

UCLA

UCLA Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Film and Politics in the Lusophone World (1960s—1970s)

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8rj7p4zp>

Author

Cordeiro da Silva Dias, Ines

Publication Date

2016

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Film and Politics in the Lusophone World

(1960s—1970s)

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy
in Hispanic Languages and Literatures

by

Inês Cordeiro da Silva Dias

2016

© Copyright by

Inês Cordeiro da Silva Dias

2016

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Film and Politics in the Lusophone World

(1960s—1970s)

by

Inês Cordeiro da Silva Dias

Doctor of Philosophy in Hispanic Languages and Literatures

University of California, Los Angeles, 2012

Professor John Randal Johnson, Chair

In my dissertation I analyze how politics and film interact in Lusophone (i.e., Portuguese-speaking) countries in Europe (Portugal), South America (Brazil) and Africa (Mozambique and Angola) between the 1950s and the 1980s. During this period the countries in question were undergoing significant political changes, and film was an important medium used in the process of transformation. Portugal went from a fascist dictatorship to a democracy in 1974, Angola and Mozambique became independent in 1975, and Brazil became a military dictatorship in 1964. One of the purposes of my study is to explore and contrast the film-related policies in effect under different governments.

In the case of Portugal, fascist colonialism used film as a form of propaganda to support its occupation of Mozambique, Angola, Cabo Verde and Guinea-Bissau. With the 1974 April

revolution that ended the dictatorship, film was used to advance the democratic values of the revolution. The previously mentioned African countries, especially Angola and Mozambique, used Third Cinema as a counter-discourse to Portuguese propaganda, showing in a series of documentaries how their struggle for independence was legitimate. In the case of Brazil, directors of Cinema Novo criticized neocolonialism in Brazil; the movement began in the late fifties, but underwent through significant changes when a military coup established a dictatorship that would last until 1985.

In spite of the extensive common ground among the diverse Lusophone countries, very few studies have thus far used a transatlantic approach. I start from Gilroy's conception of the Atlantic Ocean as a space of cultural exchange, and from Shu Mei Shih and Françoise Lionnet's notion of minor transnationalism to explore such issues.

The dissertation of Inês Cordeiro da Silva Dias is approved.

Françoise Lionnet

José Luiz dos Passos

María Teresa de Zubiaurre

John Randal Johnson, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2016

Table of Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	1
<u>PART I—Brazil</u>	
<i>Chapter 1</i>	11
- The Origins of Cinema Novo: A New Cinema is Born	
<i>Chapter 2</i>	55
- Cinema Novo and the Military Dictatorship	
<u>PART II—Portugal</u>	
<i>Chapter 3</i>	85
- Portuguese Estado Novo Film and Colonial Propaganda	
<i>Chapter 4</i>	145
- Cinema de Abril	
<u>PART III—Lusophone Africa</u>	
<i>Chapter 5</i>	186
- Liberation Cinema After Independence in Lusophone Africa	
<i>Chapter 6</i>	229
- Filming the Nation After Independence: Mozambique and Angola	
<i>Conclusion</i>	289

List of Figures

Figure 1—“Portugal Não é um País Pequeno”	38
Figure 2— <i>Barravento</i>	94
Figure 3— <i>Kuxa Kanema</i>	255

Acknowledgments

This dissertation would not have been possible without the contribution of many people and institutions, which I would like to thank. First, I must thank my advisor, Randal Johnson, for his invaluable support throughout these five years, for his great insights and comments, and for always being available when I needed him. I would also like to thank the other members of my committee, José Luiz dos Passos, Maite Zubiaurre, and Françoise Lionnet, who were always available to assess my work and give me suggestions.

I also want to acknowledge the following UCLA funds that financed my research trips to Portugal, Mozambique, and Brazil: the Ben and Rue Pine Travel Award, the International Institute Fieldwork Fellowship, the Harry and Yvonne Lenart Graduate Travel Fellowship, and the Research Travel Grant from the UCLA Graduate Division.

In Portugal, I wish to thank the Conservation Center ANIM (Arquivo Nacional das Imagens em Movimento) at the Portuguese Cinematheque, and in particular Sara Moreira and Luís Gameiro for their assistance. In Brazil, I wish to thank the Brazilian Cinematheque in São Paulo, in particular Alexandre Miyazato, and the Cinematheque of the Museum of Modern Art (MAM) in Rio de Janeiro, with a special thanks to Fabricio Felice and Hernani Heffner for their help. In Mozambique, I want to thank the Instituto Nacional de Audiovisual e Cinema (INAC), especially Djalma Lourenço (the Institute's President) and Cristalino Castigo.

My interviews with filmmakers were also fundamental to this project, and I would like to thank Camilo de Sousa (Mozambique) for spending several days telling me about the history of film in Mozambique and for giving me essential information, as well as facilitating contacts with other people that I should interview. In Mozambique, the interviews with Gabriel Mondlane,

Cristalino Castigo, Polly Gaster, Luís Carlos Patraquim (who I interviewed in Lisbon), Licínio de Azevedo, Mia Couto, and Joaquim Lopes Barbosa (who kindly gave me access to his film), were also essential, and I would like to thank all of them for their availability and for all the information that they shared with me. Francisco Júnior, Cristina Dias, and Dinis Martins were an important help in giving me contacts and personal support during my stay in Maputo.

In Brazil, I would like to thank José Luís Cabaço, Murilo Salles, and Nelson Pereira dos Santos for their interviews, and to Ondjaki, Rita Chaves, Vavy Pacheco Borges, and Ivelise Ferreira for facilitating important contacts for these interviews. I would also like to thank Allan Ribeiro and Martha Penna for their personal support during my stays in Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo.

To conclude, I would like to extend my personal gratitude to my parents, Manuel and Quirina Dias, for their support and encouragement, and to Rita Bernardes, Nuno Marques, Duarte Drummond Braga, Carlos Pio, Paul Cella, Elizabeth Warren, Camilo Gomides, and Joseph Vogel for our intellectual discussions about my dissertation and other scholarly topics and all their help, without which this dissertation would not have been possible.

VITA

Education

M.A. Comparative Studies. Center for Comparative Studies, University of Lisbon. July 2008.

B. A. Modern Languages and Literatures—Portuguese Studies. University of Lisbon, July 2004.

PROFESSIONAL APPOINTMENTS

2006-2011. Lecturer, Camões Institute, University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras.

GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS

2015-2016. Dissertation Year Fellowship. Graduate Division, UCLA.

2014. Ben and Rue Pine Travel Award, Department of Spanish and Portuguese, UCLA.

International Institute Fieldwork Fellowship, International Institute, UCLA.

Research Travel Grant, Graduate Division, UCLA.

Summer Research Grant, Latin American Institute, UCLA (awarded and declined).

2013. Harry and Yvonne Lenart Graduate Travel Fellowship, Humanities Division, UCLA.

Ben and Rue Pine Travel Award, Department of Spanish and Portuguese, UCLA.

2011-2012. Del Amo Graduate Fellowship, Department of Spanish and Portuguese, UCLA.

2005. Luso-American Foundation Travel Research Grant, Luso-American Foundation.

PUBLICATIONS

2016. Review of Cowans, Jon, *Empire Films and the Crisis of Colonialism, 1946–1959*. H-

Diplo, H-Net Reviews. April, 2016.

- 2010.** “‘O País das Maravilhas’ e ‘A Lata de Lixo’: Fronteira e Identidade Nacional em *Teatro*, de Bernardo Carvalho.” *Tinta*, vol. 10 (Fall). 69-74. Web. (www.tintaucsb.com).
- 2007.** “A Mulher como Lugar do Outro em Cesário Verde.” *Cesário Verde: Visões de Artista*, Ed. Helena Carvalhão Buescu and Paula Morão, Lisbon: Campo das Letras. 127-135. Print.
- 2007.** “*O Livro de Alda*, de Abel Botelho: o Poder Destrutivo da Sexualidade Feminina na Sociedade Burguesa Novecentista.” *Portuguese Literary and Cultural Studies 12 (The Other Nineteenth Century)*. Ed. Kathryn Sánchez. University of Massachusetts Dartmouth: Center for Portuguese Studies and Culture. 333-340. Print.
- 2007.** “Scritto sul corpo: *The Bluest Eye* di Toni Morrison.” *I cinque sensi (per tacer del sesto) – Quaderni di Synapsis VI*. Ed. Francesco Ghelli. Firenze: Le Monnier. 194-202. Print.
- 2006.** “Um Monstro da Cidade Moderna: A Figura da Prostituta em Toulouse-Lautrec.” *Textos e Pretextos*, nº 8 (Primavera/ Verão). 34-43. Print.
- 2006.** “A Reconstrução depois da catástrofe: o caos como condição de uma nova ordem.” *ACT 14 – 1755: Catástrofe, Memória e Arte*. Ed. Helena Carvalhão Buescu, et al., Lisboa. 307-314. Print.

Introduction

In his book *Third Cinema in the Third World*, Teshome Gabriel identified a Third World film culture that arose in the 1960's, called "Third Cinema," which "was built on the rejection of the concepts and propositions of traditional cinema, as represented by Hollywood." According to Gabriel, Third Cinema was meant to "immerse itself in the lives and struggles of the peoples of the Third World" (Gabriel xi). This movement was more concerned with a political approach to film than with questions of style or aesthetics, and it inaugurated a new way of thinking about cinema in the context of Third World countries, in an attempt to create a new form of depicting these realities through film. The movement was born in Latin America, with Brazilian Cinema Novo being an integral part, but soon won followers throughout the world.

My objective in this dissertation is to study the different expressions of political ideologies through film, how it can be used to endorse power and ruling ideologies, or to subvert them, either through criticism or by a call to revolutionary action. The different dimensions of identity, colonialism and neocolonialism underlie these problems and affect cinematic production. My dissertation discusses how film and politics interact in the Lusophone world, with a special focus on Brazil, Portugal, Mozambique, and Angola. I focus on the 1960s and 1970s, when the countries in question underwent significant political transformations, and film was an important medium in the process of change. Portugal went from a fascist dictatorship to a democracy in 1974, Angola and Mozambique became independent in 1975, and Brazil became a military dictatorship in 1964. In each case, I discuss the political use of film both before and after these transformations. In relation to Brazil, I examine the aesthetics and political strategies of the

Cinema Novo movement both before and after the military coup. In the case of Portugal, I focus on the ways film was used as propaganda in support of African colonialism prior to the 1974 revolution, then on its usage to advance democratic values after the fall of the dictatorship. In Angola and Mozambique, filmmakers used Third Cinema during the war of liberation as a counter-discourse to Portuguese propaganda, and as an important component of cultural policy after independence. In Mozambique, in fact, the creation of a film institute was one of the government's most important cultural projects.

The concept of Third Cinema was first advanced by the Argentinians Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino in the text "Towards a Third Cinema," published in 1969. Solanas and Getino distinguish three types of cinema: first cinema is the sort of productions that follow the model of Hollywood, which have as main goals entertainment and box office profit, and that usually convey a bourgeois worldview (41-42). Second cinema, also known as *cinema d'auteur*, "demanded that the filmmaker be free to express himself in non-standard language and inasmuch as it was an attempt at cultural decolonization" (42). They use as examples the French "*nouvelle vague*" and Brazilian Cinema Novo. The figure of the director is central to this type of cinema, but loses its importance in the context of Third Cinema, where the political message becomes the main focus of film. The documentary genre tends to be privileged and the collective message is far more important than the need for personal expression. We find many metaphors that associate film with war: Solanas and Getino defend a guerrilla cinema, "with the camera as our rifle" (49). This idea of "guerrilla cinema" materializes, for instance, in the liberation cinema of Angola and Mozambique, when the directors would travel to the liberated areas to film how the guerrilla movements fought against Portuguese colonialism.

Solanas and Getino defend that the role of the spectator is fundamental in the context of Third Cinema. It is not enough to have a passive audience that merely consumes the films: the films must educate and incite to action, and therefore be part of the revolution. If the films are successful, they become a cinema of the masses:

This *cinema of the masses*, which is prevented from reaching beyond the sectors representing the masses, provokes with each showing, as in a revolutionary military incursion, a liberated space, *a decolonized territory*. The showing can be turned into a kind of political event, which, according to Fanon, could be a “liturgical act, a privileged occasion for human beings to hear or be heard.” (Solanas and Getino 53)

This is precisely the opposite of what happens with most Hollywood cinema, which is usually a form of escapist entertainment. In fact, Hollywood cinema was seen as an important enemy to fight, especially in the context of Brazilian Cinema Novo and Portuguese cinema of the revolution of 1974. Hollywood dominated domestic markets in both Brazil (Johnson and Stam 18) and Portugal (Costa 30), and it suffocated national cinema by taking over of the vast majority of the national movie theaters. Therefore, the national films had little to no space to be screened and therefore struggled to recoup the costs of production. In both contexts, the filmmakers demanded laws that may protect national cinema and create quotas for national films to be exhibited. However, there was another problem: audiences that had become so used to Hollywood cinema that they showed little or no interest in national films. The filmmakers then faced another challenge, that of educating the audiences to watch national cinema. This will be a major challenge that most directors have in mind, both in their theory and in their praxis.

Hollywood cinema was therefore an important part of what they saw as cultural colonialism, imposing a lifestyle and a worldview that was often against the interests of a large part of the population. Franz Fanon was a major influence for Solanas and Getino's notion of Third Cinema, especially his book *The Wretched of the Earth*. Published originally in 1963, in the context of the Algerian war against French colonization, Fanon analyzes the psychology of the colonized and discusses the possible ways to fight for and achieve liberation. The most influential chapters are "On Violence" and "On National Culture." Fanon advances the argument that one of the strategies of the colonizer was to disparage the cultures of the colonized, claim them to be inferior or "uncivilized," so that the colonizer could impose his own cultural frame and make the colonized believe that he was inferior and therefore should passively accept the rule of the invader. Reclaiming national culture became an essential step of national liberation: "National culture in the underdeveloped countries, therefore, must lie at the very heart of the liberation struggle these countries are waging." (168)

According to Fanon, the violence of colonialism results in the violence of the colonized, but this violence is liberating because it serves to unite all the colonized individuals against their oppressor:

The arrival of the colonist signified syncretically the death of indigenous society, cultural lethargy, and petrification of the individual. For the colonized, life can only materialize from the rotting cadaver of the colonist. [...]

But it so happens that for the colonized this violence is invested with positive, formative features because it constitutes their only work. This violent praxis is totalizing

since each individual represents a violent link in the great chain, in the almighty body of violence rearing up in reaction to the primary violence of the colonizer. (50)

At the individual level, violence is a cleansing force. It rids the colonized of their inferiority complex, of their passive and despairing attitude. (51)

When Solanas and Getino speak of a guerrilla cinema, they clearly have Fanon in mind. Their case against the cultural hegemony of Hollywood cinema also has its roots in Fanon's writings. Both concepts were also central to the Brazilian Cinema Novo, and that is particularly striking in Glauber Rocha's manifesto "An Esthetic of Hunger" (1965), which became the most important theoretical text of the movement. Rocha claims that hunger "is the essence of our society" (70). Hunger should be intellectually understood. Latin American cinema must therefore adopt hunger as an esthetic and political statement: "the most noble cultural manifestation of hunger is violence. [...] From Cinema Novo it should be learned that an esthetic of violence, before being primitive, is revolutionary. It is the initial moment when the colonizer becomes aware of the colonized. Only when confronted with violence does the colonizer understand, through horror, the strength of the culture he exploits" (70). The esthetic of hunger is present both in the stories and in the characters depicted in the films of this period, and also in the artistic options taken by the Brazilian filmmakers. Faced with very small budgets to direct their films, they opted to use that scarcity of resources as an esthetic statement.

The writings of Franz Fanon also had a significant impact in the cinemas of Angola and Mozambique, both before and after independence. However, Amílcar Cabral was the most influential thinker in both contexts. He was the leader of the PAIGC—Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde ("African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cape

Verde”), and one of the most important intellectuals of liberation in Africa. Cabral had similar views regarding the importance of culture in the process of decolonization, and he defended that national liberation was necessarily an act of culture (225). However, he did not share Fanon’s theory of violence and race:

Cabral’s Pan-Africanism was controversial in that it was “nonracial” (antiracist) in the sense in which the South African movement came to define the term. Pan-Africanism for Cabral, in other words, was not about skin colour, nor was it about a romanticization of the African past. It was truly about a revolutionized African world and the creation of connections that could link popular democratic forces to combat colonialism and neocolonialism. (Manji and Fletcher 11-12)

His ideas were central to liberation movements in Angola and Mozambique, and in particular to the creation of the Mozambican National Film Institute immediately after independence. Another fundamental concept developed by Cabral was his understanding of nation-building: “the building of the revolutionary movement was actually the building of Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verdean nations. It meant respecting the multiethnic nature of Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde, as well as the need to transcend ethnic identity and match it—rather than replace it entirely—with a national identity” (Manji and Fletcher 10). Angola and Mozambique faced similar challenges—in fact this was one of the major challenges of most African nations in the wake of independence—and Cabral’s theories were instrumental in the imagining of a national identity, which became one of the dominant themes of Angolan and Mozambican independence cinemas.

In fact, the problem of national identity was a major theme in all of the contexts that I analyze in this study. As Robert Stam has pointed out,

it might be argued that precisely because of the third world's neo-colonized status, its intellectuals/ filmmakers have necessarily been concerned with the ramifications of nationalism. Hollywood filmmakers enjoy the luxury of of being "above" petty nationalist concerns only because they can take for granted the projection of a national power which facilitates the making and the dissemination of their films. In the Third World, in contrast, national power rarely provides a quiet substratum of confidence.

(Stam 243)

The concern with national identity becomes clear in Angola, Mozambique, and Brazil, but how does Portugal fit in the equation? Even though Portugal is part of Europe, it has always been a peripheral country, and it is also in a position of dependency towards other European nations, such as England, France or Germany. As Boaventura de Sousa Santos has noted, Portugal is both a colonizer and a colonized country (in chapters three and four I explore this contradiction and how it is reflected in film), and therefore suffers from the same problems of self-representation that a colonized nation has ("Between Prospero" 11). The problem of national identity is one of the central issues in my dissertation, as this is one of the main concerns of all the film movements that I discuss. The political transitions that marked both decades in the countries here studied further destabilize the idea of nationhood in every case. In this context, Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities* has become an important reference in my approach. Anderson advances that "print-language is what invents nationalism" (134), because it creates a

community of readers that can share through newspapers, literature, etc., the same national narrative with their fellow citizens, even if they never met and live miles away from each other.

However, if Anderson attributes to print-language the creation of nationalism, what is the role of cinema? Print-language created nationalism, but Third World nations still have to deal with unsettled national identities that are constantly shaken because of their inability to overcome their neocolonial status. The development of cinema, radio, television, and now the internet serve the same function of print-language, and can even include in the imagined community of the nation other national languages, as Anderson has pointed out:

It is not clear yet whether thirty years from now there will be a generation of Mozambicans who speak only Mozambique-Portuguese. But, in this late twentieth century, it is not necessarily the case that the emergence of such a generation is a *sine qua non* for Mozambiquian [sic] national solidarity. In the first place, advances in communications technology, especially radio and television, give print allies unavailable a century ago. Multilingual broadcasting can conjure up the imagined community to illiterates and populations with different mother-tongues. (135)

In fact, in Mozambique the vast majority of the population was illiterate and did not speak Portuguese. Film became a more effective medium to reach its citizens, even in the rural areas, where mobile cinema would bring the news to the population, as I discuss in chapter six. As Ella Shohat and Robert Stam have noted, “The cinema’s institutional ritual of gathering a community—spectators who share a region, language, and culture—homologizes, in a sense, the symbolic gathering of the nation. Anderson’s sense of the nation as ‘horizontal comradeship’ evokes the movie audience as a provisional ‘nation’ forged by spectatorship” (103).

Another important concept that shapes my dissertation is the notion of “minor transnationalism” advanced by Françoise Lionnet and Shu-mei Shih. They point out how the paradigm of Derridean deconstruction has become important to criticize the center, but how that is not enough: “Critiquing the center, when it stands as an end in itself, seems only to enhance it; the center remains the focus and the main object of study. The deconstructive dyad center/margin thus appears to privilege marginality only to end up containing it” (3). My attempt here is precisely to shift that center. As I explained in this introduction, it was in Latin America that a new cinema was born in the 1960s, a cinema that wanted to create a new language and a new aesthetic able to represent the Latin American realities. Third Cinema and Brazilian Cinema Novo were groundbreaking in this attempt, and the movement echoed to other parts of the world (Gabriel 1). The first two chapters of my dissertation, “The Origins of Cinema Novo: A New Cinema is Born” and “Cinema Novo and the Military Dictatorship,” focus on Brazilian Cinema Novo and establish a theoretical framework that can be found in the cinemas of Angola, Mozambique, and Portugal (the cinema of the April revolution). The only cinema that does not fit this framework is Portuguese colonial cinema, which is of course Eurocentric, but that serves as a perfect counterpoint to Third Cinema. However, even in this case the influence of Brazil is inescapable: for instance, the texts of the Brazilian sociologist Gilberto Freyre that develop the concept of lusotropicalism were central to the development of a Portuguese colonial identity that differentiated itself from other European colonialisms.

Lionnet and Shih’s definition of the transnational is also useful to illuminate the cultural exchanges between Lusophone filmmakers that took place in the 1960s and in the 1970s: “the transnational designates spaces and practices acted upon by border-crossing agents, be they

dominant or marginal. [...] The transnational [...] can be conceived as a space of exchange and participation wherever processes of hybridization occur and where it is still possible for cultures to be produced and to be performed without necessary mediation from the center” (5). In the contexts that I analyze, the filmmakers circulated between countries: for instance, Mozambican Ruy Guerra became a leading director of Brazilian Cinema Novo. When Mozambique became independent he returned to his home country to contribute to the Mozambican National Film Institute, and he took with him other Brazilians who also participated in the building and training of the Film Institute. Glauber Rocha, on the other hand, flew to Portugal immediately after the revolution of April 1974, and participated in the collective film *As Armas e o Povo*.

Chapters three and four, “Portuguese Estado Novo Film and Colonial Propaganda” and “Cinema de Abril,” are dedicated to Portugal. In chapter three I analyze the colonial propaganda films produced in the context of the Estado Novo dictatorship. In chapter four I focus on the films directed in the wake of the April revolution, and how these films deal with the reconstruction of a democratic state. Chapters five and six, “Liberation Cinema After Independence in Lusophone Africa” and “Filming the Nation After Independence: Mozambique and Angola,” are dedicated to Angola and Mozambique. In chapter five I discuss the films that defend the cause of the liberation armies fighting against Portuguese colonialism and depict the point of view of Angolans and Mozambicans in film for the first time. Chapter six concentrates on the development of a national cinema in Angola and in Mozambique after independence, and how film was used to advance an idea of nationhood.

Chapter 1

The Origins of Cinema Novo: A New Cinema is Born

*“...uma revolução que pretendia inventar
um cinema para o país
ou um país para o cinema”*
Cacá Diegues, 115

Brazilian Cinema Novo was one of the most important film movements of the sixties, and it would have repercussions not only in the cinema of Latin America, but also in other parts of the world. It would also become one of the most important cultural manifestations of the period in Brazil. A group of young directors (Glauber Rocha, Nelson Pereira dos Santos, Paulo César Saraceni, Ruy Guerra, Cacá Diegues, and Joaquim Pedro de Andrade were the most renowned) claimed a new form of making cinema that opposed the models of Hollywood, which were, until then, the dominant model in filmmaking in Brazil. This was a cinema that claimed a political engagement with society, and that wanted to represent the Brazilian realities absent from the big screen thus far, in particular the oppression faced by the various disenfranchised groups of society. This movement was born in the larger context of the rise of Third World cinema in the early 1960s.¹

Cinema Novo was conceived as a heterogenous movement, where personal expression was highly valued. Its main purpose was to create a cinema that was Brazilian and that opposed neocolonial practices of filmmaking, allowing freedom of expression to those involved. Accordingly, the movement saw its activities as part of a political praxis. Cinema Novo can be

divided in three phases, which coincide with important political events: the first one went from 1960 to 1964, year of the military coup that put into effect a military dictatorship that would last until 1985. Many of the films were set in a rural context, especially in the *sertão* (the hinterlands of Northeastern Brazil), or in the favelas. The second phase comprised the period from 1964 to 1968. The setting shifted to urban Brazil, and the films tended to be analyses of failure (Stam and Johnson 35)—with the coup of 1964 the left realized that it was politically defeated. In 1968, the military dictatorship passed the Institutional Act Number 5 (AI-5), which inaugurated a period of stronger repression, substantially decreasing civil liberties in Brazil. The AI-5 also marked the third phase of Cinema Novo, that went from 1968 to 1971. This phase was also called “cannibal-tropicalist,” and the escalation of repression lead to the use of allegory and other forms of coded language (Stam and Johnson 38).

In this chapter I will focus on the films of the first phase, from 1960 to 1964, and analyze how they form a new cinematic language, and how they establish a political approach to film: cinema was seen as an important medium that could be effective to intervene politically in society. I will first analyze the films that Rocha considered the origins of Cinema Novo, in his 1963 book *Revisão Crítica do Cinema Brasileiro*, in particular in the chapter “Origens de um Cinema Novo,” where he identified the films of the movement that he considered the most important ones, because they drew the defining lines of the movement, both esthetically and thematically.² The majority of the films are from 1962, the most prolific year of this period: *Os Cafajestes* (Ruy Guerra), *Assalto ao Trem Pagador* (Roberto Farias), *Cinco Vezes Favela* (Marcos Farias, Miguel Borges, Cacá Diegues, Joaquim Pedro de Andrade e Leon Hirszman), *Porto das Caixas* (Paulo César Saraceni), and the documentary *Garrincha, Alegria do Povo*

(Joaquim Pedro de Andrade). He also included the shorts of Linduarte de Noronha, *Aruanda* (1959-60) being the most remarkable. I will then see how the themes of the earlier cinema developed in the following films of the same period, released in 1963 and 1964: *Barravento* (Glauber Rocha, 1962), *Ganga Zumba* (Cacá Diegues, 1963), *Vidas Secas* Nelson Pereira dos Santos, 1963), *Os Fuzis* (Ruy Guerra, 1964), and *Deus e o Diabo na Terra do Sol* (Glauber Rocha, 1964). I will finally discuss how these films contributed to Glauber Rocha's famous manifesto "An Esthetic of Hunger," which he published in 1965, and where he defined the esthetic of Brazilian Cinema Novo as an *esthetic of hunger*.

Even though Brazil had been independent for over a century, the fact that it was part of the Third World did not give it the material conditions to exercise such independence. Fanon, who was a major influence in the movement, demanded, in his book *The Wretched of the Earth*, a redistribution of the wealth among First and Third World, and noticed how the cold war division between socialism and capitalism maintained Third World countries economically dependent of First World powers: "Colonialism and imperialism have not settled their debt to us once they have withdrawn their flag and their police force from our territories. For centuries capitalists have behaved like real war criminals in the underdeveloped world" (57). In the same vein, Glauber Rocha stated that "Latin America remains, undeniably, a colony, and what distinguishes yesterday's colonialism from today's colonialism is merely the more polished form of the colonizer and the more subtle forms of those who are preparing future domination" (59).

In the sixties, film was still an expensive medium that required a specialized technical knowledge, which was not accessible to everyone. Therefore, it had thus far been a practice of developed countries, in particular of Hollywood and its film studios. Fernando Solanas and

Octavio Getino, in their manifesto “Towards a Third Cinema” (1969), noticed how in the precedent years the Hollywood model had monopolized cinematic production, imposing as a result a cultural imperialism which silenced all cultural manifestations not following that model: “The placing of the cinema within U.S. models, even in the formal aspect, in language, leads to the adoption of the ideological forms that *gave rise to precisely that language and no other*” (41). The issue of cinematic language became therefore central to Latin American filmmakers, who were trying to create a national film that opposed Hollywood’s dominance. For the directors of Third Cinema and of Cinema Novo, culture was central to a revolutionary process that would free underdeveloped countries from their oppressors. For that revolutionary cinema to be accomplished, it was not enough to use related themes, but it was essential to also build a new language that could express a different reality from that portrayed in Hollywood and European cinema.

In order to better understand the artistic and political proposal of Cinema Novo, it is important to contextualize it within the history of Brazilian cinema. Until the early sixties, Brazilian film production was rather incipient, and most of the national market was taken by foreign cinema, mostly from Hollywood. In the thirties, the appearance of sound film gave a new hope to national cinema, and Adhemar Gonzaga founded the Cinédia Studios (Rio de Janeiro, 1930), which began producing *chanchadas*, a genre that tended to emulate Hollywood musicals. In the forties, Atlântida Studios (Rio de Janeiro, 1943) continued the tradition of *chanchadas*, and Vera Cruz Studios (São Paulo, 1949) aimed at making movies for the rich, following the Hollywood studio model. Unable to make profit of its productions,

which were expensive and had little success among the public, Vera Cruz went bankrupt in 1954.³

Cinema Novo was opposed to the cinema produced in Brazil until that moment, which tried to emulate the American studio system. The directors of this movement were particularly critical of Brazilian film studios, following that foreign model, namely Atlântida, which was especially known for the *chanchadas*, and Vera Cruz. However, it was the model reproduced by these studios that was criticized, not their existence, as Randal Johnson pointed out: “Thus although in one sense Cinema Novo reacted against Vera Cruz, in another it was a continuation of a collective struggle by filmmakers of all persuasions to develop the film industry in Brazil” (7). Nelson Pereira dos Santos underscored the importance of the existence of these studios: “Vera Cruz was an achievement of Brazil, it was our first film industry, a collective achievement. So everyone fought for what they thought Vera Cruz should be, not over its existence as such” (quoted in Johnson, 7). The issue of creating a national cinema was therefore paramount to those making films in Brazil at the time, whether they wanted to imitate the Hollywood system or create a cinema that was opposed to it. The national issue might not be central in films that came from powerful countries like the US or Europe, but they became vital for Third World cinema: “Although all cultural practices are on one level products of specific national contexts, Third-World filmmakers (men and women) have been forced to engage in the question of the national precisely because they lack the taken-for-granted power available to First-World nation-states.” (Guneratne and Dissanayake, 57) In *Vida de Cinema*, Cacá Diegues conflated cinema and nation in the context of Cinema Novo: “uma revolução que pretendia inventar um cinema para o país ou um país para o cinema, tanto faz. Uma revolução que

começava a empolgar nossa juventude” (Cacá Diegues, 115). The importance of new filming technologies would also prove to be crucial to the development of a new cinema, namely the development of light cameras and higher film speed, which made filming on location possible.⁴ It was the lightweight cameras that made Glauber Rocha’s famous motto possible: “Uma câmera na mão e uma idéia na cabeça.”

In the wake of the bankruptcy of Vera Cruz, Brazilian producers began to question the studio model, and became open to less expensive alternatives.⁵ It was in this context that the directors of Cinema Novo started conceiving a new way of making cinema. They were critical of the models imported from Hollywood, and in particular of the *chanchadas*, because these portrayed a stereotyped Brazil and failed to represent its problems, offering an escapist version of the country. Cinema Novo was born of the necessity to create a national cinema that invented a new cinematic language capable of representing the realities of the country and that opposed, both esthetically and politically, the cultural dominance of the United States.

The film movement in question was the first attempt to create a national cinema that was concerned with the challenges of Brazilian society. In the early sixties, the participating directors felt the need to represent the social realities of Brazil, giving particular attention to those who were marginalized by society, living in the favelas or in the poor rural areas of the Northeastern regions of the country. According to Glauber Rocha, the critics immediately asked for a definition of the group as a clearly delineated school. The directors agreed that everything that was not *chanchada* should be considered Cinema Novo, and that their first tactic was to put an end to that style of making cinema (Rocha 131-32). In May 1962, Cacá Diegues, one of the directors of the movement, published in *Movimento 2* (the journal of the National Student’s

Union) a text entitled “Cinema Novo,” where he advanced a definition: “Cinema Novo is a committed cinema, a critical cinema, even when, because of the youth and inexperience of its members, this commitment and this critical attitude become somewhat naive and lacking in analytical focus. But even this naiveté is valid, for Cinema Novo is, above all, freedom” (Stam and Johnson 66). Others, like Alex Viány and Paulo César Saraceni, added that “Cinema Novo é uma questão de verdade, e não de idade” (Viány 8). The movement had a clear political agenda: opposing Brazil’s condition of neocolonialism, its economic and cultural dependency on the US. Italian neorealism was a significant influence, not only in the choice of major themes, which aimed at denouncing the social ills of society, but also in making movies on location and using non-professional actors. This allowed the directors to not depend on studios, and to make lower budget films, since financing was usually a challenge. Therefore, looking for inexpensive alternatives to make a film was a way of having more creative and political freedom. The scarcity of means was tightly connected to an affirmation of cinema as independent from market pressure, and this would become both an esthetic and political choice. As Ismail Xavier noticed, the new cinematic language that would develop in the context of this movement was a result of the tight relationship between cinema and politics: “the new cinema asserted its cultural value and ideological strength through a constant search for an original film style able to turn the scarcity of means into a channel for aesthetic experimentation. This implied the creation of an aggressive art cinema with national and political concerns” (Xavier 1). It is important to emphasize that the Cinema Novo movement was not a homogenous movement, where all the directors followed a pre-defined set of esthetic principles to direct their films. On the contrary, the films that came out were extremely diverse, and as Randal Johnson perceived, “Cinema

Novo is a much broader and more diverse than is often thought. [...] Studies concentrating solely on those elements that tend to unify Cinema Novo often result in impoverished and limiting definitions of the movement” (xi). In “Prefácio de uma Revolução” Glauber Rocha underscores this very variety as a result of the Brazilian context: “As ‘mil faces do *cinema novo*’ desorientam os críticos nacionais (inter) que buscam a coerência ‘típica’ das culturas ricas, desconhecendo a complexidade multirracial e econômica do Brazil” (*Revolução* 35). When the movement defined itself as everything that was not *chanchada*, it was already keeping it broad enough to allow the complete freedom of expression of each of its directors. What united the Cinema Novo directors was the desire to create a national cinema that dealt with national issues and that created its own new esthetic (even if it was diverse), instead of imitating the foreign models imposed mainly by Hollywood. Furthermore, this new Brazilian cinema aimed at expressing the need for national liberation from neocolonialism and from the situation of underdevelopment.

The films of the first phase were where this political concern was more directly expressed, since after 1964 the directors would have to deal with a growing censorship that limited the ways in which they could express their political views. On the other hand, many of these films did not become the most iconic of the movement, and many of them still lacked the esthetic sophistication that we find in the second half of the sixties and in the seventies. Nonetheless, they were a fundamental step to develop a new language and a new national cinema, as well as an esthetic that would soon develop into what Glauber would later coin as the “esthetic of hunger.”

Cinema Novo was both a practical and theoretical movement. The directors accompanied their filmmaking with theoretical texts that discussed what film should be, especially in the

Brazilian context. The name of the movement pointed to the creation of a new type of cinema that should therefore be different both from Hollywood and from Europe, which dominated the market at the time, leaving little space to national films. Brazil produced mostly *chanchadas*, which presented escapist stories, and did not aim at portraying what the directors of Cinema Novo saw as the Brazilian reality, and therefore did not have a positive political impact in the country. They aspired to a new type of cinema that could create a language able to voice the realities of the country, through a Brazilian perspective. In the films listed by Glauber, the Brazilian reality so far hidden from the big screen became visible. They showcased the main tendencies of the first phase of Cinema Novo, both in esthetic and in ideological terms. The majority of the protagonists were outcasts, who tried, often desperately, to fight their marginal position in society. Some of these films did not become the most iconic of the movement, in part precisely because they were experimenting with a new way of making cinema. They are nonetheless fundamental to understand how the movement was formed.

Glauber Rocha considered that *Os Cafajestes*, directed by Mozambican born Ruy Guerra, inaugurated Cinema Novo in Rio de Janeiro (Johnson 93). The film stands out from the others in this list because it is an urban film, and instead of being set in a favela, it takes place in the southern part of Rio,⁶ and in the pristine beaches of Cabo Frio, a small town not far from the city. This is also the film where the influence of the French Nouvelle Vague is more noticeable, whereas the influence of Italian neorealism was stronger in the other films of this period. It tells the story of two young friends, Jandir and Vavá, who plot to make money by taking photos of a beautiful young woman, Leda, who is the lover of Vavá's uncle. Jandir is from a poor background, while Vavá comes from a rich family that is in eminent risk of losing its fortune. On

their way to pick up Leda, Vavá, who owns the camera, asks his friend to check the f-number in the light meter. Jandir comments that the quality of the photo doesn't matter, what matters—and what will give them the money—is the content, but his friend replies that since they are taking photos, they might as well do it properly. Vavá hides on the trunk of their car, a Buick (which he promised to Jandir as payment), and Jandir picks up Leda. On the road, he screams to his hidden friend the f-stop numbers. Leda doesn't understand why Jandir screams those numbers, and he tells her that screaming gives him a sense of freedom, encouraging her to scream with him. This act is self-reflexive of the technological apparatus of filmmaking, and at the same time, screaming such technicalities becomes an excuse for a moment of joyous freedom for the couple, which can be equated with the pure joy of making films, an act of freedom for the directors. Later on, at the beach, Jandir finally convinces the girl to go swim naked, and when she returns, he and Vavá (who finally disclosed himself, getting out of the trunk) chase her in the car driving in circles, trapping her naked, and taking photos of her naked body. This was the first frontal nude in the history of Brazilian cinema, and it was one of the reasons why the film was such a scandal, leading to its prohibition two days after its premiere.

The presence of a camera as a narrative device points to the situation of the Brazilian filmmaker in the early sixties. The two friends use the camera to make money, and to exploit women,⁷ which highlights the commodification of both women, sex, and art. This is the most auto-reflexive film of the period, and the presence of a camera in many of the scenes points to the situation of the artist, who has to find ways to sell his art in a similar way to what prostitutes do. In the introduction to *Revolução do Cinema Novo*, Ismail Xavier illustrates how the concern with the material conditions necessary to make films was one of the main preoccupations of

Rocha's writings and filmmaking, which he refers to as the economy-politics question: how to invent a cinema within the context of underdevelopment and cultural colonialism: "[O cinema,] porque indústria, fenômeno de massa, disputa de mercado, circulação de imagem e afirmação de poder, ele dá expressão a todo um complexo de questões envolvendo arte e técnica, cultura e dinheiro, e também às rivalidades nacionais, pelo o que nele se condensa de capacidade produtiva e valor simbólico" (Rocha, *Revolução* 25). *Os Cafajestes* was the only film of the first phase where this dilemma was articulated in the diegesis of the film, whereas in Rocha these discussions were present in his writings, but they were never this explicit in his films.

The first scene of *Os Cafajestes* already hints at this: Jandir picks up a prostitute at night, in Copacabana, taking her home and making her leave in the middle of the night by setting the clock up several hours, which she only realizes when she is in the street, with no place to go until the first bus arrives. After he picks her up, the camera shows images of Copacabana at night,⁸ including that of a shop window with female mannequins, accompanied by a melancholic soundtrack, underscoring the objectification of women, this time turned into literal objects. The identification of the artist with the prostitute became one of the major themes of modern art in the nineteenth century. Walter Benjamin pointed out the true situation of the man of letters with the rise of capitalism: "he goes to the marketplace as a flâneur, supposedly to take a look at it but in reality to find a buyer" (17). The commodification of art continued to be a major theme throughout the twentieth century, and it was an underlying motif in *Os Cafajestes*.⁹

Film, even more than literature, depended heavily on financial investment, even to create the cheapest movie. In the previous decade, big studios like Vera Cruz and Atlântida dictated the kind of films produced in the country, and Cinema Novo directors had to convince producers to

invest in them. These studios had preferred to import foreign models and adapt them to the local public, but the directors of Cinema Novo wanted to create a radically new cinema. *Os Cafajestes* was produced by Jece Valadão, who also played Jandir, and who had been looking forward to become more than an actor. As Glauber Rocha pointed out in “Origens de um *Cinema Novo*,” Guerra’s film proved that such experimental, low budget movies could make a profit (135). These young directors aspired at escaping the commodification of their work, but they were also quite aware of the need to find money to keep doing cinema. The filmmaker identified with the prostitute, who had to sell what she had of most sacred—her body, her love—to earn money. This is also one of the reasons why so many of the main characters of these films were prostitutes. They pointed to the commodification of every realm of human life, and in some instances to the impossibility of escaping from it.

Cinema Novo took a strong political stand against capitalism, criticizing the Hollywood industry for its commodification of the medium, but the filmmakers knew it was impossible to completely escape such logic, and that became one of the themes of *Os Cafajestes*. As Randal Johnson pointed out, “[u]nderlying the film’s drama is a criticism of capitalism and the reification of human beings inserted in it” (95). This might be one of the reasons why *Os Cafajestes* is the most hopeless film of this phase, the only one where the characters see no way out of their empty lives. They all try to quench their immediate desires, following again the logic of capitalism, which promised that happiness could be easily achieved through consumption. Vavá’s payment to Jandir for his help was a Buick, and it was no coincidence that the car was an American luxury vehicle, standing both for masculinity and for the social status that capitalist commodities confer. Kristin Ross, in her book *Fast Cars, Clean Bodies*, notices that cars and

cinema came hand in hand as both symbols and vehicles of modernization: “the two technologies reinforced each other. Their shared qualities—movement, image, mechanization, standardization—made movies and cars the key commodity-vehicles of a complete transformation in European consumption patterns and cultural habits” (38). This was also true of the urban middle and upper-middle classes of Brazil, that emulated the European and American lifestyles: “Guerra’s film attacks the country’s moral underdevelopment and points an accusing finger not at the marginalized elements of Brazilian society, nor at foreign imperialists, but rather at the middle and upper-middle class” (Johnson 95). Guerra was pointing the finger to the Brazilian elites, who despised their country’s cultural expressions and tried instead to imitate what they believed to be more civilized societies: US and Europe. This also meant that they adopted capitalism as the model to follow. The type of criticism advanced here was in fact very similar to that aimed at the *chanchadas*, which also tried to emulate a foreign, capitalist model, stifling other forms of national cinema.

The two male characters look for money just to satisfy their lust for drugs, cars, and women (unlike the characters of other films of this period, as we will see). When they realize that Leda was dumped by Vavá’s uncle and that the photos they just took are useless, they decide to follow her suggestion of photographing Wilma instead, the daughter of the rich uncle. This way, Leda gets her revenge for being dumped and the guys still get to blackmail the old man. They take Wilma to the beach, and Jandir tears her clothes, telling Vavá to take photos. However, the young man is in love with his cousin and hesitates. Suddenly the sun sets and there is no more light to take the photos. The technical restraints render the camera useless, and the tone of the film changes, becoming darker, just like the landscape. The desperation of the four characters

intensifies: Vavá reveals his unrequited love for Wilma, who ends up sleeping with Jandir as a form of revenge. When the sun is rising, Vavá runs through the dunes shooting a gun, and Wilma runs after him. The film ends with the two abandoned in the sand, and with Jandir and Leda leaving in the Buick to Copacabana. He drops her off at a house, and she sits looking wistfully at her reflection in the dirty water of a fountain, while Jandir drives his car off the road. The car runs out of gas and he walks away, completely detached from the radio news that announces the beginning of the liberation struggle in Angola, at the time colonized by the Portuguese,¹⁰ and a march of hunger of fifty thousand people taking place in Recife. When this last piece of news is heard, Jandir swallows more pills of speed, which shows his complete alienation towards the political realities of his country. However, these pieces of news coming through the radio (that we continue to listen even though the car is left behind) are the only piece of hope hinted at in the film: therefore, any possibility of change is with the lower classes of society, who organize an armed struggle to combat colonialism in Angola or who march in protest in Recife. The thematic of *hunger*, which would become the main symbol of Cinema Novo, is therefore announced in the end of *Os Cafajestes*. The film concludes with Jandir halting and turning his back to the camera, cutting the possibility of any hope of change for him (and for those alienated like him), while the weather report announces unstable weather. The film wanted to reveal the alienation resulting from the characters pursuing superficial capitalist values as a model to their lives, which is why the narrative is so hopeless for the main characters.

Assalto ao Trem Pagador was directed by Roberto Farias and released in 1962. Based on a real robbery, the film tells the story of six men who committed a high-profile heist to a train transporting money. They all live in a favela in Rio de Janeiro, except for Grilo (Reginaldo

Faria), who lives in a small apartment in middle class Copacabana. Grilo is their connection to the chief, Engenheiro (Engineer), who devised the entire robbery plan, but the leader of the group is Tião Medonho (Eliezer Gomes). Tião and Grilo represent two opposite poles of the figure of the criminal: while Grilo, a handsome blonde man, wants to spend his money in expensive cars and clothes to impress a rich young woman, Tião, a well-built black man, wants to save the money to help his kids have a better life. Except for Grilo, who is a selfish playboy, the spectator is led to identify with the criminals, who only wish to escape the dire poverty of the favela. The film also introduces the issue of racial politics: after Grilo tries to set the band up so that the police would get them, the rest of the group takes him to the favela to kill him. Before being killed, Grilo accuses Tião of being envious of him for being blonde and having blue eyes, whereas Tião is ugly and looks like a *macaco* (which means monkey in Portuguese and is a frequent racial slur in Brazil). He accuses Tião of being envious because, no matter how much money he gets, he will always look poor, while Grilo can look rich because of his blue eyes. In the sixties it was uncommon to voice racial differences in Brazil in such an explicit manner, and to point out so clearly that to be rich one had to be white. Rocha also notices this: “A sequência da morte de Grilo provoca uma reação racista e anti-racista ao mesmo tempo. Porque quando Tião, um negro, diz para os peixes comerem os olhos azuis de Grilo, há uma revolta tipicamente racial” (137). This scene echoes Fanon’s *Wretched of the Earth*: by killing Grilo and feeding his blue eyes to the fish, Tião embodies the violent revolt of the colonized against dehumanization. As Fanon pointed out, racial exclusion dehumanizes the colonized subject, who “is reduced to the state of an animal” (7). The use of the racial slur *macaco* expresses that, and is met with the violent reaction of Tião and his group.

The characters of *Assalto ao Trem Pagador* are very different from the ones in *Os Cafajestes* because they are not alienated from society, and their criminal activity is a result of their dire economic situation and of the fact that they don't have any other option left to improve their financial life. Tião ends up dying shot by the police, but first tells his wife Zulmira to never confess where the money is hidden, because that money is for their children to have a better life. After his death, the police and the journalists follow Zulmira to her house, suspecting that the money is hidden there. They search all over the house, destroying everything, and in an act of despair she reveals where the money is. While the journalists grab the money, she leaves the house with her children. The final scene shows the police cars driving by her and her children, harassing her and trapping her in the middle of the road. The closing image is a still of Zulmira and her children with a desperate look their faces, shrouded by a cloud of dust. Her hopelessness illustrates the situation of those living in the favela, chased by an oppressive system, and constantly harassed by the police.

Glauber Rocha criticized the fact that Roberto Farias played safe and did not make any innovations in formal terms. *Assalto ao Trem Pagador* was in fact more conventional in terms of filmic language than *Os Cafajestes*. However, the plot was in line with the thematics of Cinema Novo, depicting the struggles of the disenfranchised, and siding with the outcasts of society. According to Rocha, Farias's film consolidated what *Os Cafajestes* had begun: it reinforced the prestige of a new national cinema among the Brazilian public, it established the foundations for a school of urban criminal cinema, and introduced Luiz Carlos Barreto to the group (137). Barreto became not only an important producer of the Cinema Novo movement, but he was also behind the cinematography of *Vidas Secas*, which came to stand as the cornerstone of Brazilian

cinematography, and that would later on inspire Rocha's manifesto "An Esthetic of Hunger."

Assalto ao Trem Pagador achieved the biggest box office revenue of the year. As a result, Luiz Magalhães Lins, the banker who invested in the film, decided to also invest in *Garrincha*, *Alegria do Povo* and *Vidas Secas* (directed by Nelson Pereira dos Santos), which would be released in 1963 and would become one of the most emblematic of Cinema Novo (Rocha 136).

Cinco Vezes Favela was a singular experiment because it originated outside the traditional production system, since it was supported by the Centro Popular de Cultura da União Nacional dos Estudantes—CPC. It gave complete freedom to the five young directors, who believed that in order to have total liberty to express a political agenda, they had to be independent of the big production companies and their commercial interests. The film was composed of five shorts by young directors of Cinema Novo, many of them taking their first steps in filmmaking, and their purpose was to create films that politicized the audience. Except for *Couro de Gato* (directed in 1961 by Joaquim Pedro de Andrade), which was made independently and later added to the project, all the shorts were filmed with the support of CPC. The first one, *Um Favelado*, directed by Marcos de Farias, tells the story of a poor man from a favela who is about to be thrown out of his shed for not paying the rent. He can't find a job, and his last resort is to help a friend and his gang in a robbery. The gang leaves him to be caught after the assault and he ends up being beaten by the crowd and arrested by the police. *Zé da Cachorra* (directed by Miguel Borges) is about a man who decides to challenge the owner of the sheds in the favela, a speculator that refuses shelter to a family. However, *Zé* is alone in his revolt, and the rest of the *favelados* would rather leave than confront the owner. *Couro de Gato* tells the story of a group of kids who steal the cats to sell them so that craftsmen can make drums of the animals'

skins. One of the kids ends up empathizing with one of the cats, and shares his food with the feline, but realizing that the cat is still hungry and he has no more food, he ends up selling the animal anyway. *Couro de Gato* is the only short that escaped the political schematism of the other films, and it is arguably the best film of this collection.¹¹ Leon Hirszman's *Pedreira de São Diogo* is about the workers of a quarry. Their sheds are built on top of the hill, and an explosion to extract rocks has the potential to destroy their homes. The workers unite to stop the quarry owner, who only cares about profit, and manage to save their houses. *Escola de Samba Alegria de Viver* (directed by Cacá Diegues) criticizes the passion for samba among the dwellers of the favelas, and implies that they should instead be concerned with political organizing. This paternalizing view of the cultural manifestations of the people can be found in other films of Cinema Novo, and it fails to see such cultural displays as ways of resistance against social oppression. In his essay "On National Culture,"¹² Fanon explains how the colonizer constructs the colonized culture as primitive and inferior. It is important to have in mind samba's African roots, and how the white elites frowned upon this musical genre for a long time, as they also did to other Afro-Brazilian cultural manifestations, such as *capoeira* and *candomblé*. However, Diegues had some reservations about the script, written by Carlos Estevam, because he found it too manichaeian, as he would later reveal in his book *Vida de Cinema*:

Em princípio, não gostei muito do argumento, achava errado estabelecer oposição entre lazer e política, cultura e militância. Mas, se pudesse fazer daquilo um veículo para defender as duas coisas, poderia ser interessante. [...] "Escola de Samba Alegria de Viver" acabou sendo um filme moderno, sem costura convencional de estrutura. Mas não há como corrigir um erro essencial de roteiro. (Diegues 127)

Jean-Claude Bernardet reminded that many directors changed their attitude regarding the role of politics in film and how politics should be addressed, sometimes to antagonistic positions from the one they held in *Cinco Vezes Favela* (43).

The filmmakers of *Cinco Vezes Favela* pursued a prescriptive political agenda, and failed to understand the realities of those they wanted to represent. The film ended up being too simplistic, and therefore not effective: “As histórias foram elaboradas para ilustrar idéias preconcebidas sobre a realidade, que ficou assim escravizada, esmagada por esquemas abstratos. [...] O resultado dessa estrutura dramática simplista não era um convite à politização, mas sim à passividade” (Bernardet 42). However, the film was crucial as an exercise of discovery of new ways of depicting Brazilian realities, and many of its directors understood that failure, which helped them look for more effective strategies to achieve their political goals. Eduardo Coutinho, who was the production manager of *Cinco Vezes Favela* and who would become one of the most important directors of documentaries in Brazil, defended that the most important in the films of this first phase was the exercise of looking for a new language that could express the realities of Brazil:

Dos filmes em preparação, não esperamos tanto que eles sejam bons e bem feitos: torçamos antes para que sejam empenhados, polêmicos no bom sentido da palavra, que não usem os velhos truques que até os norte-americanos começam a abandonar. O estilo do Cinema Novo deve ser livre, normalmente, pois todos os caminhos—a montagem intelectual, a improvisação, o plano demorado—podem levar ao que interessa: o tratamento crítico de um tema vinculado à realidade brasileira. (quoted in Viany 29)

Porto das Caixas, directed by Paulo César Saraceni, is one of the most emblematic films of the list, and one of the most innovative esthetically, side by side with *Os Cafajestes*, and Glauber Rocha considered it one of the most mature of this phase. It tells the story of a woman married to an abusive husband, who tries to convince her lover to kill him. The lover never has the courage to do it, and she ends up being the one committing the murder. The film ends with her and her lover on a bifurcation on the train tracks near the town. They separate, each one following his own way, and she finally achieves her freedom from an abusive man, and follows her own path without depending on anyone. Once again Fanon comes to mind, and the spectator can empathize with the woman who killed her husband as her way out of an abusive relationship. *Porto das Caixas* is also one of the most sophisticated films of the period in terms of cinematic language: for instance, the contrast between light and shadow, which at times shrouds the woman, indicating her darkest moments, especially her desire to kill her abusive husband. Glauber Rocha notices that in Saraceni's movie the woman kills consciously and is not punished, while in the other movies the characters kill unconsciously and get punished. The scene where she kills the husband with an axe evokes Dostoyevski's *Crime and Punishment*, but in *Porto das Caixas* the woman has no regret for her crime, and there is no punishment, just the attainment of freedom.

