2

Tashkent 1968

OVERVIEW

It is worth lingering on the first (1968) edition of the Tashkent festival as a vantage point from which to assess specific configurations of the transnational circulation and reception histories of the participating regions by looking at the films and figures that dominated it. Not surprisingly, the biggest share of films and participants in 1968 came from the largest film industries: Egyptian, Indian, and Japanese delegations, as well as the Soviet host's own Central Asian and Transcaucasian. Yet Algeria, Ghana, Guinea, Iraq, Iran, Vietnam, Indonesia, Cambodia, North Korea, Malaysia, Syria, Lebanon, Mongolia, Senegal, Somalia, and Tunisia all had at least one feature-length fiction film included in the program. Predictably, the documentary and short film program was considerably more diverse, with many more African countries (many of which had severely underdeveloped film industries) represented. In terms of the global geography this selection represented, only the exclusions of Israel and South Africa were nonnegotiable—not only as a demonstration of Soviet geopolitical commitments but to ensure the participation of the rest of the progressive Arab world and Africa. China's involvement remained under discussion, with the committee going back and forth on whether it should be invited. In the end, China never participated in the festival (unlike Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which initially declined the invitation but then sent in films anyway and remained an active participant in subsequent editions as well).[1]

The fiction film program was dominated by Arab realist cinema of social critique, largely via productions from nationalized film industries. The Japanese delegation was represented, for the most part, by the Japanese political cinema of the "Old Left." There were also quite a few genre films providing entertainment but with a "humanist" and social message—whether from Egypt, India, or Japan.[2] The Central Asian program was split between historical epics and contemporary poetic cinema: the former represented by either adaptations of literary classics or by adventure films that, while broadly following cinematic conventions of the

genre of the western (the so-called Easterns), adopted to a more socialist-realist bent, depicting the establishment of Soviet power in Central Asia.[3] The more lyrical Central Asian films on contemporary topics explored the conflict between tradition and modernization.[4] The documentary selection in the first edition was indicative of the thematics and styles that would dominate the festival in later years: from the focus on the struggle against imperialism through the dual prism of the war in Vietnam and the plight of Palestinian refugees (explored in greater detail in chapters 3, 4, and 8), to autoethnographic and newsreel nonfiction simultaneously celebrating modernization and local cultural traditions (which will be discussed in chapters 6 and 7).

INDIA'S PARTICIPATION: PREHISTORY

The Indian delegation at the 1968 Tashkent festival was the largest in terms of number of films, participants, and celebrities—a trend that continued in the 1970s, with the Indian delegation also staying longer than others and being the beneficiary of special invitations, receptions, and photographed tours. As Sudha Rajagopalan has shown, this privileged relationship goes back to the late 1940s, when the celebrated Soviet director Vsevolod Pudovkin visited India. The trip laid the groundwork for the distribution of the first two Indian films widely screened in the USSR, *Children of the Earth* (*Dharti Ke Lal*, 1946), the directorial debut of Khwaja Ahmad (K. A.) Abbas, and the Bengali film *The Uprooted* (*Chinnamul*, 1950), directed by Nemai Ghosh—the choice that, in retrospect, defined the parameters of the relationship between the two film cultures for decades to come. Both films were in many ways reflective of politics and aesthetics of the Indian People's Theater Association (IPTA), which supported them. IPTA's own origins go back to the internationalism, antifascism, and anticolonialism of the Indian Progressive Writers' movement of the 1930s, whose politically engaged, socially conscious aesthetics had an enormous impact on all the artistic and intellectual life of India. The term *association* in IPTA's title is perhaps too restrictive a word to accurately describe what was actually a wide-reaching movement that sponsored popular theater productions all over the country, blending local/regional vernacular folk musical, artistic, and literary traditions with progressive (a combination of Nehruvian and communist) ideology, which lent itself successfully to cinema—and to exchanges with the Soviet Union.[5]

CHINNAMUL AND INDIAN INDEPENDENT CINEMA

Paradigmatic of a the more experimental direction within IPTA aesthetics, *Chinnamul*—with its sound-image montages creating what Bhaskar Sarkar refers to as a "polyvocal texture, engaging multiple subjectivities, attitudes and modalities"—departed significantly from the established cinematic narrative and representational formulas, thus appealing to the legacies of the 1920s Soviet

avantgarde.[6] Ghosh, an IPTA activist and member of the Calcutta Film Society was, indeed, an admirer of Early Soviet cinema and was eager to travel to the Soviet Union, where he spent two months apprenticing filmmaking with the Soviet masters upon his film's release. But it appears that far from advancing his cinematic career, his association with the Soviet Union created political problems when he returned to India, forcing him to move to Madras. His second film, *Yonder Lies the Path* (*Paathai Theriyudhu Paar*, 1960), the first Tamil language film to be released in the USSR in 1964, made little impression in either country.[7]

Yet *Chinnamul*'s experimental aesthetics, low-budget location shootings, and use of nonprofessional actors anticipated the rise of independent cinema in Bengal. Ritwik Ghatak, who would come to be recognized as the originator of Indian Parallel Cinema, had been involved in the film's production. Entrusted by the Communist Party to accompany Pudovkin during that important 1949 visit, Ghatak would also become an important mediator between Early Soviet and Indian Parallel Cinema as Bengali cinephiles were some of the first to see the Soviet montage classics: *Battleship Potemkin* (*Bronenosets Potiomkin*, Sergei Eisenstein, 1925) was the first film screened at the Calcutta Film Society in 1947, five years before Eisenstein's and Pudovkin's works were included in the First International Film Festival India in Mumbai, where it was seen by larger Indian audiences. In the course of the 1950s and 1960s, in addition to various informal political screenings around the country (such as those conducted through the Society of Friendship with the Soviet Union), the Film Society Movement further cemented Early Soviet cinema's presence in India.[8] And Indian Parallel Cinema, while profoundly shaped by local artistic and political forms, would as a result frequently reference Pudovkin's and Eisenstein's techniques.[9]

K. A. ABBAS, RAJ KAPOOR, AND THE SUCCESS OF THE INDIAN MAINSTREAM IN THE USSR

If *Chinnamul*'s Soviet screening points toward future developments in Indian independent filmmaking (which would feature prominently at Tashkent throughout the 1970s and early 1980s), the other film chosen for Soviet exhibition, Abbas's *Children of the Earth* heralded the future success of the socially minded commercial Hindi cinema. Abbas's artistic trajectory is also linked to IPTA, as one of the founders (in 1942) and leading figures. By 1949 Abbas was already well known as the screenwriter of *Lowly City* (*Neecha Nagar*, Chetan Anand, 1946), a film based on Maxim Gorky's play *Ne dne* and influenced by Pudovkin's and Eisenstein's cinematography. The film won a Cannes prize but found no distribution in India. Indian government was even less eager to export abroad what it saw as an IPTA-influenced negative portrayal of India as a backward country.[10] Abbas had to lobby for the permission to have his films distributed in the USSR through India's Information Minister and went so far as to plead his case directly to Nehru.[11] And after many months of diplomatic negotiations, in 1954 Abbas led the official delegation

as part of the first Indian film festival in Moscow, which included Raj Kapoor and Nargis, as well as the director Bimal Roy and actor Dev Anand, all at the height of their popularity in India. The films that were reported as particularly popular with Soviet audiences were Roy's *Two Acres of Land* (*Do Bigha Zamin*, 1953), Chetan Anand's *Aandhiyan* (*Storms*, 1952), Abbas's *The Wayfarer* (*Rahi*, 1952), and Kapoor's *The Vagabond* (*Awara*, 1951). It was reported that millions of viewers lined up to see these films, with *Awara* drawing 63.7 million viewers in 1954, making it the highest grossing domestic and foreign film of the decade.[12] Contrary to Indian officials' concerns, IPTA-associated Indian films were the perfect package for Sovexportfilm: combining elements of political and social consciousness, required by the Soviet censors, with colorful markers of cultural authenticity, such as music, dance, poetic language, and performance style, which appealed to movie-starved Soviet audiences.[13]

The visit resulted in the signing of an agreement of friendship and cooperation between Soviet and Indian film industries, kicking off the socialist audience's love affair with Hindi popular cinema, which extended all the way to China.[14] Soviet-Indian cinematic ties would go beyond film reception to film production, with the first of many Soviet-Indian coproductions, *Pardesi*/*Khozhdeniia za tri moria*, codirected by Abbas and Vasili Pronin and starring Nargis, even nominated for the Cannes Palme d'Or prize in 1958.[15] Roy, Kapoor, and Anand, as well as Mehboob Khan (the director of *Mother India* [*Bharat Mata*, 1957]) and Satyajit Ray would all serve on various juries of the Moscow film festival between 1959 and 1969.

