chapter15, 10.4324/9781315688251.ch15

Palestinian national institutions into dialogue with the local film community with the aim of reaching out to remote audiences. As a result, they have contributed to the creating of links between communities, a crucial step if Palestine is ever to build a fully fledged film industry.

Film festivals are thus central to imagining a future for the Palestinian local film economy within the context of a non/industry of film and in negotiation with the global financial networks of global art cinema. Many events have identified themselves as actively working towards building a film industry through the local enhancement of film culture and thanks to the relative integration into the international art cinema scene. For example, the Al-Kasaba International Film Festival (2006–2010) welcomed Cannes festival director Thierry Frémeaux in 2009 to give an opportunity for local artists to learn the ropes and join the global art cinema circuit; the organisation FilmLab: Palestine launched "Days of Cinema" in 2014 as part of its plan to "effectively promote film art and film culture in Palestine with the greater aspiration of creating a productive and dynamic film industry, including through training workshops, residencies, and co-productions" (Film Lab: Palestine 2016). These festivals' connections to the global circuits are mostly made possible by their financing through the same European institutions and foreign national cultural institutes also behind many European film festivals, and which profit from opening new markets in Palestine.

Days of Cinema is a good example of this, as its partnership with numerous Danish institutions has inflected the event's programming. Denmark benefits from a strong presence in the Palestinian territories via the Danish House in Palestine (DHiP) and the Danish ministry of affairs' Centre for Culture and Development (CKU). In this particular case, Denmark's financial involvement led to the screening of five Danish films in the Days of Cinema 2015 and a workshop to present the Aarhus film lab in the 2014 edition. Partnerships with other Arab countries have not been as successful. In 2015, while many speakers were invited to join from the region in order to discuss possibilities for building independent regional Arab networks and South/South collaborations, most were denied entry at the border controlled by Israel. The conversation therefore shifted towards topics that European speakers could offer, representatives of institutions such as the World Cultural Fund (also a partner of the event) that, conversely, were allowed in by the occupier.

Conclusion

The example of the Palestinian non/industry of film illustrates the necessity of finding tools to account for the agency and struggles of undermined economic, political and diplomatic actors on the local and international scene. Contexts where a strong state is absent and political tensions constant, a situation to be found in many countries in the Global South and beyond, can be included in research on World Cinema if we expand the conceptualisation of the term beyond the binaries examined in my introduction. World Cinema becomes a more useful category if we reflect on the various levels at which it operates: epistemological, economic and political. Taking this multiplicity of layers into consideration allows us to draw a new map of world cinema that enhances paradoxes, negotiations and power relations.

References

al-Qattan, O. (2006) "The Challenges of Palestinian Filmmaking: 1990–2003", in Dabashi, H. (ed.) *Dreams of a Nation*, London and New York: Verso, 110–130.

al-Zobaidi, S. (2008) "Tora-Bora Cinema", *JumpCut: a Review of Contemporary Media*, 50, www.ejumpcut.org/archive/jc50.2008/PalestineFilm/.

Anderson, J. (2014) "The Hand That Feeds Bites Back", *New York Times*, 16 October, www.nytimes.com/2014/10/19/movies/israel-and-suha-arraf-differ-on-nationality-of-villa-touma.html?_r=0.

Arasoughly, A. (2013) "Film Education in Palestine Post-Oslo: The Experience of Shashat", in Mette Hjort (ed.) *The Education of the Filmmaker in Africa, the Middle East, and the Americas*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 99–123.
Bishara, A. (2015) "From Dust to Concrete: Infrastructural Change, Intractability, and the Colonial Road Movie", *American Anthropologist* 117 (2): 398–401.
Chan, F. (2011) "The International Film Festival and the Making of a National Cinema", *Screen* 52 (2): 253–260.
de Valck, M. (2007) *Film Festivals: From European Geopolitics to Global Cinephilia*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
Dickinson, K. (2010) "The Palestinian Road (Block) Movie: Everyday Geographies of Second Intifada Cinema", in Iordanova, D., Martin-Jones, D. and Vidal, B. (eds) *Cinema at the Periphery*, Detroit, IL: Wayne University Press, 137–155.
Falicov, T. L. (2010) "Migrating from South to North: The Role of Film Festivals in Funding and Shaping Global South Film and Video", in Elmer, G., Davis, C. H., Marchessault, J. and McCullough, J. (eds) *Locating Migrating Media,* Latham, MD: Lexington Books, 3–22.
Film Lab: Palestine (2016) 25 August, http://flp.ps/flp/.
Ganti, T. (2014) "The Value of Ethnography", *Media Industries Journal* 1(1): 16–20.
Gertz, N. (2004) "The Stone at the Top of the Mountain: The Films of Rashid Masharawi", *Journal of Palestine Studies* 34 (1): 24–36.
Gertz, N. and Khleifi, G. (2008) *Palestinian Cinema: Landscape, Trauma, Memory*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Govil, N. (2013) "Recognizing 'Industry'", *Cinema Journal* 52 (3): 172–176.
Hill, J. (2000) "General Introduction", in Hill, J. and Church Gibson, P. (eds) *Critical Approaches to World Cinema*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, xiv–xv.
Jacir, A. (2008) "Letter from the Editing Room", *This Week in Palestine* 117: 16–19.
Lobato, R. (2012), *Shadow Economies of Cinema*, London: BFI.
Naficy, H. (2000) *An Accented Cinema: Exilic and Diasporic Filmmaking*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Nagib, L. (2006) "Towards a Positive Definition of World Cinema," in Dennison, S. and Song, H-L. (eds) *Remapping World Cinema: Identity, Culture and Politics in Film*, London and New York: Wallflower Press, 30–37.
Najjar, N. (2008) "Making a Feature Film in Palestine", *This Week in Palestine* 117: 12–14.
Ostrowska, D. (2010) "International Film Festivals as Producers of World Cinema", *Cinéma & Cie: International Film Studies Journal* X (14–15): 145–150.
Salti, R. (2006) "Critical Nationals: The Paradoxes of Syrian Cinema", *Kosmorama* 237.
Solanas, F. and Getino, O. (1969) "Towards a Third Cinema: Notes and Experiences for the Development of a Cinema of Liberation in the Third World", in Corrigan, T., White, P. and Mazaj, M. (eds) *Critical Visions in Film Theory*, Boston and New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 924–938.
Strickland, P. O. (2014) "Suha Arraf On Her 'Stateless' Palestinian Film", *The Electronic Intifada*, October 9, https://electronicintifada.net/content/suha-arraf-her-stateless-palestinian-film/13936.
Turner, M. (2014) "The Political Economy of Western Aid in the Occupied Palestinian Territory Since 1993", in Turner, M. and Shweiki, O. (eds) *Decolonizing Palestinian Political Economy: De-Development and Beyond*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 32–52.
World Cinema Fund (2016) *World Cinema Fund Supported Films* 2005–2015.

Downloaded By: 10.2.97.136 At: 05:41 22 Mar 2023; For: 9781315688251, chapter15, 10.4324/9781315688251.ch15