Aruanda (Linduarte Noronha), the only film in the list that was produced before 1962, is a documentary about a community of ex-slaves that survives by making clay pots and selling them in the markets. The film underscores the fact that this town (like many others in rural Brazil) has no support from civil institutions, and that the population has no access to basic rights. They are condemned to an unproductive economic system, from which there is no way

out. Glauber Rocha considered this documentary one of the most important in Brazil at the time, because it broke away with the propaganda documentaries financed by the state, which lacked any understanding of film or cinematic language (Rocha 144). Rocha described *Aruanda* as an essay-film that passed a political message and was innovative in esthetic terms.

Rocha's "Origens de um *Cinema Novo*" closes with the analysis of another documentary, *Garrincha, Alegria do Povo* (Joaquim Pedro de Andrade). Rocha emphasizes the role of the genre as an important school for any young director, where they have the opportunity to practice making their first films, to try new filming strategies, etc. According to the Bahian filmmaker, *Garrincha* inaugurated the feature documentary tradition in Brazilian new cinema, developing what *Aruanda* had initiated. This documentary focuses on the story of one of the most famous Brazilian football players, bringing together popular entertainment and politics. In this case, there is no hint of paternalism towards popular entertainment, as there was in *Escola de Samba Alegria de Viver*. Garrincha had humble origins, and before becoming a famous football player, he used to be a blue collar worker in a textile factory in the suburbs of Rio de Janeiro. The film underscores his working class background, noticing that he chose to build his house in the community, where he still spends time with his old friends. The film takes this moment to highlight the hardships of the workers of the textile factory. The football games are seen as collective therapy that allows the individual to feel part of something bigger and it increases his self-esteem, making him forget for a few hours the hardships of life. The role of football in Brazilian society was a recurrent theme in Brazilian Cinema Novo, appearing in such films as *A Falecida*, by Leon Hirszman (1965), or in Nelson Pereira dos Santos' *Rio 40 Graus* (1955), an important precursor of the movement.

Barravento was the first feature film directed by Glauber Rocha, in 1962.¹³ He does not include it among the films discussed in “Origens de um *Cinema Novo*” because it is his own film,¹⁴ but it was obviously one of the most important of that year. He points out that, like *Cinco Vezes Favela* and *Porto das Caixas*, *Barravento* was produced with one of the lowest budgets of that year, with less than four million *cruzeiros*, and that it should be considered, along with *Cinco Vezes Favela*, an experience of young debutant directors (Rocha, *Revisão Crítica* 138). The script was written by Luis Paulino dos Santos, who also started directing the film, but he decided to abandon the project in the middle of the shooting Rocha took over the project, but he was never completely happy with it, and he only edited because Nelson Pereira dos Santos insisted (Johnson 121-122). Regarding his first feature, Rocha has declared the following:

Barravento is not really my film, because I directed it almost by chance.... It's virtually an unfinished film, primary in its construction. There are a number of ideas that I was unable to develop. But some elements of *Barravento* are part of my concerns: mystical fatalism, political agitation, and the relationship between poetry and lyricism, a complex relationship in a still primitive world. (quoted in Johnson 122)

In spite of Rocha's reservations regarding this film, *Barravento* became one of the most important films of the first phase of Cinema Novo. In a text published in 1961 (probably after *Barravento* was filmed, but prior to its release), entitled “O Processo Cinema,” Rocha declared the following concerning his first feature film:

Quando aceitei a profissão de fazer filmes e para isto fiz a penitência de noventa dias numa praia deserta, sem muito dinheiro e com uma equipe humana heterogênea, só admiti aquele trabalho contrário às minhas idéias originais sobre o cinema porque tive a

consciência exata do País, dos problemas primários de fome e escravidão regionais, e pude decidir entre minha ambição e *uma função lateral do cinema: ser veículo de idéias necessárias*. Idéias que não fossem minhas frustrações e complexos pessoais, mas que fossem universais, mesmo se consideradas no plano mais simples dos valores: mostrar ao mundo que, sob a forma do exotismo e da beleza decorativa das formas místicas afro-brasileiras, habita uma raça doente, faminta, analfabeta, nostálgica e escrava. (Rocha, *Revolução 48*, my emphasis)

Therefore, it was a political motivation that led him to accept taking over *Barravento*. Filming was here described as an urgency to expose a Brazilian reality often left in the shadows: the living conditions of the Afro Brazilian community, which was still being exploited by the political and financial elites. In fact, one of the most innovative traces of this film was that almost all the characters were black: the story focused on a small community of fishermen in Bahia, made almost in its entirety of Afro Brazilians. Until then, even in the few films that had black characters in leading roles, Afro Brazilians were never the vast majority of the cast.¹⁵ As Robert Stam pointed out, “*Barravento* made a dramatic rupture with the racial conventions of casting and plotting within Brazilian cinema” (Stam 226). António Pitanga, who played Firmino in *Barravento* and who was an important actor in the films of the first phase of Cinema Novo, also declared that “*Barravento* was a political-cultural manifesto in favor of the black liberation struggle” (Stam 219).

It is nonetheless significant that Rocha considered the dissemination of such ideas a “lateral function of cinema.” This was because he privileged the authorial voice in cinema and the complete freedom of the artist, who should never submit his esthetic creation to anything, not

even to political ideas. Politics should be integrated in the films, but the filmmaker should never make this his priority, running the risk of making propaganda instead of cinema. It is important to note that creating a new esthetic was one of the biggest political stances of Cinema Novo, because only a new language could free Brazilian filmmakers from American cultural hegemony, and would allow them to express the hurdles of Brazil. Such new language would allow the directors to express the political struggles of the nation without submitting to simplified forms that would not be more than simplistic propaganda. The fact that the question of language was so central to Rocha could be one reason why he did not quite consider *Barravento* his film. Even though it was a project he had supported from the beginning, it was not his own project, and he was probably still experimenting with his own cinematic language. However, it is a consensus among critics that Rocha's first feature was a pivotal film in Brazilian cinema.

Nonetheless, the film opens with a message in intertitles that seems to convey a rather paternalistic view of the Afro Brazilian religious and cultural expressions: "No litoral da Bahia vivem os negros pescadores de "xaréu," cujos antepassados vieram como escravos da África. Permanecem até hoje os cultos aos Deuses africanos e todo este povo é dominado por um misticismo trágico e fatalista. Aceitam a miséria, o analfabetismo e a exploração com a passividade característica daqueles que esperam o reino divino." This view was related to Rocha's alignment with Marxist historical materialism, as Robert Stam pointed out (219). The filmmaker declared the following concerning his intervention in the script: "I reorganized black mythology according to the dialectics of religion/economy. Religion is the opium of the people. Down with the Father! Long live human beings fishing with nets. Down with prayers! Down with mysticism!" (quoted in Stam, 219). In fact, at first sight, the film seems to convey the Afro-

Brazilian subject as passive, incapable of revolting against his oppressors in part because of his religion, which is described in the intertitles as the main cause for such passivity. It seems to completely disregard *candomblé* and other Afro Brazilian religions as a means of resistance in itself. Fanon had already pointed out to the importance of culture in the process of fighting against colonialism, noting that the colonizer repressed the colonized culture, both by forbidding it and by despising it, saying it was inferior to European culture. On the other hand, the claiming of that very repressed culture by those colonized was an essential part in the process of revolution.¹⁶ In Brazil, the repression of Afro Brazilian religions was very similar to what happened in Africa, mainly because these religions had African origins, but they also became an important form of cultural resistance among black Brazilians, both during slavery and after abolition, which went hand in hand with political resistance.

The belief in *candomblé* is at the center of the narrative in *Barravento*. The film begins with the homecoming of Firmino to Buraquinho, the small fishermen village where he was born. He returns from the city, where he had gone to try a better life, without succeeding. In the village, all the fishermen obey to Mestre, who has accepted working for a capitalist who provided them a net. It was safer to fish with a net than using the traditional *jangadas* (rafts), but in exchange they had to pay most of their profit to the capitalist. Firmino tries to convince the fishermen to revolt against the capitalist, but without success. At the same time, he rivals with Aruã, son of Iemanjá, the goddess of *candomblé*, and the other villagers believe that he is protected by her from death. In exchange for that protection, Aruã must remain a virgin, but Naína, the only white girl of the village, is in love with him. Firmino wants to prove to the villagers that Aruã is just a man, without any special powers or divine protection. He cuts the

fishing net hoping that the men, seeing no alternative, will revolt against the capitalist, but Mestre convinces them not to do so, and to use the *jangadas* to fish. He says that if Aruã can safely spend the night at sea without the *barravento* (the turning wind which brings the storm) striking, the men can safely go fishing in their *jangadas* because they will have the protection of Iemanjá. However, Aruã defends that the villagers should revolt against the capitalist, and emphasizes that he is only a regular man, and that he can't protect anyone, but he ends up accepting spending the night at sea, stating that after that he will leave for the city, where he hopes to find a job and save money to buy a new net. Meanwhile, Firmino convinces his lover Cota to seduce Aruã, and the young man falls for her. In the morning, Firmino warns the fishermen that the old Vicente (Naína's father) is at sea, and both Aruã and his friend Chico go look for him. Only Aruã returns, while the other two die. Aruã and Firmino end up fighting, and even though Firmino wins, he tells the villagers that they should follow his opponent: "É Aruã que vocês devem seguir. O Mestre não. O Mestre é um escravo." Mestre withdraws his support from Aruã, who insists that he never had any special powers. The young man finally decides to go to the city, and the last image is of him leaving the village, passing by the lighthouse where we had seen Firmino returning in the beginning of the film.

At first sight, *candomblé* is seen as the main obstacle against political struggle, and it is against this type of belief that Firmino is fighting when he confronts Aruã. However, Robert Stam has noted that this idea, which is stated both in the epigraph, in Rocha's own statements, and in Firmino's views, is contradicted in some stances of the film:

Yet in other ways the film affirms the power and beauty of *candomblé*. This ambiguity doubtless derives partially from the ambivalences of the director himself as a white

Protestant, yet who as a Bahian inevitably imbibed the ambient respect for Afro Brazilian religiosity. The ambiguity also derives, as we have seen, from the film's conflictual production history and the fact that the original director, who had partial African ancestry (...), was more sympathetic to *candomblé* than the white Marxist Rocha. (221)

As Stam observed, Firmino is a border-line character, born in the village but who lived in the city, who speaks against *candomblé*, but performs a *despacho* to take revenge on Aruã, who he blames for his forced exile to the city: "Firmino is a liminal, beyond Good and Evil, border-line character sharing many characteristics with Exu" (222). Aruã too will become a liminal figure: when he leaves the village, heading to the city, he passes by the same lighthouse where first Firmino first appeared, and he makes his way under what is left of a porch in ruins (Fig. 1), an image that points to him becoming a liminal character, just like Firmino was. Stam also compares Firmino to the *barravento*, because he is the one bringing change and turmoil to the village, even though his actions backfire most of the time (223). He also underscores the care given by Rocha to the representations of the religious ceremonies, which were very respectful and thoroughly researched:

Rocha presents a religion that is dignified, complexly codified, and efficacious for its practitioners. A crucial ambiguity, pointed out by Xavier, also marks the film's system of explanation: all the narrative events can be explained either in the materialist manner *or* as evidence of the truth and efficacy of Afro-Brazilian religion. [...] the film is the "irresolvable equation of these two opposing perspectives." (224)

The characters in this film, just like the characters in most of Rocha's films, are ridden with contradictions, and it is in these contradictions that political art differs from propaganda:

whereas propaganda tries to simplify an idea to make it more appealing and easier to understand and to adhere to, political cinema explores the contradictions inherent in every political gesture, even if these contradict a certain ideological positioning. Rocha's criticism to many of the films of the first phase have precisely to do with the fact that many directors preferred to play safe and create schematic characters (like Tião Medonho in *Assalto ao Trem Pagador*, cf. *Revisão Crítica* 136), or portray certain ideas, like class struggle, in an oversimplified way (as it happens in *Zé da Cachorra*, Miguel Borges's film in *Cinco Vezes Favela*, cf. *Revisão Crítica* 140). If this was still a problem in many of the films of 1962, the following films would become more complex and less schematic, such as *Vidas Secas*, *Deus e o Diabo na Terra do Sol* or *Os Fuzis*.



Fig. 1—*Barravento*

To conclude, even if *candomblé* might be seen in the film as an obstacle to political struggle, it is in the hands of black characters that the struggle can be made, as Aruã asserts when he says goodbye to Naína before leaving the village: “Firmino é ruim, mas tem razão. Ninguém

liga para quem é preto e pobre. Nós temos de resolver a nossa vida e a de todo o mundo.” The figure of change, the outsider—Firmino—is also black. Black characters are not denied agency, and they are diverse and complex, some of them passive, like Mestre, and others heroic and willing to take matters in their own hands, like Firmino and Aruã. As Jean-Claude Bernardet pointed out, all the characters are integrated within the community, and all of them have their function, except for Firmino, who just arrived from the city (73). This is very different from what happened, for instance, in *O Pagador de Promessas* (“*The Given Word*” Anselmo Duarte, 1962),¹⁷ where black characters—the group that practices *candomblé* and *capoeira*—deserve sympathy for their social condition, but are never the protagonists. The same is true in what concerns the representation of Afro Brazilian cultural practices in Duarte’s film: they are implicitly condemned in favor of a renovated catholicism (Stam 219). Glauber Rocha considered that the film’s attempt to have a leftist end failed: “Está certo que o resultado seja católico: o irritante é que Dias Gomes propôs um final de esquerda; o espetáculo, o sucesso periférico das formas torceu a idéia; ao público, e à grande parte da crítica, foi vendido gato por lebre” (*Revisão Crítica*, 164). Jean-Claude Bernardet observed that films like *O Pagador de Promessas*, *A Grande Feira* (Roberto Pires, 1961) or *Maioria Absoluta* (Leon Hirszman, 1964) had a populist point view, because they were directed to the politicians, and therefore considered that change could only be achieved through a shift within those in power. The director of *Barravento* opposed that view: “Glauber Rocha opôs-se a essa orientação. A idéia talvez mais importante de sua *Revisão crítica do cinema brasileiro* é que os filmes brasileiros não devem denunciar o povo às classes dirigentes, mas sim denunciar o povo ao próprio povo” (Bernardet 66). According to Bernardet, Aruã and Firmino represented the leaders, but their actions did not

lead to any change: “A liderança não provoca uma integração nem resulta dela: o líder e a massa vivem em compartimentos estanques, embora o primeiro pretenda estar na perspectiva da coletividade” (77). They are both associated with the lighthouse, which opens and closes the film, and signifies both leadership and isolation. Firmino wanted revenge from Aruã and aspired at becoming a leader to the rest of the villagers. On the other hand, Aruã never felt comfortable with the role of leader that the population gave him, and he often questioned it, saying he was not protected by Iemanjá, and that he was just a regular man. His last words to Náina reinforce his rejection of that role, when he says that no one cares about them because they are black; but he also takes upon himself the task to bring a new net, therefore never completely refusing his role as a leader. His departure also reinforces the idea that salvation can only come from the city. It is also important to note that Firmino’s criticism of the fishermen’s unquestioned obedience to Mestre was accurate: the main obstacle among the villagers was that they expected for a leader to make every decision for them, instead of uniting and acting together against the capitalist. *Barravento* escaped populism precisely because it exposed this problematic without dictating an easy solution, like any leader would do, and goes deep in its analysis of the challenges faced by Brazilian society and its relationship with the structures of power. The discontinuity editing contributed to the complexity of the narrative and the avoidance of populist solutions.

Ganga Zumba, directed by Cacá Diegues and released in 1963, before the military coup, was another important film of the first phase. It was Diegues’s first feature, and he was the youngest of the group at only 23 years old. Just like *Barravento*, the cast of *Ganga Zumba* was almost entirely composed of black actors. The film was an adaptation of the homonymous historical novel authored by João Felício dos Santos (1962), which Ruy Guerra had

recommended to Diegues, and it narrated the escape of the slave Ganga Zumba and his companions, and the establishment of the kingdom of Palmares, which would become one of the most legendary *quilombos*¹⁸ in the history of Brazil. Due to financial restrictions, Diegues was only able to adapt the first half of the book, until the part where Ganga Zumba establishes Palmares and becomes its first king. Twenty years later, in 1984, Diegues would finally be able to film the second part of the film, this time with a budget big enough to shoot *Quilombo* the way he had conceived it. *Ganga Zumba* also presented a series of historical misrepresentations, namely on the portrayal Yoruba iconography—Palmares was Bantu— as a result of the little knowledge that historians had at the time about the history of Palmares (Stam 231).

Cacá Diegues wanted to make a film about a group of the population that he felt had made a major contribution to the Brazilian cultural manifestation, but that was still regarded in a marginal manner:

Sempre achei um maravilhoso mistério o fato de que a parte da população mais sofrida e excluída de nossa sociedade formal, a que já fora escrava e seguia sendo tratada como tal, fosse capaz de produzir uma cultura tão poderosa, que, criada por derrotados, se tornava muitas vezes representante vitoriosa da cultura nacional, como no Carnaval, na música, na linguagem, no futebol. (Diegues 157)

On one hand, the film's plot is not as complex as other films of the period, like *Barravento*, *Porto das Caixas* or *Vidas Secas*, and it is definitely more didactic, but on the other hand it is one of the first to fully support Afro Brazilian emancipation, and to tell the story from the point of view of the black Brazilian subject. If *Barravento* showed some reservations about the revolutionary possibilities of Afro-Brazilian religions, *Ganga Zumba* emphasized the

revolutionary potential of such religious manifestations—for instance, they follow the symbol of Oxumaré, carved in the trees, to find their way to Palmares. And even though the film unequivocally supported the political emancipation of the Afro Brazilian subject, the black characters were not a uniform block: they also had their own contradictions, and not all of them had the same opinion regarding what emancipation actually meant. For instance, in the beginning of the film, Ganga Zumba had his reservations about the maintenance of a free a *quilombo*, saying that one day white people would manage to put an end to Palmares.

However, the two characters that were more reluctant about going to Palmares were the two female characters, Dandara (Luiza Maranhão) and Cipriana (Léa Garcia), which was problematic because it made the revolution a masculine endeavor. Cipriana believes that going to Palmares is a nonsensical idea, and she ends up staying with Diogo, a maroon slave who prefers to live by himself, hiding from the slave masters. It is also Cipriana that reveals her companions to a group of slaveowners when Dandara drops her fan and Cipriana tries to get it, evoking the trope of the vain, thoughtless woman who can't be rational and therefore puts men in danger. After the fight, having killed all the white travelers, they capture Dandara, and Sororoba wants to kill her for having betrayed her race, but Ganga Zumba defends her and says that she should go to Palmares with them to learn to stand for herself. Later at night, around the fire, they discuss the position of Afro Brazilians in society, and both women think that black people being slaves and white people masters is just the natural order of things, and that there is not much one can do to change the situation.

Apart from this gender problematic, *Ganga Zumba* is quite successful in depicting what would later be known as *black power*, by making Afro Brazilians the subjects of their own

history, with agency to fight against oppression and to find their own strategies of liberation. As Randal Johnson observed, “Afro-Brazilian culture is pictured as somehow transcendent, destined to overcome any temporary situation of political repression” (59). Gilberto Freyre’s theories of a peaceful miscegenation in Brazilian society are completely overthrown in the film, and Fanon’s notion of therapeutic violence is present in several moments in the film: for instance, when Ganga Zumba and Cipriana ambush the overseer and kill him, Ganga takes his heart away as a trophy, while smiling at his accomplice.

At the same time, we can consider *Ganga Zumba* as a metaphor of the political situation of the period, when the young directors of Cinema Novo could finally free themselves from their oppressors, i.e., a neocolonial cinema that had thus far suffocated the birth of a new national cinema: “Assim como o primeiro [*Ganga Zumba*] era uma metáfora sobre o presente e o que fazer com a liberdade que tínhamos antes do golpe militar, o segundo [*Quilombo*], de 1984, era um filme de antecipação, o relato de uma utopia que pretendíamos construir com a volta da democracia” (Diegues 158).

These films, selected by Glauber Rocha, established the main themes of Cinema Novo. Some of them did not become the most iconic works of the movement, but they were essential to understand its development and consolidation. The directors of this period believed that filming should be accompanied by discussions and by reflections on what it meant to create a Brazilian cinema. This is why failures like *Cinco Vezes Favela* were also crucial to the development of Cinema Novo: creating a radical new cinema needed both theory and practice, as well as trial and error. In 1965 Glauber Rocha wrote his now famous manifesto, “An Esthetic of Hunger,”¹⁹

which was the result of the films of the first phase. Violence was an expression of the economic and political realities of neocolonialism in Brazil:

The international problem of Latin America is still a case of merely exchanging colonizers. Our possible liberation will come, therefore, in the form of a new dependency. This economic and political conditioning has led us to philosophical weakness and impotence, that engenders sterility when conscious and hysteria when unconscious. It is for this reason that the hunger of Latin America is not simply an alarming symptom: it is the essence of our society. [...]

Cinema Novo shows that the normal behavior of the starving is violence; and the violence of the starving is not primitive. (Rocha in Stam and Johnson 69-70)

The *esthetic of hunger* was rehearsed in the films previously presented, which introduced some of the obsessional themes of the first phase of Brazilian Cinema Novo: the violent reaction of the oppressed, and the desperate attempt to escape a miserable condition, which most of the times could only be achieved through violence. We will find these themes developed with more sophistication in the works that would become the benchmarks of the first phase of Cinema Novo—*Vidas Secas* (Nelson Pereira dos Santos, 1963), *Os Fuzis* (Ruy Guerra, 1964) and *Deus e o Diabo na Terra do Sol* (Glauber Rocha, 1964). The struggle to survive in the inhospitable *sertão*, frequently affected by severe drought, alienated the disenfranchised, stripping them from their human dignity. The films were nonetheless optimistic, since they always implied the possibility of change—even if the change was not likely to happen to the main characters, it was a possibility for their social class. The filmmakers believed that denouncing the social injustices lived by those oppressed politically or economically was an important step to change the

situation. Filmmaking was therefore a political praxis (Stam and Johnson 33), that could help the working classes achieve class consciousness.

Glauber Rocha's "An Esthetic of Hunger" examined the conditions of a Brazilian cinema and its possibilities in a context of colonialism. It became one of the seminal texts of Cinema Novo, and it is considered its most important manifesto. According to Rocha, Latin America was still a colony that needed to set itself free from its oppressor. Even though Brazil had been independent for over a century, the fact that it was part of the Third World did not give it the material conditions to exercise such independence. In *The Wretched of the Earth* Frantz Fanon demanded a redistribution of the wealth among First and Third World, and noticed how the cold war division between socialism and capitalism maintained Third World countries economically dependent of First World potencies: "Colonialism and imperialism have not settled their debt to us once they have withdrawn their flag and their police force from our territories. For centuries capitalists have behaved like real war criminals in the underdeveloped world" (Fanon 57). In the same vein, Glauber Rocha stated that "Latin America remains, undeniably, a colony, and what distinguishes yesterday's colonialism from today's colonialism is merely the more polished form of the colonizer and the more subtle forms of those who are preparing future domination" (Rocha in Stam and Johnson 69).

Hunger becomes the original form of expression of the Latin American subject, and it translates in cinematic language to the use of scarcity of technological means as an esthetic statement. *Vidas Secas* is probably the best illustration of what Glauber Rocha meant when he spoke of an esthetic of hunger, and Rocha's manifesto was written in 1965, two years after Santos' film was released. The film opens with Fabiano and his family walking in the *sertão*

amid a drought, in search for a place that can offer them food and a house. They are starving and end up killing their parrot to eat it. Vitória, Fabiano's wife, declares: "Também não servia para nada. Nem sabia falar." The issue of language is central both to the film and to Graciliano Ramos's homonymous novel, of which the film is an adaptation. Both novel and film deal with the animalization of these characters due to their social and economic conditions (which echoes *Assalto ao Trem Pagador*, when Grilo calls Tião *macaco*), and language becomes a signifier of this condition: "Era justamente a incapacidade de Fabiano e Vitória de se articularem como sujeitos que os reduzia a meros objetos horizontalizando-os com a própria natureza. A impotência existencial dos figurantes corresponde a uma impotência verbal diante da realidade" (Sant'Anna 176).

This film is the intellectual understanding of hunger that Glauber Rocha said was missing in Latin American cinema. The characters cannot speak because they are starving, but the director uses hunger as an esthetic means of expression. The scarcity of technical resources becomes a signifier in *Vidas Secas*: the use of overexposed images, the economy of the setting, the soundtrack, create a new cinematic language that gives expression to a Brazilian reality, which had so far been silenced in film. The film was so successful in establishing this new language, that until today Luis Carlos Barreto is credited for having created "a kind of light appropriate to Brazilian cinema" (Johnson 179).

As Glauber Rocha stated, violence becomes a manifestation of hunger: "Cinema Novo shows that the normal behavior of the starving is violence; and the violence of the starving is not primitive" (Rocha in Johnson and Stam 70). In Graciliano Ramos's novel the possibility of revolution is only imagined by Fabiano. While in prison, he thinks that were it not for his family,

he would join a band of *cangaceiros* (northeastern bandits), but he is never actually confronted with that possibility. The characters' struggle for survival does not leave space for any act of subversion. However, the film actually adds that possibility by introducing the figure of the bandit, that may be implied in the group of soldiers who set Fabiano free from prison: "There is nothing in the film to suggest that the members of the armed band are *cangaceiros*. [...] It is clear *only* that they represent a threat and an alternative to the ruling classes. Through this abstraction the director brings into the diegesis an option merely latent in the novel: armed struggle" (Johnson, 182). When introducing the possibility of revolt, Nelson Pereira dos Santos's film points to that desire of revolution patent in Cinema Novo. Revolution is seen as a way to escape hunger, and this is only possible through violence: "an esthetic of violence, before being primitive, is revolutionary" (Rocha in Stam and Johnson 69). Such violence is not undertaken by Fabiano or by his family, but the physical presence of the armed band opens that possibility.

If in *Vidas Secas* such violence is only latent, in *Os Fuzis* and in *Deus e o Diabo na Terra do Sol* it becomes what sets the characters in motion. *Os Fuzis*, along with *Vidas Secas*, focuses directly on the theme of hunger. The second feature film of Ruy Guerra, it was entered into the 14th Berlin International Film Festival where it won the Silver Bear Extraordinary Jury Prize. Just like in *Os Cafajestes*, the film combines documentary and fiction. Gaúcho is a truck driver that is transporting onions and stops in the small village of Milagres because his truck broke down and he is waiting for the replacement part. Just like *Vidas Secas*, *The Guns* is set in the Northeast of Brazil, that is periodically affected by extreme drought. The population of Milagres is starving, and the owner of the local warehouses, where food is stored to be later sold in other parts of the country, calls a group of soldiers to defend the goods from the starving population.

Gaúcho does not understand why the population does not revolt against the owner of the warehouses, and he also disapproves the complicity of the soldiers in that situation. Having been a soldier himself, he is closer to the soldiers than to the villagers, and it is with them that he talks about the situation. When the trucks are finally ready to leave the small town with the food, a man arrives with his dead son to the bar, where he asks for a box to bury the child. Gaúcho asks him about the cause of death of child, and the father says it was from starvation. Gaúcho urges the man to revolt, but the man just stares passively. The truck driver then revolts and confronts the soldier, shooting against one of the trucks, which leads to a chase and to his death.

The revolt of Gaúcho is useless, because he quickly dies and the people remain passive. Only Mário, one of the soldiers that had been his colleague when Gaúcho was also in the army, seems to be affected by the events, which leads to him abandoning the army. Roberto Schwarz makes an excellent analysis of this film and its political implications in “Cinema and *The Guns*” (Stam and Johnson 128-133). Schwarz points out to the Brechtian qualities of this film, where the spectator is not made to identify with the poor so that his or her political analysis might be more effective: “But human sympathy impedes our comprehension because it cancels out the political nature of the problem.” “*The Guns*, does not try to comprehend misery. On the contrary [Ruy Guerra] films as if it were an aberration, and this distance deprives of emotional impact” (Schwarz in Stam and Johnson 128, 129). The soldiers, with whom the spectator identifies, are there to defend the interests of the powerful. However, the soldiers are not the powerful themselves, nor are they the peasants, but a figure in between. They enjoy displaying their power to those beneath them: when the soldiers arrive to town, one explains all the technological details of their guns, emphasizing that one needs special knowledge to handle

them, and that this knowledge is not accessible to everyone. This scene is central in the film because it emphasizes the role of technological superiority in the exploitation of the peasants,²⁰ and it is these guns that give the title to the film, underscoring not the human beings as individuals, but the political and technological structures behind oppression. The power of the soldiers is, as we well know, very limited, and they only follow orders. Being a soldier is their job, their own form of making a wage and surviving.

The Guns is remarkable in illustrating what Hannah Arendt called “the banality of evil.”²¹ As Schwarz observed, the spectator identifies with the soldiers (let us not forget that Gaúcho too used to be a soldier), and therefore questions his or her own complicity with oppression, his or her own role in the oppressing system that lets the peasants starve to death, so that those in the cities, with more money, can be fed. Most of the films of Cinema Novo represent the disenfranchised, but end up speaking to power, as Jean-Claude Bernardet remarked, which can be seen as a failure, because the filmmakers wished to communicate to the people. *The Guns*, on the other hand, makes a deliberate choice to speak to those who do hold some power and who might have the ability to revolt, just like Gaúcho did. It reminds the middle classes that the oppressor can only abuse the marginalized with their connivance. However, revolution cannot be an act of an isolated individual who just reacts to injustice without a clear, joint strategy. Such desperate reaction can only lead to certain death, as it happened with Gaúcho, because the soldiers still detain the technological power that controls the masses. In this sense, this is probably one of the most hopeless films of the period. Only Mário questions his role in the army to the point of leaving it. But he too is isolated, and just like Gaúcho he too departs alone, in a weary and hopeless manner.

The film ends with the peasants eating the sacred ox that appeared in the beginning of the film, and that was supposed to bring rain to the region. The film opens and closes with the voice of a man preaching to the population. In the opening, such preaching is followed by an image of the ox arriving, and, in the end, by the peasants cutting the ox into pieces. The religious chants are also a recurrent soundtrack in the film, pointing to the religiosity and to the mysticism of the villagers as an obstacle to revolt. They believe that praying is their only possible salvation. As the blind man that feeds those escaping the drought declares: “O único serviço que existe por toda essa região é rezar. Esperar pela misericórdia.” Just like in *Barravento* and *Deus e o Diabo na Terra do Sol*, religion is seen as an impediment to revolution, as the opium of the people. The only moment when the peasants see some momentary relief to their hunger is when they understand that the ox is not bringing them rain, and is therefore no longer sacred, and decide to cut it into pieces and eat it.

In *Deus e o Diabo na Terra do Sol* (Glauber Rocha, 1964), religion and mysticism are also seen as a hindrance to revolution, but the main characters are two peasants, Manuel and Rosa, who are exploited by the owner of the cows that they raise. Manuel kills his boss when he refuses to pay him for his services, and as a consequence he and his wife, Rosa, have to run away. They join Sebastião, a local prophet who sacrifices their baby to God, and is murdered by Rosa as a consequence. The film ends with Corisco, a famous *cangaceiro*, being killed by the police, and Manuel and Rosa, who had joined his gang, have to run away again: “As Manuel runs across the *sertão*, free from the opposing, mystifying forces of Good and Evil, the camera follows him in a long aerial track before cutting abruptly to the sea. However, it is the camera

that reaches the sea, that proposes the solution to the metaphysical problem raised by the film's conflict" (Johnson 135).

Manuel and Rosa run away and stumble across the *sertão*—they may be running to find their freedom, but the opposite may also be true. In fact, the last image we have of them is one of desperation. It is the camera that actually reaches the sea, not them, which may point to the fact that true freedom may be achieved more through a cinematic praxis of liberation than through the deadly violence the oppression set in motion in the *sertão*. As Ismail Xavier argued, “Inegavelmente, esse final é a afirmação reiterada de que a revolução é urgente, a esperança é concreta. Mas a sua realização efetiva não está na própria aventura de Manuel e Rosa, nem nas figuras que tomaram para si a tarefa da transformação” (Xavier 74). There is a gap between the scenes of Manuel and Rosa running and the image of the sea. According to Xavier, it is precisely in this gap that lies the essential moment, because it is what fosters the strength of the teleology present in the film (Xavier 116). In fact, for the critic, the redemptive power of such teleology is radical (Ismail Xavier in Stam and Johnson 147). The messianism of Sebastião and the *cangaço* of Corisco herald the revolution, but they are not the revolution per se, nor the answer that Manuel and Rosa are looking for—they are in fact moments of alienation. This is why they need to overcome those moments, leading to their running through the *sertão*, and later to the final image of the ocean: “Messianism and *cangaço* are moments through which human consciousness moves toward lucid acknowledgment of human beings themselves as the source, the means, and the end of transforming praxis” (Ismail Xavier in Stam and Johnson 145). When Corisco is shot his last words are “Mais fortes são os poderes do povo,” pointing to a revolutionary praxis that goes beyond the characters and that is in the hands of the people.

The image of the sea points to a teleology of revolution—but such possibility is only truly attained by the camera. The importance of the camera in the path to freedom is much in line with Rocha's conception of the director as an *auteur*. The figure of the *auteur* is very different from the one described by Solanas and Getino in "Towards a Third Cinema," which instead defends a cinema where the revolutionary message relegates the director to the background: "The second cinema filmmaker has remained 'trapped inside the fortress' as Godard put it, or is on his way to becoming trapped" (Martin 42, 43). In fact, due to its auteurist feature, Cinema Novo belongs to Second Cinema.

Rocha's cinema is full of tensions and contradictions that push meaning to its limits, while at the same time it avoids the traps of a Manichaen world view (Johnson 123). These tensions are a consequence of the *cramped space* that Brazilian cinema occupied at the time, and which was condemned to a precarious existence. If such tensions must end in some kind of revolution, this is only possible through violence: "an esthetic of violence, before being primitive, is revolutionary" (Rocha in Stam and Johnson 70). It is the same described by Fanon in *The Wretched of the Earth*: "But it so happens that for the colonized this violence is invested with positive, formative features because it constitutes their only work. This violent praxis is totalizing since each individual represents a violent link in the great chain, in the almighty body of violence rearing up in reaction to the primary violence of the colonizer" (Fanon 50). However, these films fail to transform violence into positive action, in the way described by Fanon,²² and fail to create an armed struggle. Many of these works point to that possibility, but only as a hope for a future revolution, never as a concrete action to put an end to a system of oppression. Even the characters that did attempt such a revolution, like Manuel and Rosa in *Deus e o Diabo na*

Terra do Sol or *Gaúcho* in *Os Fuzis*, did so on an individual level, but their violence was not enough to create a real, concrete revolution. This may be because the films were addressed not to the people, but to the politicians, as Jean-Claude Bernardet pointed out:

Se os filmes não conseguiram esse diálogo é porque não apresentavam realmente o povo e seus problemas, mas antes encarnações da situação social, das dificuldades e hesitações da pequena burguesia, e também porque os filmes se dirigiam, de fato, aos dirigentes do país. É com estes últimos que os filmes pretendiam dialogar, sendo o povo assunto do diálogo. É aos dirigentes que se apontam as favelas e as condições sub-humanas de vida. (Bernardet 65)

Jean-Claude Bernardet remarks that the films did not get in touch with the public, which can be accounted as a failure of Cinema Novo, because it was not able to mobilize the lower classes politically. These films were not made for the lower classes, who usually did not have access to education and couldn't therefore understand a cinema full of erudite references. Some of these films even adopted a paternalistic position towards popular cultural manifestations, such as religion or samba, which could in fact be a source of political resistance. This indicated a certain bourgeois positioning of the Cinema Novo filmmakers, who believed that they could prescribe a political ethos to the disenfranchised, but who failed to understand their reality from within.

Nonetheless, the movement was able to create a new way of making films and of thinking about politically engaged cinema, and became a model for Third World Cinema. They proved that it was possible to create beautiful and complex movies with scarce technical resources that could also please the Brazilian audience. The military coup would bring new

challenges to the movement, and the filmmakers would be forced to adjust their filmic practices to the new political situation. In the next chapter, I will discuss the new esthetic and political strategies found by these directors to maintain their cinematic and political project.

Chapter 2

Cinema Novo and the Military Dictatorship

Brazil had been living a situation of political instability since 1961, when the President Jânio Quadros, who had been democratically elected that same year, resigned. He was replaced by the Vice-President, João Goulart, who faced serious opposition from the conservative sectors of society, including the military, fearing that he would impose a communist regime on the country. Goulart reached an agreement with the military, managing to become President under a parliamentary regime where part of his power was shifted to a Prime Minister. In January 1963 Brazilians voted in a referendum for a presidential system against a parliamentary one, reinforcing Goulart's power. Goulart devised a Basic Reforms Plan that included the nationalization of oil refineries controlled by foreign groups, the socialization of the profit of large companies in order to improve the economic situation of the lower classes, and land reform. These measures were extremely unpopular among the right wing sectors and the military. The economic crisis Brazil was going through only increased dissatisfaction, and a revolt of sailors who demanded better conditions for the soldiers and supported Goulart's program made the military even more hostile to Goulart's government.²³

On March 31st, 1964, the military carried out a coup that deposed João Goulart and established a military dictatorship that would last until 1985. The coup had the support of significant portions of the middle class, the major media companies, and the US. On December 1968 the hardline of the military took control of the government and issued the Ato Institucional Número Cinco—AI-5, which established dictatorship and took away civil liberties, such as the

suspension of *habeas corpus* for crimes of political motivation, and the illegality of political meetings not authorized by the police.

The institution of a dictatorship had serious consequences for many forms of cultural expression in Brazil, and in particular for the directors of Cinema Novo, who had invested in creating a political cinema that stood against capitalism and defended policies that could reduce the stark economic division between rich and poor. The coup resulted in the second phase of Brazilian Cinema Novo, that went until 1968, when the AI-5 precipitated the third-phase of the movement, also known as “cannibal-tropicalist,” that extended until 1971, when many directors went to exile to escape growing repression and censorship (Stam and Johnson 40).

Numerous films of the second phase of Cinema Novo analyze the failures of the left. As Jean-Claude Bernardet pointed out, the directors of the first phase believed that denouncing the underdevelopment of the country and the inequalities of Brazilian society would be enough to produce change. The films had the people as their target audience, but the people never connected with the films:

os filmes não conseguiram travar diálogo com o público almejado, isto é, com os grupos sociais cujos problemas se focalizavam na tela. Se os filmes não conseguiram esse diálogo é porque não apresentavam realmente o povo e seus problemas, mas antes encarnações da situação social, das dificuldades e hesitações da pequena burguesia, e também porque os filmes se dirigiam, de facto, aos dirigentes do país. (Bernardet 65)

With the military in power, the Cinema Novo filmmakers had to face the collapse of the great expectations that had put Latin America as the epicenter of change (Xavier 8). They also felt the urge to understand “the reluctance of the people to assume the task of revolution” (Xavier

13). The films of this period shift their focus to the urban realities, and the main characters usually belong to the middle class. The second phase of Cinema Novo was prolific and the films were not homogenous. I will here focus on some of the most iconic features of the period, especially in those that represent the crisis of the left and that analyze the failures that opened space for the establishment of a repressive dictatorship.

Glauber Rocha's *Terra em Transe* (1967) is arguably the most emblematic film of the second phase of Cinema Novo. The film is set in the imaginary country of Eldorado, where the conservative Porfirio Díaz has just performed a coup to take power. In the opening scenes, the journalist and poet Paulo Martins tries to convince the leftist populist leader Felipe Vieira to fight against Díaz, but Vieira refuses to do so, fearing that too much blood would be shed. Paulo leaves Vieira's palace with his lover Sara, who is a member of the Communist party and a supporter of Vieira. Sara advises Paulo to wait, that the time for fighting has not come yet, but he does not listen to her and drives against the police, who end up shooting him. About to die, Paulo begins a flashback to his part years and to his participation in the political life of Eldorado.

In this film, Eldorado stands for a dystopian Latin America, and for the promise that the continent would be the epicenter for social change. The name also evokes the legendary land dreamed by European explorers, which summons up the colonial history of the continent. In *Terra em Transe* Paulo contemplates his last years, his aspirations to power and to social justice, and the failures of the populist left. He represents the leftist intellectual who has to come to terms with the fact that their political project has failed. Porfirio Díaz—whose name is a reference to the homonymous Mexican politician—represents the right wing political leader, capable of betraying anyone to reach to power. When Díaz was young, he participated in leftwing protests,

but he subsequently shifted his alliances depending on who favored his permanence in power. Paulo had supported Porfirio in the past, but decided to abandon him to continue writing poetry and to follow his own ideas. As Ismail Xavier noted, Porfirio Diaz is a father figure to the journalist, and when Paulo chooses to follow his own political path he has to come to terms with this father figure and liberate himself from him (Xavier 71).

Felipe Vieira is apparently the political opposite of Porfirio Diaz. He is popular among the people and has the support of the unions. However, as the film unfolds, we realize that they are not so different. Vieira is in the run for power too, and he is willing to sacrifice his electoral promises to satisfy his allies. On two different occasions, Vieira and his advisors kill two representatives of the people that they proclaimed to defend: during a rally, a man complains to Vieira that someone wants to take away their land and that they'll resist with their lives. Paulo tells the man to shut up, but the man replies that Paulo betrayed them, since he had promised to defend their rights. When the rally is over, one of his allies defends that "We have to choose between electorate and commitments." The choice is clearly to favor the commitments with big economic interests.

On another occasion, during another rally, both Sara and Paulo appear somewhat detached from the crowd and from Vieira's group. Paulo tells Sara that no one will be able to speak for more than a century. To counter him, she urges Jerônimo, the leader of the union, to speak, as he is the voice of the people, and he states that everything is wrong, but that he does not know what to do to fix things and that he trusts Vieira to take the appropriate measures. This section of the film is entitled "Encontro de um Líder com o Povo" ("Encounter of a Leader with the People"), but it is in fact a disagreement with the people. Paulo rushes to cover Jerônimo's

mouth and declares: “Do you see what the people are like? Idiots! Illiterate! Depoliticized! Can you imagine Jerônimo in power?” Another man approaches and declares that he represents the real people, and that the union leader is just the one who decides their policies. He is the real people, with seven children and no place to live. The crowd calls him an “extremist” and one of Vieira’s men kills him.

These two scenes illustrate one of the major failures of the left, which had been speaking in the name of the people, claiming to know what the people needs, but in fact it does not want to listen to the people’s claims, especially when these claims go against their political agenda. Speaking for the people without actually caring to listen to them was in fact one of the major failures of the first phase of Cinema Novo, as Jean-Claude Bernardet has pointed out (65). Their illusion that denouncing the hardships of the people was enough to eliminate inequality has fallen apart, especially after the coup of 1964. As Ismail Xavier has argued, in *Terra em Transe* “Rocha’s aggressive style criticizes leftist (and Cinema Novo) involvement with populism—a political strategy that privileges the movement from the top to the bases—and demands a radical revision of the pedagogical assumptions and methods of the revolutionary art” (90). When Paulo realizes the defeat of the left, he exhorts Vieira to respond to Diaz’s coup with an armed struggle. In face of Vieira’s refusal to fight, he challenges the police by himself, and is killed. The last shot of the film is of Paulo holding a machine-gun, alone, in the dunes, which points to his utter isolation from everyone: from Vieira, whom he supported, from Sara, the communist militant that tried to warn him that the armed struggle would only lead to the deaths of innocent people, from his friend Álvaro, who committed suicide, and from the people. In his detailed analyses of the final sequence of the film, Xavier advances that “The poet, machine-gun still in hand, slowly

doubles up, and the film ends before any visible final expiration, as if in a desire of continuity or a suggestion of umbilical linkage that the narrative refuses to cut off, an instance of pain that is obsessively extended in the final shot” (61).

Terra em Transe opens with an aerial view of the coast of Eldorado, referring to the final sequence of Rocha’s previous film, *Deus e o Diabo na Terra do Sol* (“*Black God, White Devil*”), which I analyzed in the previous chapter. Ismail Xavier, regarding the end of *Deus e o Diabo*, has advanced that “Inegavelmente, esse final é a afirmação reiterada de que a revolução é urgente, a esperança é concreta” (74). *Terra em Transe* picks up where *Deus e o Diabo* left off (Johnson 135), but the camera does the reverse movement, from the sea to the land, a land in trance, as the Portuguese title indicates. Every hope is gone, only despair remains. The first sequence shows Vieira renunciation of power. The first time Porfirio Díaz appears is on a beach, with the black flag of Inquisition in one hand and a crucifix in the other. The score is Afro-Brazilian music, and there is also an Indian present, in a syncretic rendering of Brazil’s cultures. As Robert Stam has pointed out, even though the films of the second phase concentrate on white characters, racial tensions can be inferred through other elements (*Tropical* 234). In his first appearance in the film, Díaz is identified with the imperial past of Brazil, and therefore “*Terra em Transe* exposes what might be called the ‘whiteness of whiteness.’ For example, it criticizes not only white-dominated institutions (political parties, the media) but also white revolutionaries” (Stam, *Tropical* 236-237). The opening scene on the beach is one of the only two times when Porfirio appears outside of his palace. After he drinks wine as a Catholic priest does in communion, the camera cuts to Díaz inside his palace, climbing the staircase, which signifies his ascension to power. In the final sequence of the film, we see once again Díaz outside

of his palace, standing alone on a cliff, celebrating his victory. Vieira, on the other hand, has been defeated, but he has the people with him in a carnivalesque rally. The next shot is another aerial view of the coast of Eldorado, the same we saw in the beginning of the film, and then the sequence of the death of Paulo ensues, intercut with shots of Diaz's coronation.

These images of the ocean that close the circular movement of the film put Diaz in the liminal space of the coast, as he interrupts the hope of revolution. It is the Diaz's coup that renders the revolution hopeless, but the responsibilities do not lie only with him, as all the left is also to blame: the populist politicians, the communists who supported them in hopes of opening the way to the revolution, the intellectuals who backed populism, the progressive industrialists. *Terra em Transe* is indeed a film of utter disillusion with the political project of the early sixties, but the fact that the camera returns to the sea in the beginning and in the closing of the film points to a remnant of hope of transformation.

During the rally where Jerônimo speaks, Paulo declares to Sara: “Ando pelas ruas e vejo o povo magro, apático, abatido. Este povo não pode acreditar em nenhum partido. [...] Este povo precisa de morte mais do que possa se suportar. [...] A morte como fé, não como temor.” Hope lies therefore in death, as only death can open the space to transformation, to the appearance of something new. Death is a leap of faith. When Paulo drives toward the policemen he is taking that leap of faith. He screams, “Precisamos resistir, resistir. Eu preciso cantar!” (“We need to resist, resist. I need to sing!”) and drives past the two policemen. When Sara asks him what does his death prove, Paulo replies: “O triunfo da beleza e da justiça.” *Terra em Transe* has a circular structure; the baroque conception of time is also circular, and in a circular conception of time death is not the end of everything but instead brings renovation. In face of the utter disillusion of

the political project of the early years of the revolution, only death can open the space for renovation. As Randal Johnson pointed out, “Whereas on the one hand, *Land in Anguish* is indeed an anguished cry of political defeat—the defeat of the intellectual Left—on the other, its optimism for a society rising from the ruins is implicit” (141). Johnson then advances that “art transcends not only politics, but also death” (141). The work of the artist is done in solitude, and that is why the final image of the film is Paulo alone in the dunes, holding a gun. I have mentioned earlier Solanas and Getino’s use of the concept “guerrilla cinema,” and how the camera is seen as a weapon (the camera also *shoots* film). If we reverse that metaphor, the gun in Paulo’s hand is the camera in the artist’s hand, and it points to the possibility of cinema transcending death. However, cinema can only transcend death if it frees itself from pamphleteer politics—Rocha always defended that the subjective vision of the filmmaker should never yield to a political agenda. When Paulo decides to direct a film about the political betrayals of Porfirio Diaz, he is in fact betraying his art. That is why Sara tells him that politics and poetry are too much for one man—not because politics and poetry are incompatible, but because Paulo’s political choices are a betrayal to his poetry, and because “art in itself [cannot] create a revolution.” (Johnson and Stam 153). It is therefore only through an art that is completely independent that the artist can survive death and even, who knows, find the path to revolution.

Fome de Amor (1968), directed by Nelson Pereira dos Santos, also depicts the failure of the intellectual Left. The film centers on two couples, Felipe and Mariana, and Alfredo and Ula. The action begins in New York, where Mariana, a rich young pianist, meets Felipe, a failed painter who survives waiting tables. They meet when she goes to his restaurant, where he insults

her and is fired as a result. This scene establishes their class difference and the tensions that such difference conveys.

Unhappy in New York, they decide to return to Brazil, to an island near Angra dos Reis, which Felipe claims to be his. Once on the island, Mariana and Felipe realize that another couple is living there, Ula and her husband, Alfredo, a botanist and a revolutionary who went deaf, dumb, and blind in an assassination attempt. Ula married him when she was only twenty years old, and now, four years later, she regrets the dull life she is forced to live with him on the island. Alfredo is a left wing revolutionary who has been reduced to silence and inaction and who can barely communicate with those around him. He is the perfect symbol for the situation of the left in Brazil after the military coup of 1964. The fact that both couples live on an island reinforces their isolation from the world.

In New York, we see Mariana and Felipe completely isolated from everyone else, even though Manhattan is a highly populated island. Throughout the film, flashbacks of their life in New York illuminate the tensions between the couple, which were present since the beginning of the film. Elizabeth Merena and João Luiz Vieira point out that Felipe and Mariana's first love-making scene establishes the distance between them:

The film intercuts shots of Felipe's misty island with shots of Mariana's recently arrived piano. The piano suggests a different cultural and intellectual habitat, another "island."

The visual interplay between the island and the piano mimic the alternating English and Portuguese words spoken by Mariana and Felipe as they make love: "Come... Came...

Alone... Together." The fragmentation of the scene evokes the distance between them. (in

Johnson and Stam 164)

Throughout the film, in the flashbacks that take us back to New York, Felipe complains about his life in the city, the need to take any job to survive, not having a visa, having to be a waiter, selling his painting material to get by. He declares that any Latin American who arrives to New York will work for little money and will accept living in any dump, because any dump is better than the slums where they come from. Felipe says that seeing all of that makes him feel a lot of hatred, that he hates those people, and having to serve them. This declaration is very close to the revolt of the colonized described by Fanon, but, as we will see, his hatred is isolated and does not lead to revolution.

Mariana belongs to the wealthy class, so she is part of what Felipe hates. What seems to unite them in New York is the fact that both are Brazilian, and both seem to feel out of place in New York. Once back in Brazil, the only bond that connected them loses its importance and they drift apart. Mariana is sympathetic to Felipe's hatred, and she replies that "A revolução é justa porque nasce do ódio," but she fails to realize that that hatred is also directed at her. In the first scene of the film, the couple hang out at the Central Park. He wants to return some change to her, but she tells him to keep it. The scene establishes Felipe's economic dependency on Mariana. In the following scenes we see her signing checks or buying plane tickets back to Brazil. On the island, their differences become more and more visible: Felipe loves the sun and the ocean, and Mariana prefers to stay inside. The first time she leaves the house she puts on a pair of sunglasses that are very similar to the ones used by Alfredo, already hinting at their similarities. It can also point to Mariana's unwillingness to see the truth and the contradictions between Felipe's and her own ideology.

Randal Johnson pointed out that this film breaks away with Nelson Pereira dos Santos's previous films, more committed to realism. *Fome de Amor* is more experimental, closer to the French Nouvelle Vague:

In *Hunger for Love* the director ceases to be a critical observer of socioeconomic structures and turns his attention toward the ideological ways in which that society, that reality, is perceived. Rather than calling social structures into question, as in earlier films, he now questions ideology itself, especially leftist ideology, in the face of Brazil's repressive political ambience during military rule. (185)

During a flashback to when Felipe worked for Alfredo in New York, the film hints at his participation in Leftist militant actions. Felipe has a love-hate sentiment toward Mariana, or more precisely toward what she stands for. He desires to be part of her social class, but he hates that very class because he has been exploited by it. In fact, he does not hope for social justice, he just wants to have Mariana's social status. His only revolution is to conspire with Ula to get the money from Mariana. In the island, we realize that he has no revolutionary interest whatsoever and is more concerned in a hedonistic way of life, enjoying the sun and becoming Ula's lover. Unlike Paulo in *Terra em Transe*, not even art can save Felipe, who is a failed painter, and even copies paintings from other artists to impress Mariana. Both his art and his militancy are fake, serving only as tools to climb the social ladder. He has no real interest in changing society, his struggle is a purely individualist and hedonist one. Ula is similar to Alfredo, and that is why they get together. She doesn't seem to care much for Alfredo's revolutionary past, for his ideas or for his work as a botanist, she is only concerned with the status that those achievements attest. She

fell in love with him because he was an important man, but now that Alfredo is an invalid, she has lost all interest in him.