As Rajagopalan observes, the popularity of Indian cinema was founded on Kapoor's star persona, as well as the winning formula of Hindi melodramas, which combined an emphasis on the personal and lyrical (much-valued during the Thaw) with an embrace of social humanistic values, enhanced by exotic and attractive settings, music, and dance.[16] Within the Indian context, Kapoor's real power as a celebrity actor and filmmaker had a definite political dimension, with both his and Abbas's roles as cultural diplomats grounded in their significant pedigree in Nehruvian India. Raj's father, Prithviraj, had close ties to Jawaharlal Nehru and his whole family and held positions within the Indian Parliament.[17] Both Kapoor and Abbas enthusiastically advocated Nehru's vision and ideals of nationalist populism and mixed-economy.[18] Neither committed socialists or communists, they represented the ideological status quo of the Indian film industry of the 1950s, Bombay's as much as the other regions, where private studios positioned themselves as allies of Nehru's quasi-socialist vision for the country. Even the studio mogul responsible for launching cinematic careers of most Hindi stars of the period Mehboob Khan's logo featured the hammer and sickle without causing much notice or controversy. And in the course of the 1950s and 1960s, virtually every film made by Abbas and Kapoor, as well as many by Roy (along with films by Satyen Bose, Nitin Bose, and other politically committed 1950s Indian filmmakers, who came out of IPTA or New Theatres in Calcutta), gained distribution in

the Soviet Union. The exchanges were reciprocal: in 1962 alone, there were Weeks of Soviet Cinema organized in twenty cities of India, and in 1966 another large retrospective of Soviet film classics, including many films that had previously not been seen abroad.[19] And this is how the popular Indian cinema of the 1950s became a staple of socialist film exhibition from Eastern Europe throughout Eurasia, at the same time as Ray's *Song of the Road* (*Pather Panchali*, 1955) came to stand as the symbolic entry of Indian cinema to the West.[20]

INDIA'S 1968 FESTIVAL SELECTION

Despite the vibrant Indian cinematic culture of the earlier decades and its high visibility on the global socialist film circuits, however, by the late 1960s, as Rini Bhattacharya Mehta puts it, "the nationalist social form, buoyed possibly by an initial postcolonial enthusiasm for dialogue with the nation-state, had exhausted itself."[21] In many ways, the Indian film selection at the 1968 Tashkent festival demonstrates the transition period from the glory days of Nehruvian socially conscious films of the 1950s, exemplified by Roy and Kapoor, to the 1970s so-called Angry Young Men era, when Indian popular cinema would again acquire a truly global scale, albeit with progressively diminishing elements of socialist ideology. As Parag Amaldi asserts in the context of the emergence of Indian Parallel Cinema, "After the deaths of Bimal Roy, Guru Dutt and Mehboob, and the decline of V Shantaram and Raj Kapoor, there seemed to be little hope left that the commercial film industry could satisfactorily address the world-view of a literate middle-class audience."[22]

At the same time, a thriving cosmopolitan film culture was developing at the intersection of the state and the independent sphere taking place around state institutions like the Film Institute of India (1960, later renamed the Film and Television Institute), the National Film Archives of India (1964), and supported by emerging funding bodies such as the National Film Development Corporation of India. The Films Division of India, the state body in charge of producing newsreels and documentaries—which were screened before every commercial feature, thereby amounting to considerable cumulative exposure, if not popularity, for Indian state-sponsored nonfiction—also underwent a series of transformations in the 1960s, providing support for some of the most interesting Indian documentaries of the period.[23] The Film Societies movement blossomed all over the country and was crucial for the synthesis of cinephilia and New Left political ideologies, which manifested themselves in different iterations of the Indian New Cinemas, although it wasn't until the early 1970s that the movement would truly break into the international view (including the Soviet bloc cinematic circuit). But even sites such as Film Societies were not free of the state's direct involvement, with Mrs. Indira Gandhi personally taking great interest in cinematic matters, serving as a vice president of the Federation of Film Societies for all of India and, in that capacity, even helped obtain permission to exhibit to their members uncensored

films imported from abroad. The screenings of film societies included the classics of Soviet, French, German, and Hollywood cinema—but also Japanese films, such as Shindo Kaneto's 1952 docudrama *Children of Hiroshima* (*Gembaku no ko*), which became important for the reception of Japanese cinema in the Soviet film culture as well, demonstrating an emerging shared cinematic canon.[24]

In 1967, a new agreement was signed between the Soviet Film Export Agency, and the Indian Ministry of Information and Broadcasting and Ministry of Trade, reaffirming reciprocity in film trade.[25] Thus, when the Soviet delegation went to India to promote the Tashkent film festival and secure India's participation in it, they relied on already constituted formal and informal ties in place, and, unlike the case in some other regions, possessed some basic knowledge of the industry, as well as the assurance of the enthusiasm of Soviet audiences; indeed, films at the first festival mostly reflected the established networks, which made for a controversy-avoiding selection.[26]

But the Soviet delegation also explicitly stated that their goal was to represent as wide a range of film production—both in terms of geography and form—as possible. As a result, in addition to the more traditional fare, it included K. S. Gopalakrishnan's *Love or Wealth* (*Panama Pasama*, 1968), a Tamil film; another participant was Malayalam Ramu Kariat.[27] With his background in Kerala's People's Arts Club (an artistic extension of the Communist Party in Kerala, similar to IPTA), Kariat was a natural fit for Tashkent, and he remained an enthusiastic participant of the festival throughout the 1970s. Emerging Bengali Parallel Cinema was represented by Tarun Majumdar's *Young Wife* (*Balika Badhu*, 1967) and Tapan Sinha's *One's Own People* (*Apanjan*, 1968). Traditional melodramas, these films offered elements we associate with neorealism's more authentic representation of local culture through dialogue and attention to social and political realities. The time for an introduction of more radical strands of Indian cinema would have to wait until the 1972 edition, by which time Indian Parallel Cinema would reach mainstream.

JAPAN'S PARTICIPATION: PREHISTORY

The other prominent film industry represented at the festival was, of course, Japan's. Soviet-Japanese cinematic ties go back even further than the Soviet-Indian ones. As Anastasia Fedorova explores in detail, the first exhibition of Japanese films took place in Moscow already in the 1920s, and in the early 1930s a sizable number of Russian films was commercially screened in Japan (excepting those banned by the political censors, a group that included the most famous of early Soviet cinema).[28] The Japanese socialist and communist parties provided much of the intellectual and ideological impetus for these developments: notably, the All-Japan Federation of Proletarian Arts, of which the Proletarian Film League of Japan or Prokino (1929–34) was part. Prokino engaged in an active dialogue

with the Soviet film community and openly adopted the Soviet documentary style as its political, aesthetic and production model, which was further facilitated by the translations of the writings of Soviet filmmaker-theorists into Japanese. Film critics like Iwasaki Akira (who, alongside Imamura Taihei, would play a key role within the leftist film culture after the Second World War) were shaped by and contributed to the dissemination of these ideas. A member of Prokino, documentary filmmaker Kamei Fumio studied filmmaking from 1929 to 1931 in Leningrad with Grigorii Kozintsev, Sergei Iutkevich, and Fridrikh Ermler, bringing back to Japan a lifelong dedication to Soviet documentary montage ideals that served as an important token in postwar Japanese culture.[29] In turn, Kamei's *Woman Walking Alone on the Earth* (*Onna hitori daichi o yuku*, 1953) was chosen as one of the first Japanese films to be widely screened in the Soviet Union in the 1950s, paving the way for many other leftist Japanese filmmakers representing the same formation—such as Imai Tadashi and Yamamoto Satsuo, who would become regular presences on the socialist bloc screens.[30]

Unlike that earlier period, however, the immediate postwar Japanese film industry was tightly controlled by the US, which censored anything that could be considered anti-American or procommunist. Japanese Communist Party members were expelled from their jobs, and since film industry was considered especially visible by the occupation authorities, the purge significantly affected the major studios, with more than a hundred studio employees fired. Many of the purged filmmakers joined independent film production companies set up by unionists who had left the studios just prior to the purge in response to ongoing labor disputes.[31] For a brief period (most of the filmmakers returned to the major studios by the early 1960s), these companies allowed for low-budget, socially aware, and politically progressive films to be produced under a collectivist ethos that was in strong contrast to the free-enterprise studio system. They brought together a wide range of talented filmmakers, the so-called independents, whose aesthetic resonated with other realist movements of the period—from Italian neorealism to early Brazilian Cinema Novo and Indian parallel cinema. The independents included communists such as Imai, Yamamoto, Shindo, Toyoda Shiro, Yoshimura Kozaburo, and Yamada Tengo, as well as other filmmakers who, while not driven primarily by their political beliefs, were generally frustrated by the artistic and ideological rules laid down by the main studios, such as Kurosawa and Taniguchi Senkichi.