Mariana, on the other hand, becomes more and more fascinated with Alfredo's militant past and they end up becoming lovers. When they make love, an overexposed shot "suggests two things: Mariana has become both 'illuminated' and blinded" (Merena and Vieira in Johnson and Stam 165). She had been protected from the sun so far, avoiding both to be blinded and to be illuminated. However, her illumination and blindness draw her closer to Alfredo, but further isolate her from the real world. She always carries a tape recorder with her, and she begins recording the rain to listen to it when she is alone. She always has her headphones on, further isolating her from the world. At the same time, she reads leftist theory, and we see her carrying and reading a book by Mao Tse Tung. At a point she reads a passage about the articulation between practice and knowledge, and how practice generates knowledge. Near the end of the film, Mariana quotes Che Guevara: "El deber de todo revolucionario es hacer la revolución." Earlier in the film, she asks Felipe about the revolution and he replies that it needs preparation. The revolution is indefinitely postponed. None of the inhabitants of the island are revolutionaries because they do not make the revolution, they do not even make concrete plans to organize one.

In the film's last sequence, Ula and Felipe organize a party with Manfredo, an Italian mercenary, and several young women, which echoes the parties in Fellini's *La Dolce Vita*. Ula discovers a trunk with old costumes and everyone puts on a disguise. Mariana does not want to be at the party and constantly asks Manfredo to take her back to the island, but he forces her to get drunk. They even disguise Alfredo as Che Guevara, and Ula proclaims him "o Papai Noel das Américas Latinas." Felipe gets mad at Ula for doing that, and she gets back at him asking how

Mariana—who is listening to everything—has not yet figured out that all Felipe wants from her is her money. At dawn, Mariana manages to return to the island with Alfredo. The last shot of the film is that of Mariana and Alfredo on the island, seen from the point of view of Ula, Felipe and the other members of the party. We listen to Mariana declaiming Che Guevara's words about revolution, while all of the partygoers roll on the sand laughing at the two pathetic revolutionaries trapped on a small desert island.

This scene is quite evoking of *La Dolce Vita*'s last sequence, when a party celebrating a divorce ends at the beach, in the early morning, and fishermen pull out of the sea a giant fish that had been dead for three days—the same number of days that took Jesus Christ to resurrect. There is an uncanny close up of the dead fish's eye, as if death itself stared at the audience. In *Fome de Amor*, this party also celebrates the breaking up of the two couples, Mariana and Felipe, and Alfredo and Ula. Moments earlier, Mariana had declared: “Crucifiquei o Marxismo-Leninismo na minha cabeça.” This scene symbolizes the death of leftist ideologies, as the two last characters that still believe in them, Mariana and Alfredo, walk alone, isolated in a small island, while the partygoers laugh at their pathetic ideology. The partygoers, if we continue the analogy with Fellini's film, represent the bourgeoisie that supported the military coup, hedonist and completely alienated from the social realities of Brazil.

O Desafio, directed by Paulo César Saraceni in 1965, follows the same theme of the leftist petit-bourgeois intellectual in crisis in face of the failures of the left. The film focuses on the affair between Marcelo, a leftist journalist who feels helpless after the coup, and Ada, a bourgeois woman married to Mário, an industrialist who manages a factory of 2,500 workers. As Jean-Claude Bernardet has noted, dialogue predominates in the film, rather than action:

O filme é extremamente dialogado; poder-se-ia dizer que é composto por uma série de conversas que reproduzem essas conversas de bar que a juventude intelectual mantém interminavelmente sobre assuntos políticos, estéticos ou pessoais. [...] No entanto, através do uso abundante de diálogo, *O Desafio* não pretende realmente discutir idéias, mas antes caracterizar um certo estado, e, se não insinuar críticas, pelo menos sugerir perplexidades ante tal estado. [...] Para essas personagens que não agem, não fazem nada, a palavra é simultaneamente uma forma de reação e de alienação. (147)

The film opens with Marcelo and Ada in a car, on the way to one of their romantic encounters. As in *Fome de Amor*, the distance between the couple is evident. Realizing that Marcelo is despondent, Ada complains that he is exaggerating the effect of the coup, and that he is giving too much importance to the political problem and forgetting about their relationship. In fact Ada does not agree with the current political situation, but she believes that there is no reason for it to interfere with their personal lives, with their relationship. He tells her that before the coup, when they both had hope and believed in the possibility of a revolutionary process in Brazil, he was happy with her because he felt that their love and their idea were the same thing. Now he realizes that they belong to opposite worlds: “É a porra desse golpe militar que impede que a gente possa estar do mesmo lado.”

In the following sequence the couple is in the house where they had their first encounter. In the bedroom, after making love, she stands against a wall where there is a poster of *Deus e o Diabo na Terra do Sol*. She complains to Marcelo that she can't stand being apart from him, that her life with her husband no longer makes sense. During this shot, the frame only includes half of her face, which points to her feeling divided between her bourgeois comfort (earlier she told

Marcelo that it was not that easy to abandon husband, apartment, son), and her love for Marcelo. As Bernardet points out, Ada is the first bourgeois woman to be considered a person in the context of Brazilian Cinema Novo; until then, they were only caricatures. The spectator sympathizes with Ada, understands her hesitations. Ada is in favor of leftist ideas, and she finds her intellectual friends much more interesting than the superficial, empty and selfish bourgeoisie with whom she has to socialize at parties. However, she is not willing to give up her status quo, and that is why her relationship with Marcelo is destined to fail. In the shot with the poster from *Deus e o Diabo* we see that she is split between two worlds, and refuses to choose. She tries to convince Marcelo that life can continue as usual after the coup, that there is no need to pick a side, but Marcelo knows that in that context it is no longer possible not to choose. In fact, Ada ends up staying with her husband, not because she decided to, but just because she did not act. Ada illustrates the idea that not to choose is choosing the side of the oppressor, even if that choice is made by omission. Bernardet argues that *O Desafio* introduces the theme of class struggle in a couple's relationship (a theme that is developed in other films of this phase, as we have seen in *Fome de Amor*):

Ada e sua relação com Marcelo são um fenômeno fundamental porque introduzem no cinema brasileiro algo que até agora não chegara a existir, ou seja, a luta de classe. O rompimento Marcelo-Ada afirma que essas personagens são marcadas por seu meio e que entre esses meios não há acordo possível. A ilusão do bom entendimento entre classes opostas passou; a mudança de governo extinguiu uma ilusão eufórica e esclareceu a situação. Vivemos num “tempo de guerra,” diz a canção final do filme. (148)

The image of Ada with the poster of Rocha's film also points to the disillusionment of the left, the realization that their project was just an impossible dream. The hope that the ending of *Deus e o Diabo* announced is gone; so is the Cinema Novo filmmakers' hope of bringing about political change with their movies.

The split image of Ada is repeated in another sequence, after a dialogue with her husband, who complains that she is distant, and promises her that now the political situation will improve his business and their lives, as he will have more time to dedicate to her. In the next shot, Ada washes her hands, just like Pilates did. She wants to separate herself from the political situation, but she is immersed in it: as her husband points out, the factory also belongs to her. The camera then pans from her hands to her reflection in the mirror, where we can only see half of her face.

Marcelo, on the other hand, knows well on which side of the barricade he stands. However, he does not know what to do with it. He yearns for the war, as he declared to Ada: "Como posso estar em paz quando estou precisando de guerra," but he has no idea how to act. Before the coup he was writing a book, but now that book no longer makes sense, it's just alienation. Marcelo considers his book an alienation because he realized that his beliefs in change were a dream, that his art was not able to change anything—and in this he differs from Paulo Martins in *Terra em Transe*. Marcelo represents the first shock in face of the coup, when a sentiment of powerlessness takes over, and the character cannot overcome his lethargy and react. Paulo Lima, on the other hand, is ready to act, even if acting is suicidal. *O Desafio* closes with Marcelo alone, walking down the street, while the song "Eu Vivo num Tempo de Guerra" plays:

É um tempo de guerra

É um tempo sem sol.
E você que prossegue
E vai ver feliz a terra
Lembre bem do nosso tempo
Desse tempo que é de guerra.
Veja bem que preparando
O caminho da amizade
Não podemos ser amigos, ao mau
Ao mau vamos dar maldade.
Se você chegar a ver
Essa terra da amizade
Onde o homem ajuda ao homem
Pense em nós, só com vontade
Essa terra eu não vou ver!

The last shot shows Marcelo walking down a set of stairs, and then down the street. This descending movement represents his descent to the new reality after the coup. The song indicates the possibility of war, of a struggle against dictatorship. However, if any victory is possible, it cannot be attained by Marcelo's generation, as the last verse, "Esta terra eu não vou ver!" shouted by the singer, indicates. This last sequence echoes the last sequence of *Deus e o Diabo*, where the revolution is a possibility, but not yet to Rosa and Manuel. As Bernardet points out, this last sentence is an expression of discouragement that refers to the last words of *Deus e o Diabo*: "A terra é do homem, não é de Deus nem do Diabo" (150).

In the films of the second phase of Cinema Novo, some themes are recurrent. The disheartened intellectual, poet, artist who faces the failures of the left in the context of the coup. The couples that grow apart because they belong to different social classes and because there is no possibility of reaching an understanding or a pact between each class—the chasm is insurmountable. The analysis of the middle class and of its role in the current political situation. Another important characteristic of these films is self-referentiality, as all the films reflect upon the role of cinema—and of the arts in general—in the political life of society, its limitations and possibilities of intervention. All the films are fragmentary, discontinuous, and disruptive as they try to deal esthetically with the disruption of democracy. It is important to point out that in spite of their similarities, this group of films is not homogenous, and each filmmaker finds different esthetic approaches to deal with the subject. What unites these films is the subject, the utter despair towards a new political situation that endangers the very possibility of continuing to film in Brazil. In fact, Glauber Rocha was arrested by the political police and in 1971 he went to exile. His companions suffered similar persecutions from the regime, and some of them also chose exile.

In 1968, with the take over power by the hardline wing of the military and with the Institutional Act 5 (AI-5) the situation gets even more complicated. Censorship increases and filmmakers are forced to adapt their filmmaking to the political situation. This new reality precipitates the third phase of Cinema Novo, also known as “cannibal-tropicalist.” The political themes can no longer be approached so blatantly, and the directors turn to allegory to pass their message (Johnson and Stam 38).

O Dragão da Maldade Contra o Santo Guerreiro, directed in 1969 by Glauber Rocha, takes up the character Antônio das Mortes of *Deus e o Diabo na Terra do Sol*. Following the films of Cinema Novo's second phase that focused on the urban bourgeoisie, *O Dragão da Maldade* is a return to the *sertão*. The title is a reference to St. George, one of the most popular saints in Brazil, who is also represented in *candomblé* as Ogum. The title also announces Antônio's shift of roles: "The *cangaceiro*, the 'white devil' of Rocha's second film, is now the holy warrior wreaking havoc on the domain of the black god, the dragon of evil" (Johnson 146).

Antônio das Mortes arrives in Jardim das Piranhas because he heard that there was a *cangaceiro* living there, Coirana. He claims that he killed the last *cangaceiro*, Lampião, but he wants to see if the rumor is true. At the local bar, he tells the Teacher that he has killed more than one hundred *cangaceiros*, and that now "só vivo na tristeza da lembrança." That is why he came searching for a new enemy, so that he can recover his life—in a way, so that he can be reborn. Antônio declares to the men at the bar that Lampião was his mirror. Therefore, when he killed Lampião, he in a way committed suicide. Finding a new *cangaceiro* is finding a new life. Terence Carlson refers to the killing of Coirana as a "living suicide":

Kavanaugh calls Antônio a "living suicide" because by killing Coirana, he kills a part of himself—the *cangaceiro* he could have been in the past had his political conversion occurred sooner. On another level we may view Antônio's murder of the *jagunço* Mata Vaca as revenge for the murders of Lampião and Coirana—murders that Antônio *himself* committed. This again is the "suicide" of a former identity; however, it is a positive, progressive act. (Carlson 173)

After killing Coirana, Antônio suffers a transformation and decides to join the group of Santa and Antão. Santa is the spiritual leader of the group of *beatos* led by Coirana, and Antão, who is associated with Afro-Brazilian religions, is her follower. It is Santa who changes Antônio, making him realize the struggles that she had to go through because he killed her parents who had become *beatos*. Antônio also listens to the story of Coirana before he dies, who tells him about how he was exploited. Santa tells Antônio that if Coirana dies, the rest of the people will die too, afflicted by hunger and thirst—the end of the *cangaceiro* is the end of any hope of social justice. Earlier in the film, when Antão urges Coirana to respect God and the government, Coirana replies: “Quem é que respeita os pobres? Por isso é preciso vingança, para devolver a dignidade ao povo,” echoing Fanon and Rocha’s manifesto on the esthetic of hunger.

The idea of Antônio’s “living suicide” can be articulated with the notion of cannibalism: “Coirana, in this struggle, is the holy warrior St. George, fighting against the representative of the dragon of evil. But even as he kills Coirana, Antônio das Mortes begins to assume his adversary’s role and to take on the function of St. George in a new struggle, this time on the side of the people rather than on that of the powerful” (Johnson 145). This transformation is akin to the ceremonial act of cannibalism, where the warrior who eats his adversary embodies his qualities. Randal Johnson further advances that Antônio das Mortes also kills Mata Vaca, the *jagunço* (“contract murder”) who is following orders of the colonel, therefore killing his other half, as Antônio himself was a *jagunço*. By killing Mata Vaca, “he takes revenge for the murders of Lampião, Corisco, and Coirana, murders that he himself had committed” (145). Antônio kills his two mirror-images, Mata Vaca and Coirana, in a double cannibal act. Antônio’s symbolic cannibalism of the *cangaceiros* ultimately leads to his own transformation, and he incorporates

the qualities of the *cangaceiros* and the hatred against the powerful that leads him to kill Mata Vaca and his *jagunços*. When Antônio returns to Jardim das Piranhas he demands that Mattos orders the colonel to open the warehouse and distribute food to Coirana's *beatos* and that he changed his opinion about them when he saw them up close. The *beatos* were the feared other; but once Antônio was able to see them as human beings struggling to survive, he realized their humanity and decided that he could no longer be an instrument of their oppression.

The *cangaceiros* represent the anger of the people against those that exploit them. Colonel Horácio, Mattos, and their circle fear not only the latent violence of the people, embodied in the peasants that follow Coriana, Antão and the Santa, but also their *otherness*. The metaphor of cannibalism has its roots in Brazilian modernism, epitomized in Oswald de Andrade's *Anthropophagite Manifesto*: "Oswald de Andrade advocated cultural irreverence in place of subaltern obfuscation, using the metaphor of 'swallowing up' the alien" (Schwarz 8). This notion of "swallowing up" the alien loses its playfulness in *Antônio das Mortes* and embodies the violence of the exploited against their exploiter. When Antônio kills the *cangaceiros*—Lampião, Corisco, Coriana—he is trying to kill the threatening *other* that lurks among the exploited. If the killings undertaken by Antônio are a cannibalistic act, he ends up incorporating their meaning, and becomes himself a *cangaceiro* when he opens the way for the assassinations of colonel Horácio, Mattos, and Laura. The *other* is always a mirror image of the self—just like Lampião was Antônio's mirror image. However, as Xavier pointed out, *Antônio das Mortes* is also a reflection of the modernization of Brazil, which is not seen as something necessarily positive in the film. The reign of the rural colonels is threatened, but there is another type of power that is about to replace them, capitalism, represented by foreign multinationals

such as Shell. Antônio kills the colonel, but he does not manage to create the revolution. He kills a dying rural patriarchy that was already losing ground to the conservative modernization that was on its way with the military dictatorship. When Mattos introduces Antônio to the colonel, the colonel complains about the government: “Eles podem entender de máquinas mas as terras é comigo. [...] Eu não quero saber de americanos, de reforma agrária, de indústria. Eu só quero saber de minhas vacas.” Therefore, the colonel has no interest in progress, and he therefore represents a dying order that is disappearing.

In the final scene, Antônio walks alone in a road with trucks passing by and with the Shell gas station on the side of the road, representing the coming modernization defended by the new government. Antônio can no longer fight against it with his gun or his sword, as this is a more abstract enemy. The final scene points to the present impossibility of a true revolution. The film returns to the point where it began. Ismail Xavier has noted the circular time of the film:

The adventure is designed as cycle in which, in the end, Antônio hopelessly faces the same conditions as he did in the beginning. [...] His final action produces a kind of “poetic justice” proper to the tradition of a didactic allegory in which punctual interventions of the hero repair the wrongs of the world but without requesting that logic of history expressed in the allegory of *Black God, White Devil*. (166-167)

As Ismail has pointed out, *O Dragão da Maldade* is a confrontation between past and present, with no hope for redemption: “To engender the future, one must call back the universe previous to the current decadence: the *sertão* of national heroes full of dignity. In brief, ancient Brazil is the moral reserve of the revolution” (177).

The motif of cannibalism is more evident in *Macunaíma*, directed by Joaquim Pedro de Andrade (1969). The film is an adaptation of the homonymous novel published by Mário de Andrade in 1928, in the context of Brazilian modernism. Randal Johnson has noted that this is “perhaps the first Cinema Novo film to be formally innovative, politically radical, *and* immensely popular with the Brazilian public” (Johnson 25). Mário de Andrade’s novel has been considered a compendium of Brazilian folklore, and the author used numerous indigenous myths that the German ethnologist Theodor Koch-Grünberg gathered in Northern Brazil and southern Venezuela near the Orinoco River in the beginning of the twentieth century (Johnson 26-27). Joaquim Pedro de Andrade synthesized and updated the novel to the late 1960s, using the Brazilian political situation as a backdrop to his adaptation of *Macunaíma*. With the increasing repression and censorship, Brazilian directors began adapting classic literary works of Brazilian literatures because it would be harder for the censors to oppose to the films adapting canonic works of national literature.

Macunaíma is born of an old woman and has two brothers, one black and one white. *Macunaíma* is black and Grande Otelo is the actor playing him. The director opened a new dialogue with the *chanchadas*, which had to do with the *tropicalismo* movement, which favored the mix of genres and influences, clearly inspired by the modernist *Antropofagia* (Xavier 151). *Macunaíma* nods at a certain *kitsch* esthetic, and the indirect reference to the *chanchadas* hints at that taste.

Macunaíma is born in the body of an adult, and when one of his brothers shows him to his mother, she complains that he is ugly. She names him *Macunaíma*, announced that names that begin with “Ma” indicate a bad fate. The voice over announces that “the hero of our people is

born,” but there is nothing heroic about the birth. He has two brothers, Jiguê, who is black, and Maanape, who is white. Mário de Andrade’s novel describes him “the hero without” character, which makes him an anti-hero. The main characteristics of the character are present since his birth: he is playful, lazy, and smart in getting things done the way he wants. Since his early age he has a strong sexual appetite and he is always ready to “play” (“brincar”). When his brother’s wife takes him out to the woods and gives him a magical cigarette that she had hidden in her crotch, he turns into a white prince. She finds him beautiful and they have sex in the woods. This is the first or many times that he cheats on one of his brothers, and he is always taking advantage of them, who usually stand by him in spite of his misdeeds. Macunaíma is always lazy and hates to work. He is also selfish, and doesn’t even want to share the food he found with his brothers, after a flood that destroyed their house. His mother decides to punish him by abandoning him.

He walks starving in the woods, and meets the ogre Currupira, who feeds him meat he cuts from his leg. However, that was just a trick to eat Macunaíma, and when Macunaíma runs away, the meat in his stomach screams to the Currupira’s call, so that he can find our hero. Macunaíma throws up the meat in a pool of mud: “The puddle, as filmed, forms, together with the film’s frame, the design of the Brazilian flag: a rectangle enclosing a diamond shape, within which is a globe with stars on it. [...] The image is at once a comment on the state of Brazilian politics under the military regime and a cannibalistic image, as Brazil [...] devours part of the Currupira” (Johnson 31). This scene can also be seen as a warning both for our hero and for Brazil: cannibalism can be self-devouring, and can result in the destruction of both—Macunaíma represents Brazil, and that identification becomes more evident by the end of the film. When Macunaíma is born he wears a yellow nightgown, and when he dies he is wearing a green jacket.

These are the colors of the Brazilian flag, and the main character's clothes often repeat these colors, sometimes adding blue to the outfit, the other color of the Brazilian flag.

Macunaíma finally discovers the way back home, and once he gets there he announces that he had a dream where he dreamt he lost a teeth, which means that a relative will die. The mother immediately dies. Even though the dream just announced her death, it is as if it was Macunaíma that provoked that death. The three brothers and Jiguê's new wife decide to leave for the city. On their way, they found a fountain: Macunaíma showers in its waters and becomes white. In the film, this transformation can point to the main character's preparation to enter the big city, the space of modernization and capitalism. Ismail Xavier advances that, in the city, he adheres to consumerism uncritically, and becomes therefore part of the capitalist society. I will develop this idea ahead, but I would like to advance the possibility that Macunaíma becomes white because Brazilian society denied unofficially many civil rights to the black population. In order to fully participate in the consumerist society and become one of them, Macunaíma has to become white.²⁴

When they arrive in the city, Jiguê's wife disappears to become a prostitute—another sign of the mercantilization of capitalist society. Macunaíma encounters Ci, the love of his life, who is part of the urban guerrilla struggle against the military. We only see them together at their house, and Macunaíma lives the lazy life that he enjoys. It is Ci that supports him and the house, while she fights at the same time, only demanding from the hero that he satisfies her sexual appetite. He seems completely oblivious of her political struggle, which reinforces his alienation from the political situation that the country was going through. Since Macunaíma is a metaphor of Brazil this points to a large of the middle class, who preferred to ignore the political situation as long as

they could carry on with their hedonistic way of life (we can say that this was also probably Felipe's ultimate desire in *Fome de Amor*).

In one of her operations, Ci explodes herself and dies, "in what Joaquim Pedro de Andrade refers to as the 'self-cannibalism' of the Left" (Johnson 32). Before she died, she had promised her lover her *muiraquitã*, a stone that was supposed to have special powers. The *muiraquitã* disappeared with the explosion and Macunaíma discovers that it is a rich industrialist of Italian origins, Venceslau Pietro Pietra, who has the stone. After several attempts at tricking the entrepreneur into giving him the stone, including dressing as a woman and trying to seduce him, he recovers the stone during a big *feijoada*²⁵ where the meat is that of the guests that are randomly selected through the *jogo do bicho*, a Brazilian illegal lottery. Venceslau represents industrial capitalism, feeding on other Brazilians to increase his fortune, in yet another instance of cannibalism. Ismail Xavier points out that Macunaíma's battle against Venceslau is an oedipal one, and the industrialist is the obstacle to fulfill his desire:

However, following the law of desire, the appropriation of the *muiraquitã* is an illusory fulfillment. Lack and nostalgia for the ultimate object remain. Furthermore, we see a Macunaíma for whom the victory over Venceslau, the journey to the city, and the experience of commitment are far from constituting a rite of passage [...]. Victorious, Macunaíma does not make the leap in quality. (146)

Macunaíma and his brothers finally return to their home in the forest. Once there, they all have to look hard for food, but our hero once again indulges in his laziness and refuses to contribute. His brothers, who had supported and helped him until then, grow tired of his selfishness and abandon him. Macunaíma spends the days lounging in his hammock and eating

bananas, until one day he wakes up with the desire to “play.” He heads to the river, where a Uiara—a Brazilian mythical figure, similar to a mermaid, who enchants men to then eat them—lures him to the waters and devours him. Randal Johnson noted that the final shot of the film recalls the Brazilian flag, focusing on the yellow water of the river and the green jacket that Macunaíma was wearing with his blood surfacing (31-32). This scene clearly symbolizes Brazil devouring itself.

In Joaquim Pedro de Andrade’s film, cannibalism loses most of the positive connotations that it had in Oswald de Andrade’s manifesto. Instead of devouring the other to reinvent itself, Brazil is now devouring itself to be like the other. The military regime had the support of the United States, and the conservative Brazilian middle class aspired at emulating the US lifestyle uncritically. Macunaíma’s laziness could be thought of as a form of resistance against capitalism, in a refusal to be productive. However, as Ismail Xavier has advanced, such form of resistance is very limited and selfish, and after a while it ends up being counterproductive:

The hero created by de Andrade’s transfiguration of myth is treated, in the end, from a judgmental and pessimistic perspective, from a perspective interested in exorcizing the naive faith in the virtues of individualism and *malandragem*, both seen by Joaquim Pedro as obstacles to a collective mobilization toward the economic and political production of a sovereign modernity. (152)

Cannibalism continues to be a major theme in other films of the third phase of Cinema Novo. *Como era Gostoso o Meu Francês* (Nelson Pereira dos Santos, 1971) is most likely the film where cannibalism is most literal. Jean, a Frenchman, has been captured by a tribe of Tupinambás, who plan to cannibalize him. However, he needs to be prepared for the ceremony

and ends up spending a long time with the tribe. At first Jean is reluctant to cut his beard and abandon his clothes, but he progressively adopts the ways of the Tupinambá. The tribe even gets him a wife, Sebiopepe.

Most of the film is spoken in Tupi, and the themes of cultural imperialism and cannibalism (which points back to the theme of anthropophagy) are central to the plot: “The idea (and fact) of cannibalism of course pervades the film and represents Nelson Pereira dos Santos’s contribution to the never ending Brazilian discussion of cultural colonization. The use of cannibalism as a metaphor for the cultural struggle goes back to Brazilian literary modernism and Oswald de Andrade’s ‘movimento antropófago’” (Johnson, 196).

The exploring of cannibalism in *Como era Gostoso o Meu Francês* reminds us of Glauber Rocha’s manifesto and brings the theme of hunger into discussion. In “An Esthetic of Hunger” Rocha begins by noticing how Latin America has been left starving by colonialism, and how that became the essence of its society, to then claim that hunger as the condition for esthetic expression:

This economic and political conditioning has led us to philosophical weakness and impotence that engenders sterility when conscious and hysteria when unconscious. It is for that reason that the hunger of Latin America is not simply an alarming symptom: it is the essence of our society. There resides the tragic originality of Cinema Novo in relation to world cinema. Our originality is our hunger and our greatest misery is that this hunger is felt but not intellectually understood. [...] Therefore, only a culture of hunger, weakening its own structures, can surpass itself qualitatively; the most noble cultural manifestation of hunger is violence. (70)

One of the consequences of such violence is cannibalism, as portrayed in *Como era Gostoso o Meu Francês*. In fact, in a context of centuries of colonialism, it is not possible to completely reject the culture of the colonized:

The position of outright rejection [of foreign cultures] seems mistaken to me. We are all, from a certain point of view, Europeans—in our language, in our way of life. At the same time we resent the terrible influence of American technological civilization, and our way of thinking makes it clear. All this amounts to the summation of our contradictions. On the other hand a romantic return to our origins is absurd. (Pereira dos Santos quoted in Johnson 197)

When Jean has an opportunity to escape, he gives up at the last minute and stays with his wife. At this point, he has already learned to speak Tupi and adopted the ways of the Tupinambá. When he is totally assimilated to the tribe and indistinguishable from the other Tupinambás, the tribe sacrifices and eats him:

Ironically, his assimilation into the tribe occurs on the eve of his own destruction. There really is no “middle ground.” Assimilation of a European into the Tupinambá means, essentially, the destruction of the European.

It is in this light that we must see the film’s final act of cannibalism as a gesture of defiance, a special kind of revolt. It represents the ultimate kind of assimilation: one that in the process of assimilation definitively transforms that which is being assimilated. (Peña in Johnson and Stam 199)

The question of national culture has been a central debate in Brazilian culture, and the period of modernism inaugurated the metaphor of cannibalism that continues to be useful up to

today. Amílcar Cabral and Franz Fanon defend that national culture is a necessary weapon against colonization, and essential to the process of liberation. Brazilian anxiety towards the foreign dominant cultures of Europe and the US is turned upside down, and it is a European who is completely assimilated. However, his assimilation is also his death. Cultural cannibalism is an essential part of Brazilian identity, but if taken to its ultimate consequences might signify the disappearance of national identity. This is one of the central dilemmas of Brazilian identity, and the films of the third phase of Cinema Novo return to this modernist theme as an allegory to think and debate the political and identitarian impasse of the Left in the context of the dictatorship.

Chapter 3

Portuguese Estado Novo Film and Colonial Propaganda

In 1926 a military coup initiated a dictatorship in Portugal. In 1928 the President, General Óscar Carmona, summoned António de Oliveira Salazar to be the Minister of Finance. With the Portuguese Constitution of 1933, Salazar became the Prime Minister and the Estado Novo was created. The Estado Novo was a totalitarian regime inspired by Italian fascism, even though it claimed to be apolitical (Vieira 25), and its main slogan was “Deus, Pátria e Família.” As Patrícia Vieira has noted, “Salazar’s administration was founded upon the belief that ‘political truths’ exist and are as real as scientific laws” (25). The dictatorship’s propaganda had the purpose of showing those “truths” to the Portuguese people.

Even though Salazar was not particularly fond of propaganda, he saw it as a necessary evil. The Prime Minister gave a series of interviews to António Ferro, which were published in the Portuguese newspaper *Diário de Notícias* on December 19-23, 1932.²⁶ In 1933 they were published as a book, which would become the quintessential book of propaganda of the regime (Rosas XIII).²⁷ In one of the interviews Salazar stated the following:

Mussolini, e agora Hitler, enchem esses intervalos, esses espaços mortos, com discursos inflamados, cortejos, festas, gritando o que já se fez e o que se pensa fazer. Fazem bem porque assim vão entretendo a natural impaciência do povo, a galeria exigente das situações de autoridade e de força que estão sempre à espera do número difícil e perigoso, do número de circo... Teremos de ir para aí, para uma propaganda intensa conscientemente organizada, mas é lamentável que a verdade precise de tanto barulho

para se impor, de tantas campanhas bombos e tambores, dos mesmos processos, exactamente, com que se divulga a mentira. (Rosas 122-123)

Salazar considered propaganda an essential tool to put into practice his “politics of truth.” António Ferro would soon be appointed to undertake that enterprise. Ferro became the key figure of the regime’s propaganda, and he was the main person behind the government’s cultural policies. In 1932, he suggested to Salazar the creation of a propaganda department, emphasizing its importance to the newborn regime. In 1933 Salazar named Ferro the director of the Secretariat of National Propaganda (Secretariado de Propaganda Nacional—SPN), which would become, in 1944, the National Secretariat of Information, Popular Culture, and Tourism (Secretariado Nacional de Informação, Cultura Popular e Turismo—SNI),²⁸ a position that he would hold until 1949 (Vieira, *Portuguese Film 2*). As the director of the SPN/SNI, António Ferro implemented a series of policies that had an important impact on Portuguese cultural practices, even after he left the Secretariat. These cultural policies had as one of its most important missions the creation of the “Portuguese New Man.” The concept was already evident in the interviews of 1932-1933, and the propaganda of the SPN/SNI wanted to impose that “New Man” on Portuguese society. Both Salazar and Ferro believed that liberalism had weakened the character of the “Portuguese race” (a term dear to the regime), which should be regenerated, even if such regeneration had to be imposed from above (Rosas XXVIII-XXIX). The “New Man” rejected modernity to a large extent, and valued instead a rural lifestyle, religion and family: “esse ‘Homem Novo’ salazarista, [era um] ser trabalhador, probo, disciplinado, respeitador da religião e da ordem, chefe de família zeloso e patriota, alegremente conformado na ‘casinha branca’ e no quintal que o ‘viver habitualmente’ lhe dava por destino” (Rosas XXIX). SPN/SNI’s propaganda sought to develop

this idea and impose it on the people. António Ferro believed that modern dictatorships (following the Italian model of Mussolini) needed celebrations, crowds and public displays of nationalism, and the arts to strengthen the idea of a “New Man” (Rosas XV). Film was among the arts that could contribute to this propagandistic project, and the director of the SPN/SNI would have a central role in the development of film in such terms (Vieira, *Portuguese Film* 2-3; 58). In this chapter I will focus first on the documentary films during the colonial war, and then on the fiction films of the same period.

Film’s potential as an instrument of propaganda had already been recognized by other European totalitarian regimes, and Lenin and Goebbels, among others, had understood its potential (Taylor 15-16). The propaganda cinema of both Italy and Germany was an important influence in the Portuguese filmic policy of the Estado Novo.²⁹ Salazar had also recognized its importance in the establishment of the Estado Novo, even though he found it an expensive medium (Vieira, *Portuguese Film* 1-2). In fact, Salazar had a more pragmatic view of the role of art at the service of the government, which he felt should be didactic: “The statesman condemned the notion of ‘art for art’s sake’ and adopted the Platonic idea that art works do not possess an intrinsic value; they should merely serve as vehicles for the education of the people” (Vieira, *Portuguese Film* 3). António Ferro, on the other hand, viewed art as a model of how life should be: it should create an image of life under Salazarism that would be imitated by the Portuguese people. Inspired by Valéry and by Italian fascism, he created the “Politics of the Spirit,” which valued art as an essential part of a nation’s development, along with science, industry, and so forth:

Ferro recognized that “lying is the artist’s only truth,” but he believed that art’s potential resided precisely in its infidelity to the facts, in its ability to lie and conjure up a different reality. Artistic creations thereby offer a set of possibilities that should serve as an inspiration and a guide for the regime’s politics, given that fiction is, to some extent, more truthful than the prosaic truth of the real. In other words, it is life that should imitate art and not vice versa. (Vieira, *Portuguese Film* 34)

Cinema was a perfect medium to put his “Politics of the Spirit” in practice. A series of measures were taken to increase national filmic production. Before the creation of the SPN, in 1927, the “Law of the 100 Meters” was issued, and it made mandatory the exhibition of a Portuguese film of at least 100 meters in every film program. Other measures were taken in this direction, leading to the creation of the Protection of National Cinema Law in 1948, which established the guidelines for films produced with the support of the Portuguese government, and it privileged historical films and documentaries. Obviously, the films had to be in line with the ideology of the Estado Novo (Vieira, *Portuguese Film* 3-4). Ferro established the two main missions of national cinema: to educate the Portuguese population both morally and aesthetically, and to show Portuguese culture and civilization to other countries.

It is important to point out that Salazar was not a cinephile, and he thought that the seventh art was too expensive and had a small impact on the population. Therefore, as Maria do Carmo Piçarra has noted, “Não se pode afirmar que, durante o Estado Novo, existiu uma produção cinematográfica, sistemática e suficientemente relevante em termos absolutos, através da qual o país se tenha procurado projectar interacionalmente, embora tenha havido um esforço para fazer a projecção da nação, internamente, através dos filmes” (*Azuis* 62). However, cinema

did have an impact, compared to the other arts: “Em termos relativos, a produção cinematográfica nacional concebida com propósitos propagandistas é muito importante e dispôs de meios e apoios significativos por comparação com outros meios de expressão artística” (*Azuis* 62). Even though the measures put in practice by the SPN did not yield the expected results (Vieira, *Portuguese Film* 4), they set the mood for much of the colonial film production of the Estado Novo.

Here I will focus on the colonial films of Angola and Mozambique (from 1961 to 1974) because these two territories occupied most of the attention of the colonial filmic production of the time. Even though documentary was the preferred genre to portray the colonies, there were also fiction features. Angola was the main stage for both genres, because it was the largest colony, with more natural resources (oil, diamonds, agriculture, etc.), and it was geographically closer to Portugal than was Mozambique. The ways in which each country was depicted vary.

Both fiction and documentary films intended to depict the colonies not only as a site of opportunity, but also as a highly modernized, prosperous place, with the double intention of justifying the colonial enterprise and of garnering people to move there. At the same time, this ideology tried to erase the peripheral position that Portugal has always occupied within Europe. Indeed, one of the central ideas of the colonial project of the Estado Novo hinged on a pretense of equality among all citizens, independently of their race or the place where they were born—they were all equally Portuguese. The idea of equality among races was in some ways inspired by the Brazilian sociologist Gilberto Freyre, who was a confessed admirer of Salazar, and who visited Portugal and its colonies in 1951. Freyre’s theories sustained that the Portuguese had an exceptional ability to adapt to the tropics and to miscegenate, which made the Portuguese

particularly apt to colonize. According to Freyre, Portuguese colonization was different from other European colonizations because it was not established through violence, but rather through the miscegenation of the Portuguese with the colonized.

Now, what we call Lusotropical civilization, when considered bio-socially, is no more than this: a common culture and social order to which men and groups of diverse ethnic and cultural origins contribute by interpenetration and by accommodation to a certain number of uniformities of behaviour of the European and his descendant and continuator in the tropics—uniformities established by the Lusitanian experience and experimentation. It can, therefore, be seen that it is a concept, the sociological concept, of Lusotropical civilization, of Lusotropical culture and social order that exceeds the mere political or rhetorical or sentimental concept of “Luso-Brazilian” or “Lusian community” which, even from the sociological point of view, does not attain consistency or relevance. (Freyre, *Integração* 103)

Therefore, Portuguese colonization was not racist, but it rather privileged assimilation: “Aliás está dentro da tradição portuguesa no Brasil, como no Oriente e na própria África, a tendência para assimilar elementos estranhos. E assimilá-los sem violência, dada a oportunidade que sempre, ou quase sempre, lhes tem dado, de se exprimirem. De modo que a assimilação se faz docemente e por interpenetração” (Freyre, *O Mundo* 36).

At first, Salazar was not a strong supporter of Freyre’s Lusotropicalism, even though in 1959 the Ministry of Foreign Affairs sent his book *Integração Portuguesa nos Trópicos* to the governors of the overseas territories.³⁰ When the United Nations started pressuring Portugal to change the colonial status of the African and Asian territories, Freyre’s theories of Portuguese

exceptionalism became quite useful to justify the Portuguese presence overseas. As Maria do Carmo Piçarra has noted,

A década de 1950 é, pois, de início de uma nova declinação do modelo político colonial. Até à década de 1940, inclusive, [o Salazarismo] teve subjacente uma posição antropobiológica—que definiu um padrão de raça portuguesa e opôs-se à miscigenação [...]. Sarmiento Rodrigues (1899-1979), ministro das Colónias desde 1950, acciona a reforma administrativa, não descurando a reforma ideológica do modelo colonial. Este assimila então—adaptando-o e despojando-o da componente sexual—o luso-tropicalismo, teoria do sociólogo brasileiro Gilberto Freyre (1909-1987), sobre um multiculturalismo assente num denominador comum: a especificidade da adaptação do português e sua cultura a ambientes tropicais. (Piçarra and António, vol. 1 24)

Another step taken in this direction was that the Estado Novo stopped referring to the occupied territories as “colonies” and started designating them officially as Overseas Provinces (“Províncias do Ultramar”). In his visit to Portugal, Gilberto Freyre noted:

O Ministro do Ultramar de Portugal é um oficial da Marinha para quem o Oriente e a África portuguesas existem não como colónias, mas como outros Portugais. E esses Portugais, como Portugal. O mar, o espaço, a distância, não separam essas várias Províncias portuguesas umas das outras senão ficticiamente ou matematicamente; na realidade elas formam todas um só Portugal, cada vez mais consciente da sua unidade, dentro da qual cabem arjos de diversidade. (Freyre 308)

However, this announced equality was not real. A system of apartheid operated in many places in both colonies. For instance, in both Luanda and Lourenço Marques black individuals

did not have the same access to cinemas as the white did: they had their own theaters and the movies screened were different. This was also true in other places, like clubs, hotels, etc. Even among the Portuguese there were differences, depending if they were born in the metropolis or in the colonies, and if they were second or third generation. They had certain restrictions in terms of the places where they could live, rights to buying propriety, etc. In 1928 the Portuguese government established the Indigenous Labor Code, which would be reinforced by the Colonial Act of 1930, where a policy of *assimilation* was implied (Cabaço 109-110). In 1953 the *Estatuto dos Indígenas Portugueses da Guiné, Angola e Moçambique* is published, and it defines the requirements to hold an “alvará de assimilação,” which included speaking Portuguese “correctly,” having a job that paid enough for the person to support themselves and their family, and behaving according to Portuguese manners (Cabaço 113). Even though the category of *indigenato* (“indigenous status”) was abolished in 1961, it was part of the colonial culture to differentiate its black citizens and to segregate them according to their category. The *assimilados* had access to certain spaces forbidden to the *indígenas* (the indigenous population that was not considered assimilated), but they were still separated. For instance, in most of the movie theaters in Lourenço Marques, the *indígenas* were not allowed to enter, but the *assimilados* had authorization as long as they sat on the back, in a section reserved for them. This segregation continued to be enforced unofficially even after the law was abolished, but its elimination from paper allowed for the advancement of the rhetoric of equality among both white and black citizens. Such rhetoric contributed to obliterate the cultural identities and manifestations of the African people, or at least to submit them to Portuguese culture and to regard it as something to attain.

The colonial films made during the Estado Novo regime proclaimed this imagined equality, independent of their race, especially in documentaries. Many of them were directed to a foreign audience, with the intention of legitimizing the colonial enterprise, which was not seen in a positive manner by the international community, especially since other European countries started the decolonizing process in Africa. The propaganda cinema of the 1960s and 1970s advanced the concept of equality.

Even though Ferro had left the SPN/SNI in 1949, the influence of the “Politics of the Spirit” was still quite visible. Most of the films of this period intended to offer an ideal image of the Portuguese colonial empire. However, once António Ferro abandoned the direction of SPN/SNI, propaganda, in particular cinematic propaganda, gradually lost financial support. Even though the SNI continued to film in the colonies, this was done with meager funding from the government, which affected the production both in terms of technical and human resources. If the “Politics of the Spirit” prevailed, it was because Ferro did not have a successor and therefore no other ideology was strong enough to occupy its place (Piçarra, *Azuis* 314).

The colonial empire was central to the Estado Novo’s rhetoric of Portuguese exceptionalism. As Boaventura de Sousa Santos points out in his article “Between Prospero and Caliban,” “Portugal is and has been since the seventeenth century a semiperipheral country in the modern capitalist world system” (9). Europe never fully recognized Portugal as an equal within the continent, and such an outlook is still at work in the present, in spite of the country’s integration in the European Union. Portugal turned therefore to its colonial empire to compensate for a feeling of inferiority towards Europe; this compensatory gesture was intensified during the Estado Novo regime. In 1934, at the Colonial Exhibition in Oporto, a map of Europe, covered by

the overseas territories (Fig. 2), was used as propaganda for the event, stating that “Portugal is not a small country.”³¹ Manuela Ribeiro Sanches notes:

A negativa que a frase propagandística inseria como legenda da imagem—“Portugal não é um país pequeno”—revelava o modo como a pequenez da nação carecia de um império para se libertar da sua periferia, afirmando-se assim como potência a nível nacional e internacional, ao mesmo tempo que legitimava o seu empreendimento colonial. (Sanches 7)

This map became one of the most ubiquitous images of Portuguese colonialism, and it maintained its importance during the colonial war. Portuguese colonial cinema emphasized the nation’s grandiosity through its colonies, whether in documentary or in fiction. As Maria do Carmo Piçarra pointed out, the films aligned with the Portuguese Estado Novo aimed at creating an “imagined man” (“homem imaginado”), which was the ideal man living under the regime³²—



Fig. 2—Portugal Não é um País Pequeno

and which is the same as the “New Man” that I already mentioned. This idea was closely aligned with Ferro’s “Politics of the Spirit,” which defended that life should imitate art, and therefore aimed at creating a model to be followed by the Portuguese. According to Piçarra, this imagined man was constituted not only by what was left within the frame, but also by what was left offscreen. In fact, what was left offscreen was often more revealing than what was revealed through the lens (*Azuis* 19). This was particularly true in the images of the empire, where the African populations were often erased, or put in the backdrop of the films, treated like landscape rather than like people.

Newsreels

Newsreels were an important documentary genre. The first official newsreel, *Jornal Português*, began in 1938 and ended in 1951, when it was replaced by *Imagens de Portugal*, which lasted from 1953 to 1970.³³ As Piçarra notes, the references to the Portuguese colonies in the newsreels were scarce until the beginning of the colonial crisis, in 1953.³⁴ This first crisis took place when the Indian Union gave up on trying to negotiate politically the independence of Goa, Daman, and Diu with Portugal, since Portugal refused to give up its sovereignty of the territories (Piçarra, *Azuis* 138). The attacks in Angola during the first months of 1961 would precipitate the colonial war that would soon spread to the other African territories occupied by the Portuguese. In the third phase of *Imagens de Portugal* (1961-1970), when the Tobis studios assume its production, one of the clauses of the contract with the SNI mentions the need to film topics in the overseas provinces, and that the newsreels should be screened in the movie theaters of Luanda, Lourenço Marques, Goa, and Macao (Piçarra, *Azuis* 171):

Nesta série há uma mudança óbvia: a par das notícias sobre a guerra, também as colónias e os seus habitantes se tornam finalmente notícia, o que se deve desde logo às reformas promovidas por Adriano Moreira, responsável pela pasta do Ultramar entre 1961 e 1963, que depois prossegue com a promoção de uma imagem de progresso e ordem nas colónias, onde a vida continua nas cidades enquanto, segundo a propaganda, a guerra no mato é ganha pelos portugueses. (Piçarra, *Azuis* 174)

In the third series of *Imagens*, the subject of the colonies is present in almost every edition. The government realized that the vast majority of the Portuguese knew very little to nothing about the colonies. In order to gather popular support for the war, the regime needed to explain to the population—and to the international community, which increased its pressure for decolonization—why these territories were crucial to the nation. The main topic was therefore the *Ultramar*, the extension of the territory, of its people, and the civilizing mission of the Portuguese, and the second most important topic was the war. The reports usually focused on the economy (agriculture, industry, tourism, mining), sports, culture, and political and military events. Whenever possible, racial inclusion was emphasized. The *Ultramar* became a crucial part of national identity, fed by a simplified Lusotropicalism (Piçarra, *Azuis* 174). These topics would be further explored in longer documentaries, as we will see.

There was also a major concern with the distribution of *Imagens de Portugal* in Brazil, on one hand because there was a large immigrant Portuguese population living in the former colony, and on the other hand because Salazar's regime saw Brazil as an example of the success of the Portuguese colonial enterprise, reinforced by Freyre's theses, and as an illustration of the "modo português de estar no mundo" (Piçarra, *Azuis* 199).

Newsreels in Angola

Even though the contract between Tobis and the SNI called for the distribution of *Imagens de Portugal* throughout the colonized territories, such distribution was in fact quite irregular, even though it increased during its third series. However, Angola and Mozambique also produced their own newsreels. In Angola, there was *Actualidades de Angola*, which began in 1957 and had 55 editions until 1961, where it was halted until 1967, when a new series was produced until independence in 1975, with 179 editions. The first series was produced by António de Sousa and João Silva, and it was financed first by the Direcção dos Serviços de Fazenda e Contabilidade and later by Centro de Informação e Turismo de Angola—CITA.³⁵ The second series was produced directly by CITA, and it was directed, among others, by João Silva, Ricardo Mesquita, and Jaime Brás (Piçarra and António, vol. 1 25).

Actualidades de Angola followed the basic model of *Jornal Português* and *Imagens de Portugal*. The first number (1957) lasted 9 minutes. The opening credits, for this and for the following numbers of the first series, feature the sound of drums and black men dressed in tribal garb. Each number had around 300 meters of film, which lasted about ten minutes (Piçarra and António, vol. 1 161). The first issue therefore reinforces typical stereotypes of the African. It did not aim at representing the Angolan ethnic groups, but just to give an exotic appeal to the newsreel. The first news piece is about the visit of the Minister of National Defense, General Santos Costa, to different provinces in the territory, and it opens with the official reception and military honors, reinforcing therefore the nationalist character of *Actualidades de Angola*, and the role of the military as guarantor of stability in the territory. Even though the war for

independence would only begin in 1961, this was the year of the crisis in Goa, and there were already signs of civil disobedience throughout the Angolan territory that threatened the Portuguese presence. The fact that the first number of *Actualidades de Angola* opens with the figure of the Minister of National Defense seeks to reinforce the feeling of protection by the Portuguese military among the colonists. The second part of this edition is dedicated to a series of inaugurations of construction works in Moçâmedes:³⁶ a hospital and an industrial association, a fisheries building, the future harbor, and the new premises of the Angolan Railroads. This series of inaugurations aimed at illustrating the investment of Salazar's government in the overseas territories, and its endeavor to modernize Angola. There is an emphasis on the machinery performing most of the tasks, underscoring the modernization of the territory. These two topics will become recurrent in *Actualidades de Angola*, and in other documentaries of the period.

In fact, because of the growing pressure on Portugal to decolonize its occupied territories, the colonial narrative would promote the modernization undertaken in the colonies as a justification for the presence of Portugal. This narrative was in contradiction with the suspicious attitude of Salazar towards modernity, and his preference for a rural lifestyle, away from the evils of modernization. The space of modernity was therefore transferred to the colonies, and the metropole remained the place of tradition. In this manner, Portugal was still the guarantor of the essence of the Portuguese race, but the country could finally join the thrust to modernity through its colonial enterprise. This ideology intensified with the development of the colonial war, and it became a ubiquitous topic in colonial cinema. The film *Zé do Burro*, directed by Eurico Ferreira in 1971 (Mozambique), which I analyze below, is one of the best examples of this contrast

between the tradition and rurality of the metropole and the modernity of the the cities of the African territories.

The second number of *Actualidades de Angola* covers the visit of the Minister of National Defense to other provinces of Angola, but it also presents a series of cultural moments, such as the Museum of Angola and its collection of catholic religious art and the fortress of São Miguel, built by the Portuguese. It closes with a soccer match between the teams of Lourenço Marques and Nova Lisboa. The cultural pieces were less frequent than the ones focusing on economic and industrial development, but they were quite recurrent. Football was always a popular subject, and it was a form of entertainment highly regarded by the regime, part of a triad that came to be known as the three Fs—fado music, Fátima,³⁷ and football.

Actualidades de Angola 46 (1960) hints at the pressure that the Portuguese government was going through because of its colonial presence in Angola. The opening credits still feature the black tribal men and the sound of drums, but it adds as a background images of modern buildings in construction, and of factories, reinforcing the concept of modernity in Angola. From the 1960s on, whenever possible, the pacific coexistence of blacks and whites is emphasized in the documentaries. The armed struggle against the Portuguese troops is always attributed to foreign groups wanting to destabilize the peaceful coexistence of blacks and whites in the occupied African territories.

As I mentioned earlier, with the international pressure to decolonize, the Estado Novo adopted a simplified version of Freyre's Lusotropicalism that insisted on the exceptionality of Portuguese colonialism. According to the regime, one of its differences when compared to other European colonizations was the ability of the Portuguese to mix with other races. With UN

resolution number 1514, it became more pressing for Portugal to show that it was racially democratic. The documentaries (more so than the fiction films) tried to illustrate said integration. In the episode 46 of this newsreel, dedicated to the city of Nova Lisboa,³⁸ the camera shows a hospital fully equipped to assist newborns, whether they are rich or poor, black or white, as the voice-over emphasizes. It also shows the Casa dos Rapazes, a charity ran by a priest that takes care of about one hundred orphan boys. The report emphasizes the benefactor character of the Portuguese, and the excellent conditions of the premises, hygienic and fully equipped. The following piece is on the pool of Clube Desportivo Ferrovia, and it shows people relaxing at the pool on the weekend, while the voice over elucidates: “Não vamos dizer, forçando a imagem, que a gente aqui vive a felicidade ao ar livre, na tranquilidade dos dias pacíficos, isso vê-se. Só a ONU seria capaz de ver o contrário” The next piece is set on the local zoo, and we see a white man petting a lion—a clear sample of how the white settlers manages to tame everything that is “savage” in Africa, both animals and human beings. The indigenous law was the perfect example of that ability to tame the African subject: those who accepted and adopted the Portuguese ways could become (second class) citizens. In one of the last moments of issue 46, the voice-over introduces the artistic tour of the group Holiday on Ice through Angola: “Na sua digressão pelo mundo civilizado [...]”—thus emphasizing that Angola is already part of the “civilized world” thanks to the Portuguese presence in the territory, hinting once again to the “taming of the wild” undertaken by the Portuguese.

Actualidades de Angola 49 opens with a sequence on a tobacco factory, emphasizing that it is the most modern of the entire national territory—once again, modernity happens in the colonies. This modernity is emphasized by the images of state of the art industrial equipment (we

do not see anyone doing manual work), and everything is perfectly clean and shiny, with all the employees (all of them black, except for those supervising or higher technicians) wearing white garments. This can be seen as a metaphor for a positive colonialism, since the colonial gaze has always worked on the binaries white/clean versus black/dirty. Dressing the black workers in white symbolizes their purification through work, and by cooperating with the Portuguese in the industrial exploitation of Angola. In her book *Fast Cars, Clean Bodies*, Kristin Ross focuses on the consequences of the process of decolonization in French society, giving a special emphasis to the Algerian war. Ross explains how modernization, hygienization and colonialism were intertwined:

Modernization offers a perfect reconciliation of past and future in an endless present, a world where all sedimentation of social experience has leveled or smoothed away, where poverty has been reabsorbed, and, most important, a world where class conflict is a thing of the past, the stains of contradiction washed out in a superhuman hygienic effort, by new levels of abundance and equitable distribution.

And yet the French experience, in its highly concentrated, almost laboratory-like intensity, has the advance of showing modernization to be instead a *means* of social, and particularly racial, differentiation: a differentiation that has its roots in the 1950s discourse on hygiene [...]. (11)

The same was true for the representations of Portuguese colonialism in national colonial cinema, which was modeled after its European counterparts.³⁹ Cleanliness is particularly emphasized in the visits to factories in Angola, which are frequently filmed, rendering modernization and cleanliness inseparable. If the factories are clean, the nation is clean,

colonialism is clean—therefore disproving, according to the colonial propaganda, the accusations waged by the UN and the international community against the Portuguese presence in Africa. The piece on the tobacco factory then moves on to show that it also takes care of the social lives of its workers (all of them black): the camera shows workers playing foosball and ping-pong, while the voice over explains that the factory has its facilities fully equipped with a infirmary, a cafeteria, a game room and shower rooms. The second part of *Actualidades de Angola 49* concentrates on short news, showing a mass celebration and a parade of Mocidade Portuguesa (the youth organization of the regime), while the voice over stresses that the development of Angola is only disturbed by foreign aggression—therefore insisting that the armed struggle does not represent an internal discontent and that what the Portuguese are doing is bringing development to the territory: “Angola luta na guerra e na paz. Na guerra que lhe foi imposta por criminosos estrangeiros. Na paz a todo o custo para garantir o desenvolvimento da terra e a felicidade da gente.” This number ends with the Portuguese troops disembarking “to guarantee national sovereignty,” closing with a banner in a building that says “Aqui também é Portugal,” underscoring the idea that Angola was not a colony, but an essential part of the nation.

The first series of *Actualidades de Angola* came to a halt in 1961, right after the beginning of the war. In 1967 the second series begins, although only a few numbers produced from 1971 on are available for screening. The war had become an important subject, but the rhetoric remains the same: the attacks are coordinated by foreign groups with the intent to destabilize the country. According to the propaganda, the local populations are manipulated or forced to cooperate with the guerrilla groups, but they do not support them, and are themselves victims of the liberation armies. The opening credits have been updated: they begin with an

aerial view of Luanda. Aerial views of the bay of Luanda became iconic at the time, because they showed at once the natural beauty of the bay and the modernity of the city, with all its high buildings (more common in Luanda than in Lisbon). This aerial view is followed by images of Angolan women dancing, and of a white woman walking on a runway, most likely during a beauty pageant, quite popular at the time. There are also images of zebras, rhinos, etc. The perception of Africa remains quite stereotypical, but it is integrated with images of the Portuguese presence and of “civilization,” which was in line with the lusotropicalist ideology in vogue at the time.

Actualidades de Angola 159 (1971) opens with the visit of the Minister of the Overseas Provinces, who visited different provinces of Angola and had the opportunity to fly over the regions “dominated by the terrorists,” as the voice over declares—“terrorists” was the designation given at the time to the liberation armies. The voice over reassures the spectator that, in spite of everything, one can feel the calmness in those regions, and that the cities continue to grow and the people continue to make progress. To prove this, the next story is about the construction of a dam on the Cunene River. This number also covers the 5th African Conference of Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, which brought to Angola 106 delegates of different African countries—all of them white. The voice over concludes: “Só com a cooperação de todos os povos poderá resultar a construção do mundo novo que todos desejamos,” and it adds: “[Verificou-se um] clima de tranquilidade social e unirracial que em todo este trabalho se processou.” This is one of many examples when the voice over contradicts the images, something that happens quite frequently in the films of colonial propaganda. The voice over often declares the multiracial co-existence in schools, factories, and public spaces, but the images

contradict such statements, showing the lack of participation of black individuals, or then a small minority used as a token for the camera.

Actualidades de Angola 168 (1972) has the same opening credits as the previous one, but it adds a final sequence with soldiers jumping from a helicopter and shooting to a bush. This number focuses mostly on cultural and leisure events, such as a regatta, the race of São Silvestre or the procession of the Three Wise Men. Even though news about the war was frequent, the newsreels also wanted to show that business continues as usual, and that the majority of the territory was not affected by war. The issue 206 (1974) of this newsreel shows the cotton crops, and the voice over assures the spectator that now the women that produce the cotton are paid fairly, and that the price of this commodity has never been higher. The images reveal black women in line, all of them peasants, being paid by a white man. Once again the images contradict the discourse, and what we see is how the labor force was black and the business owners were white.

When the revolution of April 25, 1974, ended the dictatorship, the issue of the colonies and of the war became one of the pressing issues that required a quick solution. The revolution was led by the lower ranks of the military, especially by captains, who became known as the “Capitães de Abril.” The movement is known as Movimento das Forças Armadas—MFA. One of their motivations for the revolution, besides introducing a democratic regime in Portugal, was to put an end to the colonial war. There was immediately the idea of giving the occupied territories the right to self-determination and autonomy. However, the liberation armies from Angola, Mozambique, Guinea Bissau and Cabo Verde were unfaltering in their determination to be independent, and said that they would continue to fight unless full independence was granted.

The Portuguese government agreed, since it did not have the means or the will to continue a war that Portugal could not win. The transition period began, and it took several months of negotiations with the different liberation armies to agree on the terms of independence and transition of power. Guinea-Bissau became independent in September 10, 1974, Mozambique in June 25, 1975, and Angola in November 11, 1975. During the transition period CITA continued to produce *Actualidades de Angola*, and the content began to change in these last numbers, since it was no longer under censorship.

Actualidades de Angola 217, from the second half of 1974, illustrates the contradictions of the moment: the first half still has many of the characteristics of traditional Estado Novo propaganda, but the second part focuses on the speech of General António de Spínola⁴⁰ announcing decolonization. The first piece is about a parabolic dish that had just been installed and that would provide an image quality superior to that of Europe.⁴¹ Another piece of news focuses on an attack in a *musseque* (“shantytown”) of Luanda in which stores were robbed and destroyed. The *musseques* were traditionally absent from the newsreels and documentaries, and they finally gain visibility. The news usually avoided this type of subject during the dictatorship. However, the voice over declares: “Houve quem acusasse os brancos de quererem dar cabo dos negros e estes de quererem acabar com os brancos, mas a verdade de tanto quanto se passou, foi apenas grupos agitadores vindos de fora, absolutamente estranhos aos musseques, onde ninguém os vira até então.” Once again, the voice over emphasizes the idea of racial unity, and the notion that the threat always came from outsiders. This issue ends with the speech of the General António de Spínola on the beginning of the process of decolonization. The last image shows manifestations of support to the MFA in Lisbon.

Actualidades de Angola 221 (1974) reports on a local slaughterhouse, illustrating an enormous lack of hygiene, thus revealing that the image of a modernized and hygienic colonization was not true. A group of white women, originally from Madeira, present some of the housing problems of their area. Number 222 mentions the opening of air bridges between Luanda and other African countries, and a strike of workers in the ports of Luanda, where the workers explain their demands: better wages, working conditions, etc. Number 232 reports on the arrival of Jonas Savimbi, the leader of UNITA (National Union for the Total Independence of Angola), to Luanda, and on Agostinho Neto speaking with peasants who were also militants of the MPLA. The last issues of *Actualidades de Angola* illustrate the period of political transition, and finally reveal some of the problems that existed and that censorship had forced into silence. However, some of the ideas of the Estado Novo regime were still present, in particular those inspired by Lusotropicalism. In fact, Lusotropicalism had such an impact that it still permeates the way most Portuguese think about their colonial past.

Newsreels in Mozambique

In Mozambique, there was also a newsreel, entitled *Actualidades de Moçambique*, produced and directed by António de Melo Pereira. It lasted from 1956 to 1969, and it was financed by the Centro de Informação e Turismo de Moçambique—CITM (“Center for the Information and Tourism of Mozambique”), the Mozambican version of CITA. The idea behind the newsreel is very similar to its Angolan version, but there are some important differences that have to do with the specificities of each territory during the period. Angola was far more industrialized than Mozambique, and therefore the frequent pieces on factories are rare in the

Mozambican newsreel. The economy was centered on agriculture and tourism, and these were the economic activities that would have more importance in *Actualidades de Moçambique*. Other favored subjects were official visits, either from members of the metropolitan government or from the governor of Mozambique throughout the country. Leisure activities and sport were also a preference. Tourism was an important economic activity,⁴² and therefore it also had a privileged space in this newsreel.

The first edition was produced in 1956, and it was a special number dedicated to the visit of the President Francisco Craveiro Lopes to Mozambique (*O Último Dia da Visita Presidencial —Actualidades de Moçambique*). In ten years Melo Pereira produced 113 newsreels and more than 10 documentaries (Convents 293). He guaranteed a monthly edition of the newsreel, with news from Mozambique and from South Africa.⁴³ The opening credits rely on stereotypical images of Africa, and the director uses a black man dressed in leopard skin, blowing a horn. *Actualidades de Moçambique 41* (1959) begins with a report on the new electrical power plant of Lourenço Marques, followed by another story on the touristic organization of Beira (the most important city in northern Mozambique). This organization served mostly the (white) tourists of Rhodesia, and it had bungalows and camping facilities. Another story focuses on the swimming pools of Lourenço Marques. The swimming pools were the epitome of the colonist lifestyle of the capital city, and were often filmed for the newsreels and other documentaries. This reportage shows three of the most important pools, at the Polana Hotel, the Cardoso Hotel—the two most important and luxurious hotels of Lourenço Marques—and another one at the Associação dos Velhos Colonos. The voice-over states that “são o expoente máximo da civilização de Lourenço Marques.” If Luanda was represented as the place of modernity in the Portuguese colonial

empire, Lourenço Marques was seen as the capital of leisure and tourism, and it became known as the pearl of the Indian Ocean. Even though *Actualidades de Angola* and *Actualidades de Moçambique* were occasionally shown in the metropole, the target audience was mostly the colonists living in the territory. However, they were produced by the Center of Information and Tourism, so the directors always had in mind how to promote the colonized territories, not only among the colonists, but also among those that could in the future consider moving to the colonies. Convincing more people to immigrate to the overseas territories became even more pressing with the beginning of the war. This was visible not only in the newsreels, but in the documentaries of propaganda on Angola and Mozambique. This is most likely one of the reasons why *Actualidades de Moçambique* focused so much on leisure and tourism.

The other important economic activity in Mozambique was agriculture. The colonial government felt the need to bring white settlers to the rural areas, to guarantee the dominion of the Portuguese in the entirety of the Mozambican territory, and not only on the urban areas. *Actualidades de Moçambique 31* (1958) shows the arrival of colonists to the margins of the Limpopo River (province of Gaza). The story focuses on a family from Trás-os-Montes, a rural province in the North of Portugal, where the majority of the population were peasants. The images of this newsreel confirm that this is a family of poor peasants, who had very little possessions, as we see by the small luggage they bring with them. The government offered them 10 acres of land, and a house in a condominium that had just been built for families like them. Images of peasants coming to Mozambique were common in the documentaries of this period. *Zé do Burro* (Eurico Ferreira, 1971), a fiction film that I will analyze below, focuses precisely on one of those peasants who migrated to Mozambique to cultivate his own piece of land.

Actualidades de Moçambique 50 (1959) shows the harvesting on the Limpopo. The town where the peasants live is new, well organized and clean, but it does not have the sophistication of the cities and towns shown in Angola. The Portuguese are humble farmers, but there are also black Mozambicans working with them.⁴⁴ Another recurrent story in these newsreels is the official visits of government representatives. Issues 71, 72, and 73 (1961), and 91, 93, 95, and 98 (1963) focus on such visits. Their visits are great opportunities to show the work of the Portuguese. For instance, we see the farming success of settlers on the Limpopo (both black and white) who managed to make the lands, once unproductive, cultivated and fruitful. The newsreels also illustrate the construction of dams, ports, etc. *Actualidades de Moçambique*, just like *Actualidades de Angola*, focused mostly on showing the works of the Portuguese in the colonized territories, and how its “civilizing effort” was fruitful and welcomed by the local populations. This was meant to reassure the colonists of national integrity. The voice over narrated everything, and it was quite rare that there was direct sound. Exceptions were made to rare speeches of political leaders, or to songs and other type of performances. The black populations were never interviewed or asked to give their opinion, and their satisfaction with colonialism was transmitted through the voice over.

Colonial documentaries

The main themes of the newsreels are repeated in the colonial documentaries sponsored by the regime. A year after the first attacks of UPA and MPLA took place, Vasco Hogan Teves coordinated a documentary of 23 minutes entitled *Angola—Decisão de Continuar* (1962).⁴⁵ As the title indicates, the film explains why the Portuguese government has decided to continue in

Angola. Even though the film does not directly declare that in order to continue, Portugal will have to wage a war against the enemy, this fact is understood between the lines. The documentary opens with images of the bay of Luanda, which once again stands for development and beauty, while the voice over proclaims: “onde os portugueses criaram com o seu trabalho e sacrificio uma terra civilizada e a promessa de um futuro de progresso e grandeza, onde não havia distinção entre cores, religiões e credos políticos, onde a única preocupação era trabalhar [...]” It adds that Angola is a land of unending resources, and we see images of a dam, an electrical power plant, an oil extraction site, factories, etc.

The second part of the documentary denounces the attacks against white settlers that took place in February 4 and in March 15, 1961. The intention of this section is to create a sense of outrage among the Portuguese, and to portray the liberation groups as terrorists who commit atrocious acts of violence with no apparent reason, except that they are being influenced by foreign ideas. The regime usually avoided graphic images, but this documentary uses photos of dead bodies from the UPA attack of March 15. The camera lingers on the images of corpses, both black and white, as the voice over declares that the crimes were perpetrated without distinction of blacks and whites, in order to underscore that the “terrorists” had no concern about the black populations, and to manipulate the audiences to feel outraged by the attacks. The strikes of February 4 had been led by the MPLA, who attacked a police station and other governmental buildings in Luanda, with the intention of releasing political prisoners. This offensive was a failure to the MPLA, and 7 policemen and 40 members of the MPLA were killed (Davidson 185). The raid led by UPA in northern Angola, whose leader was Holden Roberto, was particularly violent: unlike what happened in Luanda, where the MPLA only attacked police

officers, UPA charged against European civilians and *assimilados*, and around 300 died, even though these numbers were never confirmed (Davidson 189).

Angola—Decisão de Continuar, like the vast majority of the Portuguese propaganda, did not distinguish the different liberation armies involved, referring to them under the generic term “terrorists.” Released a year after the attacks, this documentary exploits the images of the raids to create fear and outrage regarding the liberation struggle, and therefore justify the beginning of the war. The voice over declares that the strikes were a genocide, and it insists that they were undertaken by foreigners, showing the photo of two black man with the subtitle “Souvenir de Leo-ville,” a clear reference to the Democratic Republic of Congo and to its capital city under Belgium dominium, Léopoldville. The voice recounts that women and children left the area of the attacks, while “europeus e indígenas” stayed behind, defending each other. The rhetoric of Lusotropicalism is therefore reinforced, and it becomes essential to continue defending the presence of the Portuguese in its African colonies. The film also shows Portugal defending the occupation of its African territories at the United Nations, exhibiting the photos of dead bodies in big posters. The voice over later guarantees that the Portuguese will continue their enterprise, in spite of international pressures: “assegurar com uma das mãos a charrua e com a outra a espada, como durante séculos,” therefore reinforcing the binomial of land and struggle that was an important trope of Portuguese colonialism. The documentary closes with a speech of Salazar guaranteeing that Angola is part of Portugal, and the image of the Portuguese assembly with everyone applauding. All the people applauding are white except for a black gentleman, on whom the camera focuses, and who is the most enthusiastic of all in clapping his hands to the words of Salazar. The image was used to underscore the support of the black populations for the

Portuguese government, but the fact that there is only one black individual among tens of whites ironically belies that intention.

Temos Também o Dever de Ser Orgulhosos dos Vivos, directed by Perdigão Queiroga in 1964 (22 minutes), is very similar to *Angola—Decisão de Continuar*. Its intention is to emphasize the work of the Portuguese troops in defending the colonies. It shows a public manifestation of support to the Portuguese troops held in Lisbon, and it repeats the story of the first “terrorist attacks” in 1961. The rhetoric of Lusotropicalism is again at the forefront of this documentary: on a visit to a cellulose factory, the voice over insists that it has the most modern equipment, and that it also promotes a social environment where employers and employees live in perfect harmony. Photos of black and white children learning together in a school illustrate these statements.

Angola na Guerra e no Progresso, directed by Quirino Simões in 1971 (77 minutes), is also a justification of the colonial war. The film opens with a map of Africa to show to the audience where the conflict was taking place. These maps were frequently used to give a geographical idea of the territories to the Portuguese audience. The documentary repeats the idea that the attacks are led by foreigners, and it blames the achievement of independence in Congo, Ghana and Guinea as the origin of the conflict: “Com a independência do Ghana e da Guiné inicia-se o abandono de África às ideias emancipadoras.” “É no Congo ex-belga que a violência atinge a maior intensidade.” On the other hand, the film wishes to illustrate that, in spite of these attacks, life follows as usual. Images of a white woman being chased by black men with machetes—another stereotypical racist image—and other images of attacks stress the senseless violence of the enemy, who is once again nameless or referred to as terrorists. The voice over

affirms that the fight against the so-called terrorists is led both by Europeans and *indigenas*, and we see images of black soldiers with a Portuguese flag on their uniforms. The documentary interviews a mixed couple that had been attacked (he is white and she is black). This sequence is quite unusual, on one hand because it showed a mixed couple, and on the other because there is an actual interview where the couple speaks. The purpose of the sequence is to reinforce Lusotropicalism, and to advance that the raid had targeted everyone indiscriminately. There is a strong emphasis on the quality of the living conditions of the Angolan black populations, in an attempt to prove that Portugal led an equalitarian regime (which was obviously not true). The documentary presupposes that the information will not be questioned by the viewers. In a sequence that shows images of developed cities, the voice over asserts: “De norte a sul, de este a oeste, o desenvolvimento de Angola é firmado através destas imagens das suas cidades, *propositadamente não identificadas*, porque em todas elas se verifica um índice de crescimento e um ritmo de vida que definem o progresso global da província” (my emphasis). The lack of identification of the cities aims at giving a homogenous image of development, on the one hand, and of national unity, on the other.

Even though the films that defended the war were important throughout the 1960s until 1974, there were more films that focused on the positive aspects of colonialism. The war was fought in the bush, but the people in the urban areas still lead a normal, happy life. There were many documentaries that portrayed the carefree life of the colonists, and one of their objectives was to convince more people to move to the colonies. The modernity of the cities in Angola and in Mozambique was always on the spotlight. The happy poverty of Lisbon contrasted with the filmic representations of the cities in the African territories. Even though in Mozambique there

were sequences dedicated to the rural life and Portuguese farmers, there was still an emphasis on modernity, mostly through the reportages on all the constructions being done across the country. Either fiction or documentary constantly emphasized the modernity and the wealth of the African cities. For instance, a short documentary directed by António de Sousa, entitled *A Grande Cidade* (1970), and presented by Fernando Pessa,⁴⁶ is completely devoted to Luanda, and echoes many other films that portrayed the Angolan capital. The title itself points to its grandiosity and singularity: if Luanda is *the* great city, it surpasses Lisbon in terms of development. In fact, the film starts by saying that it was Diogo Cão who discovered Angola, pointing to the Portuguese mythology of the “discoveries” as proof of a people’s exceptionality, to immediately show how modern the city is in 1970. The presenter declares that nowadays airplanes, ships, and trains help promoting the development of the province, while we see an image of an airplane landing or Luanda’s skyscrapers, followed by intense traffic in the large avenues. The aerial view of Luanda was a common sequence in other documentaries and in fiction films, displaying the modernity of the city, which contrasted with Lisbon and its typical neighborhoods. At the end of the *A Grande Cidade*, Pessa comments: “[Luanda] é hoje um pequeno mundo de cimento armado, arquetado com muito esforço e sacrifício e tenacidade de suas gentes, que portuguesas nasceram e portuguesas querem morrer.” If the metropolis is poor but happy, there is a place where anyone can make their own fortune: the African territories. Portugal offers all types of possibilities to its people, and though the metropolis may be the sweet, simple home where everybody is a family,⁴⁷ the colonies offer the opportunity for adventure and moneymaking, without the need to leave the nation. In fact, the final assertion of the documentary emphasizes the fact that even those who are born in the colonies are Portuguese, and belong to the nation in the same way.

Another film that foregrounds modernity is *O Romance do Luachimo—Lunda, Terra de Diamantes*, directed by Baptista Rosa (1969), and produced by RTP—Rádio e Televisão de Portugal. The documentary focuses on every aspect of Diamang, the diamond extraction company located in the region of Lunda, in Angola. The documentary is particularly lengthy, lasting 163 minutes,⁴⁸ which might have been one of the reasons why it was not quite successful. According to José da Costa Ramos, the film took five years to be completed (Piçarra and António 106). Diamang—Companhia de Diamantes de Angola was the most important diamond company in Angola during the colonial period, and it was formed by financial investors from Portugal, Belgium, United States, and France.⁴⁹ It had the rights to explore the majority of the diamond mines in Angola. However, the film does not mention that Diamang is not an exclusively Portuguese company, in an attempt to underscore national pride. The concession contract stipulated that 70% of the workers had to be Portuguese (*Companhia* 16), and therefore it was easy to make a documentary that focused on the Portuguese living there. The film is extensive, and it shows in detail every aspect of the company: the diamond extraction process, the villages built for the workers, their leisure activities, healthcare, education, agriculture and livestock, etc. The voice over explains that the size of the Lunda region is equivalent to half of the Portuguese territory, and that the administration functions like a small, independent country, which should be seen as model to follow. According to José da Costa Ramos, the film intended to portray Diamang as an icon of efficiency:

Trata-se de dar a ver a eficiência na sua plenitude. A eficiência aplicada no processo industrial como resultado de um processo de gestão científico, no sentido que Frederick Winslow Taylor lhe deu. O que distingue o filme de Baptista Rosa dos outros é a

inferência que a eficiência demonstrada a nível industrial pela superior aplicação dos princípios científicos de gestão pode e deve ser alargada às restantes esferas da vida humana, da habitação à saúde, da educação à organização dos tempos livres. Por isso do filme desprende-se, mais do que de qualquer dos outros, uma sensação de perfeição distópica suavemente totalitária. (José da Costa Ramos in Piçarra and António, vol. 1 105)

At Diamang, everything was industrialized: agriculture, the distribution of every type of products that are imported to the Lunda (fabrics, furniture, house products, food, etc.), meat production, etc. The film wanted to depict the company as a paragon of how a nation should function. In 1963 Diamang published a book entitled *Companhia de Diamantes de Angola (Angola Diamond Company)*,⁵⁰ itself a text of propaganda that envisioned to legitimize the existence of Diamang by defending that it had not only contributed to the development of Angola, but had in fact created a nation:

In return for the wealth of diamonds which Lunda promised, [...] Diamang gave her own rich gifts: Diamang brought into play those principles by which savage people are civilized and the stature of human beings heightened. [...] Besides being a mighty force working for pacification and for education, Diamang has always followed the best systems for developing virgin land and dealing with backward natives. For, obeying the noblest impulses of the Portuguese nation, it gave a country to people who had no country, to whom the very idea of a country was quite unknown. To tribes who, because of their differing dialects, could not communicate with one another, the Company offered

one common mother-tongue, the Portuguese language. [...] It has never put into practice doctrines of “racial superiority.” (*Companhia* 12-13)

As we can see, Diamang advocated to itself the creation of a nation. This documentary was a way to illustrate such an enterprise. However, the ideal image that the company publicized did not match reality—especially in what concerns racial equality. As an example, one of the sequences shows women cultivating a big field of pineapples. The voice over declares that the administration helps the local populations to improve their private crops, and it also buys them the surplus of their yield. Once again, the images belie the voice over: the fields that the women cultivate are too big to be owned by them (they work in large groups), and they are being supervised.⁵¹ This was probably a plantation owned by the company.

Diamang built 128 urban centers to serve the populations, with beautiful cement houses, parks and gardens, pools, tennis courts, etc. The images of these villages show idillic streets with manicured gardens and happy dwellers. The documentary also shows the houses of the manual workers (all of them black), which are made of wood, but still look quite decent. A group of women bathes their children in a water tank—which might indicate that they do not have running water. In what concerns leisure, even though the voice over declares that there are a lot of sports and activities available to everyone, we never see one black individual in these spaces. Even when there are big sports events at the local stadium, the audience is segregated among blacks and whites. The film also depicts the leisure of the *indígenas*, focusing on the “Festa do Boi Assado,” where they roast an ox to be shared among the participants. As José da Costa Ramos pointed out, the whole scene looks staged: the fire is too high, and it looks like it was prepared in a rush, for the camera (Piçarra and António, vol. 1 107).

O Romance do Luachimo ends with a tour of the local museum, Museu do Lunda, that includes an extensive collection focused on the local ethnic groups, with one room dedicated to their religions, one to their pottery, one to African masks, another to African sculptures. There is also a room dedicated to the Portuguese explorers of the regions, and to the local *sobas*,⁵² and another one dedicated to the regional fauna and flora.

During his visit to the Portuguese colonies, Gilberto Freyre visited Diamang and declared that it was the opposite of what he believed to be the spirit of lusotropicalist colonialism. He found that the company followed the capitalist model used by the other European nations in their process of colonization, which was in the antipodes of the Portuguese model. This was not far from the truth, since the administration of the diamond company was also Belgian, French, and American. However, this was in fact the role that Portugal had long occupied in Africa: that of an administrator that granted the rights to concessionary companies to exploit the local resources. Nonetheless, the documentary hides this reality, and if we were to believe in it, the company was completely dominated by the Portuguese. This was also true of many of the factories depicted in propaganda documentaries, which had foreign investors behind them. It was convenient for the propaganda to hide these facts, and to attribute the industrial exploitation of resources to the civilizing mission of the Portuguese colonial enterprise. Furthermore, *Romance de Luachimo* fits perfectly in the discourses of modernity and nationhood developed by the Estado Novo propaganda.

Most documentaries followed the principles of propaganda that I have explained here, but during this period there were some that were atypical because they did not follow the traditional models of colonial cinema, and were therefore forbidden by censorship⁵³. However, they can still

be considered colonial films because they depicted the colonized territories and did not defend independence. One such film was *Esplendor Selvagem*, also directed by António de Sousa (1972, 94 minutes). It was banned by censors, even though the director was a man of the regime. António de Sousa had become one of the main sources of images of Angola to the Agência Geral do Ultramar, and he continued to be the steadiest producer of films in Angola until 1974 (Joana Pimentel in Piçarra and António, vol. 2 110; 137). The reason given by the Censorship Commission was that it was “anti-political” because it questioned the so-called Portuguese character of all the territories and its inhabitants (Piçarra 317). Sousa filmed the images from 1957 to 1972, and he alternated between 35mm and 16mm cameras, mainly because of lack of financial support (Piçarra 296). The film focuses on the African tribes that exist in Angolan territory, and it depicts their traditions, rituals, etc. It also pays attention to the local fauna and flora. The approach underscores the exotic stereotypes associated with Africa and repeats incessantly expressions such as “the enigmas of Africa,” “the violent contrasts,” “the exoticism,” “Africa of myths,” “strange, fantastic Africa,” “violent Africa,” etc. The title itself, *Esplendor Selvagem*, reinforces that outlook. Even though the documentary explains the traditions of different tribes, there are moments in the film where these traditions are amalgamated, as in the opening of the film. The voice over describes the procedures of some of the rites, but it never explains their spiritual meaning and it never gives the word to the members of each tribe to explain what is being performed.

The opening sequence show images of important rivers, like the Kwanza, other geographical attractions, or animals such as the giant sable antelope.⁵⁴ The voice over declares: “Sente-se o enigma do interior de África, enigma que cabe ao europeu decifrar e controlar,

subjugar.” After this sentence, the camera introduces the tribes, with men dancing. The African tribes are treated in the same manner that the landscape and the local fauna are: as a wild curiosity that the European man has to tame and subjugate. Since the film enacted all the colonial clichés associated with Africa, why was it forbidden? António Caetano de Carvalho, the president of Comissão de Exame e Classificação dos Espectáculos, stated the following:

[...] se trata de um filme de reportagem, de características fundamentalmente etnográficas [...]. Assim, se fosse um filme para passar apenas em sociedade de investigação, não teria qualquer problema. Para o circuito comercial, porém, podem realmente suscitar-se dúvidas, principalmente numa altura em que muita gente nos acusa do grande atrazo [*sic*] em que se encontram as nossas populações de África. (quoted in Piçarra 306)

Therefore, the main problem with this film, in which António de Sousa wanted to document the local people and landscapes that fascinated him, was that it denied the modernity of Angola. With the aggravation of the war, the Portuguese government felt the pressing need to show that the occupied territories were completely modernized. Anything that might suggest the slightest contradiction to this notion would be censored. This was one of the drastic changes that colonial cinema suffered with the emergence of war. The colonial films of the first half of the century had nature as one of its favored subjects, followed by a curiosity about the African tribes. This changes in the sixties, and the reason behind this shift is linked to international pressure, inasmuch as Salazar regarded modernity with suspicion.

Angola, Terra do Passado e do Futuro, directed by António Escudeiro (1973, 17 minutes) was also forbidden by censors. The film was commissioned by Manuel Vinhas, the owner of

Cuca Beer, the most important brewery in Angola. The film was meant to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the company, and Escudeiro had complete freedom to film whatever he pleased, with access to all types of resources, including helicopters, cars, etc. In an interview, he declared that the documentary was in fact an excuse to travel around the country and assess the war: “Este filme é um falso filme porque o importante era ver o país todo, como é que ele estava, como é que a guerra ia. Informava o Vinhas e depois essa informação ou era transmitida directamente a Paris, onde estavam os tipos do MPLA, ou então, inclusivamente ia eu a Paris e falava com o Mário Pinto de Andrade” (Piçarra and António, vol. 2 179).⁵⁵

In spite of the documentary being an excuse to help the MPLA, it cannot be considered a revolutionary film, because it never questions the Portuguese presence in Angola. It was forbidden because it focuses too much on the work of black Angolans, and abstains from showing any whites. The film also avoids the authoritarian voice over that explains everything to a passive audience, and relies as much as possible in music and sounds to accompany the images. The opening sequence relies solely on the sounds of nature and machines, while we see images of animals and natural landscapes, tractors in the fields, men fishing and women working in a village, oil platforms, factories. However, the voice over praises the technological advancements of Angola: “O avanço das técnicas possibilitou o aproveitamento mais rápido e racional das riquezas naturais de Angola, já exploradas, a estimular a imaginação para mais iniciativas. [...] Grandes empresas, pedras angulares na vastidão desta terra nova.” The documentary therefore supports the presence of big companies, which were one of the main agents of colonialism. *Angola, Terra do Passado e do Futuro* carries on with an aerial view of the bay of Luanda, the local beaches, and more images of nature. It closes with a baobab tree, a stereotypical symbol of

Africa. Even though the documentary avoids most of the traditional tropes of the colonial propaganda of the period, it still uses stereotypical images of Africa, with hints of exoticism in some sequences.

The last film that I will be analyzing here was the one that suffered most cuts. *Catembe—Sete Dias em Lourenço Marques* (1965) was directed by Faria de Almeida, born in Mozambique and son of Portuguese colonists. It was produced by António da Cunha Telles (Productions Cunha Telles, 1962-67), who also produced iconic films of the Portuguese Cinema Novo during those years (*Verdes Anos*, 1963, by Paulo Rocha, *Belarmino*, 1964, by Fernando Lopes, and *Domingo à Tarde*, 1966, by António de Macedo). *Catembe* mixed both fiction and documentary.

Catembe is a fishermen's village on the south of Maputo bay (at the time under the designation of Lourenço Marques bay), and part of the film was supposed to depict the daily lives of its inhabitants. The project sent by the producer and the director to request funding from the SNI detailed that the film was supposed to tell three stories: the first one on the life of the city of Lourenço Marques, the high rises, the touristic spots, etc.; the second part would be a research on the lifestyle, the mentalities, and the atmosphere of the city; the third part was a fictionalized poetic love story, about a girl who lived in Catembe and was named after the village itself. She was supposed to be black, but the actress playing her, Filomena Lança, was of mixed race. This last part was supposed to be mostly set at the dancing bar *Luso* (Piçarra 235). Faria de Almeida justified the choice of this dancing (which actually existed) in the following words: “a acção principal terá lugar no dancing *Luso*, típico em Lourenço Marques pela harmonia das raças, onde os brancos e os negros, portugueses ou sul-africanos se divertem e amam, vivem—enfim—na melhor comunhão de raças que é possível imaginar.” (quoted in Piçarra 235).

The SNI granted the money to the project. In fact, Faria de Almeida had just returned from London, where he studied film at the London Film School (then known as London School of Film Technique) with a scholarship from the SNI. Based on the description of the project, the SNI had every reason to believe that the film would promote Lusotropicalism, on the one hand, and the modernity of the city, on the other. However, once the censors viewed the film, they objected to the depictions of the bohemian nightlife, as well as to the images of poverty taken in Catembe. The film was divided in seven parts, corresponding to the days of the week. Sunday, the first day, depicted the leisure moments of the white middle class in the city, spending time at the beach or at the local pools, the luxury hotels Polana and Cardoso, where everyone went on the weekends, a lazy lunch followed by a nap. Monday focused on work, which was only performed by blacks, and it was filmed in the Xipamanine, a poor neighborhood in the periphery of Lourenço Marques. The censors were also displeased with the depiction of racial conviviality, which is seen mostly at the dancing, noting that it should be shown instead at the mixed schools, sports events, etc.

After passing by the censors, *Catembe* suffered cuts in 103 shots, and it entered the *Guinness Book* as the world record for the film with most cuts from censorship. The original film, before the cuts, had 7874 feet and the duration of 1h25m; after the cuts, it was reduced to 3937 feet and it only lasted forty five minutes (Piçarra 259).⁵⁶ In spite of all the cuts, censors ended up completely forbidding it. However, according to the director, the film did not attack directly the regime: “Fui ingénuo. É que não se tratava de um filme tão grave para o regime... Não deitava o regime abaixo” (Piçarra 244). Maria do Carmo Piçarra believes that the documentary was censored not only because of its depictions of the daily life in Lourenço Marques, but also

because of a new cinematic gaze, heavily influenced by French *cinéma vérité* (243-244).⁵⁷ In an interview with the director, he agrees with her that that might have been one of the reasons to the censorship to the film (Piçarra 244-245). That must have been one of the reasons, but taking into account the two previous films that were also censored, the main objection must have been because of the way the film showed that in Lourenço Marques there were two different social classes, one white and with money, the other one poor and black, that was at the root of the cuts and subsequent prohibition.

The film opens with a journalist interviewing people in the center of Lisbon, asking people what idea do they have of Lourenço Marques. The first man replies that he has no idea, but imagines that it must be just bush. In this way, the director introduces the typical stereotype about Africa as a wild place, so that such idea can be deconstructed throughout the rest of the documentary. The second interviewee, on the other hand, knows the city well and has been visiting it for the past sixteen years. He says that the city has grown immensely and that now there is a new square, new hotels etc. There is even a woman that thinks that Lourenço Marques is a little better than Lisbon, especially in terms of leisure. Another man compares it to Nice. The last one, who doesn't have much of an idea, when asked if it might be a jungle, replies that it most likely is. The camera then cuts to an aerial view of the city, showing its high rise buildings, large streets, the Hotel Polana (the epitome of luxury in Lourenço Marques and one of the most famous spots of the city up to nowadays). As I have shown before, these aerial views, whether in Angola or in Mozambique, were a favorite way to depict the modernity of the cities. The voice over informs the spectator of demographic data to illustrate said modernity: a city with 300,000 inhabitants (200,000 black), three hospitals, five churches, one airport, six buildings with more

than twelve floors, eight movie theaters, four daily newspapers, etc. However, the biggest hit of the *vida laurentina* is the Sunday, when everyone goes to the beach in the morning, has their typical curry lunch, followed by a nap and a walk by the esplanade along the waterfront. As the images show, these leisure opportunities are only enjoyed by whites.

Monday is dedicated to work. Due to censorship, the opening scenes showing working black Mozambicans were cut and replaced by a sequence of the port and the cargo ships, the big avenues, the train station, etc. The second part has images that were filmed in Xipamanine. There are several close ups of black individuals in their daily lives—such close-ups humanize and dignify the black subject. The camera does not exoticize them, and one of them even speaks to the it (something unseen in all the other documentaries) to say that he thinks Lourenço Marques is a beautiful city, with a lot of tourists. Tuesday is entitled “As Bifas,” the name given by the *laurentinos* (the inhabitants of Lourenço Marques) to the South African tourists.⁵⁸ A boy and a girl speak to the camera about the female tourists from South Africa, who tend to be more liberal sexually. The girl says that there are a lot of things she would like to accomplish, but that Lourenço Marques does not offer many possibilities to young girls like her. She also complains about lack of freedom, social freedom in particular. The boy says that Mozambican (white) girls are quite futile in their use of free time, but she disagrees and says that they don’t have access to the arts or music since childhood. The boy condemns the social repression forced on the younger generations, and confesses that the “bifas” are a huge hit among young boys like him because they were raised with more freedom. This sequence includes a comic gag of a man at the esplanade catcalling two passing “bifas.” Thursday, with the subtitle “A Poesia da Outra Banda” opens with an aerial view of Catembe, followed by a beautiful sequence of fishermen pulling the

fishing net from the ocean. All of them are black, contrasting with the previous scenes of the urban middle class. The soundtrack adds dignity and heroism to their work.

The last sequence, dedicated to Saturday, is filmed in Lisbon, at the café O Passo, where white Mozambicans reminisce of their golden days in Lourenço Marques. This sequence is clearly inspired by *cinéma vérité*, as it happens with the other sequences of the film where people are interviewed. The film closes with the girl from the newspaper stand saying that she would love to go to Lourenço Marques one day. Faria de Almeida has mentioned the influence of *cinéma vérité*, in particular the works of Chris Marker, Alain Renais, and Agnès Varda in this film (Piçarra 243). In an interview, he emphasized that the film *Cléo de 5 à 7* was a strong influence in *Catembe*. I believe that such influence was stronger in the third section of the film, which told the love story of the girl Catembe with a white man, and that was cut by the censors. Just like in Varda's film, a documentary of the city is used as a background to tell the fictionalized story of a girl. *Cléo de 5 à 7* also incorporates references to French colonialism: in the end of the film Cléo meets a young soldier who is on leave from the Algerian war.⁵⁹ However, the documentary sections of *Catembe* seem to be closer to Rouch's cinema: the interviews that he makes in Lisbon, asking people what they think about Lourenço Marques, recalls films like *Chronicle of a Summer*. And there is also the close relationship that Rouch had with Africa. One of the reasons for Faria de Almeida to avoid the comparison might be connected with the criticism of Rouch's films and how they exoticized the African subject (the interview to Faria de Almeida is from 2010). *Catembe* avoids exoticizing black Mozambicans, and their daily routines are not explored in what they might have of "African," but instead focus on their work, and on their living conditions in poor neighborhoods, such as Catembe or

Xipamanine. Nonetheless, black Mozambicans are interviewed only once. However, we cannot know if there were more interviews that were cut by censorship. In Mozambique, the film only shows the interviews to a journalist and to the young boy and the young girl.

The censored sequences that survived contain, among others, an aerial view of the poor peripheries of Lourenço Marques, where people live in shantytowns, an image of two black boys helping their white bosses to put a sailboat on the water, and images of the fishermen village in Catembe, with decrepit wooden houses and muddy streets. Half of the cut pieces of the film were filmed at the dancing *Luso*, where mixed couples dance and drink. These were shots of the fiction sequence, and in the last one a man tells Catembe, in English, “I can’t live without you, I love you, I love you.” The man should probably stand for a South African tourist looking for an affair with a Mozambican girl. In fact, most of the mixed couples are white men with black or mixed race women, but there is one where the man is black and she is white. This last couple represented one of the biggest taboos of interracial relationships, as Jon Cowans explains in his book *Empire Films*, in particular in the chapter “Black-White Couples and Internal Decolonization.”

After *Catembe*, Faria de Almeida never filmed again, even though he had everything to have a promising career, and he had been a brilliant student at the London Film School. The film he directed as his graduation project, a short entitled “Streets of Early Sorrow” (1963), won the first prize at the Amsterdam Cinestud Festival. Even though *Catembe* adhered to some of the lusotropicalist ideas advanced by Freyre, it explored its sexual aspect, precisely the one to which Salazar objected. However the film did not oppose colonialism nor did it criticize the Estado Novo regime. The only political inflection was in the contrast between moneyed whites and poor

blacks, and in the fact that he used the word Portugal to refer to the metropole, something that was forbidden by the government, as Portugal included all the colonized “provinces.” However, these last two issues disappeared from the censored version, but even so the film failed to be cleared. These examples of colonial documentaries censored by the government—*Catembe*, *Esplendor Selvagem*, and *Angola, Terra do Passado e do Futuro*—show how strict was the image that the regime wanted to circulate. These three films are the only documentaries that present interesting innovations in terms of filmmaking and subject matter. The other ones follow a strict model that was repetitive, both aesthetically and thematically.

Colonial Fiction Films

Compared to the colonial documentary production, fiction films focusing on the subject were not frequent. However, they are interesting to look back because they reaffirm many of the tropes found in the non-fiction genre. The Portuguese government only produced one official fiction feature fully financed by the SPN, *A Revolução de Maio*, directed by António Lopes Ribeiro in 1937. The film accompanies the transformation of a Communist that falls in love with a girl who admires Salazar, and because of her ends up converting to the ideals of the Estado Novo regime (Vieira, *Portuguese Film* 29). In 1940 Lopes Ribeiro also directed *O Feitiço do Império*, which tells the story of a wealthy Portuguese who lives in Boston and has no interest in returning to Portugal. However, when he visits Angola he ends up falling under the spell of the Empire and decides to move there. *Chaimite—A Queda do Império Vátua*, directed by Jorge Brum do Canto in 1953, recounts the last battle that the Portuguese fought to dominate

Mozambique. In the film, Mouzinho de Albuquerque defeats Gungunhana, portrayed as a bloodthirsty savage that attacks the good colonists that try to make a living as cotton farmers.⁶⁰

The two last films offer an epic approach to the deeds of great Portuguese in Africa. Most of the fiction features of the 60s and 70s tend to lose that epic tone, some more than others. *Uma Vontade Maior*, directed by Carlos Tudela (1967), is a missionary film that lasts 2h15m. As Jon Cowans demonstrated, missionary films were a preferred genre for colonial cinema, since they offered a great opportunity for white savior narratives. These narratives defended acculturation as an effective—and benevolent—form of imperialism: “As Chinua Achebe’s novel *Things Fall Apart* illustrated, their proselytizing began to undermine the beliefs and self-confidence of host societies, launching the process of mental colonization. The entire missionary enterprise required a certain cultural arrogance, and missionaries went beyond proselytizing, promoting many forms of acculturation” (40). *Uma Vontade Maior* illustrates perfectly this process of acculturation, that anti-colonial critics such as Franz Fanon and Amílcar Cabral have criticized in their writings. The film tells the story of Carlos, who decides to become a missionary as a young boy, against his father’s will. As soon as he is ordained, he leaves the metropole to Angola, where he joins a mission in the region near Nova Lisboa. When he arrives to the mission, he sees the tough conditions that await him, but he declares that he was prepared to face them. In a class where black kids are taught Portuguese, he sees that most of the kids don’t have notebooks, and his superior notes that if the kids from the metropole sent the materials that they no longer use would be enough—therefore appealing to the benevolence and the white savior spirit of the white audiences that would see the film. The teacher, who is black, notes that many of these children could not even speak Portuguese when they arrived, but that they are learning. The black teacher

is therefore an example of acculturation that should be regarded as an example of success. The film strongly advocates for Angolans to become Portuguese, and it shows that if they make an effort to learn how to behave as Europeans, they will become part of society.

In the middle of the film, a village is affected by a disease that begins to kill some of its inhabitants. When Father Carlos arrives, the son of the Chief is extremely ill. The kimbanda (the name given to the traditional healers in Angola) is trying to help the kid, but Carlos pushes him away and expels him from the hut. The kimbanda is completely infantilized in the film, and accepts to be thrown away as a little kid caught doing something wrong. The child survives the night and the Chief thanks Carlos for curing the kid. However, Carlos did not have any western medicine with him, and there was no doctor available, so it is implied that it was Catholic faith that saved the kid. Later on, a doctor arrives and the people from the small village are spared from the disease. The Chief thanks to Carlos, who tells him that it was a shame that some of them had died because no one called him earlier, and that those deaths would not have happened had they called him immediately, instead of hoping that the kimbanda would help them. The chief concedes that the kimbanda knows nothing, and agrees to let Carlos catechize the entire village.

In the end of the film, Carlos is old and sick, but does not want to leave the mission that he helped expand and improve. His superior finally convinces him to return to Lisbon, where he can continue his mission by telling people of the work of the missionaries and recruiting more people to come as missionaries. Father João is ready to take his place in Angola and continue Carlos' work. Father João was a little kid that Carlos received in the mission in the beginning of the film. He was a black kid who could barely speak Portuguese, but who learned everything and

became a perfect missionary himself. Carlos has done the most important job a missionary should do: proselytize (and acculturate) the Angolans to the point where they are ready to continue the work of the white savior by themselves—as long as they do it by following strictly the principles of catholicism and European civilization.

The other fiction films of this period that deal with colonialism are not as serious as this one, being either action movies, comedies, or both. The most popular cinematic genre throughout the Estado Novo was the “comédia à portuguesa,” which gave a contrasting perspective of the country within its European borders:

Avoiding references to either the political situation [...] or the serious social problems that affected the country during this period, the comedies forged the image of *a poor but happy Portugal* and of *a Lisbon organized as a village*, where a few meager marks of modernity (cabarets, automobiles, electricity, etc.) peacefully coexisted with a traditional, patriarchal, and hierarchical social structure. (Vieira, *Portuguese Film* 13, my emphasis)

Zé do Burro, directed by Eurico Ferreira (1971), is a typical “comédia à portuguesa,” with the only difference that is set in Mozambique. It plays with the genre and adapts it to the idea of modernity attached to the colonial cities. It was produced in Mozambique by Somar Filmes, a production company settled in this city and owned by Courinha Ramos, who also wrote the dialogues. Both Angola and Mozambique had small companies that produced films, mostly tourism publicity, newsreels, and some documentaries. The production of fiction films was rare, and in Mozambique Somar Filmes only produced two features, *O Explicador de Matemática* and *Zé do Burro*.⁶¹ These two films, and *Zé do Burro* in particular, are fundamental because they perfectly illustrate the point of view of the colonists living in Lourenço Marques, which not

always completely coincided with the metropolitan colonial government. Some even considered it the first Mozambican film (Convents 302), but this is highly controversial, as the film depicts the point of view of the European and infantilizes the Mozambicans. The film adheres to the lusotropicalist tropes of the so-called Portuguese ability to easily adapt to a new environment in the colonial space. It also emphasizes the contrast between Portugal as a rural country and Mozambique—especially Lourenço Marques—as a cosmopolitan space. In spite of the poor quality of the plot, it is a great example of how film was used to convey a political message on the colonial venture.

The film *Zé do Burro* is the most important of these two, even though its quality is questionable, to say the least, and it adopts the style of the “comédia à portuguesa.” It tells the story of a simpleton from a small town in Portugal who arrives with his donkey to the big city of Lourenço Marques. *Zé do Burro*, the main character, comes in a ship, and contrasts with the rest of the passengers, who seem very cosmopolitan, while he wears clothes typical of the Ribatejo province of Portugal. His donkey is lowered by a derrick, offering the first comic moment of the film. The main comic devices of the plot are centered on misunderstandings, as it is typical in this genre. In fact, *Zé do Burro* does not understand how a big city works.⁶² When he leaves the docks, he feels lost with all the traffic, and with the instructions of the signaler police. One of the longest gags of the film is when he “parks” the donkey and gets a parking ticket. He also tries to put the donkey in a plane to go to the north of Mozambique, where he has bought a house with a piece of land. The flight attendant tells him that he can’t bring the donkey with him, so he decides to walk with the animal to his new home, setting off what we could call a road movie on a donkey. On the road, he meets a man driving a Volkswagen wagon who laughs at him when

they meet, asking if he's for real.⁶³ What interests me in these scenes is how Mozambique is portrayed as a much more modern space compared to Portugal. Even in the countryside Zé's attitudes are out of place; the cars overwhelm him in Lourenço Marques, and he does not understand standard parking signs, mistaking the post for the designated place to tie his donkey. Indeed, the presence of the donkey in Lourenço Marques is weird enough to be a joke in itself.

After an adventurous journey on the road, he arrives to the promised land: the farm he had bought to a man in Portugal, house included. This promised land is by the border, and the fellow Portuguese (all of them white) worry that he won't be able to cultivate the land due to its proximity to the border, where the liberation armies are. As the driver of the Volkswagen tells Zé, "A terra presta, o problema são os homens." Guido Convents points out:

Para o realizador *O Zé do Burro* não tem significação política, mas torna-se difícil aceitar tal posição quando a guerra já decorria no país. [...] [O] filme corresponde à política do Estado Novo, que quer promover a imigração dos portugueses para Moçambique. Isso não impede que *O Zé do Burro* seja submetido a uma nova censura em Lisboa e chegue às telas da metrópole com dois cortes que tornaram incongruentes passagens importantes. (Convents 302-03)

Courinha Ramos was involved in the production of *Catembe*, and he wanted to avoid problems with the censorship, which justifies this affirmation from Eurico Ferreira. Denying the political purposes of a film can be an attempt (conscious or unconscious) to pass its ideology as more innocuous than it actually is. Besides, propaganda films not only intend to indoctrinate their public with a certain political message, but they also mirror many of the fantasies of a considerable group of people within a country. Dictatorships, independently of their degree of

authoritarianism, are always supported by at least a part of the population. Aldous Huxley was quite aware of this when he wrote:

Political and religious propaganda is effective, it would seem, only upon those who are already partly or entirely convinced of its truth... The course of history is undulatory, because (among other things) self-conscious men and women easily grow tired of a mode of thought and feeling which has lasted for more than a certain time. Propaganda gives force and direction to the successive movements of popular feeling and desire; but it does not do much to create those movements. The propagandist is a man who canalizes an already existing stream. In a land where there is no water he digs in vain. (Taylor 10)

In fact, colonialism had more support from the Portuguese people than the Estado Novo regime had in the early seventies. Even though the Revolution of 74 (which put an end to the fascist regime) was carried out by the military who opposed the colonial war, that did not mean that they necessarily opposed colonialism itself. Let us not forget that the colonies compensated for the semi-peripheral position that Portugal always held within Europe and that since the fifteenth century they were an essential part of the country's identity.⁶⁴ Therefore, Portuguese colonial cinema conveyed a message that many believed at the time. Additionally, the majority of the Portuguese⁶⁵ living in the African territories had an obvious interest in maintaining their presence—and their economic control—in the overseas provinces. The films in question want to assert the legitimacy of the Portuguese presence and authority in the colonies, and this was a shared interest among the government and the colonizers. The films mirror these intentions, and the concomitant rhetoric at work.

An important part of such rhetoric was the idea of Lusotropicalism, and that is illustrated in *O Zé do Burro*. When Zé arrives to his promised land, the administrator and the other white residents tell him that it is almost impossible to cultivate the farm, since it is next to the border, where all the “rebels” are. In fact, both in fiction and in documentary, the liberation armies’ struggle (wether from Angola or Mozambique) is always considered as “something” undertaken by foreigners. It may influence the black population, but only because they are naïve. In line with the Rousseauian notion of the *bon sauvage*, the Africans born in Portuguese territory are pure and innocent, and they have a good heart (this same view was patent in *Uma Vontade Maior*). However, they are not intelligent enough to think by their own heads, and are easily influenced by the foreign ideas that agitators have been trying to introduce in there. This is why the film situates the land that Zé do Burro bought by the border: because such desire for self-determination has to be, for the Lusotropicalist imaginary, a foreign idea. In fact, the man who leads the army composed by gullible Mozambicans is Chinese. Instead of guns, they are armed with sticks, in an attempt to deny its strength and depict the liberation army as an anecdote. The fact that their leader is a non-black foreigner denies, at the same time, that there is a true will of independence among the Mozambicans, and that the black subjects are capable of having their own, legitimate ideas. Thus infantilized, they are portrayed as always needing a leader—wether he is Chinese or Portuguese.

In spite of the threats at the border, Zé has no problem in adapting to his new situation. Even though the local African population is suspicious at the beginning, they soon trust him and help him cultivate his farm, which becomes a success. A few days later, Zé arrives to his new land, an African man from the community comes to talk with him: “Eu já sei que o patrão

comprou estas terras, e a gente vai sair,” to what Zé replies: “Qual sair nem qual carapuça! As terras são grandes e aqui cabe toda a gente. A questão é que aqui haja vontade de trabalhar. E venham lá esses ossos!” Therefore, the Africans (the “good ones” at least) immediately subject themselves to white power and respect the Portuguese right of property (that is why they refer to Zé as “boss”); they are rewarded by being allowed to stay in those lands and work for him. Zé is always the leader, however, and adopts a paternalizing attitude towards the Africans—in fact, the first people he meets are children, which underscores the infantilization of the African subject in the film. The rebels, too, start abandoning the Chinese leader to join Zé one by one, and in the end even he joins Zé and the African population, and the film ends in happiness with a big celebration that mixes African and Portuguese music.