JAPANESE CINEMA ON THE GLOBAL FILM CIRCUITS

Presented as the West's discovery of Japanese cinema, Kurosawa's *Rashomon*'s 1951 win of Cannes' Palm d'Or and the Oscars' Best Foreign Language Film takes on another significance within this broader context. Just as what Ray's film did for India, *Rashomon* made Japanese cinema "legible" to the (Western) European cinematic establishment by foregrounding art cinema's emphasis on the subjectivity

of the individual artistic vision, which was easily subsumable in the discourse of freedom of expression as a key value of the "Free World." For a Japanese critic like Iwasaki, steeped in earlier political avant-garde aesthetics, however, it was *Rashomon*'s antiutopian relativism that created the film's appeal for Western audiences, a quality that Iwasaki saw as being at odds with Kurosawa's "innate humanism," to say nothing of the political engagement of the independents.[32]

So while *Rashomon* came to define Japanese cinema in the eyes of the US-aligned West for years, within the socialist film circuit it was represented instead by Imai, Shindo, Yoshimura, and Yamamoto. Their films were purchased and widely seen all over the USSR and Eastern Europe—as well as recognized by European Marxist film scholars such as George Sadoul, who was referring to this larger group of Japanese filmmakers when in 1955 he claimed that when it comes to realism, "among capitalist cinemas, Rome is a worthy competitor of Tokyo" (and not the other way around).[33] As in the case of India, Japan's film canon came to be constructed differently based on the geopolitical alignments: in the West, festivals, critics, and subsequently scholars consistently privileged studio-auteurs like Ozu, Mizoguchi, and Naruse, while in the socialist bloc, the independents Shindo, Imai, Fumio, Yamamoto, and Kobayashi were screened and celebrated.[34] Kurosawa overlapped both spheres, owing at least in part to his passion for Russian literature and culture, which motivated his close ties to the Soviet Union (culminating in his coproduction of *Dersu Uzala* in 1975).[35]

Outside the Socialist sphere, independent films have been largely discussed as foregrounding politics over style, but within Soviet critical reception, they were seen as setting aesthetic standards, their poetic qualities highlighted.[36] These films had considerable aesthetic impact on Central Asian filmmakers in particular. Thus Khodzhakuli Narliev, a Turkmenian filmmaker associated with the poetic school of Central Asian cinema, attributed the style of his films (several of which would be screened at Tashkent) to Shindo's famously dialogue-less *The Naked Island* (*Hadaka no shima*, 1960), which he saw at the Moscow film festival in 1961, where it won the Grand Prix.[37] Several other filmmakers and critics cite this film as an important inspiration for the poetic realism of the 1960s Central Asian cinema.[38] In turn, *The Naked Island*'s success in Moscow allegedly saved Shindo from bankruptcy, since after the festival he was able to sell his film in sixty-one countries.[39]

Beyond their ties to the Soviet Union, the independents' commitment to anti-imperialism also led them to actively participate in the Afro-Asian film festivals of the 1950s and early 1960s, allowing them to enter into dialogue with other politically minded filmmakers all over Asia, from China to India. Japan's geopolitical association with the US, however, made its participation in the Afro-Asian solidarity complicated. On the one hand, Japan was a participant in the Bandung meeting, yet on the level of official policy and mainstream cultural sectors, certainly including the film companies, its alignment with the US made it the center of a different kind of pan-Asianism: that of an anticommunist "Free Asia." The Japanese film

industry was the founder of the Federation of the Motion Picture Producers Association of Asia (FPA) and the Southeast Asian Film Festival (AFF), the region's first and largest annual pan-Asian film event, which included also Hong Kong, Thailand, the Philippines, Taiwan, Malaysia, and eventually South Korea; a formation that, as Sangjoon Lee demonstrates, was an extension of the CIA-funded Asia Foundation, whose aim was "to protect 'free Asia' from the invasion of the communist force throughout the cinema."[40] In fact, most AFF participants were ardent pro-American and anticommunist film executives supported, partially or fully, by the American government.[41]

Commercially, especially after the success of *Rashomon* on the European market made clear the potential financial earnings from Japanese film exports, the film studios were keen to expand their market farther into Asia, with India especially in their sights. For the studio system, Japan's participation in Bandung and Afro-Asian movements promised potential extension of its commercial film market across Asia through genre films, many of which were implicitly or explicitly pro-American or anticommunist.[42] For the progressives, on the contrary, it meant the possibility of establishing new horizontal relationships with Asian (and African) countries as a way to overcome Japan's own legacy of imperialism. And for the socialists and communists it was an opportunity to form solidarity against continuing Western (especially US) political and economic power in the region, joining the liberation movements as an act of political resistance.[43] Peaceful coexistence for the Japanese was an especially powerful slogan, reconciling many potentially conflicting ideologies by placing Japan at the forefront of the antiwar movement in its role as the only victim of the atomic bomb, followed by the US occupation. For progressives, who opposed the Japanese imperialism that led to the war, it also meant positioning themselves on par with the other Bandung participants as a semicolonized Asian state with uneven development (a sharp division between the peasants, the workers, and the urban elites). This became the official position of the Japanese Communist Party.[44]

This was the broader ideological motivation that led Yamamoto to participate in the Jakarta 1964 Afro-Asian festival. In his final communiqué, he vowed "to support the liberation movement of the peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, and to make use of films, the weapon in our hand, to this end." And on receiving an invitation from Vietnamese filmmakers he met at the festival, Yamamoto got involved in the making of one of the first Japanese films on this topic: *Vietnam* (Masuda Kentaro/Koizumi Takashi, 1968).[45] Although Japan was within the US sphere, it was the only foreign country that had a TV station working in Vietnam for the duration of the war (and after): Japan's Nihon Denpa News (NDN). Ho Chi Minh had personally granted it permission to have a representative office in Hanoi in 1961, which allowed these Japanese filmmakers in the course of the 1960s and 1970s to record 1,510 rolls of 16 mm film at a total length of around six thousand meters (now included in the documentary series *Memoirs of Vietnam* [*Ky uc Viet*

Nam]).[46] Yamamoto's antiwar epic *Men and War* (*Senso to ningen*, 1970–73), which was screened to great success at the Tashkent festival in the 1970s, goes back to this experience: it was in Vietnam, he claims, that he was struck by the continuities between US aggression and Japan's actions against China during WWII.[47] As we will see in detail in chapter 8, this was a position very much embraced by the Soviet film institutions. But it also provided affinities with the anti-imperialist orientation of many of Tashkent's other foreign participants, further solidifying their networks of solidarity.

But as the 1960s progressed and Japan's economic miracle drastically lifted the country into the top echelon of world economies, the Japanese New Left, the founding members of which had split from the Communist Party (JPC) in the 1950s, no longer saw Japan as an equal partner in Afro-Asian alliance, approaching it instead as part of the First World and extending to it the corresponding ideological critiques.[48] These differences further mapped on to aesthetics as the new generations (both the Japanese New Wave and the more radical political filmmakers) opposing the traditionalist humanist neorealist mode of the "independents." The Sino-Soviet split further exacerbated these divisions, leading to another split within the JPC between the pro-Chinese main wing and an "alternative" (pro-Soviet) wing Voice of Japan Comrades' Society (*Nihon no koe*).[49] By 1968, the politically radical artists and intellectuals were considerably more in line with their counterparts in Western Europe (and Latin America), while the older generation remained affiliated with the JPC and its Soviet and broader Afro-Asian solidarity networks.

JAPAN'S 1968 FESTIVAL SELECTION

In 1968, the complicated dynamics of the Japanese Left had to be confronted by the first Tashkent selection committee sent to Japan, where it also had to negotiate among three competing film consortia, all of whom were interested in exclusive participation at the festival. One was the Japanese Motion Picture Promotional Corporation (MPCC), which included the five major studios and distribution channels headed by Nagata Masaichi, who helped found the Federation of the Motion Picture Producers Association of Asia (FPA) and the Asian Film Festival. The MPCC had a close working relationship with the Japanese government, through the Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Trade and Industry (MITI), and Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and prior negotiations with it took place on the level of Soviet Ministry of International Relations (MID), which meant that MPCC's participation in the Tashkent festival was linked to further trade relations and therefore strategically important.[50] For Japan, as its participation at the Asian Film Festival progressively declined in the course of the 1960s, hopes for active distribution in Europe, despite the initial promise, didn't bear fruit, and its film industry entered a period of malaise. The MPCC was thus incentivized to expand its market outside the "Free Asia" realm.

Rivaling the MPCC and the five studios was the independent group of producers, the Japanese Film Revival Society, led by Yamada Kazuo, a film critic and Japanese Communist Party (JCP) militant with long-standing ties to the Soviet Union. Starting in the 1950s, Yamada had been a regular contributor to the Communist Party newspaper *Akahata*, as well as a writer for *Godo Tsushinsha*, a film industry newspaper. Although he went freelance in 1962, he kept his industry ties, making him one of the few film critics with the breadth to discuss cinema from an industry perspective, albeit a highly critical one. He was also the president of the Eisenstein Cineclub and an organizer of the International Cinema Library, a company that in the 1960s and 1970s distributed movies from the Soviet Union, Latin America, Vietnam, and other countries for the Japanese cinephile market. He quickly became a familiar figure on the Moscow and Tashkent festival circuit (as well as subsequently the Havana Festival for the New Latin American Cinema).[51] Yamada was known to be an outspoken critic of the Asia Film Festival (AFF), calling it a direct extension of NATO and a propaganda outlet for "American wars of imperialist aggression in Asia."[52] In his exchanges with the Tashkent organizers, in hopes of dissuading them from working with the MPCC, Yamada repeatedly stressed the role Nagata played in the AFF, which was about to take place in Seoul. As Baskett notes, to exclude the participation from politically radical producers, the AFF "limited each member to five film entries, which corresponded exactly to the number of the major Japanese film studios, thereby effectively locking out any possible influence by the independents."[53] Yamada's concern in finding out that the Soviet organizers were dealing with the MPCC was that it would resort to similar insider tactics. Instead, he generously offered for the Japanese Film Revival Society to take over the entire selection process.[54]

Another group whose participation was solicited by the Soviets was the Screenwriters' Guild of Japan, presided over by Yagi Yasutaro, who was a regular collaborator of Shindo and Imai and associated with the "other" Communist Party, the Voice of Japan (as well as a range of non–Communist Party affiliated filmmakers). The guild had just co-organized a highly successful Soviet-Japanese symposium on cinema in Moscow in May 1968, and its participation had been confirmed prior to the Soviet delegation's trip. Yamada tried to dissuade the Soviets from this decision by pointing out the guild's anti-JCP position. Perhaps surprisingly, even though the JCP officially condemned the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, no such matters were raised by Yamada.

In the end, maximally broad representation of Japanese cinema was a priority to festival organizers. The fact that it was scheduled exactly at the same time as the AFF in Seoul was, apparently, a coincidence, which was batted away by the Soviet planners (who did, however, reschedule their festival to accommodate the Carthage film festival, in which many leftist Arab and African filmmakers took part). The AFF itself became the scene of political/ideological conflict. As Sangjoon Lee details, its 1966 Seoul edition ended in scandal after the Best Director award was

given to none other than Yamamoto for *The Witness Seat* (*Shonin no isu*, 1965), resulting in festival jurors being summoned to court and interrogated by the National Intelligence Service for "violation of the anti-communist laws."[55] As this episode demonstrates, Yamamoto's films in the course of the 1960s were produced both inside and outside the studio system; thus, *Shonin no isu* was submitted to the festival by Daiei Studios (one of five major studios forming the MPCC), while his submission to the Tashkent festival just two years later, *The Slave Factory* (*Dorei kojo*, 1968), was independently produced. In the end, Soviet organizers succeeded in bringing films and representatives from all three film consortia to Tashkent. The heads of the five studios each got to choose two films, and five more films were selected from independent studios.[56]

The most striking feature of Japan's selection was its exclusion of any New Wave or radical Japanese filmmakers of the time, who by then had become quite visible internationally. Instead, many of the former "independents" who dominated at Tashkent had returned to the leading studios, and much of their output had become more commercially driven, attracting domestic publics at the festival, as well as Soviet audiences (who greatly enjoyed genre films such as *Snow Woman* [*Kaidan Yukijoro*, Tanaka Tokuzo, 1968] and *Black Cat* [*Kuroneko*, Shindo Kaneto, 1968]). Yet the background of these directors also spoke to their experience of opposing the hegemony of the commercial film production of both Hollywood and the mainstream Asian film industry on a broad scale, given the fact that in 1968, Japan was still the leading film producer in Asia. This history could thus be construed as a bridge between the experiences of the newly independent African countries and those of the more highly developed Asian industries. And the anti-war outlook of older directors such as Yamamoto allowed for further synergies with the increasingly militant anti-imperialist position of the other delegations at the festival, giving Japan a continuously important presence at Tashkent.

EGYPT'S PARTICIPATION: HISTORICAL AND CINEMATIC CONTEXTS

A similar set of factors also characterized the Egyptian selection at the festival. The prominence of Egypt (with nine fiction films included in the 1968 program) was no doubt boosted by the status of its film industry as the most successful in the Arab world. But it was also due to fact that, after considerable Soviet military support in the devastating Six-Day War, in 1968 Nasser announced a series of pro-socialist economic reforms that aligned the country even more closely with the Soviet Union. Egypt was also the second-largest recipient of Soviet aid at that time (India being the largest).[57] But despite its massive showcase at Tashkent, Egyptian cinema in 1968 was, like the rest of the country, in crisis, with production in 1967 dropping to its lowest point since 1940.[58] When the film industry was partially nationalized in the early 1960s, it was primarily meant to control the distribution

network, thus undermining the import of Hollywood films, which still accrued the largest share of distribution. While foreign imports, the taxes and fees from which provided important support for the industry, decreased dramatically, Egypt no longer had the resources to increase production to meet demand.[59] The state tried to find markets for Egyptian movies abroad through film commissions in Latin America and around Asia, as well as encouraging participation in film festivals in Europe and the Eastern bloc.

The overall history of Soviet films on Egyptian screens seems to be rather full of fiascos, from the cancellation of the 1957 festival of Soviet Cinema after its opening film, Pudovkin's *Mother* (*Mat'*, 1926), was deemed too politically subversive, to the overall lack of attendance at Odeon, one of Cairo's largest movie palaces, which was rented out by the Soviets as an extravagant cultural extension of the Soviet-Egyptian military alliance through the 1960s. Most films were shown there without translations, which likely further limited viewership.[60] More successfully, Soviet films with Arabic subtitles were regularly shown on Egyptian TV, speaking to greater cultural impact than Odeon's poor attendance would suggest, as further evidenced by the success of Kozintsev's *Hamlet* (*Gamlet*, 1964), a film that resonated with the Egyptian audience in the aftermath of the war as a political allegory, as analyzed by Margaret Litvin.[61]

In the meantime, the Egyptian state's intervention in film culture did succeed in creating a vibrant, cosmopolitan and highly politicized sphere, receptive to international exchanges. Contributing to it was the creation of the High Cinema Institute in Cairo in 1959, the first film school in all of the Arab and Islamic worlds, as well as the activities of the Cairo Film Society. These developments generated a cadre of filmmakers and critics steeped in serious professional and aesthetic training, as well as a new cinephile public who attended a wide range of film screenings, read translations and publications of film criticism, and participated in public film discussions.[62] Egypt's active role on the international film festival circuit created further opportunities, and the Moscow film festival served as an important bridge there: the new head of the Cinema Institute served on its jury in 1963, and Youssef Chahine, who started teaching in the institute from its inception, was also a regular.

And although he is now largely considered an auteur associated with the European art cinema circuit, Chahine was one of the filmmakers who had a strong reputation in the Soviet Union going back to the release of *Struggle in the Valley* (*Sira' fi al-Wadi*, 1954) in the USSR in 1956. Chahine's *Jamila, the Algerian* (*Jamila, al-Jaza'iriya*, 1958) was an indisputable success when screened as part of the first Moscow International Film Festival in 1959. *Jamila*'s star and producer Magda claimed that "when it was shown in the Soviet Union ambulances had to be brought to carry those who have fainted because of the heavy congestion."[63]

While such claims appear to be part of the mythology (common also among the Indian stars, whose memoirs abound with similar stories) about the wildly

enthusiastic Soviet audiences of foreign films, especially in the 1950s, there is no doubt that the Moscow screening was a significant event for Chahine and Magda. Against protests by the French, it not only solidified Chahine's international reputation as a political anticolonial auteur; it also opened new markets for him within the socialist festival circuit. Despite what is often claimed in scholarship on Chahine, the film did not get any awards at the festival, nor was it included in the official program.[64] For the directors of the Moscow festival, who were applying to receive accreditation from the Paris-based International Federation of Film Producers Association (FIAPF), the importance of France's role in the cinema world could not be ignored.[65] Yet by 1959, it was also clear that the lack of Soviet support for Algeria was having a negative impact on its status vis-à-vis the Afro-Asian solidarity network. Thus, a compromise was reached: a different film by Chahine, *Forever Yours* (*Hubb lel-Abad*, 1959), was entered into the official competition, while *Jamila* enjoyed a lively public screening as part of the festival. In subsequent years, several major Egyptian productions, including Chahine's *Saladin* (*Al-Nasir Salah al-Din*, 1963) and Salah Abu Seif's adaptation of Naguib Mahfouz's *The Beginning and the End* (*Bidayah wa Nihayah*, 1960), were screened as part of the MIFF, while films by Tewfiq Saleh and Kamal El Sheikh were shown as part of a regularly held Weeks of Egyptian Cinema in Moscow.[66]

By the mid-1960s, bureaucratic inadequacies, logistical problems, and censorship of political dissent (including the more left-leaning radicals) soured the relationship between filmmakers and the Egyptian film industry. While the state privileged patriotic realist films, the industry relied for commercial success on films not so different from the prenationalized era (with melodramatic plot structures, recognizable stars, and popular music), leaving artists with little room to maneuver. The crisis reached its peak in the aftermath of Egypt's tragic defeat in the Six-Day War, when more than thirty thousand Palestinians fled to Egypt (and the work of displaced Palestinian filmmakers, as well as other Arab filmmakers' support of the Palestinian cause, became one of the focal points of the Tashkent festival, starting with its 1968 edition).[67] The defeat brought about the loss of faith in Nasser and Nasserism, as well as the distrust of the state-controlled media, with its false early claims of victory.[68] In February 1968, Nasser sent troops onto the streets of Cairo against a civil protest, ending any possibility of a renewed connection between the new generation of Egyptians and Nasser's vision of the nation or, by extension, a state-supported cinema as its expression.

Following the protests, a collective of young filmmakers, technicians, students, and critics formed the New Cinema Group, which disavowed its ties with conventional Egyptian cinema. Their manifesto, written in 1968 and discussed at the first Alexandria Festival for Young Directors in 1969, would be the first call for a renewal and reinvention of Arab cinema along the lines of other international New Cinemas, and the collective would make its connections first with other Arab filmmakers at the 1972 Damascus Film Festival for Young Directors and

later joining similar movements originating in Africa and Latin America in Algiers in 1973.[69] Like many other New Cinema manifestos, its reinvention was articulated in explicit opposition to commercial filmmaking, calling on the models of neorealism, European New Waves, and British Free Cinema in combination with local vernaculars, turning to Latin America, Japan, and India for models of engaged filmmaking.

Like virtually everywhere else in the world at this period, the informal film networks created through cine-clubs and film societies nurtured the new generations of filmmakers and critics. Their cinematic canons, however, were in stark opposition to Nasserite-era visions of cinema. In line with this divergent ideology, the Soviet films screened by the Cairo Cine-club, which served as one of the centers for the new movement, were either early montage classics by Eisenstein and Pudovkin or films by Andrei Tarkovsky and Sergei Paradjanov coming through the Western film festival circuits.[70] This art-cinema orientation was quite antithetical to the kind of filmmaking advanced at Tashkent, making such contacts of little interest to young Egyptian filmmakers. As a result, the selection of Egyptian films was largely taking place on the state level, and this meant effectively excluding the New Cinema Group from the festival.