Zé do Burro is an excellent depiction of the ideal of the lusotropical man. He easily adjusts to the land, is successful in cultivating it, and has the entire African population on his side. He even ends the war through his sympathy and by the way he includes the Africans in his endeavor. The black characters are always portrayed as inherently submissive and eager for a paternalizing leader who will guide them into prosperity. They rarely speak in the film, and are never given any agency. Even the Chinese leader loses his patience with their portrayed dumbness.

Having a Chinese man leading the liberation army denies, on one hand, Africans’ ability to become leaders, and on the other hand, insists on the idea that the desire for independence is a foreign idea introduced by Communist regimes external to Mozambique (or any other Portuguese colony, for that matter). In fact, there are many documentaries that underscore these two visions. *Temos também o dever de ser orgulhosos dos vivos* and *Angola na Guerra e no*

Progresso also convey that notion. Along with advancing the idea that the war was provoked by foreign influences coming from Communist countries, a colorblind policy was also seen as essential to placate the criticism of the international community, while reinforced the lusotropicalist ideology imparted by Salazar's regime. Fiction films, however, tended to completely erase the African subject, even though they insisted on Lusotropicalism, which in this case had more to do with the ability to adapt to new geographies and climates. *Zé do Burro* is one of the few colonial fiction films where the Africans have some prominence,⁶⁶ and even here they rarely have the word (except to tell Zé that they will leave his land). They are represented with a very clear purpose: to show the superiority of the Portuguese and how easy it is to end the war, since all of them have good hearts.

Eurico Ferreira also directed *O Explicador de Matemática* (1972), and Courinha Ramos produced it. It is a comedy in the same vein as *Zé do Burro*, and it was the only other fiction film made in Mozambican besides *Deixem-me ao Menos Subir às Palmeiras*, that I analyze on the chapter dedicated to liberation cinema. *O Explicador de Matemática* is much less political in terms of the message that it wanted to pass, since the subject of war is totally absent. The film is entirely set in Lourenço Marques, but the only blacks we (rarely) see on screen are the servants, who are depicted as dumb and comic—one of them is even called *Soap* (*Sabonete*), which also points to the desire of “cleaning” the black subject, making him white. The film tells the adventures of a math tutor who tries to scam a family, and the colonial motif is completely absent in the film.

Burgueses, Malteses e às Vezes was directed by Artur Semedo in 1974,⁶⁷ and produced by him in a partnership with Sulcine Luanda—Sociedade Ultramarina de Cinema. Set mostly in

Luanda, it is an action and comedy film that erases the black subject from the screen. The film tells the story of Trafaria, a swindler that runs away from the metropole to Luanda because he owes money to someone. In Angola he will also be part of some scams and becomes involved with Pais de Sousa, a rich businessman that pretends to be a good husband and a good catholic, but has in fact a lot of lovers and is involved in diamond trafficking.

There are only two times when we see black individuals on screen. One is a street sweeper in Lisbon and the other one appears in the last scene of the film, in the desert of Angola:

A cena final encena, pela primeira vez, o encontro de Trafaria [a personagem principal] com uma personagem negra, um indígena que se cruza com o grupo em pleno deserto, mas que parece totalmente alheado das aventuras e desventuras das personagens brancas.

[...] A única aparência que Semedo não desmonta é a aparência de normalidade num território de guerra. A ausência destes tópicos da retórica do filme mina, por isso, qualquer sentimento de genuíno remorso, transformando esta sequência final [...] na representação da condescendência paternalista face às populações negras, consideradas incapazes de *resistir*, ou sequer de *reconhecer*, a exploração colonialista a que estavam sujeitas. (Piçarra and António, vol. 1 74-75)

As Baptista pointed out, the film may introduce what we could call a Marxist criticism of the capitalist process of the so-called “Angolan economic miracle” (Piçarra and António, vol. 1 71-73). The first sequence of the film is set in a train with Portuguese emigrants going to Germany to look for better jobs. Economic emigration was very common at the time, and it illustrates the contradictions of the colonial enterprise—if, on one hand, it generates enormous profit for some, on the other the Portuguese in the metropolis struggle to make a living on very

low wages and with poor working conditions. We are introduced to Trafaria, who gets into trouble when he is trying to help immigrants cross the border. After getting into a fight, we see him on an airplane to Angola—the passengers are very different from those at the train, and they seem to be businessmen with money to spend. In Luanda, he meets Pais de Sousa, a rich entrepreneur that Trafaria also tries to swindle. From here on, the film is a sort of action comedy that reminds the Trinita westerns, without a visible attempt to create social criticism. Baptista points out that the film intended to criticize the figure of the businessman through Pais de Sousa, but Trafaria, the main character with whom the spectator sympathizes, is also after his money, which weakens any possibility of denunciation of the colonial capitalist enterprise.

Therefore, if at the beginning of *Burgueses, Malteses e às Vezes* we can sense a hint of disapproval of the economic hardships of the Portuguese citizens that are forced to emigrate, the film soon becomes one more comedy without any intention of criticizing the current state of affairs. Even if there is a faint attempt of criticism, this is only focused on the class differences between poor and rich whites. The plight of the colonized Angolans is never taken into consideration. Despite the fact that most of the film is set in Angola, not only there is no attempt at criticizing colonialism, but the African subject is erased in an unearthly way. Even though this erasure happens in most of the fiction films of this period, the fact that the characters walk on the streets of Luanda and go to public spaces, such as cafes and restaurants, where we never see one black character (nor even as a servant), is very strange, to say the least. As Boaventura de Sousa Santos observed, “In either mode of reproduction, dominant identity is always ambivalent, for even total negation of the other is only possible through the *active production of the other's nonexistence*. The production implies the desire of the other experienced as an abysmal absence

or insatiable lack.” (Santos, “Between Prospero” 20, my emphasis) As we have seen, Portugal tries to compensate its sentiment of inferiority towards Europe through the colonial Empire—or the Overseas territories, which the Estado Novo rhetoric claims to be as Portuguese as Lisbon or Trás-os-Montes. However, in this gesture also lies the fear of being absorbed by the colonies:

For this reason, the “empire's lie,” which, according to Bhabha, results from the pretense of integrity and completion in the appropriation of indigenous cultural knowledge, is different in the case of the Portuguese empire. The lie, in this case, often consisted in claiming to be an empire “like the others,” while hiding the fear of being absorbed by the colonies, as when the Portuguese crown fled to Brazil and established the empire's capital in Rio. This was an act of representational rupture without parallel in Western modernity. (Santos, “Between Prospero” 18)

Erasing the African subject from the filmic representations is a way to repress that fear. I believe that this process is not exclusive of the Estado Novo ideology, but it is present at the core of the Portuguese identity.⁶⁸ Therefore, even films that seem to oppose Salazar's government tend to lose its critical force when it comes to the Portuguese colonial empire. In a documentary produced by the German Democratic Republic before Independence,⁶⁹ entitled *Moçambique, a Luta Continua*, Samora Machel, the leader of Frelimo at the time, who would later become the first President of Mozambique, criticizes the Portuguese Communist Party—PCP⁷⁰ for not supporting and not understanding the liberation struggle of FRELIMO (which also followed a communist ideology). In fact, Machel accuses the PCP of never being willing to listen to the projects and to the demands of the African people. Therefore, the *active production of the other's nonexistence* is a political gesture that is not exclusive to the Estado Novo regime, but that is

transversal to other layers of Portuguese society—even to those that aimed at a democratic society. Such erasure is present in Portuguese colonial film, both in documentary and in fiction. Even the films that had scenes censored by the government do not question colonialism.⁷¹

Operação Dinamite (1967) is an action movie directed by Pedro Martins. Max, played by Nicolau Breyner, a famous Portuguese actor, is a CIA spy that is trying to recover some files from the Pentagon that fell in the hands of an international group of spies that act in Lisbon that intends to send the documents to Hong Kong. Just like any cliché of a James Bond film, there are a lot of beautiful women chasing him. The film was produced by Felipe de Solms in a partnership with Angola Filmes and Internacional Filmes, who also distributed it. Most of the film is set in Lisbon, but there is a sequence set in Luanda, where Max travels on a mission. When Max arrives to Luanda by plane, the audience is introduced to the city with an aerial view of the bay, one of the most popular images of Luanda in colonial cinema, as I have shown above. The next sequence shows images of the modern streets of the capital seen from Max's car, driving by (the film is full of expensive cars, another typical motif of James Bond movies). Max parks the car at a mansion, extremely luxurious, where he is greeted by a beautiful blond woman. his mission is to bring back to Lisbon Sílvia, a young woman whose father just died. Max and Sílvia return to Lisbon, where the rest of the story will unfold in the traditional suspense of spy movies.

The images of Luanda in *Operação Dinamite*, just like in *Burgueses, Malteses e às Vezes*, completely erase the black subject from the screen. However, images of the black “other” appear dislocated to another scene, that in a way announces the trip to Luanda. Max and his partner Toni go to the bar Sanzala to look for a man. Sanzala⁷² was the name given to the slaves' quarters in

sugar cane plantations and similar haciendas. At the bar, two men sing mariachi music on a stage, and behind them there is a painting of black men dressed as African warriors. The bar is decorated with African masks, and there's a lot of wood that reminds some African huts. The African "other" is therefore tamed and frozen in the walls of a bar, where the white Portuguese go to have fun and enjoy safely the colonial exoticism that has been erased in Luanda. According to the images of Africa in this film, the Portuguese accomplished their mission of controlling the African subject, that can be enjoyed as a fetish at a nightclub in the metropole. As Patrícia Vieira has argued, the colonies functioned as a fetish for the nation:

If we extrapolate from the Freudian theory of fetishism to analyze Salazarist discourse about Portugal, we can see that, on the other hand, the leaders of the New State were conscious of the true political, economic, and geo-strategic dimensions of the country as a peripheral European nation. On the other hand, they aggrandized Portugal by drawing attention to the size of its territory and through the use of sexually charged terms like "dilation" and "sap." The empire does functioned as a fetish that helped keep the illusion that the country was a great European power. In other words, the empire was the nation's lost phallus. (*Portuguese Film* 184)

According to Freud, the fetish is a mechanism to deal with the fear of castration—and fear of castration is fear of becoming powerless, of losing control. The fetish is a supplement that deviates the attention from the phallus and from the fear of losing it. The presence of the phallus is dislocated to an object that at the same time distracts from the phallus and compensates for its lack. As I have argued before, the colonies compensated for the sentiment of inferiority that Portugal felt towards Europe, as the map "Portugal não é um País Pequeno" illustrates (Fig. 2).

The African “other” represented for the Estado Novo regime that fear of losing power, i.e., of losing the colonies, especially in the late 1960s, when the colonial war is putting the entire empire at risk. Therefore, this African “other” is erased from Luanda and reappears in Lisbon, as a fetish, painted on the wall of a bar in an African themed bar for the entertainment of Portuguese men. The sexual component is added when Max meets another beautiful woman at the bar, Cherri, who immediately falls for him. Therefore, Max dominates the scene, as the Portuguese have dominated Africa.

Likewise, it is the small trip to Luanda that confers to the film an international swing, which makes it more plausible for Lisbon to be at the center of a spy plot involving agents of the CIA. Therefore, it is the colonies that make Portugal a country visible to the rest of the world, where an action movie copied from Hollywood spy movies can therefore make sense. According to Vieira, “What is at stake here is Portugal itself, whose aspiration of becoming a powerful nation in economic and political terms depended, as we have seen, on the colonies. [...] The overseas territories supplemented the mainland and sustained an image of a country that did not really exist” (*Portuguese Film* 183).

The colonies were an essential part of the idea of nationhood during the Estado Novo regime. That is why the liberation struggle was systematically depicted as a foreign idea disseminated by the Communist countries among innocent Angolans, Mozambicans, Bissau-Guineans, etc, who were otherwise happy to be part of the Portuguese nation. Due to international pressures, the documentary films felt the pressure to represent black Africans as being fully integrated in society. Even though many of the images belied that, the voice over reassured the audiences that such integration was a reality. But the most important part of the

Portuguese civilizing effort was the modernization of the African territories, and how it put Portugal among the most developed countries of the time, as the images led to believe. Fiction, on the other hand, tended to have an escapist approach, especially during the war, which is completely erased from most of the fiction films, together with the black subject. *O Zé do Burro* was the only movie that actually depicted the conflict, but it did so in a comical manner, removing all traces of threat from the screen.

Chapter 4

Cinema de Abril

On April 25, 1974, a group of lower ranking military officers led the revolution that would put an end to the dictatorship of the Estado Novo regime. The group became known as Capitães de Abril, and the movement as MFA—Movimento das Forças Armadas. In that early morning of April, different battalions advanced towards Lisbon to undertake the revolution. As soon as word was on the streets, the population adhered to the revolution, despite requests from the MFA for citizens to stay at home, for their own safety. With an overwhelming popular support, the military was able to accomplish the revolution without violence. Only four people were killed by PIDE, the state police of Estado Novo, when a group of citizens walked to its headquarters, on António Maria Cardoso Street, demanding the release of the political prisoners. As a symbol of the peaceful revolution, the florists selling flowers in the streets of the city distributed red carnations that were put into the muzzles of the rifles of the soldiers. The carnations were in their blooming season and the red stood for the socialist and communist ideals of those leading the revolution, which became known as the Carnation Revolution.

A group entitled Junta de Salvação Nacional (National Salvation Junta), composed by military officers, was designated to maintain the government and make the transition to democracy. This Junta was predicted in the program of the MFA, and it led the government until a new government was elected in 1975. General António de Spínola was nominated President until September 28, 1974. Even though he had not been part of the MFA and of the revolution, Marcelo Caetano, the leader of the Estado Novo regime that succeeded to Salazar, said that he

would not surrender to any Captain, referring to Salgueiro Maia, who was leading the negotiations and the siege to the Carmo military barracks, and who became one of the heroes of the revolution. Marcelo Caetano said that he would only surrender to a General, and he was the one to call Spínola, who had been critical of the colonial war in his book *Portugal e o Futuro*, published in March of that year, a month before the revolution. Marcelo Caetano went to exile in Brazil until his death, in 1980. General Spínola would also escape to exile in Brazil, after he attempted a rightwing counter coup on September 28, 1974, as he was unhappy with the political left turn in Portugal, and with the process of decolonization that followed the revolution—he was against the continuation of the colonial war, but he was a defender of Portuguese colonialism, as he showed in *Portugal e o Futuro*.⁷³

In the context of the revolution, there was a period that was designated as Processo Revolucionário em Curso—PREC, and that lasted until April 1976, when the new Constitution was approved. The PREC referred to the revolutionary activities undertaken by leftwing parties, unions, and groups of citizens. These activities included political events, and social and artistic demonstrations in the context of the revolution. The PREC also included a series of measures such as the nationalization of companies deemed to be of public interest, banks, transportation, factories, media, etc., and Land Reform. It was in this context that Portuguese cinema would go through a set of changes, and that a new film movement would be born. There was an urgency to document the revolution, so the filmmakers directed a series of films, mostly documentaries, which became known as the cinema of April.

Four days after the revolution, on April 29, a group of filmmakers and other people with ties to the arts occupied the Instituto Português de Cinema, and demanded the refounding of

Portuguese cinema in its entirety. Their immediate demands included the end of censorship, the release of all the films that had been forbidden during the dictatorship, and the restructuring of the systems of production, distribution, and exhibition (Costa 11). One of their main concerns was the monopoly of Hollywood cinema in the Portuguese market. Just like the directors of Brazilian Cinema Novo, Portuguese filmmakers felt that the dominance of US cinema not only endangered the production of national cinema, but it also imposed a form of cultural colonialism.

As we can see, there was an almost immediate change of tone in what concerns the Portuguese geopolitical situation. The Estado Novo regime had made a tremendous effort to build an image of Portugal as part of the leading world nations, a country larger than Europe, which the map “Portugal não é um país pequeno” announced. As the title of the map indicates, there was an anxiety stemming from the fact that Portugal was in fact a small country, which was constantly denied through the possession of colonies (see chapter 3). Boaventura de Sousa Santos has defined Portugal as a semi-peripheral country, which means that it is neither part of the center (which can be considered Europe, and the colonizing nations are all part of this center), nor of the periphery. The colonies were the periphery that allowed Portugal to feel part of the center:

Com excepção de um período de algumas décadas nos séculos XV-XVI, Portugal foi durante todo o longo ciclo colonial um país semiperiférico, actuando como correia de transmissão entre as colónias e os grandes centros de acumulação, sobretudo a Inglaterra a partir do século XVIII, e este facto teve uma importância decisiva para todos os povos envolvidos na relação colonial, uma importância que, de resto, se manteve mesmo depois de essa relação ter terminado e até aos nossos dias. (Santos, *Pela Mão de Alice* 135)

With the April revolution, Portugal lost its colonies, and as a consequence it had to face its peripheral situation, which was a result of its economic and political dependence on more powerful countries. Therefore, the discourses changed: Portugal was seen by many of its citizens as a colonized country, that had for long depended on other European nations, England in particular, to survive. Even though the colonial past was an important issue that Portugal had to deal with, and that was addressed in many of the films of this period, there was also the problem of a strong economic and political dependence towards other nations. This situation had obvious implications in terms of how Portugal conceived its place in the world: “This means that the Portuguese colonizer has problems of self-representation rather similar to that of the British colonized” (Santos, “Between Prospero” 11). Such problems surface in the cinema born in the context of the revolution. The search for a national identity was part of the agenda of the filmmakers of this period. Boaventura de Sousa Santos argues that what shapes Portuguese culture is the notion of border. He advances that Portuguese culture has no content, just form, and the border is its form:

[...] podemos assim dizer que não existe uma cultura portuguesa, existe uma forma cultural portuguesa: a fronteira, o estar na fronteira. Este modo de estar cultural é, no entanto, completamente distinto do modo de estar cultural da fronteira norte-americana. A nossa fronteira não é *frontier*, é *border*. A cultura portuguesa é uma cultura de fronteira, não porque para além de nós se conceba o vazio, uma terra de ninguém, mas porque de algum modo o vazio está do lado de cá, do nosso lado. E é por isso que no nosso trajecto histórico cultural da modernidade fomos tanto o Europeu como o selvagem, tanto o colonizador como o emigrante. (Santos, *Pela Mão de Alice* 134)

Therefore, hybridity characterizes the very essence of the Portuguese colonial experience: “The first difference is that the ambiguity and hybridity between colonizer and colonized, far from being a postcolonial claim, was the experience of Portuguese colonialism for long periods of time” (Santos, “Between Prospero” 16). Some of the colonial films presented such ambiguity, such as *Burgueses, Malteses e às Vezes*, which illustrates the double position of the Portuguese as both colonizer and emigrant (see chapter 2).

Even though Portugal was briefly hesitant to completely decolonize the African territories, that hesitation soon vanished, and decolonization became one of the tenets of the revolution. The Portuguese also saw in decolonization a sort of redemption of the colonial experience. Therefore, many of the films of the revolution condemn colonialism, attributing it to the fascist government, in an attempt to expurgate the revolutionary citizens of such misdeeds. Giving up the colonial empire meant focusing on the country itself, and therefore facing the fact that Portugal, in its European context, was a peripheral country, underdeveloped and economically and culturally dependent on more powerful nations.

One of the main obstacles to the rebuilding of a democratic country was the low levels of education: “By the end of the *Estado Novo*, one third of all the Portuguese were illiterate, one third of those aged 15 or older had full primary education, 3% had completed secondary education and a residual 0.6% had undergone university education” (Pereira and Lains 128). In order to improve these levels, the new government would have to invest heavily on this area, and culture would be fundamental in the process.

Provided that independence pressed the discussion of nationhood in the African territories of Angola, Mozambique, Cabo Verde and Guinea Bissau, the loss of the colonial empire and the

new political situation also urged Portugal to rebuild its concept of nationhood. The filmmakers that marched to the Instituto Português de Cinema on April 29, 1974, believed that film was a pivotal instrument in the creation of a new, democratic nation: “A marcha dava corpo a uma ambição recente: a refundação de todo o cinema português, do seu enquadramento legal às estruturas de produção, distribuição e exibição até à *conceção do seu papel político e social num Portugal novo*” (Costa 11, my emphasis). Therefore, film became a political tool that should intervene in the rebuilding of a socialist, democratic society. The films of the revolution can therefore be considered Third Cinema, as they fulfill the main principles defined by Teshome Gabriel (3).

As I have shown, even though Portugal was a colonizing nation, it was (and still is) informally colonized. Its dependence on foreign countries was similar to that of Brazil or of many Latin American countries in the 1960s and 1970s. On the other hand, decolonizing the minds also meant, in the particular case of Portugal, to leave behind the colonialist mindset disseminated by the Estado Novo regime, withdraw from the occupied territories, and deal with the problems that came from decolonization: the returning troops, the traumas associated with the war, the hundreds of thousands of Portuguese that would soon be returning to Lisbon and that would have to be reintegrated into society.⁷⁴ Obviously, the cinema of April did not solve these problems, but it attempted to at least denounce them, and create a space for the rest of the country to reflect about them and try to find solutions. I will look into these attempts, their failures and accomplishments, in the analyses of the films of April.

The cinema of the revolution also aimed at contributing to the revolutionary transformation of society, by documenting and spreading the collective experiences happening in

the country, from the Land Reform, to the occupation of factories, to public manifestations, etc. The films would help to develop a radical consciousness as they were shown to groups of people, who discussed the political acts depicted in the films, and tried to find solutions to the issues that were presented. Once again there was the urge to create a *new man* that was politically engaged in the transformation of society. In terms of esthetics, there was a lot of freedom: “Não, isso não, não tínhamos critérios estéticos, nem técnico-formais, cada um fazia como quisesse o que quisesse. O que se pedia é que tivesse alguma coisa a ver com aquela realidade que se vivia, mais nada” (Manuel Neves in Costa 136). One of the main ideas during this historical moment was “Liberdade.” Directors, too, explored that same freedom when making their films. If the films were not too experimental it was because of the urgency to film everything, to register every event, and to immediately have it available to show it to the population. Nonetheless, it is important to point out that the documentaries became an important filmic genre in the cinema of April. Some directors were more conservative, but others did experiment with the limits of the genre, such as João César Monteiro and Fernando Lopes, as we will see.

The political priorities of the revolution were *to democratize, to decolonize, and to develop*, which became known as *the three D's*. Hollywood was seen as an important obstacle to achieve those priorities, as it suffocated national cinema, not allowing it enough space to be screened, and therefore preventing the films to recoup the costs of production at the box office. The two major distribution companies of the time, Filmes Lusomundo SARL and Intercine, had a monopoly that controlled the majority of the national movie theaters, and that prioritized the distribution of foreign cinema, Hollywood films in particular (Costa 37). The US films took up most of the movie theaters, and left little space for national cinema to be screened. The

filmmakers of the revolution also believed that Hollywood cinema imposed a political and cultural hegemony on the Portuguese audiences:

A Hollywood evocada é mais do que um centro de produção cinematográfica. Constituiu um espaço imaginário que detém não apenas a capacidade de produzir imagens como também os imaginários a elas associados. Isto porque o seu alcance não se restringe à indústria cinematográfica. Abrange também as chamadas indústrias culturais, através das quais as suas imagens se refratam em vários níveis das vidas social, política e cultural. Mais: é desse espaço que emanam não apenas os conteúdos, mas também as formas de construção e circulação das imagens (por exemplo, os *multiplexes* dos centros comerciais). (Costa 15-16)

Therefore, what was at stake was not only the production of more Portuguese films, but the formation of new audiences. One of the main obstacles to the development of a national cinema was the lack of interest of the public in seeing Portuguese cinema. For instance, the workers of Cinema Londres, in Lisbon, denounced the low attendance to the midnight sessions of 1974 that screened Portuguese films. The one with most attendance reached only 44.4% of the seats (*O Passado e o Presente*, Manoel de Oliveira). Many of the films programmed were acclaimed works of Portuguese Cinema Novo, such as *Verdes Anos* (Paulo Rocha) or *Acto de Primavera* (Manoel de Oliveira) (Costa 34).

One of the first cleavages in the sector was a result of this problem: the production sector and the distribution and exhibition sectors had opposing views on the subject. The production sector defended the screening of Portuguese cinema, and the group advanced a series of measures, some of them turned into bills. For instance, they demanded the limitation to the

import of foreign films, especially those coming from the US (Costa 12). On the other hand, the distribution and exhibition sector worried about losing income. The ushers were particularly critical of the attempts to limit the exhibition of foreign films, as an important part of their income came from tips.

In the wake of the revolution, those working with cinema believed that the Sindicato Nacional dos Profissionais de Cinema—SPC was the best departure point to restructure Portuguese cinema (Costa 29). The SPC had been created during the Estado Novo regime, and it represented 3,000 workers from distribution and exhibition, and 200 from production. However, the split between the two groups grew to the point that, in June 1974, the vast majority of the workers associated with production created a new union to represent them, Sindicato dos Trabalhadores da Produção do Cinema e da Televisão—STPCT: “O argumento crucial da divisão radicava na divergência de interesses entre os elementos da produção que queriam reconstruir o cinema português a partir da “base” e os elementos da distribuição e de exibição, cujo trabalho se fazia nas salas onde prevalecia a exibição do cinema norte-americano.” (Costa 30)

The crisis continued during the PREC. Even though there was a clear turn to the left, there were a lot of divisions among different groups, who had divergent views on how the Instituto Português do Cinema—IPC (Portuguese Film Institute) should function. The IPC wanted to have the final word on the content of the films, and it wanted to have full control over box office rights. Many disagreed with this policy, such as Cinequanon, one of the film cooperatives created in this period, which stood against the IPC policies and lost the financing of the INC: “O desentendimento reatualizava duas das questões substanciais das reivindicações dos elementos das cooperativas: a capitalização e o controlo do IPC sobre os conteúdos e

propriedade do filme” (Costa 99). Many of the filmmakers and technicians felt that the Portuguese Communist Party had excessive control of the IPC (Costa 111). According to one of the directors involved in the process, Fernando Lopes, the solution should defend the socialist principles of the revolution without compromising creative freedom: “Para Fernando Lopes, havia que optar por um *‘um princípio centralista’* e *‘um princípio que não pondo em causa o socialismo na sociedade portuguesa, propunha uma zona de liberdade criativa e estética, através de três grandes cooperativas’*” (Costa 112).⁷⁵ Alberto Seixas Santos, on the other hand, advanced that the opposition to the IPC and to the agenda of the Communist Party had to do with who had the power when deciding what films to do. The Communist Party wished to have that power centralized on the members of the party, whereas the majority of the filmmakers wished that the decisions would be taken by the teams working directly in each movie, within each cooperative, where everything was decided democratically, among all the participants (Costa 159).

Even though some can see these conflicts as a reflex of the political instability that the country was going through, we can also consider them a symptom of democracy. People finally had the chance to discuss ideas and to think of a new project for national cinema, no longer controlled by censorship. The clash of ideas was the result of a democratic environment where people could finally advance their own political and cinematic proposals. The cinema of the revolution depicted these discussions, and the coexistence of different points of view in many areas of the new political life. Furthermore, this film movement had the intention to create an *archive* of the revolutionary process, of which arguing different ideas was an important part. One of the mottos of the filmmakers was “*filmar e mais filmar*” (Costa 19). The concern with

building an archive of the revolutions was articulated with the replacement of old power institutions by new ones. That entailed imagining a new nation, in the context of the revolution, and therefore a new archive was needed to officialize the political overturn of the fascist regime:

Archives are not merely receptacles of the past; concepts of history themselves are shaped by archives. The relationship between power and knowledge is crystallised within the material and metaphorical spaces of archives [...]. Foucault's notion of archives as not merely the material spaces of the repositories that are the archive, but more abstractly the “law of what can be said, the system that governs the appearance of statements as unique events.” (McEwan 742)

The slogan “*filmar e mais filmar*” was a call to create an archive of the revolution, a way to inscribe that political moment in History, to reset History and overcome the four decades of fascism that had loomed the country. *As Armas e o Povo* (1975) is one of the most important films of the period, and it illustrates that urgency of registering the revolution. The film depicts the six days between April 25 and May 1st, and how the Portuguese were living the revolution. It was directed by a collective of filmmakers, *Colectivo de Trabalhadores da Actividade Cinematográfica*, and had the participation of Acácio de Almeida, José de Sá Caetano, José Fonseca e Costa, Eduardo Geadá, António Escudeiro, Fernando Lopes, António de Macedo, João Moedas Miguel, Glauber Rocha, Elso Roque, Alberto Seixas Santos, Artur Semedo, Fernando Matos Silva, João Matos Silva, Manuel Costa e Silva, Luís Galvão Teles, António da Cunha Telles e António-Pedro Vasconcelos. The most iconic participant was probably Glauber Rocha, who traveled to Portugal as soon as he learned about the revolution. He appears in several shots interviewing people on the streets, asking them what they think of the revolution:

Glauber Rocha surge no filme pondo questões de forma enfática ao povo da rua. As suas perguntas são entoadas como se de uma forma de incitamento à acção se tratassem, gesticulando para que os inquiridos se aproximem da câmara: “*diga o nome do senhor*”; “*O senhor foi reprimido pela ditadura?*”; “*O senhor está disposto a lutar pela liberdade do povo?*”; “*você quer que a guerra continue ou acabe?*” [...] Nesta ordem de ideias, o espetador é concebido como agente ativo, que o cinema mobiliza no sentido de o tornar participante no processo de mudança social. (Costa 92)

Glauber Rocha has always privileged auteur cinema, where the filmmaker has complete esthetic freedom, which should never be submitted to a political agenda. In *As Armas e o Povo*, Glauber probably had all the freedom to conduct the interviews, film the population, etc. However, it was the first and only time that he participated in a collective film. This is the film where Glauber is the closest as a filmmaker to the idea of Third Cinema advanced by Solanas and Getino, where the urgency to pass a political message overcame the esthetic concerns of a film. Glauber himself felt the urge of “*filmar e mais filmar,*” registering the bustling in the streets, and the euphoria of the people with the end of the Estado Novo regime. It is Glauber’s charismatic image on the screen that marks his presence, more than any esthetic traits typical from his films. But he is never alone: he is surrounded by a mass of people, eager to speak to the camera, to give their opinions on the revolution. One old man is too moved with the revolution and has to gather himself before declaring that it still seems unbelievable that the dictatorship came to an end, and that he is very happy with the freedom that everyone lives on the streets. Glauber also gives the word to those who are not sure of what they think of the revolution: a woman who lives in a precarious house declares to the camera that she is not sure yet if the

revolution is good or bad. Others say that they wish that the colonial war comes to an end, and that the Portuguese should leave the colonies as soon as possible. The sequences with the interviews conducted by Glauber are the ones where the audience feels closer to the people, and where the feeling of euphoria in the streets is more marked. Glauber Rocha saw film as a dialectic process, and his interviews reinforce that dialectic, where the new political situation is discussed, and where the director is seen interacting with the people being filmed.

The other parts of *As Armas e o Povo* are dominated by the voice over, recounting the steps of the revolution on April 25 and the following days. It also informs the spectator of previous revolts that attempted to defeat fascism in Portugal. Another section shows the release of the political prisoners in Caxias, who are briefly interviewed on their way out, but who usually declare that they still have to learn the news to have a formed opinion—many of them say that they had no access to information from the outside world and that therefore still need time to understand the what is happening. The second half of the film focuses on the celebration of May 1st, declared a national holiday by the MFA. We see aerial images of the masses marching in the streets, and the speeches of important political figures that had opposed the Estado Novo regime, such as Álvaro Cunhal (leader of the Portuguese Communist Party) and Mário Soares (leader of the Socialist Party). However, in this second sequence, those who speak are the political leaders and the voice over. The people become an anonymous mass, whereas the sections filmed by Glauber give them individuality.

It is important to underscore that this is a film in its entirety, and that each director filmed a piece that contributed to the whole. The documentary manages to portray every instance of the revolution, from the people celebrating on the streets, to the political leaders, most of them just

returning from exile, giving their speeches. In the end of the documentary, the voice over emphasizes the participation of the masses as central to the revolution: “O Movimento das Forças Armadas derrubou o governo. As massas populares, o povo e os trabalhadores de Lisboa, apesar dos apelos para ficarem em casa, vieram para a rua. Foi a partir da rua, foi com as massas populares em luta e movimento que foi depois derrubado o fascismo.” And it later adds that the celebration of May 1st is, most of all, a demonstration against the colonial war, as the masses are on the streets to declare that “não é livre um povo que oprime um outro povo.”

As Armas e o Povo closes with the people who came to the May 1st rally singing the national anthem, which then fades into the song *Grândola, Vila Morena*, by Zeca Afonso. Zeca Afonso had had many of his songs forbidden by the Estado Novo censorship because the regime considered it too evocative of communism. *Grândola, Vila Morena* was never forbidden, but the soldiers of the MFA chose it to play at Radio Renascença, which they occupied, at 12:20am of April 25, as the second and definite sign for the troops to advance with the revolution. *Grândola, Vila Morena* became the anthem of the Carnation Revolution. When the national anthem fades into this song, it coalesces the nation and the revolution as one.

A Portuguesa, the Portuguese national anthem, was written by Alfredo Keil and Henrique Lopes de Mendonça in 1890 as a response to the British Ultimatum. It was soon adopted as a republican hymn, and when Portugal became a republic, the song was adopted as the new national anthem. However, if we look at the lyrics, and at the historical context in which it was created, the anthem extolls Portuguese colonialism: “Heróis do mar, nobre povo.” The colonialist undertones of the song have been seldom criticized in Portugal. During the revolution, no one ever questioned the anthem. Therefore, its presence in this film, as in many other films of the

revolution that condemn colonialism, is at odds with the anticolonialist message, as it contradicts that desire to decolonize, and unveils the ambiguous attitudes of Portugal towards its colonial past.

Another major theme of the cinema of April is the concern to represent through film the rural realities of the country, the peasants and their struggles against the large landowners. Just like in the first phase of Brazilian Cinema Novo, there is a (re)discovery of the countryside. João Mário Grilo advances the film *Acto de Primavera*, a documentary directed by Manoel de Oliveira in 1963 that focused on the celebration of the passion of Christ in a small town in the north of Portugal, as the forerunner of this tradition, that would be explored in the second half of the 1970s, in the context of the revolution (Grilo 90).

Torre Bela (1977) depicts the peasants in the context of April 25 and the Land Reform, and it is probably one of the most iconic documentaries of the period. It chronicles the occupation of the *quinta*⁷⁶ Torre Bela by a cooperative of peasants of the region, who claim the land to cultivate it. The film covers the period going from April 23, 1975 to July 11 of the same year. The *quinta* belonged to the family of the Duke of Lafões and his seven brothers, it occupied 1,700 hectares (4,200 acres) of land, and it was the biggest enclosed agricultural field in Portugal. The film was produced by the Portuguese cinema cooperative Era Nova, and it was directed by Thomas Harlan,⁷⁷ a German militant of the Left that had already been in Chile, Poland, and the Soviet Union. In an interview included in *Outro País*, a documentary directed by Sérgio Tréffaut about the foreign filmmakers that came to Portugal to film the revolution, Harlan comments that he, like many foreigners, traveled to Portugal to see how a revolution undertaken by the military was the opposite of other military coups that had established dictatorships, as it

was the case in Chile. He wanted to register what he called “the suicide of the Portuguese army,” because an army that undertook a revolution like that of April 25 was in many ways committing suicide (Daney 6). He underscores that he is not a filmmaker and that his intention, when he traveled to Portugal, was not to make a film. It was the circumstances that made him film the occupation of *Torre Bela* (Harlan 13). Harlan decided to go Torre Bela to register the occupation, and the idea was to send the negatives every week to a lab in France, have them developed and returned, and show them to the people of the cooperative, so that they could discuss the events and strategies and advance their struggle, and also to show it to other nearby towns, so that others could learn and even repeat the experience.

Torre Bela can therefore be considered, to a certain extent, a guerrilla film, as it was used as a weapon during the occupation of the *quinta*. In fact, the director did more than just film and observe the course of events. In an interview to *Cahiers du Cinema* in 1979, Thomas Harlan has declared that the filming team soon began intervening in the events: “A nossa não-intervenção transformou-se desde o início em intervenção” (Harlan 14). The final cut of the documentary hides that intervention, and the audience has the impression that the camera was only there to film, without participating. However, that was not true, as the director admitted. In his documentary *Linha Vermelha*,⁷⁸ José Filipe Costa exposes the conditions in which *Torre Bela* was filmed, and unveils the actions undertaken by Harlan to add drama to his film. On one hand, Wilson, the leader of the peasants during the occupation, immediately realized the importance of the documentary to advance their cause. He took advantage of the camera and became one of the main characters of the film. On the other hand, Harlan decided to take matters into his own hands

and force many of the events, so that the film was full of drama and excitement, and not a dull journalistic piece.

For instance, one of the most iconic moments of the documentary is when the peasants invade the palace of Torre Bela, as it was referred to by the local population. They enter the house, look at the family photos of the Duke, play the piano, open the drawers, try the clothes on, etc. This is the most transgressive moment of the film. The peasants can finally see how those that exploited them for decades lived, all the luxuriousness of the house, the clothes, etc. In *The Wretched of the Earth* Fanon describes how the colonized always desire to occupy the place of their lords. This sequence of *Torre Bela* is the embodiment and the accomplishment of such desire, which is probably why it is so subversive, but also because it violates the privacy of a home that was completely barred to the villagers until then. As Costa explains in *Linha Vermelha*, many people used that invasion as an excuse to condemn the occupation, claiming that the peasants only wanted to steal, and had no interest in cultivating the land. On the other hand, Costa advances that that invasion was also useful for the people to measure all that wealth, and from where it came, since the workers had such lower wages paid by the Duke of Lafões.

The peasants were reluctant to enter the house, but Harlan precipitated the invasion by arranging a meeting between representatives of the cooperative and the military police, knowing that they would likely give the green light to the occupation. And as we can see in *Torre Bela*, the military police was very receptive of the occupation, saying that the laws had to come from the people, and they should not wait for a decree to act, and that it would be the law that would follow their revolutionary actions. The Land Reform did not cover yet the *quinta* Torre Bela,

which complicated things. If it was not by the direct action of Harlan, the peasants might have never entered the house.

Harlan also admitted to provoking the heated debates between the peasants during local assemblies, almost to the point of physical violence (Costa, *Linha Vermelha*). During those sequences, the camera lingers in the confusion, we listen to people arguing, screaming at each other, but we can barely understand what they are saying. The camera does not make an effort to clarify what each individual has to say, it avoids focusing on any particular person when they are speaking, it cuts people in the middle of their speeches, stealing the meaning from what they had to say. The director preferred to manipulate the people to increase chaos. *Torre Bela* does not show how the elements of the cooperative organize to work, their political discussions, etc. There is only one sequence where Wilson and another peasant discuss about a hoe that the peasant should give to the cooperative. The man argues that he does not see why he should give them something that is his, but Wilson attempts to explain to him that everything will belong to everyone, and that it is better for him, that he is in fact winning by ceding his hoe to the cooperative, as he will have access to all the tools owned by the cooperative.

The militant essence of the film seems to be lost in the heated discussions where the director chooses not to give any meaning to the arguments. In the interview that Harlan gave to *Cahiers du Cinema* in 1979, he agrees that *Torre Bela* reveals the animal side of Portugal: “Para [Cunha Telles, um cineasta português], *Torre Bela* revela o Portugal animal. O comentário é adequado [...]” (Harlan 17). He also admits to having betrayed the peasants, who trusted fully in the filming team: “É aí que reside a grande contradição: ao darem-nos confiança, são traídos” (Harlan 17). When the final cut of the film was shown to the participants of the

occupation, the reaction was negative: “Aperceberam-se de que tinham sido objeto de uma reflexão sobre a história, que para eles não era fácil fazer. Em concreto: qual o interesse que havia em mostrar, com uma grande crueldade, toda a conflitualidade das relações que estavam na base da sua comuna” (Harlan 21). In this sentence, Harlan mentions that the conflict was at the base of their commune, but forgets to mention that he fueled that conflict to add drama to his film. The otherness of the peasants is reenacted in these sequences, and the director denies them the power to speak by themselves. In the same interview, Harlan declares: “*Torre Bela* é portanto e antes de mais um filme sobre a tomada da palavra, um filme que acaba por ser excessivamente falado uma vez que é ao falar que o personagem se descobre, ganha consciência da sua imagem e pode, por conseguinte, agir e tornar-se um personagem dramático” (20). However, the film itself belies this statement, because it purposefully takes away the meaning of those words. In this sense, this film is very close to Jean Rouch’s *Les Maîtres Fous*, which was accused of exoticizing an African ritual, instead of dignifying it:

Some Africans have, however, condemned the ambiguity of a partial, external and residually exotic approach. This criticism is backed up by European critics like Gaston Heustrate, who see in Rouch merely a ‘paternalistic “scientist.”’ This is no doubt an overhasty verdict, but it stresses the external nature of Rouch’s approach: he has never stepped over the line and relinquished control; he has never gone over to the other side of the camera and let himself be carried along in the destabilizing rituals he was filming. (Barlet 8)

Harlan’s attitude in the way he filmed the occupants of Torre Bela is in many ways similar to that of Rouch. Even though he provoked many of the events, he and his team always

remained exterior to the events, as he declared in the interview to *Cahiers du Cinema* (Harlan 16). The fact that Harlan was a foreigner with little knowledge about the Portuguese, their language and their culture, reinforces this comparison. If a film adopts a paternalistic point of view, it loses its ability to be militant cinema. Comparing the peasants to animals dehumanizes their struggle. *Torre Bela* alternates between paternalistic moments where the animalization of the peasants is exploited, and moments where the occupation of the peasants is respected and celebrated.

After seeing the documentary, the peasants asked Harlan to include in the credits a declaration written by them, about why they occupied Torre Bela, noting that they fought not only against capitalism, but against themselves (Costa, *Linha Vermelha*). They fought against their own limitations, since they had never had the opportunity to take control of their own lives, to organize politically, and even to discuss their own political ideas, as all of that was forbidden during the dictatorship. According to José Filipe Costa, Harlan never included that declaration, silencing once again the protagonists of his film.

Linha Vermelha ends with the voice over saying: “Mais do que registrar a vida como ela era, tu [Thomas Harlan] querias dirigir a realidade como se fosse um filme.” The occupation of Torre Bela became the most famous land occupation of the years of the PREC, in large part due to Harlan’s documentary⁷⁹. Looking back to those years, it is hard to know what really happened, and we are left with *Torre Bela* as the main narrative of the episode. Therefore, the documentary manages, in a certain manner, to replace reality. When José Filipe Costa decided to film *Linha Vermelha*, he wanted to make a documentary about the people that had occupied the *quinta*, but he soon realized that Harlan’s film was one of the central questions of the history of that

experience (Daney 6). Therefore, *Torre Bela* the film imposed itself on the reality of the events not only by the ways in which it provoked some of the situations, but also because it is what is left of the memory of that place in the official history of the occupation.

Another concern of April cinema was understanding the fascist regime that had oppressed the country for more than forty years. *Deus, Pátria, Autoridade*, directed by Rui Simões and produced by the Instituto Português do Cinema and by the Radio e Televisão de Portugal in 1975, is one of the most important documentaries of the time regarding this subject. The title of the film is taken from the three dogmas of the Estado Novo regime: God, Fatherland, and Authority. The film opens with the lines of a famous speech given by Salazar in 1936 defending these three principles: “Não discutimos Deus e a virtude, não discutimos a Pátria e a sua História, não discutimos a autoridade e o seu prestígio.” The main purpose of the film is to deconstruct the three tenets of the Salazar regime. The documentary uses a considerable amount of archive material from the *Jornal Português* and from other documentaries of Estado Novo. The editing is clearly influenced by Eisenstein, resorting often to the strategy of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, in many ways similar to Murilo Salles’ editing in *Estas São as Armas*, which I analyze in chapter 6.

The first images of the film show workers in a glass factory working, while the soundtrack mimics the sounds of machines in a plant. The voice over declares that “o homem chegou mais longe que os animais pelo trabalho. O trabalho é a principal actividade humana.” *Deus, Pátria, Autoridade* then shows the testimonies of a series of workers, that describe the arduous working conditions to which they are subjected daily. The first worker, in front of a threshing machine, complains that they lead “uma vida muito porca.” “Porca” means dirty, but it

is also the word for pig. Therefore, the first testimony contradicts in many ways the voice over that declared that it was the work that distinguished men from the animals. The worker adds that he and his companion live like two locked up dogs, reinforcing the animalization of the peasants due to the unfair exploitation of their work. Therefore, the work that was supposed to dignify the human being turns him into an animal when he is exploited by a greedy system. The film proceeds by showing other testimonies from workers, and the voice over later emphasizes that while most of the people work hard in exchange for a small wage, their bosses live in luxury—to illustrate this, the director juxtaposes the image of a house in a slum to a mansion. A sequence with drawings simplifies the production process of a car, explaining that the boss buys the raw materials for a cheap price, pays a small wage to the workers, who do all the work, and then sells the car with a large profit. The voice over concludes that the boss made a lot of money and did not work at all. The film then has the working class as its target audience, and wants to clarify the system of production that exploits them, so that they can act against such exploitation. The film moves on to cover the issues of emigration—during the dictatorship a large part of the active population had to emigrate in order to survive—and colonialism. The documentary explains why colonialism was unfair to the local people, and how the exploitation suffered by the Portuguese working class was repeated in the colonies, where those exploited were the Africans. It gives Mozambique as an example, where monoculture replaced local agriculture, leaving the populations completely dependent. We can see in this sequence, once again, the didactic purpose of the documentary.

The film then carries on to the deconstruction of the three dogmas, *God, Fatherland, Authority*. The first section is dedicated to *God* and it opens with Salazar's speech: "Não

discutimos Deus e a virtude.” The Pope gives a speech on world peace in voice over, while we see images of the colonial war. The documentary continues with a dialectical montage of the Pope speaking to a crowd and images of the colonial war. The next sequence shows people giving alms to the church, putting money in an alms box, while the soundtrack plays the sounds of a cash register, associating the Church with capitalism and with the exploitation of the working classes and the poor.

The section dedicated to *Authority* focuses on the activities of PIDE, the political police of the regime, and its surveillance of thousands of citizens. The section on *Fatherland* begins with a criticism to colonialism, opening with images of Goa, Daman and Diu, in India, which were the first territories to become independent in 1961, and that therefore symbolize the loss of the colonial empire, which was central to the national identity of the Estado Novo regime, as I argued in chapter 3. The documentary explains why the liberation armies in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea Bissau decided to take arms against Portugal, as it was the last resort available to resist and fight against colonialism. The last part of *Deus, Pátria, Autoridade* focuses on the April revolution and on the challenges that nation still faces in the fight against capitalism. The case of the factory Applied Magnetics is given as an example of the challenges faced by the workers. With the revolution, many multinationals left the country and the factories were occupied by the workers, that decided to continue producing under the management of the workers. However, these factories still need to buy the raw materials to other multinationals, that at the time boycotted the companies that were being managed by workers. They faced the same problem when they needed to sell their products. Therefore, the pressure of the multinationals to

boycott the factories that abolished high management and worked as cooperatives made the functioning of factories such as Applied Magnetics almost impossible.

Deus, Pátria, Autoridade has a didactic approach to the revolution. It wants to educate the audience about the Estado Novo regime, so that people can understand how it maintained power, and therefore avoid that history repeats itself. It also advances the challenges faced in the reconstruction of the country, which is trying to change the economic and political structure imposed by Salazar's regime. This is a militant documentary that is a weapon to change the current state of affairs, and that is aimed to an active audience, willing to take action into their own hands.

The documentary closes with the testimonies of exploitation of a series of peasants. The director gives them the word to recount in their own words their experiences of oppression. This was a common strategy in many documentaries of this period, as we saw for instance in *As Armas e o Povo*, as there was the need to finally give the word to those who had been silenced by the regime. The last sequence has the testimony of a peasant, who recounts how a series of lawyers forged documents so that he lost his farm. He concludes by saying that if he had had the opportunity, he would have killed all those lawyers and the judge with no shame, for what they had done to him. This last statement echoes Glauber Rocha's *Deus e o Diabo na Terra do Sol* (cf. chapter 1), and the scene where Manuel kills his exploiter. It also echoes Fanon's concept of violence in *The Wretched of the Earth*. The voice over closes the film emphasizing that Fanonian violence: "A história deste camponês é afinal a história da burguesia. Uma história de ladrões. É contra a burguesia que o proletariado português continua a lutar. [...] em que o proletariado responde com a violência da libertação à violência da exploração capitalista." This type of

violence was present in other documentaries of the period. For instance, *Liberdade para José Diogo*, directed by Luís Galvão Teles and produced by Cinequanon (1975), presents the case of José Diogo, a peasant that wounded a landowner, who would die two weeks later. The landowner, Columbano José Pinheiro, was an admirer of Salazar, and refused to accept the new laws established by the unions after the revolution. He had fired José Diogo for demanding, with other workers, that Columbano accepted to abide to the limit of 8 hours of daily work, and to pay the lawful wages. José Diogo lost his mind in one of the arguments and wounded the landowner. The film ends with a popular court where the population acquits José Diogo. However, the traditional court maintains José Diogo in jail. The documentary closes with an appeal for the creation of more popular courts that should replace the judiciary system inherited from the fascist regime. The story of José Diogo echoes once more the thesis of Fanon on violence and reminds us again of Manuel's assassination of his boss.

Que Farei Eu Com Esta Espada, directed by João César Monteiro in 1975, is one of the most experimental documentaries of the period. In the early summer of 1975 the film was screened at the national television, and it was followed by a debate where important intellectuals, many of them with ties to cinema, participated (João Bénard da Costa, Maria Alzira Seixo, Eduardo Prado Coelho, and Correia Jesuíno, among others). They debated what type of cinema should be produced in the context of the revolution (Costa 92-93). Correia Jesuíno believed that *Que Farei Eu Com Esta Espada* was too vanguardist and could not therefore speak to the people: “Como tal, essas obras deveriam ser ‘legíveis,’ e não como o filme de João César Monteiro, entendido como demasiado ‘vanguardista’” (Costa 95). Maria de Alzira Seixa challenged this point of view: “considerar o filme de César Monteiro como demasiado avançado para uma

audiência popular seria uma atitude de simplificação e minimização do próprio povo, feita em seu nome” (Costa 95).

In fact, even though *Que Farei Eu Com Esta Espada* was one of the most experimental documentaries of the revolution, it had a straightforward message that could be easily understood. The title is taken from a poem of Fernando Pessoa’s *Mensagem*,⁸⁰ entitled “Conde D. Henrique.” The Count D. Henrique was the father of Afonso Henriques, who became the first king of Portugal. Pessoa’s poem gives an answer to the question: “À espada em tuas mãos achada/ Teu olhar desce./ ‘Que farei eu com esta espada?’// Ergueste-a, e fez-se.” (Pessoa 21) According to the poem, when Count D. Henrique rises the sword, he creates the Portuguese nation. However, the film itself never answers to the question “Que Farei Eu Com Esta Espada?” Therefore, Monteiro’s documentary questions the nation, its past, and its future. The film opens with the title “Que Farei Eu Com Esta Espada” written in graffiti on a wall, desacralizing the poem. Among the main artistic displays of the revolution were the ubiquitous murals celebrating the revolution. So the graffiti also gives the word back to the streets. It is no longer the king or the poet who asks “Que Farei Eu Com Esta Espada?,” but the people. The revolution has returned the word to the people. However, it is not so easy to take back the power into the people’s hands. The first image of the film, after the title, is that of a canon pointing to a military ship in the Tagus river, which belongs to NATO. In the first months of 1975, there was a serious threat of a foreign intervention in the country, as the US and its allies feared that Portugal would become a communist regime, which could contaminate other countries in Europe. For that reason, the US and the NATO sent a few ships that were docked in the Tagus River.

Monteiro's film relies in the Eisensteinian technique of montage of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. The voice over is completely absent in this documentary, and the political messages, including the criticism to NATO and to American imperialism, are delivered through the editing of the film. To recapitulate, the first shot shows a canon pointing to a NATO ship in the Tagus river. The second shot shows a caravel, suggesting a reference to the Portuguese "discoveries" and to colonialism, reminding the Portuguese of their colonial past, and that they too have threatened other nations. The third shot is taken from Murnau's *Nosferatu*,⁸¹ and we see the ship of the vampire docking at the port of Wisborg. *Que Farei Eu Com Esta Espada* will repeat this association in other sequences, and the vampire is always associated with NATO and with American imperialism, which threaten to suck the blood of the Portuguese, who just got rid of another vampire, fascism. The sequence continues to intersect images of the NATO ship with images of *Nosferatu*, and it ends with a demonstration of workers demanding the withdrawal of the ships: "Fora a NATO, independência nacional!" The director interviews some of the American sailors, and asks one of them what he thinks of democracy, to which he replies: "Democracy? I don't know." If the excuse for the presence of the American ship is to defend democracy, it looks like the sailors do not have a clear opinion of what democracy is. Later in the film, Monteiro juxtaposes a sequence of *Nosferatu* leaving the ship with his coffin under his arm with one of US soldiers walking by the boardwalk of the Tagus river with their US Navy jackets.

Another iconic figure of *Que Farei Eu Com Esta Espada* is a prostitute that recounts her sexual encounters to the camera. She describes how she approaches the sailors, how much she charges, etc. She also declares that, if women could have decent paying jobs that would allow them to survive, they would not prostitute themselves, but she sees more and more prostitutes on

the streets, pointing to the fact that women's rights do not seem to advance. Her presence is also a metaphor of Portugal, who needs to sell its resources to foreign powers in order to survive. Just like the prostitute, the country does not have many options, as the threatening ships confirm: even when the people try to take the destiny of Portugal into their own hands, the international community is vigilant to stop them.

But the clients of the prostitute are not only foreign sailors. She recounts an episode when a well-dressed man hired her, and she found out he was a priest. She says how he performed oral sex to her, to a point where she was so hurt that she could not work and had to be in treatment for three months. She concludes that that's how she experienced sex with a priest for the first time, and that she thinks it's wrong. This sequence is quite characteristic of João César Monteiro, who often plays with sexual taboos in his films, and who uses sex to subvert power. In this specific case, it is a way to criticize the Church, one of the pillars of *salazarismo*, and one of the targets of the films of this period, as we have seen with *Que Farei Eu Com Esta Espada* also criticizes other pillars of the Estado Novo regime, such as colonialism. The director interviews a group of African students, who talk about the liberation struggle and read a text authored by Amílcar Cabral, where Cabral advances that the liberation struggle is, more than anything else, a cultural act.

The second half of the film juxtaposes shots a woman wearing the clothes of D. Afonso Henriques, the first king of Portugal, and holding a sword, with images of the NATO ship and of *Nosferatu*. The masculinity of the king has been erased. The shots of the woman are either in the São Jorge Castle, in the center of Lisbon, or at a beach, facing the ocean—which suggests the Portuguese colonial past. On the last sequence, she raises the sword, facing the sea. The camera

then cuts to the navy ship, then to another sequence of Nosferatu holding his coffin on the bilge of the ship, then to another shot of two towers that are most likely from Torre de Belém (from where the ships left to the colonized territories), and finally to NATO's ship under the rain. The image is gradually overexposed until the ship fades into the light. The film then cuts to another graffiti on a wall that says: "Proletários de todos os países, UNI-VOS!"

This is likely one of the most negative documentaries of 1975, when the country was still living the euphoria of the revolution. *Que Farei Eu Com Esta Espada* illustrates how achieving the ideals of the revolution is complicated, and how the anti-revolutionary interest groups that dominated Portugal are still active and can jeopardize the accomplishment of the PREC. However, the film does offer some hope, with the final call for the workers to unite: it is therefore in the hands of the workers to unite and fight the oppressor, which is clearly capitalism. The documentary questions the future of Portugal, and there is a sentiment of uncertainty about the future when the question "Que Farei Eu Com Esta Espada?" is left unanswered.

*Os Demónios de Alcácer Quibir*⁸² was directed by José Fonseca e Costa in 1976, and it has the participation of Sérgio Godinho,⁸³ who both acts and sings in the film. It is a fiction film that also deals with some of the founding myths of the nation, which the revolution of April put into question. According to José Fonseca e Costa, the film is a metaphor for the end of the Portuguese colonial empire, which he considers the most important consequence of the Carnation Revolution, more important even than the end of fascism (Fonseca e Costa, interview). The title is a reference to King Sebastião, the young monarch that disappeared in the battle of Alcácer Quibir (Northern Africa) in 1578. King Sebastião left no successor: the throne was occupied by King Phillip II of Spain, and Portugal lost its independence, until in 1640 a coup

restituted sovereignty to Portugal. The disappearance in battle of King Sebastião gave origin to one of the most important myths of Portugal: on a foggy morning, King Sebastião would return in his white horse to save Portugal. The myth became known as *sebastianismo*, and it is present in many works of literature and film.

Os Demónios de Alcácer Quibir is set in Alentejo, which was the poorest region of the country during the dictatorship, where the majority of the population were peasants that depended on temporary work in the lands of big landowners. The film tells the story of a troupe of street performers, who are accused by the local police of participating in the organization of a strike of farm workers. A young noble woman, Lianor, helps them to get inside the palace of Dom Gonçalo, a nobleman that lives obsessed with the past, and calls himself the governor of the Indias and Africas. The group manages to find the treasure hidden by Dom Gonçalo, a box full of weapons.

The film is anachronistic, as it mixes contemporary facts, such as the colonial war, with a tale of kings and princesses. The title evokes the battle of Alcácer Quibir, and it draws a parallel with the colonial war. Just like Alcácer Quibir was a disaster for Portugal, so was the colonial war. In the film, the peasants will use the discovered guns to fight against those that oppress them, suggesting, on one hand, the organization of the armed struggle in the Portuguese colonies, and on the other hand the peasant resistance in Alentejo, where the Communist Party had one of the strongest clandestine organizations in the country. Moments before finding the treasure, one of the actors declares: “Malteses ou não, seremos sempre a mesma força explorada, enquanto a raiva não se transformar. [...] A raiva deve transformar-se em força organizada. A nossa força. A força da terra. [...] Um povo não pode viver da pilhagem de um império sem ser também ele

colonizado.” After they find the guns, the same actor announces: “É preciso organizar o povo.” These lines clearly evoke Fanon’s theory on violence, and on the need to channel the violence of the oppressed into an armed struggle against colonialism and capitalism. Even though Portugal was a colonizing country, the Portuguese peasants and blue collar workers suffered the same oppression that Angolans, Mozambicans, Bissau-Guineans suffered. Therefore, the film implies that the Portuguese have to fight side by side with the Africans for mutual liberation.

After the troupe has found the guns, a policeman finds them and tries to arrest one of the actors. To defend him, the other members of the troupe shoot and kill the policeman. More policemen arrive and kill everyone of the group, except for a mixed race woman, who runs away through the plain. This scene echoes the end of Glauber Rocha’s *Deus e o Diabo na Terra do Sol*, where the final shot is that of Manuel and Rosa running away in the *sertão*.⁸⁴ While the mixed race woman runs away, a white horse, also running away, crosses the screen, with no one riding him. The King Sebastião is not there to save Portugal, and the only survivor is a mixed race woman. The film therefore projects the hope for a better future on someone who breaks away with patriarchy and racism. The mixed race woman stands for the union between Africans and Portuguese, especially the union of those that had been oppressed by the power elites, represented in the film by Dom Gonçalo, a senile old man that could only survive surrounded by the ghosts of the past.

However, the film does not have a happy ending, as everyone in the troupe of actors is dead. The mixed race woman runs away, but just like in the case of Manuel and Rosa, her destiny is in the open, as is that of Portugal. As Randal Johnson as pointed out about *Deus e o Diabo na Terra do Sol*, paraphrasing Ismail Xavier, “The central conflict of the film is rather between

History and Destiny” (130). That is also the conflict in *Os Demónios de Alcácer Quibir*: os demónios (the demons) of Alcácer Quibir are the myth of a savior that will return to save the nation, and that has haunted the national imaginary for centuries. Dom Gonçalo represents those demons, that should remain in the past, together with Portugal’s colonial past—another demon that Portugal must face and overcome. Therefore, the film closes with a white horse riding through the plain, without a rider: the country can no longer wait for a savior, it has to take its own destiny into its own hands. That is what the troupe does when they picked up the guns and confront the police. It is also what the liberation armies in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea Bissau did when they fought for independence. In the final credits, *Os Demónios de Alcácer Quibir* is dedicated to the African liberation movements MPLA, PAIGC, and FRELIMO, “a quem o povo português deve a queda do fascismo salazarista e o fim do império colonial.” Therefore, the liberation struggle in the African colonies not only granted independence to those territories, but it was also a main drive behind the April revolution that restored freedom in Portugal.

Adeus, Até ao Meu Regresso is a documentary by António Pedro Vasconcelos, directed on December 1974 for the television. It is composed of a series of interviews to ex-soldiers in the colonial war deployed to Guinea Bissau, as well as their families. “Adeus, até ao meu regresso” was the expression used by the soldiers in the end of their Christmas messages sent to their families to be aired on national television. The messages were usually very brief, and the soldiers only stated their name, their number in the army, and then wishing merry Christmas and happy New Year. The messages were completely staged and devoid of emotion. *Adeus, Até ao Meu Regresso* does the opposite, and allows the now ex-soldiers to tell to the camera how they felt,

what they think about the war and the granting of independence to the colonies. The families of the soldiers also have the opportunity to testify about their anxieties while their beloved boys were in the *ultramar*. In the introduction of the film the voice over declares: “Este filme não pretende ser um relato do que foi a guerra da Guiné. [...] Este filme não é tão pouco um inquérito sociológico, mas apenas a fotografia a la minuta de alguns soldados escolhidos um tanto ao sabor do acaso e das possibilidades entre aqueles que verdadeiramente fizeram a guerra e a sofreram.”

This documentary therefore fulfills the desire to create an archive of the revolution. In this specific case, it creates an archive of the memories of those who fought the war, as those testimonies had been silenced by the censorship of the Estado Novo regime. The fact that there is no specific criteria in the choice of the soldiers illustrates the urgency of “filmar e mais filmar,” of registering whatever is available to the camera, so that there is as many recordings of the realities of the revolution as possible.

The film is clearly against the Portuguese colonial occupation, as the voice over states in the opening of the film: “Este filme não pretende ser um relato do que foi a guerra da Guiné. Para isso era preciso pelo menos tê-la vivido. Teria que se mostrar a ignomínia, as atrocidades, a cobardia de muitos e também a resistência, a coragem e o sofrimento de alguns, e as culpas totais de uma guerra encapotada por uma mística paranóica estão por confessar e repartir.” Since the old regime is over and those responsible for the war are probably not willing to confess their guilt, the film therefore gives the word to the soldiers that were compelled to go to the war in places that many of them knew nothing about. *Adeus, Até ao Meu Regresso* allows the soldiers to freely give their opinion about the Portuguese presence. One of them, when asked if he thinks

that the war was fair, replies that he does not know, that he does not understand it well enough to say. One thinks that the war was a bad thing, but that Portugal should not give independence to Guinea Bissau so easily, since the Portuguese had shed so much blood, that he believed Portugal should guarantee some advantage in the process. Another man disagrees, saying that all the blood shed was a strong reason to leave, as staying and trying to win some advantage would just bring more war and deaths. Another soldier declares that when he was trained to go there, he actually believed that the war was for a noble cause, but that once on the terrain he realized that things were different: “Via-se que estávamos a roubar o que não era nosso.”

One of the large sequences of the documentary is dedicated to the testimony of a soldier that was captured by the PAIGC and given as dead by the Portuguese army. His family believed in his death and even received a body to mourn. Once the war was over, the soldier was released and returned home to his family, and his girlfriend. The couple declares that they want to begin a new life, but that they will have to wait because they are poor and can't afford the wedding. The film therefore points to the lack of support of the soldiers when they return home, and to the fact that the vast majority come from poor families—all of the men interviewed come from families of peasants or belong to a blue collar background. In fact, one of the final testimonies reinforces the class equality between the Portuguese soldiers and the PAIGC soldiers, advancing that the struggle of the Bissau Guineans was the same struggle of the Portuguese workers, as they all fought against fascism and capitalism.

As we can see in this documentary and in others, the lusotropicalist rhetoric remains with a twist, and the racial component of colonialism is completely erased in these discourses. It is important to point out that the PAIGC had a similar discourse: many of the soldiers that fought in

Guinea Bissau listened to the PAIGC radio or received pamphlets from the Guinean army, where Amílcar Cabral and other leaders emphasized that both Portuguese and Bissau Guineans were equal victims of Portuguese fascism, and that they knew that the Portuguese soldiers were forced to go to war by the Estado Novo regime. After the April revolution, the Portuguese also felt the necessity to dissociate from a war that had suddenly become anathema in society.

Nós Por Cá Todos Bem, directed by Fernando Lopes (1976-78), mixes documentary with fiction. The filming crew travels to Várzea, a small town in the interior of the country, to accompany the director on a visit to his mother, D. Elvira. The soundtrack has two songs by Sérgio Godinho. The film focuses on the life in the countryside, and the difficulties lived by the few that stayed to cultivate the land, since an important part of the population had to emigrate to France and to other countries to find jobs and a better life. As João Mário Grilo noted, some directors of the revolution decided to film the rural areas of Portugal that had been forgotten during the dictatorship: “Alguns cineastas—no documentário e na ficção—partem, assim, à descoberta desse país remoto e esquecido, da sua identidade e dos seus mitos, operando um *exorcismo formal*, que teve consequências decisivas para o futuro do cinema português” (90).

One of the first sequences of *Nós Por Cá Todos Bem* introduces the “matança do porco” (“slaughtering of the pig”), an important tradition that happens once a year and that used to be accompanied with a big celebration in every family. D. Elvira recounts how her grandfather was an expert in killing pigs, and how everyone requested his services. She regrets that now all the celebrations that surrounded the event have disappeared because most of the villagers have had to emigrate. The film then proceeds to show D. Elvira and some other villagers slaughtering

one pig and then preparing it to be cut to be prepared as cured sausages like *chouriço*, *morcela*, and *farinheira*.

According to the voice over that follows this sequence, only after having filmed the slaughtering of the pig can the filming crew settle and begin the actual film, which is about the daily lives of the inhabitants of Várzea. The voice over mentions the elections that they left behind in Lisbon (this sequence is dated from April 18, 1976), which have no echo in that small village, and therefore it feels like they are in another world. The film then contrasts with other rural films that focus on Land Reform, like *Torre Bela*, where we see how the revolution had an impact in rural parts of the country. However, there are lots of small villages that have not yet felt the impact of the end of the dictatorship. *Nós Por Cá Todos Bem* is therefore an effort to highlight the situation of these remote parts of the country. According to Fernando Lopes, the film was an attempt to return to his roots, and to understand his class origins:

A seguir ao 25 de Abril, eu pedi a todos os meus colegas cineastas do *Cinéfilo* que escrevessem sobre aquilo que queriam fazer. Eu dizia que gostava de ser radical, de ir às raízes, voltar à minha aldeia e perceber qual é a minha origem e a minha posição de classe. Houve, no entanto, outras razões. [...] Com a democracia, a [Fundação] Gulbenkian achou que já não tinha que se envolver no cinema. Por isso, numa estratégia com a Fundação, agarrei numa ideia do Gérard Castello-Lopes e propus fazermos uma espécie de museu da imagem e do som da realidade portuguesa através de documentários, onde cada realizador mostraria a sua região, ou a sua região cultural. (82)

Even though the political message is not as blatantly stated as in the other films that I have analyzed here, its political importance is still patent. The film is also inscribed on the

project of creating an archive of images of Portugal in the wake of the revolution. Fernando Lopes has noted that the slaughtering of the pig filmed by his crew ended up being the last one made in Várzea. His camera guaranteed that the tradition would be registered and remembered. Nonetheless, filming the tradition of slaughtering a pig is not exactly the same as filming the revolution. Fernando Lopes believed that more than just film the revolution, it was important to think the revolution: “Para o Cunha Telles o que era preciso era filmar a revolução e enquanto eu e outros cineastas diziam “o que é preciso é pensar a revolução,” se é que isto é uma Revolução, coisa de que alguns de nós tínhamos dúvidas” (Costa 182). This is why in this film Lopes takes his distance from the revolution, and travels to a remote village to understand who he is in this new context, to what social background he belongs, etc.

Nós Por Cá Todos Bem is also about the massive emigration that afflicted the rural areas and left those who stayed struggling to maintain the lands cultivated with very little help. The expression used in title of the film, “nós por cá todos bem,” was a common expression that the emigrants used when writing to their loved ones in Portugal. It is also the title of Sérgio Godinho’s song, which accompanies the opening credits, and that mimics one of those letters: “Emigrados/ Uns para a França/ E outros para a morte/ E desta sorte/ Já todos lá vão/ Vão e vêm/ Nós por cá todos bem.// Alugados/ Uns para Lisboa/ E outros para a vida/ E à despedida/ Uns ficam outros vão/Vão e vêm/ Nós por cá todos bem.” Due to the extreme poverty that afflicted the rural areas of Portugal, many left either to Lisbon or to other countries. However, emigration only complicated the situation of the rural areas, which became gradually deserted. D. Elvira herself lived in Lisbon for about 35 years, serving as a maid to a countess that was very rigorous

with her servers. However, D. Elvira really missed her hometown and she ended up returning to Várzea.

The fiction sequences of the film do not develop an organized narrative, but instead stage tableaux depicting the lives of the maids during the dictatorship. These tableaux are inspired in D.Elvira's life as a servant, and the actress Zita Duarte plays her as a young woman: when the narrative shifts from documentary to fiction, we see a mirror with the reflection of D. Elvira, untying her black headscarf, which was typically used by the peasant women in Portugal. D. Elvira leaves the mirror and is replaced by Zita Duarte, who asks her for help to tie her own headscarf. This sequence emphasizes the interplay between reality and fiction, and renders the filmic apparatus visible to the spectator. This was part of the political agenda of the cinema of the revolution, which wished to educate the audiences and reveal that cinema was always a construction of the filmmaker and never a pure representation of reality: "O cinema ideologizava-se e politizava-se nos discursos, num movimento que crescia desde os anos 60. Denunciava-se a ilusão da naturalidade filmica que ocultava os dispositivos de poder e reprodução ideológica" (Costa 91). On the other hand, it is important to point out that Fernando Lopes had a divergent vision of what political cinema should be. He did not believe in pure political cinema, where the author disappeared and films became a pure political weapon (Costa 181-182). In this sense, his view was closer to that of Glauber Rocha on film and politics, that clashed with the conception of Third Cinema of Solanas and Getino (Lopes had met and worked with Glauber in *As Armas e o Povo*, and was very likely aware of Glauber's ideas on film).

The next sequence is a musical number, where the maids sing "Coro das Criadas de Servir," written by Sérgio Godinho (music) and the poet Alexandre O'Neill (lyrics). The choir

either says “mentira, mentira” or “verdade, verdade,” depending on the lines that Zita sings about the life of a maid. The song is full of references to the chaste ways that a maid was supposed to lead (usually followed by “mentira, mentira”) and by episodes that reveal her sexual desire (usually followed by “verdade, verdade”). The lyrics point to the social and gender situation of the maids, oppressed both by class and patriarchy. Their sexual desire is therefore a way to fight against patriarchy. However, the song hints at an affair with her employer, which complicates desire and class oppression, as they can be often contradictory. The final lines of the song point to that: “Ela bem podia ter sido, se quisesse./ Puta e até puta de classe/ Mentira, mentira/ Mas na luta de classes/ Deu-lhe para ser criada/ Verdade, verdade.”

The lyrics of the song refer to Saint Maria Goretti, an Italian virgin martyr that was killed by a man of the family that shared the house with her family. The man tried to rape her and killed her because she resisted. In the film, one of the maids reads the story from the book, while Zita Duarte embodies Maria Goretti praying to Jesus, for him to penetrate and purify her. Even though this scene reconstitutes a religious moment, the sexual tension is emphasized, pointing to the tensions between desire and oppression that I have mentioned earlier, where rape and/ or murder seem to be the punishment imposed on women that do not submit to patriarchy.

The film ends with D. Elvira cutting bread and the man that slaughtered the pig making the final cuts on the meat to cure it. The voice over declares: “Este filme, quatro meses depois, começa a chegar ao fim. Falta apenas a montagem [...]” This scene implies a parallel between making cured sausages and editing a film: editing a film is a craft, just like it is a craft making cured sausages. Through this parallel, the filmmaker inscribes himself in the same social class of the peasants that he filmed. The film closes with another celebration: “Começámos com uma

feira. Despedimo-nos com outra.” This scene reinforces the circularity of the film that mimics the circularity of the seasons and the life of the peasants in the countryside.

Nós Por Cá Todos Bem depicts a Portuguese reality that is distanced from the revolution, but that will soon suffer the impact not only of said revolution, but of the modernization of the country that will culminate in the 1980s, with the entry of Portugal in the European Union. One of the consequences of this modernization was the increasing abandonment of the fields, and the exodus of the rural populations to the urban areas. This film is also a consideration about class divisions, and about the origins of the director.

The prolific production of documentaries in the years following the revolution emphasizes a concern with the political events that the country was going through at the time. Even directors that usually prefer to film fiction features, such as Glauber Rocha, João César Monteiro and Fernando Lopes, explored the genre, trying to give an account of the revolution and of the challenges that the country was going through trying to adjust to a democratic reality. The filmmakers no longer depict Portugal as a big empire, but instead as an underdeveloped nation with a fragile economy that depends heavily on other nations. The idea of nationhood was central in the cinema of April, but it took a sharp turn from what it had been during the Estado Novo regime. Nationhood was no longer about its exceptionality and the great feats of the Portuguese race, but it is rather a genuine interest to understand the country, with its contradictions and its problems, and to film the realities that the fascist regime tried to hide for so long.

As I pointed out in the beginning of this chapter, even though the filmmakers of the cinema of April leaned politically to the left, they were divided in different groups, each with its

particular vision of what the revolution should be, how it should be filmed, and how the country should be rebuilt. These differences can be seen when we look closer at the films and see how each one deals with the revolution differently. However, we can also detect many productive dialogues between filmmakers, as well as an effort to make collective cinema and to create cooperatives that generate partnerships and give the filmmakers enough freedom to express their personal views. The vast majority of the films of April were produced by cooperatives such as Cinequanon, Cinequipa, Ano Zero, etc, which advanced a new production model. It is important to point out that these cooperatives functioned especially on the production level, but most of the films were directed by one filmmaker. The figure of the author maintains its importance, and the idea of collective cinema has more to do with production structures—the cooperatives—where all the decisions are made democratically. However, the director retains its authorial power in devising his own film. Even though the cooperatives made some collective films during this period, the only film made collectively that became a landmark of the revolution was *O Povo e as Armas*, filmed in the weeks immediately after April 25, 1974. The cooperatives would not continue for long, but they became central to the process of imagining a new Portuguese cinema in the context of democracy, and its impact lasted up to the present day. The cinema of April opened the way to what is now contemporary Portuguese cinema, which still has the State as an important funder of national cinema.

Chapter 5

Liberation Cinema after Independence in Lusophone Africa

*All cinema to be a vehicle of ideas and cultural models,
and instrument of communication and social projection,
is in the first instance an ideological fact,
and consequently, also a political fact.*
Octavio Getino⁸⁵

During the liberation war, the countries colonized by Portugal soon realized the importance of film in their struggle. The three main parties of the liberation war were Frente de Libertação de Moçambique—FRELIMO, Movimento pela Libertação de Angola—MPLA⁸⁶, and Partido African para a Independência da Guiné e de Cabo Verde—PAIGC, and they all led a guerrilla warfare. As we have seen before, Portugal had used documentary films as a tool of propaganda that intended to legitimize its colonial occupation in Africa. For instance, in 1963 the Belgian producer International Audio-Vision (IAV), represented by the director Jean-Noël Pascal-Angot (Piçarra and António, vol. 1 34), proposed to the Portuguese government the production of a series of documentaries on the Overseas Territories, intended to be exhibited internationally, in order to show to the international community what the Portuguese were doing in those regions.

It was very important for the liberation armies to have the support of other countries during the war. They were mainly backed by communist countries, in particular by the Soviet Union, China and Cuba. Film was one of the most effective tools to publicize their cause. The Portuguese government portrayed them as bloodthirsty terrorists who had no respect for the lives and well-being of the local populations, while the Portuguese were the ones bringing education

and medical assistance to the rural populations. The liberation armies needed therefore to show their side of the story and counterpose such narratives. In fact, they had several social projects in the liberated areas, where they created programs to improve the lives of the local populations. They built schools, medical facilities (these were often quite precarious, but gave the populations primary medical care), and were strongly supported by those populations, who gained autonomy and did not have to submit to the Portuguese rule).

Therefore, the first films made in Lusophone Africa focused on the three liberation armies, MPLA, FRELIMO and PAIGC, and their work in the liberated areas. As Manthia Diawara pointed out,

Even before independence, film played an important role in the lives of Lusophone Africans. Unlike other African countries where film production was controlled by the colonial master, in the Portuguese colonies the guerrilla movements were involved in the production of films, which they used as tools of liberation. Despite their limited resources, it was because they were aware of film as a potential tool of work and entertainment that the Lusophone countries in general, and Mozambique in particular, soon after their independence in 1975, continued to use it as one of the key areas for development. (91)

However, the soldiers did not have the technical knowledge to produce the films, nor the necessary equipment to film their work. In fact, the Portuguese controlled all the means of filmic production, not allowing the Africans to participate. Some would work as assistants, but their obligations did not include dealing directly with any part of the production process. Therefore, there were no Africans with the necessary training to produce their own films. That being the

case, the cinema from the war made on the side of the liberation armies was directed by foreigners, who were interested in the cause and who felt it was important to show to the foreign community the work being done in the liberated parts of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau.

Cineclubs—building a film culture in Angola and Mozambique

As we saw in the previous chapter, film was introduced in Lusophone Africa by the Portuguese colonial regime. Africans were only able to participate in the production of films after independence, but they became spectators as soon as film was brought to the colonized territories. However, there was an apartheid system in the screening of the movies, with theaters for whites—where only a few assimilated Africans⁸⁷ were allowed—and theaters for blacks. These were mostly located in the peripheries, even though some of them could be found in the center of the main cities.⁸⁸ There was also mobile cinema, which took the films to the rural areas. The tickets were cheap and everyone was allowed to enter. Besides colonial propaganda (mostly in the form of newsreels and small documentaries), the most common movies screened in those theaters were Biblical films and action flicks. They came either from Hollywood or from Europe, as well as from South Africa. As Guido Convents pointed out, “O que é evidente é que o Cine Império confirma uma situação existente: os indígenas vêem filmes, certamente depois mas também antes de 1951” (Convents, 387).

Cineclubs also had an important role in the development of Lusophone African cinema. As Convents noted, the need to see other types of cinematographies that deviated from the commercial Hollywood cinema was a general sentiment among film enthusiasts in Europe and

even in Latin America, and the Portuguese colonies were no exception to this (Convents, 214). The first cineclub opened in the metropole in 1945, in Oporto. In the following years more cineclubs began their activity in other cities of the metropole, and in 1953 Beira (Mozambique) inaugurated the first cineclub of the overseas territories; in Angola, the first cineclub opened in 1956 in the city of Huambo.

According to Paulo Cunha, “o movimento cineclubista desempenhou, durante o Portugal estadonovista, um importante papel de resistência cultural e mesmo de oposição política à ditadura vigente, e a sua evolução ajuda a compreender com maior alcance as mutações socio-culturais e político-ideológicas de Portugal no pós-Segunda Guerra Mundial” (in Piçarra and António, vol. 2 43). In fact, the cineclubs were privileged spaces where revolutionary ideas circulated. However, the majority of its members were white, and the presence of blacks was an exception. Therefore, their revolutionary concerns ran the risk of having mostly a white perspective. Nonetheless, their role in forming an opposition to the fascist regime was important, and many of the participants cared about the liberation of the black people. The majority of the films screened in the cineclubs were European, especially *cinema d’auteur*. Even though censorship was strong in the oversea territories, certain films like *Battleship Potemkin*⁸⁹ made it to the screens. As Camilo de Sousa⁹⁰ pointed out, the two main reasons for this were the ineptitude of the censors in these territories, and the belief that black Africans were too ignorant to understand the political message behind such movies.

In Mozambique, among the few blacks allowed to be part of the cineclubs, were the director José Cardoso, the painter Malangatana and the writer José Craveirinha, who became central figures of the Mozambican arts of the twentieth century. José Cardoso was the founder of

the cineclub in Beira, and was also the first Mozambican to direct the most important intervention films in the country, before independence (he would become an important filmmaker after independence). According to him, “Naquele tempo, um cineclube era uma escola, aqui como em muitos países. É uma actividade que precisa ser revitalizada. Em Moçambique, o [primeiro] a surgir foi o Cineclube da Beira, que até foi considerado o [segundo] mais importante do mundo português, quer em qualidade de filmes exibidos, quer em número de sócios” (Cardoso). He directed three 8mm films before independence: *O Anúncio* (1966), *Raízes* (1968), and *Pesadelo* (1969).⁹¹ After independence he directed, among others, *O Vento Sopra do Norte* (1987), which was the Mozambican film with the biggest audience—100.000 spectators during a year and a half showing on the movie theaters.

In 1960, the cineclub of Lourenço Marques (CCLM) was able to have a fifteen minute radio program at the Rádio Clube de Moçambique where its members discussed cinema. They were able to exam films that tackled racism. The CCLM also had a bulletin where similar issues were brought up once in a while. José Craveirinha was one of the collaborators, and in a text of 1961 he calls for a Portuguese cinema that is willing to address racial issues in the Lusophone colonial context (Convents, 231). Such postures did not seem to dispute the Portuguese presence in Mozambique, rather asking for a change in their attitude, nor did they challenge a euro-centered worldview by screening mostly Europeans films, even when these questioned the establishment. However, a more radical posture ran the risk of being completely censored, which may be one of the reasons why the more progressive members refrained from more radical statements. In any case, the cineclubs were crucial to the creation of a cinema spectatorship in Mozambique. They created an awareness of the impact film could have in society, and provided

a space for a certain intelligentsia to develop and think of cinema as a possible weapon against the fascist regime of Salazar. The movie theaters spreading across Mozambique made film an important part of the lives not only of the cinephiles who craved a *cinéma d'auteur* apart from Hollywood, but also of the African populations who were eager spectators of cinema in the theaters of the peripheries.⁹²

The same was true in Angola. Cineclubs had a similar popularity, and their members' profiles were comparable to those in Mozambique. In Luanda, Luandino Vieira,⁹³ who would become the first president of the Angolan Television Network, *Televisão Popular de Angola*, was the film programmer of the local cineclub, and the programs were illustrated with his linocuts. Cineclubs also became a privileged space for the development of amateur cinema, and they promoted screenings and festivals of films directed by local aficionados.⁹⁴ There was also a considerable production of homemade movies: between 1960 and 1970 the prices of 8mm and Super 8 cameras became accessible to the bourgeoisie. Of course, black Africans did not have the financial power to buy these cameras, so these home movies were typically white, and it was mainly the men who filmed, their wives and children the protagonists.

The cineclubs organized conferences and lectures where films were discussed, providing a space for exchanging ideas that usually opposed the fascist regime of Portugal. Many of its high profile members, like António Cardoso⁹⁵ and Luandino Vieira, were politically active, and their subversive actions resulted in their arrest by PIDE. The members of the founding group of Angola's cineclub were also part of the first cell of the Angolan Communist Party in Huambo (Piçarra 47). When Angola became independent, it had fifty one movie theaters, seventeen of

them in its capital, Luanda. Therefore, film and politics were connected early on in these two colonies of Portugal.

Paulo Cunha, on an article on cineclubism, states that,

No âmbito do movimento de libertação e das independências africanas, não pode deixar de ser notada e considerada a presença de activistas políticos entre os quadros fundadores ou dirigentes de inúmeros cineclubes angolanos. Esta relação parece-me suficiente para atribuir também aos cineclubes angolanos um envolvimento na oposição cultural ou na resistência política ao regime estadonovista, à clara semelhança do que aconteceu com o movimento cineclubista da metrópole. (in Piçarra and António, vol. 2 60)

This was true both in Angola and in Mozambique. The cinemas offered a space for political engagement with films, which were not passively watched, but gave place to an exchange of ideas among viewers. In their manifesto on Third Cinema, Solanas and Getino emphasize the importance of the screenings of the revolutionary films, and how they momentarily created a liberated space for those interested in engaging in a liberation struggle:

This person was no longer a spectator; on the contrary, from the moment he decided to attend the showing, *from the moment he lined himself up on this side* by taking risks and contributing his living experience to the meeting, he became an actor, a more important protagonist than those who appeared in the films. Such a person was seeking other committed people like himself while he, in turn, became committed to them. (Martin 54)

The films screened at the cineclubs were not revolutionary *per se*, but they functioned as a thread that connected those interested in at least discussing other possibilities of imagining their country, and its political framing. In fact, most of the European vanguards derided the

bourgeois social order, and valued those on the margins of society.⁹⁶ As I have just demonstrated, important intellectuals of both countries participated in these discussions, and were persecuted and arrested by the political police because of their subversive activities and ideas. Nonetheless, the majority of the participants of the cineclubs were white and from the middle to the upper classes. Their realities were very distant from that of the peasants who lived in the rural areas of the colonies and who were frequently victims of forced labor. In fact, the organization of the armed struggle happened away from the intellectual urban bourgeoisie, even if many of its elements later joined the troops. In Mozambique, the struggle was organized in Dar-es-Salam (Tanzania), and its main leaders, Eduardo Mondlane, Samora Machel or Filipe Samuel Magaia, were never part of that intellectual elite. As Munslow pointed out, “Effectively it was the military wing of the movement [FRELIMO] which proved to be the driving force inside the country, taking responsibility for establishing the base camps, population centers, health posts, schools, etc” (xv).

In Angola, on the other hand, the first leaders of MPLA were also main figures of the cultural elites of the country, namely Agostinho Neto, poet and the first President of Angola, and Viriato da Cruz, poet and secretary-general of MPLA—however, they were not part of the cineclubs’ movement. Their interest on film as a political weapon came in the context of the liberation struggle, and as a way to counter Portuguese political propaganda, not only within the Portuguese territories, but also alongside the international community. In fact, liberation cinema was key in getting support from the international community to their claim to independence.

Another limitation posed by the cineclubs was the fact that their cultural references remained mostly European. At this point, I should make very clear what I understand by

liberation cinema. The word “liberation” points out to the armed struggle against colonialism. In fact, both for MPLA, FRELIMO and PAIGC, liberation from colonial oppression was the first step to freedom—the first of many that would have to be taken after independence. Liberation cinema can be considered part of Third Cinema, since it fulfills the main requisites described by Teshome Gabriel:

- a. decolonize minds
- b. contribute to the development of a radical consciousness
- c. lead to a revolutionary transformation of society
- d. develop new film language with which to accomplish these tasks (3).

Liberation cinema advocates for an armed struggle as the viable method to achieve independence, since the Portuguese government had refused to any peaceful negotiation on the subject. The films that I analyze here want to decolonize the minds by portraying the African point of view, so far denied by the colonial regime, which did not allow Africans to learn how to operate a camera or to have any access to the production of cinema. By portraying them as complex subjects, capable of deciding their own destiny, and with their own ideas, the filmmakers contradict the idea of the childlike Africans who need European guidance to organize their lives and societies. The films were screened for the troops and the local populations as a way to gain more support and to inform them about the legitimacy of their fight. Therefore, these films contributed to develop a radical consciousness, not only among those directly involved, but also among progressive groups of the international community that could offer support and pressure governments to favor the liberation struggle. The films were an important part in the revolutionary transformation of society, to the point that Samora Machel made film one of his

priorities when he formed the first Mozambican government. Consequently, the cineclubs rarely engaged with a militant cinema that called for revolution—José Cardoso’s films, produced in the context of the cineclub in Beira, are an exception—even if they were a place where subversive ideas circulated. Their discussions were mostly focused on what Solanas and Getino considered Second Cinema, as we have already seen.

Cultural repression was a main strategy of colonization in Africa: “sejam quais forem os aspectos materiais desse domínio, ele só se pode manter com uma repressão permanente e organizada da vida cultural desse mesmo povo” (Cabral, 55). One of the first strategies was to diminish African cultural manifestations as childish and superstitious, if not completely erasing their existence. Therefore, when writing the history of liberation cinema, it is crucial to return the leadership to the African people, especially when they were actually making a new type of cinema.

A cultural revolution

The repression of culture is thus an important tool of colonialism. The people living in the overseas territories were divided in three categories: the settlers, the indigenous, and the assimilated. This third category benefitted those who accepted the Portuguese culture, and the established social norms of the Portuguese. By becoming *assimilados*, they won certain rights: they had access to better jobs with better wages, to better housing, and to public spaces that were denied to the indigenous. Therefore, culture can also be colonized, and film can have an important role in decolonizing it. According to Solanas and Getino, “*Third Cinema* is, in our opinion, the cinema that *recognizes in that struggle the most gigantic cultural, scientific, and*

artistic manifestation of our time, the great possibility of constructing a liberated personality with each people as the starting point—in a word, the *decolonization of culture*” (Martin 37).

Fanon, too, dedicated a chapter to the subject of culture in his book *The Wretched of the Earth*. He noticed how the African was defined as such by the European invader, and how African culture became something characteristic of an entire people, and the numerous differences and cultures were represented as a whole. In fact, every culture is first and foremost a national culture (154), and this becomes one of the main preoccupations of the liberation movements. In the context of Lusophone African cinema, this is true both in the liberation cinema and in the post-independence cinema. However, this was less visible in the films directed before independence, which were similar for three main reasons: the directors were not Angolans, Mozambicans or Bissau-Guineans; they had a common enemy, and the different struggles supported and influenced each other; the documentaries had a very specific purpose, which was to gather support among the international community and to denounce the illegitimacy of the Portuguese occupation. Nonetheless, these films already depicted important cultural manifestations of each country, such as their local languages or their traditions and artistic expression, their songs and dances.

Amílcar Cabral was probably the most important intellectual behind the cultural policies of all the African territories occupied by Portugal. For him, culture was first and foremost the first means of resistance of the African people against occupation. In spite of the constant attempts at creating a group of assimilated citizens, such assimilation did not reach everyone. In fact, it was in the Casa dos Estudantes do Império, created by Salazar’s regime to give support to the assimilated students who came to Lisbon to study, and designed to be an example of the

politics of assimilation, that the seeds of revolution spread. It quickly became an important place of resistance, where some of the most important leaders of the future armed struggle met and exchanged ideas. Among them were Agostinho Neto,⁹⁷ Amílcar Cabral, and Joaquim Chissano.⁹⁸ In 1965, PIDE closed the place and forbade all the activities related to it. Clearly, the assimilation policy was a failure, even if many of the African *assimilados* accepted Portuguese culture without questioning it. Another obstacle to this policy is that it only worked on urban centers, where the Portuguese had a strong presence; in the rural areas the populations had little or no contact with the Portuguese, and in many villages their cultural practices remained intact. It is important to notice that the liberation struggle happened in the rural areas, where the troops had more control of the terrain. They were in close contact with the local populations, and the documentaries of this period were able to depict the different local cultural manifestations.

As Amílcar Cabral noted, the only way to silence a people's culture was through genocide, because otherwise they will always find ways to resist cultural alienation. Therefore, “se o domínio imperialista tem como necessidade vital praticar a opressão cultural, a libertação nacional é necessariamente, um *ato de cultura*” (59). In Mozambique, the same idea was adopted, and many still consider independence a cultural revolution.⁹⁹ Two of the most important programs of the FRELIMO government immediately after independence were establishing a national radio and a film institute that could operate without depending on any other country to produce their own films. Films served several purposes, among them the building a national identity and unity, and also as a means to convey the political agendas of FRELIMO and MPLA:

Cinema in Angola and Mozambique has some resonance with Brechtian aesthetics, especially those elements of Brecht that emphasize art as a practice that produces

knowledge. But unlike Brecht, the mode of representation here stresses ideological factors reminiscent of revolutionary Cuba where cinema has been used to advance a massive program of political indoctrination and education. (Ukadike, 229-230)

Before independence, the idea for a future national culture was more efficiently designed in the liberated areas, where the liberation documentaries were filmed. They usually focused on local cultural practices that were not considered so by the colonial regimes. As I have pointed out, the African subject was always represented as culturally inferior, seen as less developed or even as a savage, in particular in the case of ethnographic film. The liberation cinema of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau reclaimed African cultural traditions, and valued them as complex artistic traditions, very different from the European practices, that were often thought of to be displayed in museums.¹⁰⁰ The performative quality of African art was thus emphasized, even if indirectly. In an essay about Robert Van Lierop's documentary *O Povo Organizado*, Clyde Taylor points out:

Here too, contradictions are faced and resolved creatively, chief among them the supposed contradiction between scientific socialism and national cultures. Young African women finger each other's hair in traditional cornrows preparing for solidarity rally. Colorful African dress, military uniforms and the red outfits of children (even the high-rise shoes of one militia) move to a dance at once traditional and revolutionary. The music, much of it based on old Methodist hymns, stirs echoes of Black spirituals with its plaintive African tonality, but startles when you catch a phrase like "Viva FRELIMO" or "A Luta Continua." (Taylor, 82)

I believe that such a notion of contradictions has more to do with an outside perspective of FRELIMO's cultural policies, and by taking too literally the notion of scientific socialism. In fact, both Eduardo Mondlane and, later on, Samora Machel, were always very clear about their Mozambican interpretation of socialism, and about the importance of understanding and respecting the local context.¹⁰¹

The liberation documentaries that I explore here tend to adopt a pedagogical structure, where the main purpose is to inform the foreign community of the causes for the struggle and the situation in the liberated areas. There is usually a historical introduction that contextualizes the struggle within its geo-political situation. The use of maps to locate the country is very common, and it typically precedes images of the work being done in the liberated areas. There is a guiding voice-over that explains important details to the audience. However, it is not authoritarian in the way that it was in the Portuguese colonial documentaries. There are a lot of interviews with the soldiers engaged in the struggle, even though local populations tend to be less interviewed (this might be due to the fact that most of these people, with no access to education, don't speak Portuguese, much less English, making it harder to communicate with the foreign directors). In any case, the camera tends to individualize the people through close-ups and other visual resources, emphasizing their individuality and their humanity, which was denied to them by the colonial cameras. The discourses are markedly political, defending the liberation armies' cause, and rarely making any criticism of their work.

Robert Van Lierop

In Mozambique, one of the most important films of this period, directed by the American Robert Van Lierop, was *A Luta Continua* (1971). Van Lierop was an American lawyer who was a strong opponent of colonialism in general, and of the Portuguese in particular. In 1967, on his first trip to Africa, he met in Kenya, by chance, Eduardo Mondlane, the first President of FRELIMO, and was invited to visit the FRELIMO headquarters in Dar-es-Salam.¹⁰² Mondlane asked him to contact an American magazine to write about their struggle. and the magazine told him the best way to portray FRELIMO was through photography and film. Van Lierop couldn't find anyone available to travel to Mozambique, so he decided to do it himself, even though he had little experience with film (Convents, 349-350). *A Luta Continua* premiered in New York in September 1972 and it was somewhat successful. It also had an impact with the Black Panthers:

Segundo Van Lierop, o filme corrige a ideia de muitas pessoas de que uma revolução se passa num ambiente caótico. Ele ressalta que o filme ajudou a compreender o movimento Panteras Pretas (Black Panthers) e que uma revolução não é algo espontâneo, para a qual basta colocar óculos escuros e pegar numa arma. O filme confronta o Panteras Pretas com a dura realidade, após o derrube do regime do opressor. Eles percebem que a luta só começa com a construção de uma nova sociedade. Para Van Lierop, a sua curta-metragem é importante porque invalida alguns argumentos dos inimigos da FRELIMO, mostrando que a luta é realmente apoiada pelo povo e que tudo acontece de forma ordenada.

(Convents 351)

The film had an important impact not only in the Mozambican film history, but also in what is today considered Third Cinema, and in many political movements of that time. The film certainly fits the premises of Third Cinema, in that esthetic concerns, if not absent, are not the

main issue. The director had no experience in filming, and the main aim of the documentary is political—it aspires to reveal the liberation struggle of the Mozambican people against Portuguese colonialism, and to counter the image proliferated by the Portuguese Fascist regime; the film was also important in the shaping of a Black consciousness in the US in the context of the Civil Rights Movement, as I stated before:

[...] I think they, particularly the first one, came at a very decisive time period. A lot of people used it, saw it, heard you and other people speaking using it, and in a sense, it fed in to the African Liberation Support Committee (ALSC) growth. (Minter 15)¹⁰³

Due to the precarious filming conditions, most of the documentary, especially the first part, relies on archive images (especially photos, engravings, and drawings) and on the voice over to contextualize and explain the liberation war to the audience. Since Van Lierop couldn't record direct sound, due to the technical limitations already mentioned, the film had to rely on voice over. This device becomes authoritative in certain aspects, since the images that accompany it serve especially to demonstrate the message being conveyed. However, the film does portray the views of those being filmed, and it is therefore very different from the authoritative voice used by Portuguese colonial cinema. The movie also aims at countering the anti-FRELIMO sentiment spread by Portuguese propaganda. The images serve to illustrate the reality of those living in the liberated areas, showing that FRELIMO's action is not only one of guerrilla warfare, but that it also has an important role with the local populations, bringing them education, healthcare, and agricultural assistance, things to which these populations had little or no access, since the Portuguese did not care to bring these services to rural areas far removed from the urban centers of Mozambique.

Even though Van Lierop and his team were not Mozambicans, there was the intent of giving them voice, not only by portraying their points of view in film, but also by giving them filming equipment and train them in making their own films of the liberated areas. This was part of the project that Van Lierop conceived for his filming trip to Mozambique (Minter, 18).

The copy I gained access to, owned by the UCLA libraries, was made after the independence of Mozambique, but I could not confirm the exact date, even though it should be from around late 1974 or 1975, considering the information presented. The documentary opens with content subtitles on a black background informing the viewer about the date of the shooting of the documentary (September and October, 1971), and about the April Revolution in Portugal, Spínola's takeover of the government, and the consequences to Mozambique's political situation: "However, subsequent developments proved to others what the liberation movements in Mozambique, Angola, and Guinea-Bissau always knew—Spínola and others were merely maneuvering for more imaginative and more successful ways to maintain Portugal's presence in Africa" (Van Lierop, *A Luta Continua*). These added subtitles also point to the fact that, even though the country had just won independence, the struggle continued: "The struggle to gain political independence has been successful. But the revolutions in Mozambique, Angola and Guinea-Bissau have another important dimension. In all three countries people are also waging social revolutions, aimed at creating new men, and women, and new societies where there will be no more exploitation of any human being by other."

The first visual image is that of a typical African sunset, which could be considered a cliché, but that may help viewers unfamiliar with Mozambique to recognize a widespread picture of the African continent. The following shot is of soldiers transporting weapons in canoes, and

the first voice-over appears, with an African accent, reading a FRELIMO statement from September 25th, 1964, declaring the right of the Mozambican people to self-determination, and proclaiming the insurrection of the Mozambican people against Portuguese colonialism. Ella Shohat and Robert Stam notice how Benjamin pointed out that “the caption of a photograph could tear it away from fashionable clichés and grant it ‘revolutionary use-value’” (263). The images that follow the sunset serve as a subtitle of the sunset, telling the spectator that the Africa they are about to see is very different from that of the colonial clichés of breathtaking empty landscapes, ready to be conquered and explored by the white man. Instead, the spectator is confronted with a group of black soldiers fighting for their liberation. The discourse in voice-over further emphasizes that the struggle is organized and has a strong theoretical and political framework behind it.

Most of the voice-over throughout the documentary has an American accent (all of them are male), but the film starts with an African speaker, which reinforces the will of the director to give voice to the Mozambicans. Since interviews were unfeasible due to the impossibility of recording in direct sound, the use of an African voice to open the film tries to compensate that. (The African narrator is used again to quote a speech given by Eduardo Mondlane¹⁰⁴ on the importance of education.) This sequence ends with images of the people in the liberated areas shouting the watchwords “Independence or death. We shall win. Long live Mozambique. Long live Africa.”

The next sequence has a voice-over with an American accent that dominates the entire documentary. The audience is presented with a map of Africa, followed by a close-up of Mozambique, whose size is compared to that of California, a comparison that points to an

audience that is dominantly American. The sequence goes on explaining Portuguese colonialism in Africa, and pointing to the other territories occupied by Portugal at the time. It then announces that eight million people live in Mozambique and that one million live in the liberated area, in the North. It then continues by explaining the history of the Portuguese occupation in the country, with the arrival of the Portuguese to the east coast of Africa in the fifteenth century. The historical data is accompanied by engravings and paintings. The voice-over then goes on to explain the importance of Mozambique to the other white supremacist regime of the region, namely Rhodesia and South Africa, that depended on the Mozambican ports as an outlet to the sea. They also rely on Mozambique as a buffer zone against guerrilla warfare, and as a supplier of labor force to the South African mines, with about 200,000 Mozambicans working in the mining extraction.

The documentary then moves to denounce the difficult economic situation of the Portuguese in their own country:

Today Portugal is the poorest and most backward country in Western Europe. Most of the Portuguese people are exploited peasants living in an openly fascist regime which seeks to export its class contradictions to African colonies. [...] Portugal, being a neo-colony of the richest capitalist nations, benefits only from what is 'leftover' after exploitation of its colonies by its more powerful allies. (Van Lierop 45)¹⁰⁵

This sequence is accompanied with simple drawings, resembling caricatures, drawn with a black marker on a white background. The images show a group of poor Portuguese, with torn clothes, watching a ship depart from a wharf, or a fat man in a military uniform, accompanied by a business man, whipping workers, presumably Portuguese. The film uses this resourceful device

a few times to illustrate to the spectator what is being said, when there is no footage (or no access to it) to illustrate this. In this particular sequence, the caricatures illustrate the power inequalities by making them laughable.

The next sequence opens with the names of the countries fighting for independence in intertitles—Angola 1969; Guinea 1963; Mozambique 1964—and with each name we hear the sound of a bomb. The voice-over goes on explaining how Portugal has been struggling to maintain its domination since these countries began fighting against colonialism. It is still the same type of drawings and photos that accompany the speech. The documentary continues explaining the support of the US and other NATO countries to the Portuguese occupation, and the corporations that have been investing in those territories. The building of a dam at Cabora Bassa is the best example of such interests—it would be the largest dam in Africa and the fourth largest in the world, and most of its energy will be supplying South Africa.

The documentary notices that FRELIMO has made many peaceful attempts to liberate Mozambique, namely presenting petitions to the UN or trying to negotiate with the Portuguese authorities. The massacre of Mueda, in 1960, where a group of allegedly six hundred people who wanted to negotiate were murdered by the Portuguese authorities (more caricatures illustrate the event).¹⁰⁶ The film now introduces the Mozambican liberation struggle is now introduced, and we see the first images actually filmed in the liberated areas. Men and women march and sing, holding FRELIMO flags. The voice-over explains how the liberated areas are organized, and how leadership is based on a concept of responsibility, where hierarchies are less important than teamwork and collaboration among the soldiers. The documentary emphasizes equality not only in terms of responsibility sharing, but also in what concerns sex, age, or individual prestige. In

fact, sexual equality is defended, and we see both male and female soldiers, cleaning arms, holding babies, cooking, etc. The documentary criticizes patriarchal society, present both in Portuguese colonial models and in traditional Mozambican societies, and emphasizes FRELIMO's effort to end gender inequality, noticing however that, in this aspect as well as in many others, a lot still needs to be done.

The film then focuses on the three main priorities of FRELIMO in the liberated areas: education, healthcare, and agricultural production. Each of these sequences is accompanied by illustrative images of the work being done on each subject. Education is probably the main focus, and the African voice-over returns to read another speech of Eduardo Mondlane on the subject:

We have always attached such great importance to education because, in the first place, it is essential to the development of our struggle, since the involvement and support of the population increase, as the understanding of the situation grows. In the second place a future independent Mozambique will be in very grave need of educated citizens to lead the way in development.

The focus on education underlines the democratic aspirations of FRELIMO, where all citizens, informed, participate equally in the process of building independence.

The documentary also denounces the Portuguese attitude towards each of these priorities, underlying how the colonial government went from complete negligence to the exploitation of local populations and resources. The Portuguese armed interventions in the liberated areas usually had one of the following three purposes: destroy as much of the people's food as possible; destroy as many of the structures of national reconstruction as possible (schools, hospitals, clinics); terrorize the local population, so that they feel that FRELIMO cannot protect

them. The last objective is illustrated with photos of the Portuguese troops holding heads of African soldiers as trophies, to illustrate their barbaric practices—in fact, such photos were often taken by the Portuguese troops as a way of documenting their triumphs, and as war trophies.

As Frank Ukadike pointed out, these films “give prominence to the political imperatives of the freedom fighters. The guerrillas are portrayed positively, depicted not simply as victims but as courageous individuals actively struggling against a superior colonial army” (232).

Therefore, the documentary voice-over comments on these Portuguese attacks:

Due to the nature of the war that they are fighting, the Portuguese soldiers feel that if they destroy a hut they have destroyed a school, a hospital or a clinic. [...] What they are incapable of understanding is that these institutions all exist in the hearts and minds of the people in their spirit and their determination to resist. The institutions are, in fact, the people themselves and not the structures that house the institutions temporarily. (Van Lierop 50-51)

The armed struggle is therefore humanized, contradicting the general image spread by Western media, which dismissed FRELIMO and other guerrilla groups fighting against Portuguese colonialism as “terrorists” (Ukadike 232). The human value of the struggle is emphasized, and it is described as the main force of resistance against colonialism. It is the people’s will to have a more dignified life, denied to them by the Portuguese occupation, that is their main weapon. For this to happen, it was essential to advance consciousness among the local populations, since their support was important to FRELIMO, not only for military reasons, but also for ideological ones, since the nation they were trying to build was for everyone. The Portuguese had numerous actions of propaganda to make the local communities suspicious of

FRELIMO, saying they were bloodthirsty terrorists who had no concern for their wellbeing.