As the division widened between mainstream films and the oppositional New Cinema, so did the animosity toward the Soviet bloc, which came from all sides of the political spectrum. This left some of Egypt's most notable Egyptian filmmakers, like Chahine and Saleh, in a somewhat ambiguous situation: while these two were avatars of the kind of realist Egyptian cinema of the late 1950s and early 1960s that the New Cinema Group rejected, they were also critical of the late Nasserite regime and, later, opposed Sadat's pro-American turn. In fact, Saleh would leave Egypt for Iraq and Syria in the 1970s, and his participation in the Tashkent festival during that decade would be listed under these countries.

On the whole, the 1968 Tashkent selection of Egyptian films provided a compelling overview of Egyptian cinema's immediate past, reading like a comprehensive history of the best of "films with a purpose" of the public sector of the 1960s.[71] Popular genre films were also screened, such as Fatin Abdel Wahab's and Husayn Hilmi al-Muhandis's "women's" films.[72] The most visible Egyptian participant that year was Magda, who was publicizing her own directorial debut, *Whom Do I Love* (*Man uhibb*, 1966). Her presence served as a perfect link between the more explicitly political internationalist vision of Egyptian cinema symbolized by Jamila and the more conventional melodramas that were so successful in the Soviet Union; indeed, the USSR was one of the few countries where *Man uhibb* earned commercial distribution. Chahine's absence, instead, was due to the problems with his Soviet-Egyptian coproduction (which chapter 6 explores in detail).

The 1968 Tashkent meeting turned out to be the last one of the era of Soviet-Egyptian rapprochement. Nasser's death in 1970 marked a turning point, after which Egypt officially moved further away from socialism and its internationalist

ties. In 1972, the Sadat government expelled the Soviet advisers (who had been there since well before the Six-Day War). Surprisingly, the changed climate did not seem to affect the mutually profitable film import-export flow: in the early 1970s, Soviet film imports to Egypt exceeded those from the US (many of them being the popular "Easterns" from Central Asia), while throughout the 1970s, Egyptian popular films were screened in Soviet movie theaters to great acclaim—both trends reflected in the subsequent selections of the Tashkent festival.[73]

OTHER ARAB AND NORTH AFRICAN CINEMAS

Even beyond Egypt, the first festival program would lay the foundation for what came to be a substantial and engaged relationship with the Arab cinemas throughout the 1970s and early 1980s that was one of the distinguishing marks of the Tashkent festival. One of perhaps the most significant results of the Soviet delegations' visits to the countries of Asia and the Middle East in preparation for the festival was their realization that its original planned dates conflicted with the Carthage film festival (Journées cinématographique de Carthage, hereafter JCC). Wisely, the Soviets decided not only to change the timing of their festival to accommodate this but also to provide direct transportation from Carthage to Tashkent for the participants and guests (and after this first session, Tashkent festival would change its dates to May or early June).[74] Had the planners decided otherwise, most of the primary Arab and African filmmakers and cultural critics would not have been able to attend. Soviet adaptability on this issue signaled their understanding of the cultural and political primacy of the Carthage event for Africa and the Arab world.

CARTHAGE AND TASHKENT: TAHAR CHERIAA

The JCC was founded in 1966 under the auspices of the State Secretariat of Culture and Information of Tunisia by Tahar Cheriaa, the festival's head and Tunisia's most prominent film critic. For a brief period between 1964 and 1969, Tunisia's national policy was in line with the explicitly socialist orientation of other newly independent countries, which placed cinema under the state mandate, bringing together distributors, filmmakers, and cultural critics in charge of its organization. Unlike Egypt and Algeria, Tunisia did not develop its public-sector cinema by dictating from above but rather via the initiative of the filmmakers themselves.[75] Tunisian Company for Cinematic Production and Expansion (SATPEC) was founded in 1964 and after 1968 was given legal monopoly over not only production but also imports and distribution of foreign films in Tunisia. The SATPEC-run film studio Gammarth was also completed in 1968.

These actions, however, proved largely symbolic, ignored by both the Western companies and Tunisian independent producers.[76] And the founding of the

Carthage festival took place in amid the struggle for the national ownership of both production and distribution of cinema in Tunisia, lending urgency to its vision of creating and supporting a cinematic network of independent African and Arab states. By its second edition, in 1968, the global crises of the period (the Six-Day War, the intensification of the Vietnam War, the Prague Spring) compelled a more explicitly political focus, for which the JCC would become known. In line with radical cinema of the time, the JCC and its organizers articulated a view of cinema as an instrument serving the struggle for the cultural and political independence of the Third World. Rejecting the title of an "international festival" or any association with the FIAPF, the JCC remade itself as a forum for films from Arab African countries (although its cultural program would continue screening films from the US as well as the USSR and Cuba), its goals clearly anticipating the resolutions of the Third World Cinema Committee to further extend and radicalize this cinematic network by facilitating cultural and economic cooperation between the independent film producers of the Third World.[77]

The JCC's most internationally acknowledged contribution is probably its helping to launch the Pan-African Film Festival of Ouagadougou (FESPACO) and the Pan-African Federation of Filmmakers (FEPACI), founded in 1969 as part of the Pan-African Cultural Festival in Algiers but officially inaugurated only in 1970 at the third edition of the JCC. The Ouagadougou festival was scheduled to alternate with the JCC and included many of the same filmmakers. This relationship was a radical gesture, symbolically dissolving the long-standing difference between North and sub-Saharan Africa, enabling a more direct relationship between the Arab and sub-Saharan cinematic communities, as well as the similarly long-standing divisions between the Maghreb and Mashriq.[78] And from 1968 onward, there was an important overlap between the selections of the Carthage festival—including its prizes—and that of the Tashkent festival. The film figures from both sub-Saharan Africa and the Arab world—among them Saleh, Sembene, and Paulin Vieyra—were all familiar faces at both festivals, and their films were presented regularly at both.

The Soviet delegation to the 1968 JCC consisted of representatives of Georgian and Uzbek film studios, as well as a member of the selection committee for the Tashkent film festival.[79] In turn, Cheriaa, the founder and driving force behind the JCC, also attended the 1968 Tashkent festival: he was one of the many radical Third-Worldist cineastes who fully supported the nationalization of the national film industries (especially the distribution networks) and was dedicated to promoting cooperation of the progressive film industries across the region as a bulwark against the economic monopoly of the West in the international film market. For him, a sustained exchange of ideas and analysis based on the experience of socialist countries globally was "not only useful but . . . perhaps even necessary and inevitable."[80] He was, however, openly critical of the way the Soviet bloc took advantage of its strategic position as a superpower to get the most

favorable conditions for the distribution of its own films abroad, thus contributing to the domination of foreign markets to the disadvantage of the local cinematic production.[81]

Cheriaa, like many other radical Third-Worldists, was weary of Soviet efforts to intervene in the relationships among the progressive Arab and African cinemas. He ultimately wanted a strong Third World community to reverse the power relations with both the West and the socialist bloc. This was the justification allowing only Arab and African films to officially take part in the Carthage competition: "let others be guests—like the Arab and African filmmakers are at Cannes or Berlin," a sentiment certainly shared by many filmmakers of the period.[82] Yet he, like many others, saw participation in the Soviet bloc's festival circuit as an important opportunity to extend global networks, to make connections and discuss the critical issues of concern to Third World film industries for which the Tashkent festival provided a forum.

Moreover, in Cheriaa's view, Soviet and Eastern European cinemas offered an example of viable film industries that could stand up against the pressures of their more established and richer Western counterparts. It was particularly true in terms of the infrastructures for film exhibition: all socialist bloc countries had a considerate advantage in terms of the sheer number of screens per capita (much greater than in Egypt or Lebanon, let alone Tunisia or Iraq).[83] Combined with the affordability of movie ticket prices, the number and accessibility of exhibition venues generated extremely high national moviegoing rates even in countries without a particularly strong film industry (such as Bulgaria).[84] For Third World filmmakers, the very possibility that a group of previously geopolitically peripheral countries after the Russian Revolution could create the conditions for not only developing vibrant film cultures but for fully controlling its own spaces of production, distribution, and exhibition, effectively competing with the Western monopolies, was a source of inspiration. With the exception of Egypt (and, to some degree, Lebanon), other Arab and African countries were all in the early stages of development of their national film industries. In 1966, when the Carthage festival was founded, Tunisia had just produced its first feature film through SATPEC, Omar Khlifi's *The Dawn* (*Al-Fajr*).[85] Syrian and Iraqi cinemas followed a parallel course.[86] During the 1970s and 1980s, Tashkent, alongside the JCC, became one of the only places in the world where these films could be seen.[87]

FESTIVAL SELECTIONS: ALGERIA, MOROCCO, LEBANON, JORDAN

The Algerian film public sector, ONCIC, was represented in 1968 by Mohamed Slim Riad's *The Road* (*Al-Tariq*) and *The Winds of the Aures* (*Rih al-Awras*, 1966), by Lakhdar-Hamina, who had studied cinema in Prague; this film had also been screened at the Moscow film festival the year before, to great acclaim. Algerian postrevolutionary cinema by the late 1960s was quite established, and its situation

was in many ways a model for the region: when the film industry was nationalized, the country had 440 movie theaters, more than England or Egypt, and three times more than Morocco and Tunisia combined, and box-office sales provided enough basic financing for national production and international coproduction alike.[88] Even more undisputed was Algeria's symbolic status as the "Mecca of Revolution," the center of the Non-Aligned Movement, and the originary point of Tricontinental connections; it played a key role in mediating among these various developments.[89] By the late 1960s, Algeria's cinematic connections extended to Latin America, with both Argentina and Cuba its key interlocutors, often via the Pesaro film festival and through engagement with Italian and French leftist production companies and activists, as well as through the JCC.[90] These contacts led to the establishment of the Third World Cinema Committee, whose meetings in the early 1970s alternated between Algiers and Buenos Aires, headed on the Algerian side by Abdelaziz Tolbi and Lamine Merbah.[91] Like the Egyptian New Cinema collective, the filmmakers represented at the Third World Cinema Committee stood in opposition to the mainstream representatives of their national film industries.

These industries, in the meantime, developed an extensive relationship with the Soviet Union; in fact, the Algerians, along with the Syrians, represented the largest percentage of Arab and African students at VGIK in the Soviet period.[92] Soviet film festivals—Tashkent in particular—became a major showcase for mainstream Algerian cinema. Stylistically, these films varied from spectacular epic style, associated in particular with Lakhdar-Hamina, to the films that were more popular with Algerian audiences, which showed continuity with popular genres, such as Ahmed Rachedi's "blockbuster war film" *The Opium and the Baton* (*L'Opium et le Bâton* [*Al-Afiyun wa-al-'Asa*], 1971) and Tewfik Fares's western-cum-adventure film *The Outlaws* (*Les Hors-la-loi*, 1968), as well as some examples of cinema *djidid* or New Cinema—such as Amar Laskri's *Patrol from the East* (*Dawriyyah nahwa al-Sharq*, 1973) and Sid Ali Mazif's *The Nomads* (*Les Nomades*, 1975). The thematic focus on the War of Liberation was extremely common for Algerian cinema of the period, which fit in comfortably with the historical epic/war genre that was so popular in Tashkent throughout the 1970s (as I will explore at length in chapter 8).[93]

Moroccan cinema took a slightly different arc from that of either Algeria or Tunis, as its National Film Institute (CCM) was established earlier, in 1947. It specialized, however, almost entirely on documentary production, while commercial cinema remained in private hands. The country's first feature, *To Live* (*Al-Hayatu kifah*, 1968), by Ahmed Mesnaoui and Mohamed Tazi, was presented at the 1968 Tashkent edition, beginning a tradition for Moroccan filmmakers that extended through the 1970s. Antoine Mechawar's *Arab Medicine* (*La médecine chez les Arabes*, 1968), which came to Tashkent after winning the silver Tanit at the JCC, was an important and rare example from the Interarab Centre for Cinema and Television in Beirut. The center had become an important venue for the consolidation of cinematic activities in the region (often under the auspices of UNESCO).[94]

The Jordanian entry into the nonfiction selection at Tashkent, *Exodus 1967* (*Al-Khourouj 67*, 1968), directed by the Supervisor of the Film Section of the Jordanian Ministry of Information in Amman, Ali Siam, however, stands out for a different reason. More than its significance for the cinema of Jordan, it is notable as an early example of Palestinian cinema in exile as the film's cinematographer was Hani Jawhariyah, one of the founding members of the Palestinian Film Unit.

THE PALESTINIAN FILM UNIT

The Palestinian Film Unit (PFU) was founded in Jordan to allow young Palestinians to film the revolution as it was unfolding. Subsequently moving to Lebanon, it rapidly crystallized into a Fatah-supported movement, divided among several groups with slightly divergent political orientations but united in their goal of documenting their experience and creating a new mode of filmmaking as "a revolutionary praxis growing out of armed struggle."[95] Over almost two decades, between 1968 and 1982 (when the PLO was forced to leave Beirut), Palestinian filmmakers, almost all of them in exile, joined by other progressive Arab and some international supporters, produced a body of films and texts that both came out of and contributed to the revolutionary struggle and the creation of a national cinema—in the abeyance of its nation-state. Like Vietnam's, the Palestinian struggle was in some sense "hypervisible" to the world through the eyes of outsiders, most often from the Western point of view—even when that vision was meant in solidarity or out of humanitarian impulse. The filmmaking by the Palestinians, even more than that of the Vietnamese, was driven by both the right to self-determine the representation of a people, faced with extreme dispossession, and the need to advance the revolution. Both goals were ideally achievable only by the people themselves.

Yet while the Vietnamese struggle was autonomously administered by the Vietnamese, the Palestinian struggle and its cultural expression was, by necessity, embedded in a tight network of regional and international movements (as well as states). This was in large part because of the brute fact of Palestinian dispossession, as well as the broader geopolitical alignments of the Arab world of the 1950s and 1960s as anti-Zionist. The anti-US imperialist stance associated with support for the Palestinian movements also positioned them squarely within the Cold War divide. This shaped the geography of both the production and the circulation of Palestinian revolutionary cinema once it emerged in 1968 and, in Nadia Yaqub's words, "operated interstitially within emerging public sector cinema industries within the Arab world, as well as through co-productions and solidarity networks.[96]

The openness of the Soviet bloc to this issue was an important factor in film interchanges between the progressive Arab states and the Soviet Union. Moreover, since many Palestinian filmmakers' travel documents did not allow them to move freely in an Arab world that was divided politically, and Western countries likewise

often created obstacles to entry, the Soviet bloc visa regime was more favorable to them, making it easier to attend the festivals in Leipzig, Karlovy Vary, Moscow, or Tashkent. As a consequence, such festivals and special screenings became one of the more reliable spaces for international exhibition of Palestinian and Palestine-themed cinema. As Yaqub attests: "As the decade [1960s] drew to a close, a regular international circuit for Palestinian films had come into being. The authors of substantive new works could hope for screening at Leipzig, Tashkent, Carthage, Krakow, Damascus, and Baghdad, and perhaps the Moscow film festival. In some cases, festival screenings were followed by regional screenings and/or broadcasts on television in host countries."[97]

The first example of Palestinian filmmaking represented at an international festival, *Exodus 1967*, was made while the original members of the Palestinian Film Unit (including Jawhariyah) were working as camerapersons for Jordanian television, dividing tasks between documenting Palestinian military resistance and creating some of the Jordanian documentary production.[98] As a result, the film is hardly an example of the militant filmmaking typical of the Film Unit: moderating its politics to celebrate King Hussein of Jordan's intervention at the UN following the Six-Day War, his call to condemn the Israeli aggression and to demand the return of the occupied lands (the position of which the Soviet Union was notoriously sympathetic). But even if the film is complicit with the rhetoric of King Hussein's heroism and Jordan's progress under his rule, its footage documents unflinchingly the devastation caused by the war, drawing attention to the dispossession and experience of refugees in a way that is recognizable from the PFU's films. Siam and Jawhariyah's better known film from the same period, *Jerusalem, the Flower of All Cities* (*Zahrat al-Mada'in*, 1969), set to Fairuz's famous song, had to wait to be screened at Tashkent as part of the Jordanian program in 1976. By that time, from 1972 onward, the PLO and the more politically radical (Marxist-Leninist) Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) had regular representation at the festival, and Palestine would remain at the center of both cinematic representations and political discourses at the festival.

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN CINEMA AT TASHKENT: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Even more than for their Arab counterparts, the late 1960s was a pivotal moment for sub-Saharan African cinema, marking its arrival on the international scene as a continental phenomenon. The development of filmmaking itself was inseparable from that of the festival circuit, which was explicitly designed to support it. As Lindiwe Dovey remarks, these festivals "burst onto the scene in the 1960s as significant acts of cultural and political resistance, liberation and self-empowerment, inspiring discussions and debates about Africa, African film, African filmmakers, and African aesthetics on African soil."[99] Between 1966 and 1970, such

events included the 1966 World Festival of Negro Arts in Dakar (Senegal) and the 1969 Pan-African cultural festival of Algiers in Algeria, both of which featured film screenings and participating directors. As we have seen, this was also the foundational moment for the two long-standing film festivals in Africa—the JCC (Carthage) and FESPACO (Ouagadougou). The Pan-African Federation of Filmmakers (FEPACI) was established, spearheaded first as part of the UNESCO-sponsored roundtable on African film and television at JCC '68, just a few days prior to the Tashkent opening, and inaugurated at the next JCC session in 1970.[100] Thus, the presentation of sub-Saharan Africa at Tashkent comes in the crucial moment when, on the one hand, the organizational urgency for the filmmakers and producers was directed toward the creation of an African-specific network and African audiences, and, on the other hand, it also became possible to demonstrate the vitality of this cinema internationally.

As Rachel Gabara points out, the scholarly tendency to focus on African feature films has resulted in ignoring a whole body of documentary work produced in the early 1960s, such as Paulin Vieyra's *A Nation Is Born* (*Une nation est née: La République du Sénégal*, 1961), which won a prize at the inaugural Symposium of Young and Emerging Cinemas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America at Karlovy Vary in 1962, therefore recasting the historical time line of African filmmaking.[101] These were the films that found early exhibition venues within the Soviet sphere, culminating in Tashkent's African program. The breadth of Tashkent's range of cinematic forms constituting the festival program (which included institutional and state-produced nonfiction) is precisely what allowed for a particularly extensive showcase of African cinema. And Soviet willingness to cover the expenses of the invited guests assured the unusually wide participation of African filmmakers and functionaries and their warm reception.[102] And the festival offered a particularly useful forum for establishing international networks. Given the urgency of establishing cultural infrastructure free from colonial legacies, in the late 1960s and early 1970s many sub-Saharan African filmmakers shared Cheriaa's conviction that the way to economic independence was through partial or full national control of the film industry, in particular its distribution.[103] The Soviet bloc offered more accommodating platforms through which to explore such possibilities than the largely private European or American studio and distribution system—especially as it offered training in the technical, artistic, economic, and administrative aspects of filmmaking.