Therefore, armed actions were not the only strategy used by FRELIMO; consciousness raising was crucial to the advancement of their liberation. The documentary explores such actions, and foregrounds other aspects of the struggle, such education, healthcare and better farming practices, as pivotal fields of action to FRELIMO:

The revolution in Mozambique is not made only with guns. Weapons are important components of the struggle, for without weapons the people would not have been able to drive the Portuguese soldiers away and establish liberated areas in which they could begin the job of national reconstruction. However, the people of Mozambique place their weapons in the proper perspective as tools. They are tools just as the pencil and the farm hoe are tools. One of the things that the revolution must do is change the pattern of life of the people waging the struggle. In this context, FRELIMO is like a farmer planting seeds, nurturing and transplanting these seeds in order to produce stronger trees which will be the foundation of the new society.

A Luta Continua explores the primary principles of an idea of a Mozambican nation, which will be strengthened in the post-independence years, as we will see. As any other African country, Mozambique was a concept imposed by colonialism, and it was therefore divided in many tribes, languages, and cultures. FRELIMO was aware of these internal divisions and of the problems that these might pose to internal union,¹⁰⁷ especially when independence would be achieved.¹⁰⁸ The party made an effort to value all cultures equally, and to disseminate them all as part of one nation and of one identity. The traditional dances and songs of each group were used to create that union, in cultural events where everyone was encouraged to participate. The film

shows some images of these moments, and the voice-over enlightens the audience of the co-existence of different tribes:

One of the political slogans of the people in Mozambique is “to die a tribe and be born a nation.” The guerrilla army is completely integrated. It is composed of people from all nine provinces of Mozambique and all of the different tribes. As the guerrilla army moves throughout the country it carries songs and dances from all of the tribes and all of the regions. All of these songs and dances have a political message added by the people. Wherever the army travels the people learn the various songs and dances brought from other regions. FRELIMO says that none of these songs and none of these dances belong to any one tribe or to any one region. They are part of the national culture and part of the national heritage. The guerrilla army makes this a living concept as it transplants the culture of the people of Mozambique throughout the country. (Van Lierop 51)

Here the documentary brings forth one of the main cultural motivations of what would be one of the most important cultural projects of post-independence Mozambique: the National Film Institute (INC—Instituto Nacional de Cinema), and in particular its newsreel project, *Kuxa Kanema*. During the liberation war, FRELIMO and the other liberation parties understood the important role of film in their project of national reconstruction, especially in what concerns creating awareness of the revolutionary process and of an idea of national unity. As Ukadike pointed out,

In the lusophone world, the struggle for self-determination led the freedom fighters to discover the use of the cinema as one of several weapons of revolution. Consequently, when it was time to establish their respective film industries after independence, it was

quite clear (following the stylistic options offered by the earlier films made about the revolution) which cinematic pattern to adopt. (233)

In the seventies, the vast majority of the Mozambican population was illiterate, mostly due to colonial policies that restricted access to education to the majority of the African population. Therefore, radio was the first cultural project of Samora Machel's government, and cinema was its second. I will further develop this on the section concerning post-independence cinema, but I would like to emphasize how one of the main purposes of the INC films was to circulate the different cultural manifestations throughout the country, making Mozambicans familiar with other cultures that many of them were unaware of. As we can see in Van Lierop's documentary, this was already a main concern during the liberation struggle, and we can see a sustaining cultural policy that dates back to the inception of the armed struggle.

A Luta Continua closes with the reassertion that the decisive factor in the liberation war is the men who committed to struggle for their freedom, and their deep compromise with the cause. We see again the image of a sunset that appeared in the beginning of the film, and listen to the soldiers shouting familiar slogans of revolution: "Viva a FRELIMO," "Independência ou Morte," "A Luta Continua."¹⁰⁹ The film ends with the slogan that gives name to the documentary, and that is taken from the signature that Eduardo Mondlane used in all his letters. This remained one of the most important slogans even after independence, since FRELIMO knew that independence was not the end of their fight, and that building a nation was a task as hard as gaining independence. Van Lierop also chose "A Luta Continua" as the title for his film because he knew how this was a continuing effort. In fact, that was one of the main messages that this documentary passed to the Black Civil Liberties movement, and to the Black Panthers,

as Guido Convents pointed out: “The film confronts the Black Panthers with the harsh reality, after the oppressor regime has been overthrown,” and therefore emphasizes the importance of this film within the American movement.

A Luta Continua was successful in combining footage shot in the liberated areas with other archival images Van Lierop were able to get, and complementing them with illustrative drawings when none of these materials were available to exemplify what the voice-over narrated. The film’s main concerns are very similar to those of other liberation documentaries filmed in the liberated areas before independence, not only in Mozambique, but also in Angola and Guinea-Bissau, and the strategies they use are analogous to those used by Robert Van Lierop.

In 1975 Robert Van Lierop returned to Mozambique to film the transition to independence in Mozambique. This trip resulted in a second documentary,¹¹⁰ entitled *O Povo Organizado* (released in 1976). This documentary explores the obstacles faced by Mozambique to achieve independence after the April revolution in Portugal, and the challenges of building a new nation in the wake of five hundred years of colonialism, which created a lot of contradictions that now have to be dealt with.

The film opens with images from the guerrillas during the liberation war: FRELIMO soldiers crawl under the bushes, preparing an ambush to the Portuguese troops. One of them fires a rocket, a lot of smoke fills the screen, we keep hearing guns shooting and the title appears on the screen: *O Povo Organizado*. This first scene emphasizes the importance of the armed struggle to the process of independence. In fact, even though the revolution in Lisbon put an end to the colonial war, Mozambicans (as well as Guineans and Angolans) were conscious of the decisive role of the armed struggle in achieving independence.

The documentary proceeds with images from different newspapers' headlines announcing FRELIMO's victories and Portuguese setbacks, as well as the countries that came to help Portugal during the colonial war, among them the US and Germany. The soundtrack accompanying these images is the sound of guns shooting; the sound of Mozambican chants starts growing over the shootings, and both can be heard with the newspaper headlines. The chants are heard throughout the documentary, and it also appears frequently in other documentaries. These chants usually accompany people working, especially when they are working the fields. Therefore, through the soundtrack, the documentary juxtaposes the armed struggle and agriculture, which were two main focal points of FRELIMO's struggle, as we saw in Van Lierop's first documentary, *A Luta Continua*.

This introduction ends with a close-up of a poster celebrating the Mozambican independence, with an AK47, a hoe, and a book, with the sunset in the background.¹¹¹ These symbols reinforce the importance of the armed struggle and agriculture already hinted by the soundtrack, with the book added pointing to the third bastion of the new nation, education. After this introduction, the documentary shows the negotiations for independence in Lusaka, and the ceremonial termination of Portuguese colonial rule in the Machava stadium, in Maputo (known as Lourenço Marques during the Portuguese occupation), and the people celebrating independence.

The documentary goes back to the armed struggle, explaining the Mozambican struggle against a much larger and better equipped Portuguese army, the skepticism of the international community on the odds of Mozambique winning the war, and how FRELIMO was successful against all odds, managing to have liberated a third of the country when the war ended. The

mounting costs of the war for Portugal, and the erosion of the country's political stability resulted in the April revolution: "For the first time in modern History, anti-colonial revolution returned class-contradictions to the so-called mother country and led to revolutionary upheaval in the colonizing state" (Van Lierop 1976).

The April Revolution that put an end to the Estado Novo regime is presented as the logic outcome of the fascist policies of the Portuguese dictatorship, especially those that maintained a war that was draining Portuguese human and financial resources. The film shows images of the revolution, with Marcelo Caetano surrendering, and his last words as the leader of the nation: "I'm afraid by the idea of the power lose in the streets." General Spínola¹¹² was acclaimed the new leader, who would conduct the transitional government until democratic elections could be held. However, even though he saw the end of the colonial war as the only possible solution to the African conflict, he did not favor independence of the colonial territories, supporting instead autonomy. However, FRELIMO¹¹³ was unswerving on the non-negotiability of independence. As the documentary points out, Spínola's aspirations of a democratic colonialism were ultimately put aside with the Lusaka agreements, signed in September 7, 1974, which guaranteed the independence of Mozambique and established a transitional government. These declarations of the voice-over are followed by images of the occupation of the radio station in Maputo by Portuguese settlers, who demanded, two different governments: one for the blacks, and one for themselves. However, with the strong support of the population to the leaders of FRELIMO, and with the Portuguese troops returning to Portugal, the end of colonialism became an unquestionable fact. We see images of the troops leaving in army ships, and the Mozambican people celebrating independence.

Nonetheless, the voice-over emphasizes that independence does not guarantee the end of the revolutionary process: “The achievement of political independence is only a means, and is not in itself an end. It signifies the end of one crucial phase of the revolutionary process and the beginning of another.” This issue was already an important point in Van Lierop’s *A Luta Continua*, which highlighted an important message for the Civil Liberties Movement in the US, as shown previously. The documentary proceeds by showing the many challenges that the new government will face: a very poor society, where 90% lived off the land, and the extreme inequalities between the rural realities (which represented most of the country), and the urban milieu, especially in Maputo, which best typified these contradictions inherited from colonialism: the center of the city was extremely modern, with all the modern conveniences offered by any developed city, and the peripheries, where an impoverished population lived in shantytowns, did not provide any of the basic services, such as water or electricity. While the voice-over describes these contradictions, images highlight these contradictions, juxtaposing the urban modernity with cars driving through modern avenues, and women pumping water in the shantytowns. The documentary continues by exploring the main challenges that Mozambique faced, always bringing historical context to the discussion, in order to better provide a full understanding of the situation to a foreign public unfamiliar with the complex realities faced by the country. The voice-over points out that these challenges could only be overcome through mass mobilization, and this was one of FRELIMO’s important stances: “The government is in fact O Povo Organizado—The People Organized.”

A major presidential rally, held a month after independence at the Machava stadium, illustrates that mass support to FRELIMO and to its president, Samora Machel. The camera

shows one of his iconic speeches, which drew crowds, who would sit through sun or rain to listen to him for hours. He emphasized the need to end with all the vestiges of the old regime, to abolish all class distinctions, and the importance of collective work to overcome said inequalities.

The documentary continues by illustrating the main challenges faced by Mozambicans. Agriculture was again one of the key areas for national reconstruction, and one of FRELIMO's first measures was to deprivatize the land and change the agriculture system of cash crops, imposed by the colonial system, to more traditional farming models that were more beneficial to the farmers living off the land. The film then underscored other important resources, such as Mozambique's ports and railroads—some of the best in Africa, on which South Africa and Rhodesia strongly relied during colonial times—and the Cahora Bassa dam, one of the biggest in Africa, built to provide energy to South Africa and Rhodesia, and to bar FRELIMO's advances in the region. With independence, it was important to build new economic relations with more progressive countries, and cut ties with those who still supported white supremacy regimes. Julius Nyerere's visit was given as an important step in the building of those new relations. All of these realities were juxtaposed with references to the colonial past and to the atrocities committed by the Portuguese against the local populations. Health and education were the two other main areas of action of FRELIMO, and in both of them the country faced a generalized lack of specialized professionals, and an absence of qualified infrastructures in the rural areas.

While the voice-over explained all the challenges faced by the new independent country, and the main routes of action to deal with them, the film presented images of the citizens working to overcome such challenges: a teacher giving an open air class to children in a rural

area, doctors and nurses working in precarious hospitals, men with hoes on their shoulder, singing and heading to the fields. These images reinforce the title of the film and its main message: the people organized is the main force behind the building of this new nation, and their work is Mozambique's most important asset.

The documentary ends with different images of people singing and dancing to the sound of traditional Mozambican songs, most of them in local languages, lending a heroic tone to the film, and valuing the people and their cultural traditions. The film then concludes with paintings by local artists mostly depicting the exploitation of Africans by European colonizers, and closes with a wooden statue with its wrists chained and the chain finally broken. The statue is then juxtaposed to photos of liberation fighters, and a map of Africa with Mozambique signaled.

Margaret Dickinson, *Behind the Lines*

Margaret Dickinson was another important figure, not only in Mozambican liberation cinema, but also in the creation of the National Film Institute. She started to work with film in the mid-1960s, and was an active member of the British film trade union. In 1967 she decided to take a break from her work and she traveled to East Africa with her friend Polly Gaster (who would also have a leading role in the setting of Mozambique's National Film Institute immediately after independence). In Tanzania they met, by chance, Eduardo Mondlane, and they became committed to help FRELIMO through the production of films. In 1968 she returned to England and she created the Committee for Freedom in Mozambique, Angola, and Guinea-Bissau (CFMAG) (Dickinson 131). In 1970, Dickinson went to the liberated areas of the

province of Niassa, in Mozambique, and filmed *Behind the Lines*,¹¹⁴ which was released the following year (Dickinson 131).

This documentary, like most of the liberation cinema produced in Lusophone African countries, resembled Van Lierop's films in terms of strategies and content. However, Dickinson was better equipped to film, and she was able to record direct sound. Therefore, the voice-over was not as dominant as in the previously mentioned documentaries, and it did not silence those interviewed. We hear a lot of testimonies from the FRELIMO soldiers about their fight and their life in the liberated areas. For those who did not speak English, the voice-over translated what they said, but it never completely erased the voices of the interviewed.. This is one of the main differences between Van Lierop's and Dickinson's documentaries, and in *Behind the Lines* it becomes easier to empathize with the fighters because we can actually listen to their testimonies, and their individuality is better emphasized. Another important difference is that *A Luta Continua* relied heavily on drawings, paintings, and archival images, whereas in *Behind the Lines* the majority of the images are from the liberated areas. These main differences result mostly from technical difficulties faced by Van Lierop, and they are not necessarily ideological or aesthetic.

However, all the other concerns and strategies used by both directors are very similar. They used maps to geographically situate the conflict, especially to a foreign audience. They underscored the numerous atrocities committed by the Portuguese colonial rule, and criticized its so-called politics of integration.¹¹⁵ The film highlights the multiplicity of Mozambican cultures and traditions, and healthcare and education are once again presented as two chief fields of action in the liberated areas.

The documentary portrayed the various local languages and traditions, and showed how the soldiers shared among them their different cultures. They taught each other the dances from their different tribes, but they did so wearing their army uniforms. Once again, the narrator underscored how FRELIMO found important that all Mozambicans knew the different cultures of their country, and that its manifestations would become part of the national culture, instead of being reserved to their regional ethnic groups. When Dickinson filmed the soldiers teaching each other their tribal dances, there was no exoticizing gaze from the camera, as it was common to see in Portuguese colonial documentaries.¹¹⁶ There was not either a romanticized longing for lost origins, since the dances were contextualized within the liberation struggle, and were juxtaposed to modern elements that were part of the Mozambican cultures as well. For instance, right after showing the dances, the documentary reveals how women participated in the war, noting that they had the opportunity to perform certain functions that weren't traditionally allowed to women, either by Mozambican traditional communities, or by the Portuguese government. They equally shared the domestic duties with the men. Even though other documentaries also showed the female participation in the fight, *Behind the Lines* is the one that gave more visibility to it. However, the armed struggle was still mostly a male enterprise.

Sarah Maldoror

Documentaries are therefore the main genre used in Liberation Cinema. However, in Angola, the Guadeloupean Sarah Maldoror directed two important fiction films that depicted the lives of the Africans under colonial rule. She was the wife of Mário Pinto de Andrade, Angolan poet and nationalist, who worked with her on one of these films, *Sambizanga* (1972). She also

directed *Monangambée* in 1968, and both films were adaptations of stories written by the Angolan José Luandino Vieira. Both depicted the oppression of Angolan individuals by the Portuguese government and its police. Both films were shot outside of Angola, since it was almost impossible to shoot a fiction film in the liberated areas. *Monangambée* was filmed in Algeria and *Sambizanga* in the People's Republic of Congo, with the collaboration of French technicians, and of non-professional actors affiliated to the MPLA or to the PAIGC (Ukadike 234).

Monangambée is a short film of 15 minutes, spoken in French, that tells the story of a man who was arrested by the Portuguese police. His wife promises to bring him a suit, without which he could not be brought to court. However, the policemen feel disgruntled by the fact that the wife believes that he will be fairly judged: "Le complet? Le complet? Qu'est-ce qu'il s' imagine? Qu'il aura procès? Qu'il pourra aller au tribunal?" The short also portrays the torture to which the prisoners are submitted.

Sambizanga (a feature film with 102 minutes) tells the story of Domingos Xavier, who is a worker at a stone quarry and part of the underground political movements that were preparing the way to the liberation war. He is arrested by PIDE, the Portuguese political police, and is tortured to death. The film ends with his companions setting the date to attack the penitentiaries from Luanda and free the political prisoners, on February 4, 1961. It is this assault that marks the beginning of the armed struggle for the independence of Angola. The film also focuses on Domingos' wife odyssey after his arrest, and her attempts with the Portuguese administration to know of his whereabouts and to have him freed. Maria becomes the main character of the film, even though it is the men who organize the struggle and who lead the events. She gains

revolutionary consciousness throughout the film, but she never fully participates in the political activities:

The aesthetic intention of the filmmaker was to create a positive role for women in the revolution and to essentialize the liberation struggle as the most important element in people's lives. *Sambizanga* has been criticized for being "too beautiful" and therefore less authentic to African realities. Apparently, such criticism, while it is faithful to the constraints of social realism, remains blind to the need of the filmmaker to create idealized role models who are necessary for the new revolutionary state. (Diawara 90)

In fact, it should be noticed that, in many of these films, women tend to be absent, and if they are present, they have secondary roles. Dickinson's film for instance, represents women and shows their importance in the struggle, and how FRELIMO considers them equal to the male soldiers. However, in the scenes that do not focus on women, we see that they are a minority. Even in Maldoror's films, where female characters are central to the plot, those who act in the revolution are men; women are mostly their faithful supporters.

The criticism that some devoted to the film for being "too beautiful" shows how the documentary was valued as a better genre to convey the realities lived by those involved in the liberation movement. As Gutler pointed out, *Sambizanga* was most likely conceptualized with a foreign audience in mind (84). In fact, the majority of the films of this period contemplated the same public, since it was crucial for the liberation armies to have the support of the international community, and to create a counter-narrative to that of the Portuguese colonial government. This is why it was essential to create African role models, since these had so far been erased from representations in Lusophone Africa. They were important both for the Africans imagining an

independent country, and for those outside Africa to have a different image of the one conveyed by the colonial powers. As Stam and Shohat observed, “It is not that [Third World] filmmakers substitute a pristine ‘truth’ for European ‘lies,’ but that propose counter-truths and counter-narratives informed by an anticolonialist perspective, reclaiming and reaccentuating the events of the past in a vast project of remapping and renaming” (Shohat and Stam 249).

Deixem-me ao Menos Subir às Palmeiras, José Lopes Barbosa

In Mozambique, liberation cinema comprised only documentaries, except for one fiction film that had a singular trajectory: *Deixem-me ao Menos Subir às Palmeiras...*, directed by Joaquim Lopes Barbosa in 1972. The film was produced by SOMAR under the supervision of Courinha Ramos. Lopes Barbosa, who was then in his twenties, was born in Portugal but moved to Mozambique in 1970 to work for SOMAR. He had lived in Angola for three years before moving to Mozambique, where he directed *O Regresso*, a film in Super 8 of which no copies have survived. In Angola he met Eurico Ferreira (the director of *Zé do Burro*, and a business partner of Courinha Ramos), who invited Lopes Barbosa to work for him in Lourenço Marques. Lopes Barbosa promptly accepted the invitation since in Angola there were no film production structures, and Mozambique had everything at the time: cameras, film laboratories, funding, and so forth. (Lopes Barbosa, personal interview). He worked on the newsreels produced by SOMAR, such as *Visor Moçambicano* and *Visor Desportivo* (Piçarra 262). He gained Ramos’s confidence and in 1972 he got the green light to proceed with the filming of his own fiction feature. *Deixem-me ao Menos Subir às Palmeiras...* did not have funding, and Lopes Barbosa

used SOMAR's film equipment to direct it. The actors were amateurs who did not receive any payment.

What makes *Deixem-me...* singular is not that it was produced under the colonial system, but that it was the only film that actually suggested armed struggle as a legitimate means to fight against Portuguese colonialism. It was also the first film where the characters spoke in Ronga, one of the languages of southern Mozambique. During his stay in Angola, Lopes Barbosa had discovered Angolan literature and Angolan culture, with which he immediately identified both esthetically and ideologically (personal interview). During his three years in Luanda, he read "Monangamba," a poem by António Jacinto, that speaks of the exploitation that the black workers suffer at the hands of the white colonists. The poem ends with the following lines: "Ah! Deixem-me ao menos subir às palmeiras/ Deixem-me beber maruvo, maruvo/ e esquecer diluído nas minhas bebedeiras// 'Monangambééé...'" This poem was one of the main inspirations for the film, from which Lopes Barbosa took his title. In Mozambique, Lopes Barbosa met Luís Bernardo Honwana and read his book *Nós Matámos o Cão Tinhoso*. The film's script is based on "Dina," one of the book's short stories, which depicts the brutal exploitation of the black workers by white colonists. The story happens during the workers' lunch break, known as "dina," when Maria, the daughter of Madala, is raped by the white overseer. Madala witnesses the rape, but the overseer buys his silence with a bottle of wine.

Lopes Barbosa changed the story's ending by adding more events to the script. Djimo, one of the workers, tells Madala that he can do something about the rape: "Ele pode matar-nos, mas nós não temos medo de morrer." However, Maria's father prefers not to do anything. Later, Madala dies during work, probably from exhaustion. His death also symbolizes the end of

passivity and the collective realization that the exploited must fight against oppression: the workers react to the death of Madala by beating the overseer. This moment is very close to Franz Fanon's description of the moment of enlightenment provided by violence: "The colonized man liberates himself in and through violence. This praxis enlightens the militant because it shows him the means and the end" (44).

The beating is interrupted by the owner of the land, who orders the workers to take Madala's body and bury him. The villagers prepare the body and celebrate his funeral. The final sequence intercuts scenes of Djimo in two different contexts: in one he is accompanying the funeral procession of Madala, and in the other one he is packing his belongings and leaving the village, probably to join the liberation struggle in the north of the country. When he is leaving, he stops and watches a group of children playing; they represent the future of Mozambique. The appearance of children evokes the opening scene of the film, which has nothing to do with the plot: a woman gives birth to a child, helped by a group of midwives. We listen to the baby cry and see a close-up of the woman's hand while she faints from labor. This close-up points to the black Mozambicans' manual labor exploited by the white colonists, which the poem of António Jacinto denounces: "Quem faz o branco prosperar,/ ter barriga grande—ter dinheiro?/ Quem?" The birth of the child is a metaphor for the birth of the consciousness and the revolt of the black subject, which the film celebrates. As Lopes Barbosa has noted regarding the opening sequence, "O filme centra-se em dois limites: o nascimento e a morte do homem (negro) trabalhador. Com essas cenas queria expressar o que, historicamente, sempre havia sido a herança desse homem: o vazio da esperança. [...] É a tragédia assumida por sucessivas gerações que só a luta e a revolta podem destruir" (in Piçarra 275).

When Djimo walks up the road, leaving the village and rejecting his condition of exploited, we listen to him saying in voice over (in Portuguese):

Por isso te reconheço, Madala, tão exato e necessário como o tronco da mulapa, entre micaias e morros de muxem. Contigo passo a cumprir-me, habitando nas palhotas e nos compounds e extraindo da rocha firme o mineral mais insignificante. *E conquistando, palmo a palmo, o direito de lavrar a terra.* E contigo vou adiante. E contigo estarei de pé no chão detido ao rebentar a madrugada de amanhã para saudar o dia porque é dia de cumprir o prometido. Então podem rolar pedras da montanha, e queimar-se frutos e sementes e secar fontes e rios, que na febre que eu tenho, no meio desse braseiro, ainda serei capaz de reconhecer-te Madala. Mesmo depois da tua morte, como símbolo de um povo inteiro. (my emphasis)

Lopes Barbosa was concerned with censorship, so he could not directly call for armed struggle, but this last sequence does invoke the need and the desire for independence. In fact, Lopes Barbosa knew that his film would be screened by the censors before it could be premiered in Mozambique, so he tried to erase the direct allusions to Portuguese colonialism. The white colonists speak English (even though they read a Portuguese newspaper), and the overseer, who is white in Honwana's short story, is black in the film. The fact that the overseer is black actually adds another layer of meaning, even though the main purpose of this change was to avoid censorship (Lopes Barbosa, personal interview): it points to the fact that colonialism was only possible with the complicity of large groups of Mozambicans, who accepted Portuguese authority and even helped them controlling the rest of the population. Therefore, the first act of violence against colonialism is directed towards the black overseer.

Deixem-me... obviously did not pass censorship. When the censors saw the film, they immediately banned it, and Courinha Ramos fired Lopes Barbosa right away. The director decided to leave Mozambique as soon as possible, as he realized that he could be arrested by the political police at any moment (Lopes Barbosa, personal interview). The screening of the film to the censors was made seven months before the April revolution, but at the time no one could guess that the end of Portuguese colonialism was so close (Lopes Barbosa, personal interview). According to the director, Courinha Ramos was a man of the regime and only produced the film because he trusted Lopes Barbosa and also because he had no idea of the content. He had seen some images during the editing, but without subtitles he could not understand what was being said (personal interview). However, José Luís Cabaço remembers that Courinha Ramos showed the film to him and to other members of the intellectual elite of Mozambique that favored independence (Cabaço would become one of the ministers appointed by Samora Machel right after independence). Ramos asked them what they thought about the film, and if he should move forward with trying to premiere it (Cabaço, personal interview), which contradicts Lopes Barbosa's claims that Ramos had no idea of the content of the film until he saw it with the censors. Cabaço and the rest of the group immediately agreed that *Deixem-me...* was an important film and that it should be made public, even though they were aware of the risk that the censors would forbid it (Cabaço, personal interview).

Lopes Barbosa could not take any copies of the film when he left Mozambique, but right after the April revolution Ramos contacted Lopes Barbosa saying that he had kept a copy and that he would screen it in Mozambique. The film was programmed to be screened in the cinemas of Lourenço Marques in the beginning of September 1974, but on September 7 there was a

counter-insurgency led by the white colonists who opposed independence, and Courinha Ramos thought it was prudent to cancel the exhibition. Lopes Barbosa arrived in Lourenço Marques after that, when the counter-insurgency had already been contained, and decided to screen the movie himself (Lopes Barbosa, personal interview).

Deixem-me... is a liberation film and its target audience is Mozambicans, especially the workers, as Lopes Barbosa has declared: “O filme dirigia-se a essa camada de público (em grande parte analfabeto)—daí que fosse falado em ronga [...]; a estratégia narrativa essencialmente visual, a lentidão, o transparente simbolismo de situações, destinavam-se a facilitar uma leitura que não manipulasse, para além das específicas experiências e circunstancialismo” (in Piçarra 270). Lopes Barbosa was probably the first director concerned with the Mozambican audience, and with creating a new filmic language that was directed towards the national illiterate working class. This preoccupation would resume with the creation of the Mozambican Film Institute in 1976, in the wake of independence.

Lopes Barbosa also wanted to develop a new filmic esthetic that represented the Angolan and the Mozambican realities. He got the inspiration for this new esthetic in the Angolan and Mozambican literatures of the time (first with António Jacinto and then with Luís Bernardo Honwana, among others). Malangatana, who is still one of the most important Mozambican painters, was an important collaborator in the film, as Lopes Barbosa has pointed out (personal interview), and he even appears as one of the workers. Malangatana was also the one who found the black actors and who explained to them the purpose of the film, and he certainly contributed to the development of that esthetic.

In an interview for *Plateia* in 1972, before he started preparing *Deixem-me...*, Lopes Barbosa declared that cinema should be a guerrilla front against the anachronistic *status quo*: “A sétima arte é uma forma de expressão das realidades concretas que sinto e deviam chegar a todos, como uma espécie de murro no estômago. Actualmente, a definição que dou ao cinema é a de que deve ser *uma frente de guerrilha*, actuando o mais positivamente possível contra os tabus, as morais duvidosas e os lugares comuns bafientos e anacrónicos” (quoted in Piçarra 263, my emphasis). *Deixem-me...* therefore fits the description of Solanas and Getino’s definition of Third Cinema, even though it could not fulfill its job in educating the audiences for liberation because it was forbidden by censorship. This is also the only film of the seventies made in Mozambique where the Portuguese language is almost absent, and where a local language dominates. After independence, FRELIMO’s policy favored Portuguese as the official language, and therefore none of the films made in the context of the INC used local languages to the extent that *Deixem-me...* did. Lopes Barbosa also used documentary sequences that he filmed in the *machambas*, inspired by direct cinema (personal interview), and translating his desire to portray the reality of the daily lives of those working in the fields for the colonist landowners.

Liberation cinema is what the Argentinian filmmakers described as Third Cinema. Most of these films are documentaries, which was the privileged genre of this type of cinema. Some are guerrilla films, where the camera becomes a rifle (Martin 49)—such titles as *Estas são as armas* are suggestive of that. The figure of the auteur becomes secondary to a more urgent political purpose—that of the liberation from Portuguese colonialism or, after independence, of the building of a national identity. This is why the INC in Mozambique becomes more important

than the individual names of the directors involved in the process. On the other hand, it is the one, from the three cinemas approached in this work, that is more able to create a community of viewers. These films are effective in reaching all types of audiences—from the intellectuals and the *cineclubistas* to the rural population—who in many cases were not familiar with films and with cinematic language. The huge success that these productions attained in Mozambique in the decade after independence (success that still lingers today) illustrates the ability that cinema had in building a new community.

Chapter 6

Filming the Nation in Post-Independence Mozambique

Film had an important role in the shaping of nationhood in the Portuguese-speaking African countries, especially in Angola and Mozambique. Portugal had been in a fascist dictatorship since 1933, and António de Oliveira Salazar saw the occupation of the African territories as one of its priorities. In 1961, the first revolt against the Portuguese colonial regime took place in Angola, and led to the armed liberation struggle of this African territory against Portuguese occupation, in the same year. Before long, Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde (in 1962) and Mozambique (in 1964) would follow. In 1975 the African countries under Portuguese rule finally became independent. By this time, the liberation movements had already understood the importance of film in the advancement of their political agendas, and the role it could play in the building of a new nation. Film could help create an idea of national unity and identity, by serving as a vehicle for imagining a new community, in the sense described by Benedict Anderson in *Imagined Communities*. It was also a practical means of disseminating information to the population. Most of these populations were illiterate, and, along with radio, film could play a key role in circulating information.

In this section I will only focus on the filmic production of Mozambique, and in the next one I will discuss Angolan cinema. In Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde film production was quite incipient. According to Claire Andrade-Watkins, “Television (TNVC) came to Cape Verde after independence in 1974, including productions by local filmmakers on the stories and folklore of their islands. Independence also brought a revival of the cineclub movement and renewed

participation in the dialogue of the nascent African cinema.” (140) However, production was not significant, and the first feature film produced was *N'tturudu* (1987), directed by Umban u'Kset, exiled filmmaker (Ukadike 180). Both in Guinea-Bissau and in Cabo Verde, cinema was severely underfunded, which resulted in a very limited production during this period (1975-1990).

In Mozambique, on the other hand, cinema became one of the most important cultural projects of FRELIMO. The movies produced in this time-frame were sponsored by the government and they were much in line with its political project. The government created the National Film Institute (Instituto Nacional de Cinema—INC), which became one of the most important cultural projects of the country, only second to radio. In Angola, cinema was also an important medium after independence, but it did not reach the monumental project of Mozambique's National Film Institute. In this case, auteur cinema became more important, especially the films of Ruy Duarte de Carvalho and António Ole. Even so, the political issues were very similar, and documentary was privileged in both cases. Nationhood was a key concept in both cases, and the Angolan or Mozambican people were both the main subject and the target audience.

In Mozambique, the independence process was considered a cultural revolution, as Camilo de Sousa, one of the most important directors of this period (and today), has pointed out. As Van Lierop's film had already hinted, the struggle continues after independence, with the construction of a new society (Convents 351). After five hundred years of colonialism, Mozambicans had to learn how to build that new society, and it was not an easy task. To begin with, there weren't enough people qualified to perform various important jobs, since the Portuguese impeded access to education to most Mozambicans. On the other hand, the

neighboring apartheid regimes of South Africa and Rhodesia feared that the Mozambican wave of socialism would spread to their countries, which would lead to their financing of RENAMO¹¹⁷ and the subsequent civil war that afflicted the country from 1976 to 1991.

Consequently, this cultural revolution had to face many obstacles, but it was nonetheless a fruitful one. Cinema would play a central role in that process. As Godard pointed out, the political birth of the country corresponded to the birth of national cinema (Schefer 38).

Mozambicans were eager to see themselves represented, and the films that portrayed them were huge successes. As Dickinson noticed, Maputo spectators were harsh critics, who demanded more national films than those the INC could produce (Dickinson 136). The ideas of Amílcar Cabral inspired FRELIMO in this process (Convents 357). In a conference that the Bissau-Guinean gave at the University of Syracuse in an homage to the late Eduardo Mondlane in 1972, he defined national liberation as a cultural process: “O valor da cultura como elemento de resistência ao domínio estrangeiro reside no facto de ela ser a manifestação vigorosa, no plano ideológico ou idealista, da realidade material e histórica da sociedade dominada ou a dominar” (Cabral 223).

The years that followed independence were very productive indeed. Since Mozambican directors and film technicians barely had any experience in filming, they learned mostly through practice, and by exchanging ideas among themselves and with other directors that would come to Maputo either to film or to teach them. The public, too, was involved in the process, since they were avid and critical spectators. When filming, the directors always had in mind their diverse public and created strategies to make their films readable to those who were cinematically illiterate.¹¹⁸ The narrative structure of the film was adapted to make it more accessible: the shots

were long, and the voice-over explained what was being seen. However, there was not an authoritative voice that silenced those filmed, a widespread practice in colonial documentaries. It was also common to film theatrical representations performed by the communities, a local practice with a longstanding tradition. The films produced after Independence continued the construction of “counter-narratives,” following the path opened by liberation cinema.

Mozambique was the country where film had more importance and impact. During the liberation war, Samora Machel understood the political and cultural importance of film. One of his first cultural measures was the creation of the INC in 1976. Cinema was only second to radio in FRELIMO’s cultural policies, since radio was the most accessible medium that could easily reach remote parts of the country. Samora Machel also became the “main character” of films from INC, as Margarida Cardoso¹¹⁹ put it. He was a very charismatic figure, loved by most Mozambicans, who could sit for seven hours, under the rain, listening to his speeches. He was highly conscious of his image and of his charisma, and explored it to his benefit. In one of the documentaries shot before Eduardo Mondlane’s death, it was Samora who spoke to the people in a village in the liberated areas, while Mondlane, by his side, just listened.

Most of the Mozambican population was illiterate by the time of independence, and radio and film were more effective in reaching them. It was also important for Machel’s government to create not only a national unity, but a national identity. As we saw in *Behind the Lines*, there was a concern in making the different peoples and ethnic groups know each other. This national identity was by no means homogenous, and the new government not only understood that, but wanted to make all of its population aware of that fact, and aware of the other cultures, languages and traditions. The mobile cinema was one of the main tools to accomplish that. A filming team

would go to a region and film a community. Afterwards it would bring that film to another community, so that they could learn about it, and would also film them, subsequently taking those images to other populations. The people would use their own languages, and during the screenings an interpreter would explain (rather than translate) what those in the film were saying, and what the film was about. For the directors, and for Samora as well, it was important that the Mozambicans became more familiar with the different languages spoken in the country. Since only the main cities had movie theaters, a mobile cinema team was created, so that the films could be taken to more isolated villages. This was a practice that was already at work during the colonial years, but in a much smaller scale. The films produced by the INC were extremely successful, both in the villages, and in the theaters in Maputo and Beira. The costs were not only recouped, but the films made a large profit, and most of that money was reinvested in the INC.

As a result of Machel's policies, Mozambique became the first African country to be completely independent in terms of film production. From directing, to developing, editing, and audio production, everything could be done at the INC facilities. The Institute started as a Department of the Ministry of Information, but it soon became self-governing. Two years after independence, in 1977, it became officially the Instituto Nacional de Cinema, and where it is still located in the present day.¹²⁰ The first equipment that came to the Institute was from the SOMAR studio that belonged to Courinha Ramos, which had been nationalized, like most of the companies that were owned by the Portuguese State and by other investors before independence. The INC also appropriated equipment from the Psycho-Social division of the Portuguese army, mostly the mobile cinema vehicles and the projection equipment (Polly Gaster, personal interview). However, this equipment was very old and deficient, and the INC would soon buy

more material. There were already a lot of movie theaters, since cinema was the main leisure activity of the Portuguese military stationed at the main cities, not only in Mozambique (Maputo, Beira, etc.), but also in Angola (Luanda, Huambo, Benguela, etc.).

The lack of human resources was another challenge faced by FRELIMO in every sector. The majority of the Portuguese left the country without passing on their administrative knowledge, and the Mozambicans who had some education and who were trained in administration were very few, because the colonial government had not made education easily accessible to the local populations. The INC faced similar challenges, and there was no one who knew how to use a camera or how to do anything related to producing a film. The few Mozambicans that worked at SOMAR were only allowed to do small tasks that did not require any technical training, such as carrying equipment. Therefore, they were in high need of people who could work at the Institute, from directors, to sound technicians, to editors. By FRELIMO's request, Margaret Dickinson and Polly Gaster formed the first group of students, selected from high schools, and gave them the necessary training to run all the needed tasks involved in making a film. Polly Gaster became the main person behind the Institute, and she coordinated everything, so that the Institute could function. However, even though she knew the basics of operating a camera, she did not have any training in film. Therefore, the INC invited foreign directors and technicians to come to Maputo to teach the students, among them Santiago Alvarez (Cuba), Ruy Guerra (Mozambique/ Brazil), Murilo Salles (Brazil), Antoine Bonfanti (France), and Jean-Luc Godard (France).

The students were recruited from local high-schools, and the vast majority had little to no idea of what film was, except for their experience as occasional spectators in the colonial

cinemas of the periphery.¹²¹ Gabriel Mondlane, one of the first students of the INC, recounts¹²² how he and his colleagues were approached by the recruiting team at their high-school and were submitted to psycho-metric tests. The recruiting teams came to high-schools to draft students both for the military¹²³ and for civil jobs in need of manpower. The best students did not have to go to the army, and would receive specific training for the function they would have to exercise. However, the students had no choice on the career they would follow, and this was determined by the government, according to psychometric tests and to the needs of the country. In 1977 the first group of students entered the INC and in 1978 the film classes began (Gabriel Mondlane, personal interview)

According to Polly Gaster (personal interview), the first group of trainees arrived at about the same time as the new equipment, which was enough to set up three editing rooms, a recording studio, and a film laboratory. There were five students for each area (camera, editing, sound mixing, laboratory). They were recruited by the Ministry of Labour, and the instructions were to take on the sons of peasants and proletarians. However, such task proved hard to accomplish, and the majority of the students came from families of minor civil servants—still, even though they did not come from the proletariat nor from the peasantry, they did not belong to the middle class, nor did they come from families of intellectuals or filmmakers. For this reason, their film culture was very limited—for instance, they had no idea about such film movements as the French *nouvelle vague*, which was an important influence at the time. Therefore, they were not influenced by the aesthetics of the moment, at least not prior to entering the Institute.¹²⁴ On the other hand, selecting these students was in line with FRELIMO's ideology of democratizing access to civil service jobs and giving entry to those coming from lower class families who did

not have any opportunities during the colonial regime. These students also had a fresh look on what it meant to make cinema, and it was less likely for them to try to follow foreign film fads, focusing instead on what it meant to make films for their fellow Mozambicans. Since the students' background was from the grassroots classes, they had a better understanding of what type of cinematic language would be effective with the population. On a second phase, however, film aficionados requested to join the INC and from then on the team was composed by both aficionados and recruited students who had no previous experience with film. Among these aficionados were Camilo de Sousa and João Costa, more known by his nickname "Funcho," and they became important names in the Institute.

Polly Gaster was behind the initial organization of the Institute and all its necessary logistics. She took care not only of production, but also of distribution, mobile cinema, and training. They had to bring instructors to teach the students all the necessary skills involved in the production of a movie. Since there was no one in Mozambique with such ability, the INC brought foreigners to do so. At the time, there was a huge sentiment of solidarity for the independence cause in Mozambique among leftist film professionals, and Maputo became an important place where many important filmmakers of the time congregated. Among them were the already mentioned Santiago Alvarez, Jean-Luc Godard, Jean Rouch, Murilo Salles, Ruy Guerra, Antoine Bonfanti, and Ousmane Sembène (Senegal), Djibril Diop Mambéty (Senegal), Haile Gerima (Ethiopia), Med Hondo (Mauritania). Some of these directors also filmed in Mozambique, or edited their films there (Med Hondo finalized editing two films at the INC), taking advantage from the laboratories, which were a rarity in Africa.

Margaret Dickinson, Polly Gaster's friend who had come to Mozambique with her to film the liberated areas during the liberation war,¹²⁵ mentions Simon Hartog as an important figure behind the creation of the INC. He was a British man, raised in the US, who studied film in Italy, and he was one of the founders of the London Film Co-op (Dickinson 132). He was an important figure in Left film culture, and he met Dickinson at the British Film trade union (Association of Cinematograph and Television Technicians—ACTT). It was through her that Hartog and FRELIMO connected:

In the early 1970s the ACTT campaign had taken a radical turn with a demand for the nationalisation of the film industry and it happened that there was a close link between that phase of action and the INC because the author of the relevant policy document, Simon Hartog, became the principle advisor to the Mozambican government during the setting up of the INC (Dickinson 129).

In 1976, Simon Hartog arrived to Mozambique to work with Américo Soares, head of the INC: "His task was to help organise and plan a national film service which would manage cinemas abandoned by Portuguese owners, operate a national distribution service and develop a production unit. INC was the framework in which all this done" (Dickinson 133). Polly Gaster was appointed by them the first head of production. To design the functioning of the Institute he followed the models of Cuba's ICAIC (Instituto Cubano del Arte y Industria Cinematográficos), as well as the theories of Third Cinema, which also had a strong impact (Dickinson 133). It is important to point out that this was the only time when someone actively involved with the INC consciously used Solanas and Getino's conception of political cinema. Even though the entire project of the INC was in line with the proposal in the manifesto of Third Cinema, most of the

people involved either were not familiar with this particular text or were more concerned in thinking how to shoot a film in their own terms. However, the entire project is definitely an example of Third Cinema, as I will explain ahead. Then again, it is not an accident that Third Cinema theory is embedded in the creation of the INC. According to Murilo Salles (personal interview), no one read Solanas and Getino, but their idea of political cinema was what mattered to the members of the INC: use film as a political weapon to denounce the situation of those living in the *machambas*,¹²⁶ their living conditions, and other social problems affecting the Mozambican population.

In 1977 Ruy Guerra arrived in Mozambique with a group of other Brazilians who also worked in film. Guerra was already considered one of the leading directors of Brazilian Cinema Novo. He was born in Mozambique in 1932, and studied film in Paris at the Institut des Hautes Etudes Cinématographiques in 1952. He then moved to Brazil, where he made most of his career as a film director. When Mozambique became independent, in 1975, Brazil was going through a military dictatorship that severely compromised his activity as a film director. Going to Mozambique presented itself as both a breathing space from the Brazilian dictatorship, and as an opportunity to return to his homeland and contribute to the emerging project of the INC.

One of the people that accompanied Ruy Guerra to Mozambique was Murilo Salles,¹²⁷ who became the author of what many consider the first Mozambican film, *Estas São as Armas* (May 1978). Murilo was a generation younger than Cinema Novo film directors, but the movement was one of his major references while growing up, and he considers himself a son of Cinema Novo. For him and for many of his generation, film was the space for political discussion, and most of their reference film directors—and their films—were highly politicized.

Even though many of Salles's friends joined the armed struggle against Brazilian military dictatorship, he himself never joined, but always felt indebted to it. When Ruy Guerra invited him to go to Mozambique, he believed that this was his opportunity to make up for not having been part of that armed struggle, and to participate actively in an important political movement (personal interview). Therefore, his trip to Mozambique was in itself a political act that was correlated to the political situation in Brazil, and to the possibilities of using cinema as a political weapon. When he traveled to this African country, he barely had any information about the place, but it was his desire to become a militant what took him there (personal interview).

Guerra's proposal was for Salles to assist him in filming a documentary on the Seventh Congress of FRELIMO. Even though his first plan was for a short trip, he ended up staying for two years, until the end of 1979. Their trip was financed by the Arraes family, an important Brazilian family involved in Brazilian politics, finance and film.¹²⁸ Salles met Luís Bernardo Honwana,¹²⁹ who was very close to Samora Machel, and who collaborated closely in *Estas São as Armas*. Later on, he trained 5 military cameramen that should film the battlefronts, which illustrated once again the importance given to film as a form of documentation and archive by FRELIMO. Murilo Salles also became Samora Machel's main cameraman and accompanied him everywhere, even in international trips. This distanced him from the INC, which was not directly connected to FRELIMO, and that enjoyed a certain autonomy.

When Murilo Salles arrived in Mozambique, the INC was in its dawn and film stock was not yet easy to get. Therefore, the filming of the Seventh Congress was compromised because they did not have any film stock available. In spite of that, Samora commissioned him a documentary on imperialism that explained to Mozambicans its evils, and how it had contributed

to Portuguese colonialism. Another important objective of FRELIMO was to create a national film archive, and they had an amazing repository at the time, from films donated by the sympathizers of the regime to the films held by the Portuguese production companies, especially SOMAR. Since he couldn't film new material, *Estas São as Armas* was mostly made of archival material.

The idea to make the documentary came when Murilo Salles was viewing archival colonial films, and he realized that those images were an excellent lesson on what colonialism had been (Murilo Salles, personal interview). He was given privileged access to all the historical documentation of FRELIMO, and used such images to oppose them to the colonial ones. The movie was made in 16mm and blown up to 35mm, and relied mostly on editing existing material.¹³⁰ The film was commissioned by FRELIMO, with clear guidelines, both in terms of political message and in technical terms: he should employ the minimum possible of Portuguese, the maximum possible of images and silent cinema language, as little use of narration as possible, and the Portuguese language should be as didactic as possible (Murilo Salles, personal interview). These guidelines sought to make the film as clear as possible to the target audience, since a large majority of Mozambicans only knew basic Portuguese, or no Portuguese at all, and had no familiarity with cinematic language, as it was most likely that they had never seen a film before.¹³¹ However, Salles did point out that there was no concern in using an African cinematic language, even because he barely filmed anything, and his job was mostly editing existing images (personal interview). These guidelines were followed in the vast majority of the documentaries produced by the INC, especially in what concerns the restricted use of Portuguese. As Gabriel Mondlane remarked, there was always a concern that the audience could

not read or speak Portuguese, and the Kuxa Kanema newsreels, for instance, would barely lose their meaning if they were screened without any sound (Gabriel Mondlane, personal interview). The same is true about Salles's documentary. Murilo Salles used what he called pure audiovisual language, and the soundtrack played an essential role. The music of Jean Michel Jarre was very important in adding emotion to the visual narrative, since one of the aims was to move the Mozambican people, and to touch them with their History. The editing aesthetics was influenced by Dziga Vertov and by Eisenstein, and it relied on crosscutting that created a scheme of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis.

Estas São as Armas opened with a subtitle that read "Tete During the Armed Struggle," determining the liberation struggle as the period depicted. The establishing shot was that of an airplane bombing communities, of burnt villages, and a child crying in the middle of the attack. The following sequence is subtitled "Nyazonia, August 1976" and depicted the images of an attack by the Rhodesian Selous Scouts against a Zimbabwean refugee camp in Mozambique, near the border, where about one thousand people died. The crosscutting of these two scenes juxtaposed the Portuguese colonial war and the Rhodesian military aggressions, undertaken immediately after independence, connecting them as two faces of the same evil: racist regimes aiming at exploiting the African populations. The following question appeared in subtitles: "Why are they attacking us?" and then a man explained the reasons for these attacks—which immediately established the educational purpose of the documentary. The documentary then continued showing examples of colonial exploitation, from white people capitalizing on African workforce, to other colonial symbols, such as Mouzinho de Albuquerque.¹³² Some of these

images appeared in other films of the INC, which used to recycle images to make new documentaries.

The documentary then showed a sequence taken from the colonial newsreel *Actualidades de Moçambique n° 52*, where the spectator was presented with a huge banquet given in Mozambique to receive the Governor-General of Rhodesia and the Queen of England, and that was crosscut with images of colonial agents recruiting African workforce to work in cotton fields, illustrating the enormous inequalities between the white settlers and the African populations. The exploitation of the white colonialists was again put in contrast with the hardships suffered by the local populations, but the documentary then showed that this situation was only possible because the oppressors had accomplices on the Mozambican side, and that fellow citizens were in fact helping the Portuguese. Once again, this strategy underscored the pedagogical aim of the film, which tried to understand colonialism in the best way possible, so that it could be completely defeated. The voice-over then moved on to explain the problems of tribalism, which was one of the main concerns of Samora Machel's government, and he emphasized such tribal divisions in his speeches as one of the main obstacles in the rebuilding of the nation. In fact, ahead in the film the President underscored the fact that even though Mozambique gained independence, the revolution was an ongoing process, not only because the old allies of Portuguese colonialism were still attacking the country, but also because educating the people to live in an independent, socialist country was a continuing effort. The revolutionary process was compared to a new combat, this time for national reconstruction, that could be achieved through the local industries, housing reorganization, education, and agriculture. The film therefore aimed at being part of the revolution by raising awareness of the new challenges

faced after independence. The documentary also highlighted the importance of shared governance and democratic participation: in a popular assembly, the local community was electing their future representatives. Among them were women who were also running to be elected, and the voice-over underscored this fact, contrasting it to the Portuguese discriminatory policies against female political participation. Watching *Estas São as Armas* was in itself a revolutionary act because the movie aimed at transforming its audience, which was in line with the premises of Solanas and Getino's notion of "guerrilla cinema."

The documentary moves from showing the exploitation undertaken by the white supremacist regimes threatening Mozambique to images of Samora Machel and Eduardo Mondlane speaking to the people in the liberated areas, before independence. This move erases the possibility of a passive victimization of the Mozambican people and contributes to their empowerment. At a certain point, the voice-over states that "our aspirations would not be successful only by means of our best of intentions."¹³³ Consequently, the documentary justified the armed struggle as the only path to freedom. However, this could only be achieved through the joined efforts of the entire population. Such discourse was illustrated with images from people working in the local industries: the fight was not only on the battle field, but also through labor on every section (industry, agriculture, education, etc.), so that the country could produce enough to be economically—and therefore politically—independent. Labor was not something that one did for themselves, but for their community, and only by participating in the community efforts could one achieve true freedom.

The documentary then showed a child writing the following:

A arma.

Estas são.

as armas.

The weapons were not only the actual guns with which Mozambicans fought for independence. The Mozambican flag sports an AK47, a hoe, and a book, symbolizing the weapons used to conquer independence: the AK47 represents the actual arms that were used to liberate the people from Portuguese colonial rule, the hoe symbolizes the communal work through which Mozambique can sustain itself, and the book stands for education, another important element for liberation. These elements gave the title to this documentary, and the fact that it was a child writing these words pointed to the future in a new generation, and emphasized education as one important weapon. The film ended with Samora Machel raising an AK47 and saying to the crowd: “Estas são as armas que começaram a revolução e que fizeram possível o povo ter o que tem, comida, machambas, [etc.],” and after the credits, played with the hymn of FRELIMO, the following subtitle appeared: “A luta continua.” This is another motto that was present in many documentaries, and that gave title to Van Lierop’s 1971 documentary. In Van Lierop’s case, the title pointed to the struggle against Portuguese colonialism having place. The fact that it was still one of the main mottos after independence pointed to the idea that independence was not the ultimate goal of FRELIMO’s struggle, but only an important achievement in their continuous revolutionary struggle, since Mozambique still faced many problems, both economic and social. The country still had to figure out how to sustain itself economically, because all the economic structures belonged to the Portuguese and to their allies, and all those trained in administration were Portuguese, and they were fleeing the country, burning or taking with them valuable information on how to run these institutions and

businesses, and the Mozambicans had to figure out alternative ways to take control of their nation.

Besides the economic adversities faced by the newborn country, there was also the belief that every citizen should understand what the revolution truly meant, and should therefore be educated for it. Only through that understanding could they achieve true liberation.

Unfortunately, such belief led to human rights abuses, for instance through reeducation camps set all over the country, where those who did not align with FRELIMO's ideas were sent, or those who had occupations that the party did not approve, such as prostitutes.¹³⁴

When *Estas São as Armas* was made, Murilo Salles did not put his name on it, because he felt that the documentary belonged to FRELIMO, and because it was a commission from the government. Nonetheless, FRELIMO gave him the authorship, but only much later would he add it to his filmography. It was screened for the first in Mozambique in 1980, after Salles had returned to Brazil, in the bullring in Maputo. However, its official release was in 1978. They charged one escudo (the local currency at the time, which still had the Portuguese name), and the film was screened for three days, after 6:00 pm, in continuous sessions until everyone had left the place. The film had 320.000 spectators, and it became the biggest box-office success of Mozambican cinema. Samora Machel went to the premiere and loved the documentary (Murilo Salles, personal interview). Someone from the INC (Salles is not sure who exactly) sent the film to the Leipzig Film Festival, where it won the Silver Dove, giving it international repercussion. The documentary then traveled to other countries. *Estas São as Armas* was also considered one of the five hundred most important documentaries in History. However, it is important to emphasize that the movie was not made for an international audience, and both Murilo Salles and

Luís Bernardo Honwana (who worked closely with the Brazilian director) created the film having the Mozambican public in mind.