With the exception of South Africa, colonial state organizations (Colonial Film Units, French government film commissions, and the like) had traditionally governed sub-Saharan African film production. Feature fiction filmmaking had no precedent within that preexisting infrastructure, thus setting it up in postcolonial states requiring considerable support, not only for production but also artistic and technical training. While some basic training had been offered through the British Colonial Film Unit, and IDHEC in France offered job training to African film students, there had been little to no film educational opportunities or schools

FIGURE 2.1. Claude-François de Korgou, filmmaker from Niger, signing autographs at the Fourth edition of the festival, 1976. Photo used by permission of Sputnik International.

based in sub-Saharan Africa. Filmmakers were outspoken about the problem of African cinema's inevitable dependency on international support and cooperation, given the lack of proper infrastructural development.[104] Since the late 1950s, the Soviet Union had offered massive "unconditional assistance" for the development of professional cadres for Asian and African comrades, which included fully funded scholarships and special language training programs (fig. 2.1).[105] While Patrice Lumumba University in Moscow became the destination educational institution for students from Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the Moscow Film School VGIK was likewise offering opportunities for international study, which were taken up by around one hundred students from Africa between 1960 and 1989. Leningrad film school (LIKI), Film Faculty of the Prague Academy of Performing Arts (FAMU) in Prague, the School of Documentary Cinema of GDR, and the National School of Cinema in Lodz, Poland, also accepted students.[106]

To avoid becoming too dependent on any one side (West or East) for assistance, most African postcolonial states adopted the strategy of diversifying their sources of support.[107] A good example of this is Senegal, a nation that was far from being within the Soviet sphere. Léopold Sédar Senghor, the head of the Senegalese state, was a staunch opponent of socialist reforms and was supported largely by France and the US. For Senegalese filmmakers, however, the Soviet bloc was often the better choice, a respite from France, with its soft power over newly decolonized Francophone Africa, and a promise of a more egalitarian society. Unlike French institutions, their Soviet counterparts offered a clean slate with considerably more financial assistance and no explicit expectation about the outcome of training or later control over the cinematic production of the African filmmakers they supported.

SOVIET-AFRICAN CINEMATIC EXCHANGES

Thus, by 1968, key figures of the emerging African cinema had already established contacts in the Soviet Union: the most important were Guinea's Bob Sow (Sowfu) and Senegal's Ousmane Sembene and Paulin Soumanou Vieyra. A special intermediary role was also played by Sarah Maldoror. Maldoror was French, of Guadalupe parentage, and would make her most famous films in Algeria, Guinea-Bissau, and

Congo-Brazzaville, funded by the national liberation movement of Mozambique, FRELIMO. These filmmakers had already achieved successful artistic careers before their arrival in the Soviet Union (Sow and Vieyra as filmmakers, Sembene as a writer, and Maldoror as a theater actress and director in France). They did not therefore pursue a full course of study at VGIK (which took at least five years), but they did attend classes and conduct internships (or *stage*) in Soviet film studios, which gave them an opportunity to gain direct filmmaking experience.

Sow was one of the first cineastes to take advantage of this option: in 1959, less than a year after Guinea achieved independence, he, as the head of Guinea's newly nationalized film industry, went to Moscow to practice filmmaking under the supervision of Alexander Medvedkin. After this, he returned to Guinea, where he resumed his role as head of distribution for the State Film Company, Syli-Cinema.[108] His job was sourcing films directly from distributors, mostly from the socialist bloc, to be screened in both private and public sectors, thus effectively supplanting the two French companies that controlled distribution before Guinean independence.[109] Thus, Sovexportfilm and its Eastern European equivalents played a crucial role in resolving the problem of control over distribution, famously deemed the first step toward achieving independence of the African film sector.[110] Sow died in the 1970s, after years of mediating between Guinean film production and the Soviet Union, leading to Guinean students becoming, along with Ethiopia's, the most numerous at VGIK.[111]

Vieyra was another key institutional figure in the Soviet-African nexus. Film scholar and filmmaker as well as an important producer in his role as head of a national newsreel service, Actualités Sénégalaises, and one of the cofounders of both FESPACO and FEPACI, his experience in the Soviet Union dated back to the 1957 World Festival of Youth and Students. In his account of the festival's film screenings and discussions in his 1969 volume *Le cinéma et l'Afrique*, Vieyra describes their formative impact on him as a filmmaker and critic. He visited the Soviet Union again in 1962, this time as a cameraman documenting the Senegalese prime minister Mamadou Dia's visit to Moscow, Leningrad, and Tashkent (as well as Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary), which allowed him to reconnect with his friend Sembene, who was studying in Moscow during that period.

Both Sembene and Vieyra repeatedly articulated the importance of the Soviet film sphere as the meeting place for African filmmakers and artists and the opportunity to see the films of his African colleagues. In his book, he favorably compared the festival in Moscow to an African film festival in Lille in which he participated just a few months later, contrasting both the "Soviet kindness and hospitality" and the wide range of countries represented there to the openly paternalistic (toward its African participants) tone of the Lille event and its implicit prohibition of political discussions.[112] Vieyra was a regular participant at Tashkent, where he claimed to have had his first chance to see films from Ghana and Somalia in 1968 and, in 1972, to have seen the celebrated *Soleil O*, by Mel Hondo.[113] This claim is striking

FIGURE 2.2. Ousmane Sembene with Tamara Khanum at the Afro-Asian Writers Conference, Tashkent, 1958. Photo from author's private collection.

since Vieyra was extremely active on the African film festival circuit in Europe and, alongside Cheriaa and Sembene was directly involved in the establishment of FESPACO. Yet many of the films he discusses in *Le cinéma africain*—and, in doing so, laying the foundation for African film history discourses for generations to come—he saw first in Tashkent.[114]

If Sembene saw himself first as a writer, Vieyra could be rightfully called the first historian and critic of sub-Saharan African cinema.[115] Both were attracted by the broadly based literary and artistic curriculum of the Soviet film schools and were keen to promote criticism and history as a crucial part of film culture. In his published work, Vieyra not only surveys the broadest range of African cinematic expression of the time but often offers uncompromisingly sharp critiques of African films he sees as failing in their aesthetic pursuit.[116] As Dovey notes, in his earliest writings, Vieyra somewhat surprisingly singles out Czech films as exemplary for their "human qualities: youth, freshness, spontaneity," and for the "singular power of their images" and their "psychological and emotional density."[117] Evidencing the importance of aesthetic criteria for the early development of African cinemas, as well as the wide range of international styles that shaped it, Vieyra's writing underscores a truly cosmopolitan cinematic formation. Transcending the ideological position by which these foundational figures of African cinema are usually discussed, their openness and exposure to a wide variety of international cinemas was ultimately greater than that of many of their more celebrated Western counterparts, and their active participation at the socialist bloc's film circuit further allowed for a considerably broader global outlook.

Vieyra's collaborator and friend Ousmane Sembene was without a doubt the most visible figure in establishing and maintaining the Soviet-African nexus. The Soviet view of the two is expressed in a volume dedicated to the cinemas represented at the Tashkent festival: the section on Sembene bears the title of "Father of African Cinema" and on Vieyra "The Pioneer of African Cinema."[118] Originally sent to Prague by the Communist Party of France, of which he was a member, Sembene participated in the 1958 Afro-Asian Writers Congress (fig. 2.2), together with Mario Pinto de Andrade, Angolan poet and politician, who was the founder of the Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) and its first president, and

his Mozambican counterpart—the poet and FRELIMO politician Marcelino dos Santos. Sembene knew de Andrade from Paris, where as the editor of *Présence Africaine* he had published Sembene's first story; they were part of the same communist literary circle involved in political organizing of Africans in France around the liberation struggles in Congo, Angola, Mozambique, Guinea Bissau, and Cape Verde (Sembene founded the Marseille chapter of PAIGC in 1958).[119]

In *From Internationalism to Postcolonialism*, Rossen Djagalov gives a compelling account of the Afro-Asian Writers Congress in the creation and promotion of Soviet-Afro-Asian cultural dialogue and draws out the continuities between the 1958 literary event and its accompanying film festival and the 1968 Tashkent film festival.[120] After his participation at the Writers Congress, Sembene returned to Moscow in 1962 to be trained at the Gorky Film Studio, where he spent nine months under the tutelage of Mark Donskoi, who also led the workshops at VGIK that Sembene attended. During the 1960s, Sembene continued not only to make films (and write novels), but also, alongside Cheriaa and Vieyra, played a key role in the creation of the pan-African cinematic networks: as president of the Jury at Carthage in 1968 and a leading figure in both FESPACO and FEPACI. Given these roles, his participation in the events organized in the Soviet Union further demonstrate their importance for the endogenous African film industry. At Tashkent he presented *The Money Order* (*Mandabi*, 1968), his first feature film made in Senegal in the Wolof language—but funded by the French National Cinema Center and coproduced with his own company, Domirev, and Comptoir Français du Film Production (CFFP).[121] *Mandabi* quickly became an international sensation, winning the special jury prize at Venice the same year and shown around the World as the prime example of cinema emerging from sub-Saharan Africa.

As the most widely internationally recognized African filmmaker of that period, he toured widely in Europe and the US, successfully navigating the Cold War divides. In a 1972 *Film Quarterly* interview, he remarked that he didn't speak of his experiences in Russia when in America, just as he didn't speak of his American experiences when in Russia—pointing to a sort of diplomatic code that kept him internationally connected.[122] This was generally true, but he was always outspoken on the subject of imperialist wars and the US's role in them; thus, in a 1973 interview with *Jeune Afrique*, when he was asked about the future of Africa, he responded: "The thing that I hope for above all is that the Vietnam War ends. I can no more forget Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique, South Guinea, or the Palestinians. Behind all of it one finds American power. I think Africa can change many things in all of these conflicts. It would be enough to not keep silent."[123]

Similar motivations led Maldoror to accept a scholarship to study filmmaking in the USSR: together with Sembene, she was part of Donskoi's VGIK workshop in 1961 and 1962.[124] Maldoror had already established a reputation in French theater as one of the founders—along with Ivorian filmmaker Timité Bassori, Ababacar Samb Makharam, and Toto Bissainthe—of the first Black theater company in

France: Les Griots.[125] In addition to studying Russian and attending VGIK workshops, she also served in Moscow as assistant director on Donskoi's film *Hello, Children!* (*Zdravstvuite, deti!*, 1962), an antiwar tear-jerker set at the famous Soviet international summer camp in Crimea, depicting the friendship of a group of children with a Japanese girl suffering effects from the nuclear explosion at Hiroshima. As the film included a multiracial cast of young actors, it is easy to imagine Donskoi's motivation to include Maldoror on the work crew. After her two-year stay in the Soviet Union, Maldoror joined the pioneers of the African liberation movements in Guinea, Algeria, and Guinea-Bissau alongside her partner (and MPLA leader) de Andrade. In Algeria she worked as an assistant to Gillo Pontecorvo and William Klein. Her first short, *Monangambee* (1968), was funded in part by Algeria and received an award at the Carthage film festival, as did her first feature, *Sambizanga* in 1972 (filmed in Congo, with the participation of Congolese militants), which was also screened in Tashkent in 1974.

Maldoror's achievement was quite unique: she was not only the only African woman filmmaker at that time but also a committed pan-Africanist-internationalist, whose goal was to make the African liberation struggles visible, on par with Vietnam, to the rest of the world.[126] Her political position in Angola was openly aligned with the MPLA's Marxist-Leninist (and Soviet-supported) orientation of the struggle. As Marissa Moorman asserts in her discussion of *Sambizanga:* "By 1966, three nationalist organizations, mentioned earlier, were fighting against the Portuguese in Angola. Anticolonial sentiment may have been unequivocal but the implications of this in terms of national rule and national affect were not. Therefore, when *Sambizanga* won the grand prize at the Carthage film festival in 1972, it was not only a show of support for the Angolan independence struggle generally but for a particular interpretation of that struggle and for the MPLA as the legitimate representative of the Angolan people."[127]

In the heated moment of armed struggle preceding the 1975 victory, international solidarity through consciousness-raising was an important focal point for these African revolutionaries fighting not only *against* colonialism but *for* socialism—and for this, Tashkent provided a perfect forum, making Maldoror its perfect spokesperson.

THE SUB-SAHARAN FESTIVAL SELECTION

Overall, Tashkent's selection represented a much wider geographic range than is usually represented in the English-language histories of African cinema. Guinea was represented, among others, through VGIK alumnus Costa N'Diagne, whose 1966 graduation film, *Men of the Dance* (*Les hommes de la danse*), was awarded the Gold Antilope at the World Festival of Negro Arts in Dakar. This coincided with a watershed moment in pan-African politics, the coup in Ghana that overthrew Kwame Nkrumah and reversed his prosocialist policies, creating a rift between

the more right-leaning, US-aligned states (such as Senegal) and the leaders of the radical African left (the so-called Casablanca bloc).[128] One of the manifestations of this conflict was a diplomatic crisis between Ghana and Guinea, after the Ghanaian government held a group of in-transit Guinean diplomats hostage. As Senegal sided with the new Ghanaian government, Sekou-Toure, in protest, chose to boycott the Organisation for African Unity meeting, as well as the festival in Dakar (broadly associated with the *négritude* movement that Senghor had helped form).[129]

As repercussions for his film's entry to the Dakar festival against his country's boycott, Diagne was unable to work for almost a year after his return to Guinea, but he came to officially represent Guinea with two films at Tashkent: *Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow* (1968), which had been screened in Carthage and Leipzig the same year and *Eight and Twenty*, a documentary on the celebration of the eighth anniversary of Guinean independence. A Guinean feature (based on a popular theater play) *Sergeant Bakary Woolen* (*Le Sergent Bakary Woolen*, 1966), by Mohamed Lamine Akin, rounded out the Guinean selection. Unfortunately, both Guinean filmmakers fell victim to the state repressions following the November 1970 attempted coup against Sekou-Toure; both returned to the Guinean film industry only by the 1980s.[130]

Yet the Soviet leadership of the Tashkent festival deliberately overlooked these rifts and issued invitations to all three nations: thus, Senegal, Guinea, and Ghana were all represented at the 1968 Tashkent festival. Ghana submitted its second feature film—the first one directed by a Ghanaian—*No Tears for Ananse* (Sam Aryeetey, 1965), which was also submitted to Locarno the same year. Unlike many other African countries, Ghana had inherited a considerable film (and television) infrastructure from colonial times, as well as a trained cadre. It nationalized its film industry early, in 1957, through the Ghana Film Industry Corporation.[131] Moreover, even more than other African nations, since its independence Ghana "diversified" the geography of its filmmakers' training. Thus, Aryeetey, for example, was trained initially at the colonial Gold Coast Film Unit, then in England, and on return worked and eventually led the Film Corporation, despite the fact that the organization lost much of its original ambitions after Nkrumah's fall.[132]

The documentary program also included some of the first films made in independent Cameroon, Sierra Leone, Libya, Dahomey (now Benin), and Uganda. The most widely commented on of the documentary films was perhaps Chad's French-educated Eduard Sailly's "Third Day" ("Le troisième jour," 1967)—a fifteen-minute black-and-white film without any dialogue or voice-over, depicting the state of mind of a mourning fisherman.[133] It was also notable for Malian Souleymane Cissé's international festival debut, *Source of Inspiration* (*Source d'inspiration*, 1968), made while Cissé was still a student at VGIK, undergoing the full course of study after his initial one year-*stage*. On returning to Mali with his graduate degree in 1969, he was hired as a film director by the Film Section of the Ministry of Information

of Mali (SCINFOMA), where he produced more than thirty newsreels and several documentary films. In 1972 he made his first independent film, *Five Days in a Life* (*Cinq jours d'une vie*, 1972), which together with *The Sanke Celebration* (*Fête du Sankè*, 1971) was shown at Tashkent 1972. Cissé had to wait for recognition in the West for another decade and a half, when his film *The Light* (*Yeleen*, 1987) won the Jury Prize at Cannes, heralding a new interest in sub-Saharan African cinema. Recognized internationally as a global art cinema auteur, Cissé nonetheless made clear in his interviews that to gain that status, he had to make compromises to make African filmmaking acceptable to Western audiences. He discussed the difference between *Yeleen* and his earlier, more explicitly political films: "After I made *Finyé* and *Baara*, I was labeled a political filmmaker, some said my films are too didactic. But an artist should have the freedom to experiment with theme, content, and narrative strategy. As my own experiences have shown, what you narrate may also put you into trouble. Sometimes, in order to survive a hostile environment, one is forced, not necessarily to disarm, but to construct a narrative that is not too political nor devoid of pungent criticism of the system."[134] In a reversal of the (neo)liberal modality with which Cissé came to negotiate in the late 1980s, films at the Soviet film festivals were expected to be explicitly political, although the extent to which they allowed for any "pungent criticism of the system" is highly debatable, to say the least.

CONCLUSION

Most films at the festival, regardless of their origins, explicitly addressed social realities of postcolonial contemporary experiences, creating dramatic tension out of class structures and inequalities. Very few films fall into the category of "cinema of denunciation"—that is, directly focused on exposing structures of economic or political oppression. Most of the others explored the tension between "the old" (understood alternatively as either traditional culture or the remnants of the colonial regime, or neocolonial forces) and the emergence of "the new" (the modern, often socialist, state), often framed within the individual or family unit. This describes not only the public-sector films of Arab and African countries but also "independent" Japanese films or Central Asian poetic cinema. In the historiographies of their respective national cinemas, these films often fall under the "socially engaged" or "social realist" or "humanist realist" label. They range in their acceptance or rejection of the codes of conventional language of commercial (Egyptian—or Bombay-based—or Hollywood-esque or Stalinist socialist-realist): some fully embrace it in the service of legibility and popular reach; others experiment with new codes (often ones associated with the "New" or New Wave" cinemas) to convey greater authenticity in their portrayal of social and cultural realities and subjective experiences of them ("poetic realism"). Considered overly didactic and dogmatic in film histories, not easily positioned either in relation to

"low" popular culture or to the more formally experimental art cinema, they have tended to be overlooked in scholarship on world cinema.

As we will see, while the 1968 edition of Tashkent presented a much more conservative and, as a result, harmonious body of films, the cultural New Left of the late 1960s came to manifest itself more visibly at the festival in following decades, disrupting this harmony. In this coverage of the whole sweep of socialist cinema, the Tashkent festival truly becomes a rare showcase of the power and vitality of the left-oriented cinemas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America.