It was Ruy Guerra who brought Murilo Salles to Mozambique, as I mentioned earlier, and Guerra became one of the preeminent figures of the National Film Institute,¹³⁵ not only because of the people he invited to the INC to teach and to shoot,¹³⁶ but also because of the films he directed there. The most important was *Mueda, Memória e Massacre* (1981, 80'), which became one of the chief films of the INC. Guerra went to Mueda, in Northern Mozambique, near the border with Tanzania, to film the annual reenactment of the massacre that had taken place in June 16, 1960, when the Portuguese authorities massacred about six hundred Mozambicans¹³⁷ in the Makonde plateau. In the wake of the independence of neighboring countries, such as Tanzania, Mozambican workers decided to ask for better wages and for better working conditions to the Portuguese colonial administration. They came peacefully and unarmed, but the colonial police opened fire and killed indiscriminately. This was one of the events that led to the beginning of the liberation war, and it became one of the main symbols for the struggle. For that reason, after independence the reenactment of the event through a popular staging became a celebratory practice that took place every year, as Raquel Schefer noticed:

a partir de Junho de 1976 e durante cerca de duas décadas, ocorria anualmente na praça de Mueda, frente ao antigo edifício da administração colonial e dentro dele, no próprio lugar onde se desenrolaram os acontecimentos, uma representação teatral popular, colectiva e carnavalesca, baseada na peça homónima de Calisto dos Lagos—que é também o guionista e o director dramático do filme—, na qual o povo de Mueda

encarnava simultaneamente os funcionários e militares da administração colonial portuguesa e os manifestantes. (“O Nascimento...” n. pag.)

Mueda, Massacre e Memória begins with a personal testimony of one of the people who witnessed the event in voice-over. Therefore, it is the voice of a Mozambican that opens the film, telling the audience, in first person, what happened. The voice of Mozambicans is therefore emphasized, and the film allows Mozambicans to tell their own stories, which had been silenced by Portuguese colonial rule. This contrasts with *Estas São as Armas*, where the voice-over is still in third person. Guerra’s authorial voice is strongly present in *Mueda*, and it follows many of the aesthetic strategies that he used in *Os Fuzis*, but at the same time the population of Mueda has an important role in what is filmed. The play alternates with personal testimonies of other people who were present at the massacre. The first testimony is most likely read by an actor, in voice-over, but the other witnesses speak to the camera, and we can see their voices and their emotions concerning the event. The audience can therefore easily identify with those speaking to the camera, appealing to their emotions and to the subjectiveness of the victims of the massacre.

As I have already pointed out, the majority of the films made after independence in Mozambique were documentaries, but there are three fiction films that are important milestones in this national cinema: Guerra’s *Mueda*, Zdravko Velimirovic’s *O Tempo dos Leopardos* (1985), and José Cardoso’s *O Vento Sopra do Norte* (1987). Consequently, Ruy Guerra inaugurated fiction cinema in independent Mozambique, and this is one of the reasons why it became such an important work. According to Gabriel Mondlane, Guerra became a major influence to the students of the INC (personal interview), not only because of his work in the context of Brazilian Cinema Novo, but also because he was the first one to direct a fiction feature. The vast majority

of those making documentaries at the INC aspired at making their own fiction films, but they faced both a lack of interest from FRELIMO, which favored documentaries because they were more efficient in passing their political message, and also because the students lacked the needed expertise and equipment.¹³⁸

Gabriel Mondlane has pointed out to a tradition of docudrama in Mozambique that aims at fulfilling the needs both of documentaries and of fiction, thus overcoming financial and technical obstacles to the development of fiction in Mozambique. He signals Licínio de Azevedo's *Desobediência* (2002) and his film *O Silêncio da Mulher* (2008) as examples of that tradition that has persisted in contemporary Mozambican cinema. This tradition was inaugurated with Guerra's *Mueda*, which played with both genres and their limits: "'Genre's frustration' is the expression that Guerra uses to describe *Mueda* as it is a film that politically refuses both the epic re-enactment and the documentary's reality effect" (Schefer, "Fictions..." 308). Raquel Schefer has made an interesting analysis of this film, and how it deals with memory, reality, and testimony. She declares that *Mueda* "makes a statement on the inseparability between aesthetics and politics" ("Fictions" 306), and remarks that, even though the film is often considered a fiction film, it can be regarded as a synthesis of different genres, namely "re-enactment, historical documentary, political fiction, ethnographic film" ("Fictions" 304).

Even though Ruy Guerra's participation in the Institute was pivotal for the students working there, and it strongly influenced their idea of what cinema should be, his film did not achieve the same popularity that the other films made in the context of the INC did. For instance, the film would later be edited without Guerra's consent,

suffering at least two important cuts, apparently due to divergences deriving from a historical point of view that the film would adopt, and that was not officially recognised. The film's performative time did not adjust to the Mozambican political project's pedagogical time as it would not entirely sublimate the interaction between the historical and structural dominant (the Mozambican people's heroic fight for liberation) and the superstructural component (the awareness of the fight's heroism and justness and its representation). (Schefer, "Fictions" 308-309)

Once again this event shows the tensions lived between the INC and Ruy Guerra, since the director was more interested in putting his personal creativity on the screen, expressing his subjective artistic vision of what cinema—and political cinema—should be. However, he ended up forgetting the Mozambican audience, who did not have the cinematic sophistication to understand Guerra's visual language, since their experience with cinema was very recent, and presented numerous challenges, some of them already mentioned here. If we return to Solanas and Getino's distinction between second and third cinema, we can see how Guerra's film risked at failing the main political purpose of educating his audience, favoring instead his own aesthetic choices:

[Second cinema] demanded that the filmmaker be free to express himself in non-standard language and inasmuch as it was an attempt at cultural decolonization. But such attempts have already reached, or are about to reach, the outer limits of what the system permits. The *second cinema filmmaker* has remained 'trapped inside the fortress' as Godard put it or is on his way of becoming trapped. (Solanas and Getino 42)

Mueda's importance in the context of post-independence Mozambican cinema is undeniable, because it inaugurated an aesthetic, it influenced those making films at the Institute and it registered the complexities of a historical moment—the massacre of Mueda—and its intricacies and contradictions, not so much in the past, but in the significance that the event had to the beginning of the armed struggle, and as a national symbol of fighting against colonialism. However, it failed at reaching its target audience. Even today, the other two fiction films produced in this context continue to be successful among every Mozambican with a TV set, since every year *O Vento Sopra do Norte* and *O Tempo dos Leopardos* are screened in national television to commemorate the country's independence. *Mueda* failed many of the purposes of third cinema, which were the same purposes of the Mozambican Film Institute: to create a cinema that educated and mobilized the people to act politically and to be part of the revolutionary process. It is also important not to forget that the Mozambican director had studied film in France, and the European influence is quite visible in his work. *Mueda* ended up being somewhat elitist, and fell in the same trap that much of Brazilian Cinema Novo did—it was not able to speak to those it wanted to defend, as Jean-Claude Bernardet noticed in regard to Brazilian Cinema Novo:

Aparentemente são filmes feitos para o povo, mostrando-lhe sua situação e incitando-o à reação.

Essa intenção era utópica: os filmes não conseguiram travar diálogo com o público almejado [...]. Se os filmes não conseguiram esse diálogo é porque não apresentavam realmente o povo e seus problemas, mas antes encarnações da situação social [...] e também porque os filmes se dirigiam, de fato, aos dirigentes do país. (Bernardet 65)

On the other hand, the films from the Mozambican INC were very successful at speaking to the people. The movie theaters were always full, and the Institute was able not only to recoup the cost of their productions, but also to make a large profit, which gave the means for the Institute to have complete financial independence from the government. They were allowed to keep 10% of the box office, which was more than enough to cover all the material and other costs of production. There weren't many entertainment options, and going to the movies was the main leisure activity available at the time. In fact, the INC had such a profit that by the end of each fiscal year, the money that they couldn't spend went back to the government, and it was used for other purposes, since they couldn't keep the remaining capital. This situation ended up contributing to the end of the Institute. When the crisis hit the country, partly due to the ongoing civil war that drained most of their resources, the INC had lost their own funds and was not able to overcome the crisis.

The *Kuxa Kanema* newsreel is one of the best examples of the success of the INC films amongst Mozambicans. It is important to emphasize that *Kuxa Kanema* did not comprise the entire production of the Institute, but that it was a project among others, which has to be understood by itself.¹³⁹ The idea came from Fernando Silva (Convents 45), and Luís Carlos Patraquim was an important contributor, but it was also part of FRELIMO's cultural project to have a newsreel. According to Gabriel Mondlane, *Kuxa Kanema* was tied to a political consciousness and also “com o conceito de unidade nacional para que as pessoas se sintam envolvidas, se sintam parte do mosaico cultural e também da percepção do que estava a acontecer no país” (personal interview). Therefore, the main actor of the newsreel was the President, Samora Machel, who appeared in every episode and served as a guiding line to the

narrative. According to Mondlane, he had enough charisma to pass the political message of national unity, even for those who did not speak Portuguese (personal interview). *Kuxa Kanema* aimed at connecting the different Mozambican communities and cultures, and at giving an idea of nationhood to the varied populations: “a independência trouxe uma nova coisa: as pessoas começaram a perceber que afinal Moçambique não era só Maputo, afinal Moçambique tem outras pessoas, que têm outras culturas e falam outras línguas” (Gabriel Mondlane, personal interview). During Portuguese colonialism these efforts were only undertaken in the main cities, and mostly amongst the literate population; there was not much concern with the rural communities. Therefore, cinema—and radio—were what created the imagined community to which Benedict Anderson refers in *Imagined Communities* (84; 133-135); however, in the case of Mozambique, it was not so much print language¹⁴⁰ that served that purpose, but mostly radio and cinema, because the majority of the population was illiterate, and radio and film could reach a wider audience.

The format of *Kuxa Kanema* was inspired by the colonial newsreel *Actualidades de Moçambique*, but its content and language were very different from the Portuguese ones. One of the important differences was the use of direct sound, and Antoine Bonfanti, one of the major innovators in the use of direct sound, came to Maputo to train the students. The name *Kuxa Kanema* was taken from Xangana, the language spoken in the region of Maputo, and it means “the birth of cinema,” conflating the birth of the nation with the birth of a new cinema, made for Mozambicans, with a “decolonized image” that, instead of following foreign trends, aimed at adjusting to the local audiences, to their visual culture and to the linguistic variety of the country.

The newsreel had two series: the first began in 1979, when the first filming equipment arrived to the INC, and when the students had enough knowledge to take care of all the production stages. This first series was very irregular and did not obey to any specific deadlines. Distribution relied both on the existing movie theaters and on mobile cinema, which took the documentaries to the more remote communities. The INC teams would travel the country showing their films, and then filming the local populations, their cultural practices and their daily life. These images would then be shown to other cultural groups, so that everyone understood that the country was diverse, but they were all part of one national identity, with similar struggles and desires. FRELIMO had a very strict cultural policy that aimed at avoiding tribal conflicts and at creating an idea of nationhood that reached even the most isolated communities, which had little familiarity with such concept. This was a challenge that was not specific to Mozambique, but that was common throughout the majority of the African nations, which followed a model of nationhood that was European.

The second phase of *Kuxa Kanema* coincided with the arrival of another Brazilian group, formed by Alberto Graça¹⁴¹ and Vera Zaverucha.¹⁴² They were behind the creation of a production process that disciplined the entire INC, instituted deadlines, a management system, etc. (Camilo de Sousa, personal interview). From 1983 on, there was a weekly episode of *Kuxa Kanema*, with the duration of ten minutes, filmed in black and white, that arrived to the movie theaters every week.¹⁴³ At this point, the INC also started producing an average of two to three documentaries each month. The *Kuxa Kanemas* were screened before other feature films, not necessarily Mozambican. Bollywood movies were very popular, and most films came from socialist countries, such as the Soviet Union, Cuba, China, etc. At this point, there was no

American cinema due to the boycott of the US against Mozambique, because of its communist politics.¹⁴⁴ However, it was *Kuxa Kanema* that gathered most popularity, and many people would pay their ticket to watch the newsreel and leave without seeing the feature film included in the ticket.

Even though the idea of having a newsreel came from the colonial newsreels created by Portuguese SOMAR, these were very different. *Visor Moçambicano* and *Atualidades de Moçambique*, the two series focused on the country, only had one authoritative voice-over telling the spectator what each image signified. The events were almost always positive, showing either the natural beauty of the country, some official visit from a politician (Portuguese or from a foreign country), cultural events, inaugurations of factories, etc. *Kuxa Kanema*, on the other hand, described the challenges of the new country, the problems faced that needed to be solved (even if they did not have a clear solution yet), and they even included self-criticism from the government. However, the pieces always followed the guidelines from FRELIMO and needed approval before being sent to the movie theaters. This approval was not exactly censorship, and the directors of the INC usually felt the freedom to show what they wanted (Camilo de Sousa, Gabriel Mondlane, personal interview). Despite this felt freedom, it is important to point out that they all believed in the guiding principles of FRELIMO, but they also felt that they had the freedom to expose the problems faced by the new country.

The title sequence that opened each episode always began with a map of Mozambique, with the different regions outlined, and the title *Kuxa Kanema* would appear spinning superimposed over the map, stopping with the number of the episode beneath (Fig. 3). The score used the sound of drums. This image immediately conveyed the idea of national unity, created

through film (therefore the superimposed title *Kuxa Kanema*), without erasing the different regions, which were outlined in the map. This idea of national unity was constantly reinforced throughout the films. One of the main devices used by the directors was showing the speeches of President Samora Machel. He was a highly charismatic figure, and the people did not get tired of listen to his speeches, which could last up to seven hours, and not even rain would make people leave. Machel was aware of his charisma and cultivated his cinematic image from very early in his political career. He always made himself be accompanied by one cameraman that would film all his speeches and interventions. Samora constantly curated his public image and was a master of self-fashioning. The directors of the INC were also aware of the strength of his persona and took advantage of that whenever they could. The President was an image of national unity among the diversity represented in the films, a father figure on whom all Mozambicans could rely. In his speeches, he explained what colonialism was, what it had done to the country, and



Fig. 3—*Kuxa Kanema*, opening credits

how new forms of colonialism and racism threatened the new nations, namely through the neighbor regimes that had white supremacist governments and that were waging wars against Mozambique. Samora spoke slowly and repeated the information in different ways, to make sure everyone understood the message, finishing each idea with his now famous “É ou não é?” always accompanied with a big smile to the audience. This gave the impression of a dialogue with the people, who constantly answered to him, underscoring the importance of every citizen in the building of the revolution. Most of the plans showing his speeches were lateral, which emphasized that he was not speaking to a camera, but to a real audience, which would also appear in the films.

Another important moment in many *Kuxa Kanemas* was football. This sport has always had a role of unifying different people, and it gave a leisure moment that lightened up the news, which described the challenges faced by the new nation. In *Kuxa Kanema 23* (1981) the voice over declares “o futebol é sempre notícia e o campeonato acontecimento.”¹⁴⁵ This was always the most popular moment of entertainment in the newsreel. The films also focused in other important cultural moments, such as the performance of dances and songs from different regions of the country. The idea was that every Mozambican would be familiarized with the different languages, dances, clothes and other cultural practices of their country, so that they realized that all of that diversity was part of a unified nation, and that Mozambique was not just Maputo. This was in fact another challenge for FRELIMO, since the Portuguese had created a huge disparity in terms of development between the capital city and the rest of the country. To bridge such disparities was a major challenge to the new government, and film had an important role in reconciling such differences.

The challenges were countless, and *Kuxa Kanema* reported them: students struggling to adjust to a semestral regime (*Kuxa Kanema 135*); problems of corruption within FRELIMO that the very President denounced in public speeches (*Kuxa Kanema 36*); the stores lacking food, and the uneven distribution of basic goods around the country (*Kuxa Kanema 135*); floods and subsequent problems, such as mosquitoes that transmitted diseases like malaria (*Kuxa Kanema 135*); the military attacks of South Africa and Rhodesia, and later on of RENAMO, around the country, with testimonies both of the victims of such attacks and of RENAMO fighters who were caught by FRELIMO. *Kuxa Kanema 164* (1984) celebrated the 9 years of independence, beginning with the images of the lowering of the Portuguese flag and the hoisting of the Mozambican flag. The voice-over comments on the importance of analyzing the mistakes and the successes of the new country, in order to continue the building of the nation. The newsreel was therefore also a space of reflection on the path of revolution, on the challenges faced by Mozambique and on ways to deal with them. The rhetoric aimed at making the population feel that they were part of the solution, and that the government needed their help to overcome such challenges.

Besides the *Kuxa Kanema*, the INC also produced documentaries. Their main purpose was to inform the population of a topic faced by the country at the time or to explain some historical fact. The director chose a specific subject that was analyzed in depth—opposite to the news in *Kuxa Kanema*, which aimed at quickly informing the population of what was happening in the country. Since the newsreels only had ten minutes each, no subject had space to be analyzed in depth. However, these documentaries had the same purposes as the *Kuxa Kanemas*:

they were didactic and wanted to educate and mobilize the population for revolution, and to reflect on the challenges of said revolution.

Ofensiva was directed by Camilo de Sousa (1980), and written by Luis Carlos Patraquim. The focus is on the President Samora Machel, and on an *offensive* that he led throughout the country to stop corruption and inefficacy. The documentary opens with images of him, as well as with newspaper headlines of the time. The title appears and then the President talks to the population from his jeep: “A nossa luta é contra os marginais, os especuladores, opressores do povo [...].” The fact that he appears in a jeep in the beginning of the film already points to him as a man of action, not a bureaucrat sitting in an office, who is actively changing the country’s problems. He says “our struggle,” including himself and the people in the same acting group. Samora used to wear an olive drab military uniform, which was his most common outfit, and it was the same he used during the liberation struggle in the fields. Most of the times he used a plain field uniform, without any military insignia or stars, and he would only dress a ceremonial uniform when he was in official international visits or receiving a foreign President. Even in national official ceremonies he was seen dressed in the same plain uniform. Samora Machel was very conscious of his public image, which he meticulously cultivated, both when he appeared to his people and when he was filmed. He wanted to be seen as someone close to the people (therefore his avoidance of more formal outfits), but who was still a military fighting the revolution for the Mozambican people, just as he was during the liberation struggle. *Ofensiva* encapsulates perfectly this image. The title of the documentary evokes a military action, even though there is no military battle to be fought this time. The main enemies of the nation in this documentary are corruption and inefficiency, as indicated earlier. The first challenge mentioned

in this particular film is hunger: many supermarkets are empty, and the lines to buy essential goods, such as meat, are huge, and people can spend an entire day in line waiting to get a small portion, since there is rationing. Since people spend a long time in line, they are not working, which also hinders production, namely agriculture. Samora's *offensive* is equated with a class struggle as those in charge of distributing the merchandise—public employees—are not concerned with the common good and with the welfare of their fellow citizens. The President talks personally with those in charge of warehouses and admonishes them for their incompetence and bureaucracy, noticing that food in storage ends up spoiled because it was not sold out. The same was true for medical equipment, hospital beds, refrigerators, etc., all in store while hospitals have no mattresses or other necessary items to function. This *offensive* is therefore a large inspection to the warehouses of the country, carried out by the President himself, to make sure that the vices of bureaucracy and inefficiency, inherited from the colonial state, can be erased. The documentary ends with an inspection of APIE—Administração do Parque Imobiliário do Estado. This office administered the buildings that had been nationalized and taken away from the Portuguese after independence, and that also had all the furniture left behind, which should be redistributed equitably among the population. The President visited the premises to find out that much of the furniture was being stolen and sold in the black market, and he condemned the corruption that affected most of the areas of administration in Mozambique, and that existed within his own Party. He publicly condemned this and supervised the operations to make sure the problem would go away. Other documentaries, like *Chilembene* (Luis Simão, 1982) and *E Temos Florestas* (Camilo de Sousa, 1981), mention the success of this offensive, which improved the efficiency of numerous services in the country, and emphasized that such offensive was an

ongoing process upon which depended the success of the revolution. In fact, fight against corruption was a brand image of Machel's government, which still lasts in the present, and he in fact managed to control the problem quite effectively. *Ofensiva* is quite possibly one of the most famous documentaries of this period, and it can still be bought in DVD in the streets of Mozambique. One of the reasons for such success was the leading figure of Samora Machel, and how the film portrayed him as a reliable leader who talked to his people and who was able to speak truth to those who were not doing their jobs properly. He even spoke in Xangana to the workers of a cement factory in Maputo, explaining to them the importance of being disciplined and responsible in their work, showing that he was able to navigate the different cultures of the city. He was dearly loved by his people, but at the same time he practiced a paternalistic politics, where the cult of the leader was the touchstone of his government.

Chilembene, directed by Luis Simões (1982), and also written by Luís Carlos Patraquim, focuses on the town where Samora Machel was born. The opening of the documentary stressed that this was a land of farmers, where the President was born—indicating his humble origins.¹⁴⁶ An intertitle with a quote of Samora appeared in the screen, “Não basta aplicar. É preciso também conhecer, estudar.—Samora Machel, 1971,” emphasizing that the political program of FRELIMO was created with a deep knowledge of the realities of Mozambique and the needs of its people. Similar to what happened in the opening of *Ofensiva*, this intertitle is followed by an image of a car on the road, filmed from the inside, stressing the hands on approach of Samora's government. In the same vein as Camilo de Sousa's documentary, this was another film that tried to diagnose the causes of backwardness in the agriculture production of the region. The President criticized the abandonment of the fields, addressing the farmers, and calling for a reorganizing

action. The filming team visited Cail, a farmers' enterprise, and analyzed the failures of the nationalizing process, the lack of success in understanding the needs of the infrastructures, as well as the fact that the workers did not follow instructions leading to the abandonment of the machinery. The criticism of the President to the enterprise aimed at understanding the problems in order to solve them. In the end of the documentary, the voice-over recognized that the criticism was harsh, but accurate, and it concluded by saying that this constant criticism was part of the revolutionary process: "Socializar o campo é socializar o trabalhador e torná-lo consciente em relação à sua classe. Essa consciencialização do trabalhador é essencial ao sucesso da revolução. Estar em ofensiva permanente é uma exigência da própria revolução. E por isso devemos fazer dela um dado fundamental da nossa cultura."

If *Chilembene* focuses on a town, other documentaries focus on an economic activity. *E Temos Florestas* (Camilo de Sousa, 1981) is about the forests of Mozambique and the timber industry, which at the time amounted to thirteen million dollars in exports. The film explains how this industry worked, gave numbers and highlighted its importance to the economy, including testimonies of the workers involved, explaining their work in the business, and also pointing out problems in the sector—for instance, the excessive centralization in Maputo and the need to create better plans for commercialization of products of certain regions, like Beira. Some of the workers also mention the importance of the *offensive*, which identified these problems and made an effort to address them. The film concludes by pointing out that the Mozambican people are kept as spectators of their own underdevelopment, instead of becoming agents of transformation, and then closing with the following conclusion: "a nossa incompetência e desorganização não nos permite estarmos conscientes das potencialidades que possuímos."

Um Dia numa Aldeia Comunal, directed by Moira Forjaz (1981), depicts the life of a communal village, and the challenges its inhabitants face. The communal villages were an important project of FRELIMO: “[a]fter independence, the development strategy established by the new regime for Mozambique's rural areas was based on a country-wide villagisation programme run by the state and based on two main pillars: population resettlement and the transformation of production relations” (Coelho 61). During colonialism, the Portuguese had forced large amounts of urban populations to resettle in *aldeamentos* (villages), in an effort to control them and to prevent their contact with FRELIMO. By the end of 1974, when the independence was made official, the people started abandoning these *aldeamentos*, where they were under the grip of Portuguese colonial rule, and resettled in disperse areas, without a specific plan. On the other hand, in the liberated areas, the FRELIMO combatants that governed the villages left to more urban areas. Adding to this there were also a lot of war refugees returning from Malawi and Zambia. The settlements in the rural areas were scattered and they only produced subsistence agriculture, which was negative for the country’s economy. Additionally, the appearance of RENAMO and its attacks on rural populations created the need to reorganize the population, and to give them some safety from the armed bandits. In this context, the government launched a program to create communal villages, as well as the institution of CNAC (the National Commission of Communal Villages) to administer these villages:

Theoretically, a human settlement was considered to be a communal village when it satisfied the following conditions: collective or cooperative production formed (or was on the way to forming) the basis of the economy; it had a planned physical setting with

distinct residential and productive areas; and it had institutions of local administration which ran village development and life in general. (Coelho 65)

These villages became an important part of the revolutionary project of FRELIMO, where the rural populations were integrated in a community that worked for their own wellbeing as well as for the country. The vast majority of the people living here were women and children, since the men were away working in the mines of South Africa. The communal villages became a metonym for the nation, where the revolutionary process was developed in a smaller scale. Moira Forjaz's documentary stresses this idea in the opening image, where a man hoists the Mozambican flag in the village of Bilane. The film follows a structure similar to the one already described, where the problems and the needs of the population are accessed and addressed: the lack of kindergartens to leave the children during the day, lack of agricultural machinery. They also stress the advantages of living in the village, and the progresses made: installation of a draining system, their control of what they produce through the local cooperative, etc.

The documentary is made of testimonies, just like the other ones, and the voice-over is used to connect these testimonies and to create a narrative that unites them. Hilary Owen, in her article "Engendering the Aesthetics of Solidarity in Lina Magaia's 'Dumba Nengue,'" analyzes Magaia's collection of testimonial accounts of attacks of RENAMO to communal villages, noticed the importance of the testimony in the building of the imagined community that was the nation:

Magaia's work exemplifies what George Yuidice terms in the Latin American context 'top down' testimonial, as an 'attempt on the part of the state to consolidate a national subject by means of the testimonial process'. [...] In their 1984 study, Isaacman and Stephen

refer to the 8th Session of the FRELIMO Central Committee in 1976 defining the “aldeia comunal” as the “espinha dorsal do desenvolvimento das forças produtivas das áreas rurais.” (81-82)

Um Dia numa Aldeia Comunal is a great example of how the testimony is used in film to create a national identity based in the people and in its common efforts to build their nation. This particular documentary does not feature the figure of the President, and therefore focuses its attention on the citizens, and on what it meant to be a Mozambican citizen.

The historical documentary was another important type of film produced by the INC. It was also part of the effort to build a national archive that contained not only the history of present day Mozambique, but also accounted for its colonial past, finally retold by the Mozambicans themselves. It is important to note that they did not have the opportunity to officially write their own history until independence, and doing so in the present fulfilled that need. It also aimed at educating the population on colonialism and forms of past oppression, so that they could be avoided in the future. *Ibo, o Sangue do Silêncio*, directed by Camilo de Sousa (10', s/d.) also uses the testimony to tell the story of the prison of Ibo, an old colonial fortress to where political prisoners were sent by PIDE for political reasons. The opening sequence reinforces the strength of the testimony: the screen is completely dark, while we listen to each ex-prisoner stating their name, age, when they were arrested, and for how long. There is a guided tour where the guard explains how the prison functioned; another man, who was incarcerated in Ibo, shows the parts of the premises. The documentary then goes on to tell the history of that fortress, built by the Portuguese within the context of European colonization and its trading interests.

The last major tendency in the documentaries of the INC was the depiction of the post-independence war, first against Rhodesia and South Africa, and later on against RENAMO. There were also some documentaries focusing on the Angolan civil war, showing how both conflicts were being fought against the same interests. The INC even sent a filming team to southern Angola, to its war zone, to film what was happening there. *Cinco Tiros de Mauser* (Camilo de Sousa, s/d.) was the result, which also included testimonies of local populations recounting their experiences. The documentary explains how South African troops controlled the entire region south of Huambo, and how Angolans of that region struggled with starvation and with the attacks of enemy soldiers. This documentary underscores the historical connections between Angola and Mozambique, and how their common enemies were still the same, even after independence.

Que Venham! was one of the first documentaries on the attacks undertaken by the Boers against Mozambique, and it focused on an attack of the South African army to some buildings in the suburbs of Maputo, where the ANC headquarters were installed. The film opens with a military band and a speech from the President, which is followed by images of the attacked buildings and dead bodies. Just like the other documentaries, the emphasis is put on images that do not need words to cause impact on the spectator, and these specific images of dead bodies, followed by the images of white South African soldiers, connects them as the cause of those deaths for even those who do not understand Portuguese. The voice-over mentions the traitors, which were the same from colonial times. It also points out to the fact that South Africa had been attacking not only Mozambique and the ANC, but also Angola, Botswana, etc., reinforcing a common enemy against African (black) interests. Samora Machel has a strong presence in this

documentary, in particular his public speeches to the Mozambican people, where he says he is not afraid of the war—he declares that the Mozambican people do not wish for a war, but that at the same time they are not afraid of it, since they are a product of war, and that they will keep fighting against all their enemies. The documentary ends with the slogans “Independência ou morte” and “A luta continua.” These indirectly connect this struggle to other liberation struggles from this period, namely the Cuban revolution. The fact that Samora states that Mozambique is a product of war reinforces the liberation struggle as the moment when the nation was imagined, and when it was born. The fact that he always wore military attire reinforced that idea. This is probably one of the documentaries where the nationalistic character is more exacerbated in the speeches, since it was important to emphasize the fact they were all part of one nation fighting for independence. This attack was one of the first attacks that the country suffered after independence,¹⁴⁷ and also one of the first of what would become a long civil war. The title, *Que Venham!* pointed precisely to the fierceness of the Mozambican people and its will to keep fighting against their oppressors. In later films, like *Moçambique em Busca da Paz* (s/d., directed by Isabel de Noronha),¹⁴⁸ FRELIMO emphasized that the civil war was not a war between two political parties, but it was a destabilization war supported by foreign powers, in the context of the Cold War. This was certainly true to a certain extent, but it was also an internal conflict, since most of RENAMO’s soldiers were Mozambican. They were indeed funded by foreign interests, and they never had the support of the majority of the population, but they did have some support, especially in the North of the country.¹⁴⁹

The films of the INC aimed at creating an idea of unity that refused the concept that a large part of Mozambicans were against FRELIMO’s government. However, they did not hide

the internal conflicts, and aimed at making the population more active in the political life and the rebuilding of the nation. The democratic emphasis was an important motif not only in the *Kuxa Kanemas*, but also in the majority of the films produced by the INC. In many senses, these films fit in the concept of Third Cinema: “*Third cinema* is, in our opinion, the cinema that *recognizes in that struggle the most gigantic cultural, scientific, and artistic manifestation of our time*, the great possibility of constructing a liberated personality with each people as the starting point—in a word, the *decolonization of culture*” (Solanas and Getino 37). The process of independence was considered a cultural revolution by both FRELIMO and the directors of the INC (Camilo de Sousa, Gabriel Mondlane, personal interview), and their films were made for an active public, to mobilize them and engage them in that revolution. Even in the rural communities where the vast majority did not speak Portuguese, the films were shown in a town-hall that gathered the entire population, and a translator that almost always belonged to that community would explain the film, telling the audience first what they were about to see, and then explaining the movies while they were being screened. People asked questions, gave their opinions, and those less familiar with the moving image even tried to intervene in the events being screened.

If we follow the four points established by Teshome Gabriel that define Third Cinema (Gabriel 3), the films of the INC fit the description. The strong anti-colonial message aimed at *decolonizing the minds*, explaining all the forms of oppression imposed to the Mozambicans by foreign powers (Portugal first, and then other countries that directly or indirectly were undermining the Mozambican government), as well as at creating a new visual language that fitted the cultural and visual codes of Mozambican cultures. In this sense, there was not a strong

need to “decolonize the gaze” because many of these people had never seen a film before, and the target audience was usually those who had little to no previous contact with cinema.

It contributed to the *development of a radical consciousness* because it aimed at educating the people to be active participants on the revolutionary process, helping them understand the challenges of creating a new nation that could function in all areas (economy, culture, education, health, etc.) without depending on foreign help. Therefore, it helped to create a *revolutionary transformation of society*, because it engaged people in changing their attitudes and helping actively in that development. Finally, the INC *developed a new film language* that contributed to accomplish these tasks. These four elements were strongly present in the films produced by the Institute, but the reality was much more complicated. Speaking of a revolutionary cinema that is aligned with the government in power is contradictory, to say the least. However, power comes in different gradations, and international interests were still a source of oppression against Mozambique. The cinema of the INC was indeed revolutionary, but it was not just that, and it had many contradictions. In the face of a civil war, they felt they had to choose sides, because RENAMO was being financed by South Africa and Rhodesia, which being white supremacist regimes, were obviously against the interests of the people of Mozambique. They forcibly recruited children soldiers, with the complicity of the American Heritage Foundation¹⁵⁰ (Camilo de Sousa, personal interview). According to Camilo de Sousa, staying neutral at that time was synonym with supporting Ian Smith’s regime. The INC teams kept going to war zones to film what was going on and to denounce it to the rest of the population. However, they soon realized that FRELIMO was also committing a series of abuses and war crimes, and they also had children soldiers in their troops, and they created the reeducation

camps, which were a kind of concentration camps for those that did not align with the regime. This made many of the INC members to progressively take their distance from the FRELIMO government.

In 1984, the continuing civil war had depleted the country's resources, and Mozambique was forced to ask help to the World Bank in 1984.¹⁵¹ This would be a big blow to the INC, because it forced the country to privatize many of its institutions, namely the movie theaters, which deprived the Institute from the 10% share of box office sales, leaving them dependent on the government for financing. The government, on the other hand, did not have the funds to keep sponsoring the Institute, which hadn't been allowed to accumulate capital throughout the years, as noted before, since all the remainder had to be returned to the State by the end of each fiscal year.

After the death of Samora Machel, in a suspicious plane accident when returning from Lusaka, in 1986, many of the collaborators of the INC felt even more estranged from the regime. He was the leader on whom they all relied and felt close to him and to his ideals. After his death, FRELIMO began feeling troubled by the film archives held by the INC, that they felt compromised the image of the party, and lost interest in sponsoring its activities. In 1991 a fire destroyed¹⁵² the commercial archive of the INC, dictating the end of the Institute. The premises were recovered, and the Institute reopened in 2000, renamed as the Instituto Nacional do Audiovisual e do Cinema—INAC. It functions today mostly as a national film archive that occasionally organizes film festivals, but it has discontinued producing films. The INAC nonetheless remains an important film archive with a well-organized collection of films, and in collaboration with other foreign institutions it has undertaken an effort to restore important

Mozambican films, INAC still struggles with finding funding to maintain its archive and to condition the thousands of copies of films, but it is still an important institution in Mozambique where any researcher can consult the archive and study Mozambican film.

Independence Cinema in Angola: The Camera Imagining the Nation

In this section I will look into the films made in Angola from 1975 to 1980, in the first years of independence. I will focus on António Ole and Ruy Duarte de Carvalho,¹⁵³ who were the two most important directors of the period, and I will examine how their films contributed to the development of a discourse of nationhood, and how they imagined the new nation that had just been born. These films were produced by the government network, Angolan Popular Television (Televisão Popular de Angola—TPA), and financed by the state, under a policy that envisioned culture as an important outlet in the creation of a national identity. The People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola—known by the acronym MPLA (Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola)—was the party that took office at the time. The MPLA made an important investment in culture, which was largely inspired by Amílcar Cabral, who was the leader of the Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde—PAIGC, and one of the most important African thinkers of the struggle against colonialism. For him, culture was a fundamental part of national liberation. In a lecture that he gave at the University of Syracuse in 1972, entitled “A Cultura Nacional,” he defined national liberation as a cultural process, and pointed out the fact that most liberation processes begin with the increase of cultural displays that claim pride in the oppressed culture. According to Cabral, it was in such displays that we could find the seeds of dissent that would lead to the structuring and development of the liberation movement (224-225).

Pointing out the systematic need of the colonizer to oppress the culture of the colonized, Cabral declares: “Vemos assim que, se o domínio imperialista tem como necessidade vital praticar a opressão cultural, a libertação nacional é, necessariamente, um *acto de cultura*” (225). The Bissau-Guinean’s ideas were clearly affiliated with those of Franz Fanon, who articulated similar views on culture in *The Wretched of the Earth*. Amílcar Cabral’s theories were central to the development of cultural policies and to the investment of the Angolan government in national cinema. As Teshome Gabriel observed, both Fanon and Cabral had extensive influence in Third World film practice: “The Third World, through spoke-persons like Franz Fanon and Amílcar Cabral, has developed its own conceptualization of Marxist theory and praxis. [...] To Cabral and Fanon, ‘culture,’ as a fruit of history, is likened to a ‘weapon’ in the struggle for independence, and to the Third Cinema filmmakers, the determinants of culture are no less” (14).

The Portuguese cultural and educational oppression had had dire consequences. When Angola became independent, the illiteracy rate was estimated to be between 85% and 90%.¹⁵⁴ As a result, cinema was seen as an effective medium to politically educate the population in the ideals of the revolution.¹⁵⁵ Angolan independence films can be considered Third Cinema because they aimed at educating the people to live in a decolonized, socialist nation, and they supported the socialist agenda of the MPLA. Even though Angolans had achieved independence, they saw the efforts of building a new nation as part of the same revolutionary process that began with the liberation struggle against colonialism.

It was television that propelled cinematic production in Angola. It is important to point out that, opposite to what happened in Mozambique, in Angola there was not a strong institutional support for the development of a film institute. The MPLA government did try to

create a similar structure to that of the Mozambican National Film Institute, but the civil war began immediately after independence, and the economic resources had to be directed to the conflict. In 1975, the workers of Cinangola, concerned with the closing of this small newsreel and propaganda production company, created the film cooperative Promocine. However, it was the Angolan TV station, TPA (Televisão Popular de Angola), that assumed the production of the most important films of this period. As Levin pointed out, no copies of the majority of the films of the independence survived (96).

Luandino Vieira was the the first President of the TV station. He brought to Angola three French technicians from Unicité, Bruno Muel, Marcel Trillat and Antoine Bonfanti (Abrantes, *Cinema 6*), who also went to Mozambique. Vieira's intention was to make a cinema for the nation in which the building of a national cinema had priority over the personal expression of any given director:

Era para ir devagarinho. Eu sei que fui muito apressado, fui voluntarista. A gente queria fazer tudo naquela altura. [...] Aliás, era essa a crítica fundamental do Ruy e do Ole: “Pensaram nas estruturas em vez de nos dar esse dinheiro e a gente fazer o cinema. Cinema é o que nós fazemos.” (Vieira quoted in Levin 96)

Despite Vieira's best intentions, the films that survived that period and that became the most important were the ones directed by António Ole and by Ruy Duarte de Carvalho, where the inclination to auteur cinema prevailed. From the documentaries and newsreels produced by Promocine, as far as I could determine, no copies have survived. Promocine ended by the end of the decade, and its belongings and part of its employees went to the National Film Laboratory (LNC—Laboratório Nacional de Cinema), which had just been created, together with the

Angolan Film Institute (IAC—Instituto Angolano de Cinema). Both were state-owned enterprises, but in spite of their creation Angolan cinema had practically come to a halt (Abrantes, *Cinema 10*), and it would only start its slow recovery by the end of the civil war in 2002.¹⁵⁶

In the wake of independence, TPA produced numerous documentaries directed by Ruy Duarte de Carvalho and António Ole. António Ole, more known as a visual artist, began his career in film immediately after independence. His most famous documentaries are *O Ritmo do 'Ngola Ritmos*, from 1978, *O Carnaval da Vitória*, also from 1978, and *No Caminho das Estrelas*, from 1980.

O Ritmo do 'Ngola Ritmos is a documentary about 'Ngola Ritmos, a band from the shantytowns of Luanda, known as *musseques*. They sang many of their songs in kimbundu, a widely spoken bantu language. They were also responsible for raising awareness against the colonial government at the *musseques*, and some of its members ended up being jailed by the secret police due to their political activism. The film underscores the cultural repression that was put into place by the Portuguese government as a way of domination. Music was therefore a vehicle of resistance against colonialism, and a way of creating a national identity that went against the one imposed by the colonial regime.

This film opens with a voice-over declaring: “É preciso contar a história de novo. É preciso contar a história do princípio. E no princípio existia o ritmo, mas o ritmo era clandestino.” Therefore, the band 'Ngola Ritmos put into practice the use of culture as a strategy of resistance against colonial oppression, as Amílcar Cabral had described. In fact, one of the members of the band recounts that they met Cabral in the 1950s. 'Ngola Ritmos was central to

the development of a national consciousness that built grassroots support to the liberation struggle. Ole's film intended not only to render homage to such an important group at the base of resistance against colonialism, but also to register in the official discourse of the independent country the importance of cultural manifestations in political action. As Marissa Moorman noted, the director "wants to use local cultural and historical resources, and thereby create an African system of signs, to confront the challenges of independence and development. This is a conscious effort to deepen the turn away from having Portugal serve as the measure of culture, as was the case in the official discourse (if not always in practice) of the colonial authorities" (Moorman 114). Ole's films on cultural manifestations were thus a political project of national affirmation.

O Carnaval da Vitória, also from 1978, documents the first celebration of Carnival after independence. Just like in *O Ritmo do 'Ngola Ritmos*, this cultural celebration is seen as an instrument of resistance against the cultural repression undertaken by Portuguese colonialism, as the voice-over points out: "Durante anos e anos as nossas tradições estiveram adormecidas [...]. Assim foi também com o nosso Carnaval. O colonizador bem tentou domesticá-lo e viu-o transformado em arma de luta, em afirmação de uma cultura." The documentary relies on the traditional technique of voice-over¹⁵⁷ to explain the History and the cultural importance of Carnival, but it also includes several testimonies of Angolans preparing for the celebration, where they recount to the camera how Carnival was celebrated in the past, and how they are preparing for it in the context of independence. The festive tone is emphasized by the lush use of color and movement. We can identify Ole's authorial imprint, and his preference for bright, primary colors, which we can also find in many of his paintings and installations. During the

celebrations, several people proclaim their allegiance to MPLA, and the film is clearly aligned with the party in power. In the opening scene, we see images of a beach in Luanda with the voice-over reciting the poem “Havemos de Voltar,” written by their President, Agostinho Neto. This is probably one of the most famous poems of the President, and it calls for a return to a lost motherland that can be reclaimed because of independence. Such return is possible through the recovery of cultural practices that never truly disappeared, but that were strongly repressed by the Portuguese colonial regime.

No Caminho das Estrelas, the last of Ole’s films that I will be analyzing here, is from 1980. A group of artists, writers and poets pay homage to Agostinho Neto, and the title of the film is taken from one of his poems. The film alternates between poetic moments, where we listen to poetry recited in voice-over over landscapes of the country, and biographical segments where we learn about the President’s life, especially about his role in the liberation struggle, conflating his life with that of the newborn country. The film ends with images of the celebration of independence on November 11, 1975, uniting politics and art and underscoring the importance of culture—in this particular case, literature—to the struggle for national liberation. The figure of Agostinho Neto in this film encapsulates both dimensions, as he was the leader of the MPLA and the first President of Angola, and one of the most important writers of his generation. This intersection of politics and culture extends to the MPLA: the origins of the party can be traced back to the literary magazine *Mensagem*, first published in 1948, where the first texts that called for an Angolan identity were published in the form of poems. The founder of *Mensagem* was Viriato da Cruz, and their group was also known as the 1950s’ generation. Among the collaborators were Agostinho Neto and Mário de Andrade, who would become leading members

of the MPLA (Davidson, 149-151). This film contributes to an important principle in the development of national consciousness, as argued both by Fanon and Cabral, as Teshome Gabriel noted: “the establishment of a national cultural force that is able to undergird the development of national consciousness, towards liberation” (Gabriel, 13).

The alignment of Ole’s films with the ruling party is quite clear. Nonetheless, his authorial voice also has a strong imprint: a lush use of color, and a poetic tone that is achieved through the voice-over reading poems or narrating in a poetic tone. In a recent documentary on his work directed by Rui Simões, António Ole remarks how, at the time of independence, film, rather than painting, seemed a more efficient medium to communicate with the masses, and how he came to see art as a totality. His films do transmit that concept: they conflate music, theater, popular artistic expressions, and literature. There is an attentive care with the esthetics of the visual image, and a strong emphasis in primary colors, especially reds and blues, which foreground the celebratory tone of the films, especially in *O Carnaval da Vitória*, as Angolans commemorate independence and honor those who struggled for it during colonial times. All films are set in Luanda, and they seem to amalgamate the entire country with the capital city, transmitting an idea of national homogeneity that was not necessarily true. Ole’s films look to continuing an idea of nationhood that was created by the MPLA during the liberation struggle years, and that is very similar to what Benedict Anderson described in *Imagined Communities* as the twin conceptions of revolution and nationalism, and how planning the revolution went hand in hand with imagining the nation (156-158).

Ruy Duarte de Carvalho¹⁵⁸ is better known for his literary work, which challenges genre definitions, conflating fiction, essay, and anthropology. Such challenges are also present in his

films, where he took a different approach to the concept of nationhood. He wanted to explore the cultural and ethnic diversity of Angola, and his films portray not only the urban populations, but also the rural ethnic groups that were also part of the newborn country. In the period from 1975 to 1980 he filmed seventeen documentaries and one fiction film, and they can be divided in two main groups: the films that celebrate independence, and the films that focus on the Mumuíla ethnic group and their culture and traditions.

The films that celebrate independence have many affinities with Ole's documentaries. They can also be considered Third Cinema, and they are ideologically aligned with the MPLA. However, the films are stylistically and visually distinct from Ole's: Ruy Duarte preferred to film in black and white, and his films rely mostly on interviews to Angolans. They also lack the poetic tone given by the voice-over that was recurrent in Ole's films. Ruy Duarte prefers to rely on exposing the opinions and feelings of Angolans toward the independence process, or have them recount in their own words their experiences of colonialism. Nonetheless, the celebratory tone is one of the most visible features in the films of both directors.

Geração 50, from 1975, focuses on the poets of *Mensagem*, and it is very similar to Ole's *No Caminho das Estrelas*. In fact, as Maria do Carmo Piçarra pointed out, it inaugurates a type of documentary that Ole would soon develop: "*Geração 50* [...] é precursor, em termos de documentários culturais, de uma linha cinematográfica que António Ole (n. 1951) desenvolverá com talento" (109). Ole also reads some of the poems in *Geração 50*, which illustrates the close collaboration between both filmmakers. The film is an homage to the poets of the 1950s' generation, and it is a montage of verses of the three most important writers of that period—Agostinho Neto, Viriato da Cruz, and António Jacinto—as the voice-over states in the opening of

the film. Most of the images that illustrate the verses are shot in the *musseques*, and many of the poems focus on the lives of those who lived in the shantytowns of Luanda. In this way, Ruy Duarte brings into focus the working class and their daily struggles. We see images of people washing their clothes, bathing, walking, taking a bus, while the voice-over reads a collage of poems by Agostinho Neto (“Sábado no Musseque” and “Criar”) or António Jacinto (“Poema da Alienação”), among others. In this manner, the protagonists of History are not only the leading figures of *Mensagem*, but also the anonymous proletarians of Angola. In the closing credits, Ruy Duarte attributes part of the filmmaking process to the people that he filmed: “Este filme foi realizado em setembro de 1975 e nele colaboraram, além do *povo de luanda*, Mário Alcântara Monteiro e Arnaldo Santos [sic]” (my emphasis). He will use this strategy in many of his films: if the revolution is a shared process with the people, so it is his filmic practice. Since the majority of the population did not have direct access to making their own films, having them as active participants was the closest way to democratize film. However, we cannot know for sure how involved the people of Luanda were in the making of the documentary, and this statement might be just a way to express a desire to democratize cinema.

In the documentary *Uma Festa para Viver*, from 1975, the main subject is the festive ambiance. The documentary was shot in Luanda and it depicts the two weeks preceding the celebration of independence. This was the first film of Ruy Duarte, and one of the most militant of his documentaries. It opens with a flag of the MPLA, surrounded by the following sentences: “uma festa para viver,” “um só povo,” “uma só nação,” “uma só Angola,” “11 de novembro,” once again emphasizing a unified national identity. The director interviews different citizens in different days, and documents how they are preparing for the celebration of Independence, and

what are their feelings towards the important date approaching. The second part of the film shows the celebrations held in Luanda when the MPLA took office. A euphoric mood accompanies most of the film, in spite of the threat of war outside Luanda. The use of the voice-over is also an important device, in particular in the beginning of the documentary, where it introduces the celebration about to happen and makes a reflection on its historical importance. It announces that independence is giving Angola the right to History—and therefore, the right to self-representation, and to create narratives about its own identity. Film was, for Ruy Duarte, an important medium for the establishing of Angolan history and culture, because it allowed various possibilities of representation. Until the moment of independence, all Angolans were subaltern subjects, and they were negatively represented in film, or even completely erased, as it happens, for instance, in the Portuguese film *Malteses, Burgueses e às Vezes*. In the films of independence, the African subject is the one occupying the city, whether he is black or white. It is important to point out that the process of independence did not exclude the participation of white Angolans in the building of the new nation. The only requirement for them to be included was that they accepted the new social order where everyone was given equal rights.

In *Uma Festa para Viver*, the urban setting is predominant, but that will change in other films of Ruy Duarte. *Como Foi Como Não Foi*, from 1977, was filmed in a small town called Quibala, in the region of Southern Kwanza. This film is part of a series entitled *Angola 76, É a Vez da Voz do Povo*. The other two films of the series, *Sacode o Pó da Batalha* and *Está Tudo Sentado no Chão*, were lost. In *Como Foi Como Não Foi*, Ruy Duarte interviews the elders, who describe their lives under colonial rule and the hardships they had to endure. Even though in the forties and in the fifties slavery was officially illegal in the Portuguese Colonial Empire, these

men disclose forms of exploitation not far from slavery. Some of the younger inhabitants act out what is being described. In this manner, the director involves the entire population in the filming process, even those who did not experience the episodes being told because they were too young. On the other hand, by representing what the elders narrate, the younger generations build a historical memory of the past of the town, and Ruy Duarte's camera fulfills the double duty of giving voice and of educating, and at last it registers the testimony of events that could otherwise be forgotten. It is also important that his camera writes history not so much through big, national narratives (even if some of this is present in *Uma Festa para Viver*), but through the individual testimony of the Angolan citizens—those who until then did not have a voice. Towards the end of the documentary, the voice-over states that this film was directed by the people of Quibala, attesting the agency of those who offer their testimonies. The plurality of individual stories allows the building of a heterogenous notion of national identity, and it portrays Angola as a plural society where different times, languages and cultures coexist.

The other group of films mentioned earlier are the ones that focus on the Mumuila ethnic group. If the militant character of the films of the previous group was patent, in here it is not the main point. However, the films advance another way of imagining the nation that includes ethnic groups that are usually left invisible in the big national narratives of Angola. Therefore, these films are markedly political because they insist on an idea of nationhood that is inclusive of Angolan populations seldom represented. Except for the documentaries *O Deserto e os Mucubais* and *Está Tudo Sentado no Chão*, the films of this second group are lined-up in a series entitled *Presente Angolano, Tempo Mumuila*, from 1979. This series, on which I will focus here, is composed by ten documentaries, with a total duration of about six hours. It depicts various

situations of the Mumuila's daily life. Angola, at the time of independence, still had native communities which hadn't yet adopted the ways imposed by the Portuguese colonial rule. On the other hand, urban areas presented a very different reality, where a more europeanized culture was present. The title of the series, *Presente Angolano, Tempo Mumuila*, points to the coexistence of different times and world views in the national sphere, and it indirectly signals the fact that Angola had just become an independent country. I will only focus here in two films of this series, *O Kimbando Kambia* and *Pedra Sozinha Não Sustém Panela*, because they bring forward contrasting world views, which are put in the context of Angolan nationhood. But first, I want to take a look at what Ruy Duarte wrote about his own cinema, especially in a small book entitled *O Camarada e a Câmara: Cinema e Antropologia para Além do Filme Etnográfico*, published in 1984.¹⁵⁹ In this text, he explores the history of ethnographic film in Africa, the theoretical discussions surrounding it, and the possibilities for an African ethnographic cinema at that time. This book is central to understanding his cinematic practices, and the series *Presente Angolano, Tempo Mumuila* in particular. It is also important to understand his vision of both the role of film in Anthropology and the role of Anthropology in African Cinema, and the importance of this medium in the building of national identities in a post-colonial time.

Ruy Duarte begins by pointing out the importance of the *The Algiers Charter on African Cinema* of 1975 (which was adopted at the Second Congress of the Fédération Panafricaine des Cinéastes, FEPACI, in Algiers), and how the program that it brings forth is much in line with Anthropology (Carvalho 16). This charter delineates three main questions that the African film should deal with: "Who are we?," "How do we live?" and "Where are we?"—these questions, as Ruy Duarte points out, coincide with the interrogations that an Anthropologist must make in his

scientific work. Angola, as the big majority of African countries, is constituted by a multiplicity of old nations that were amalgamated by colonial rule, and that in the present share the idea of a national unity. It is central to the author, not only in his theoretical texts but also in his cinematic practice (and even in his literary works, one could argue), to show how Angola is a heterogenous country, and how all the present identities have to be part of an idea of nation.

In order to understand these social realities and its co-existence, Anthropology becomes an essential tool:

Numa situação como a de Angola tornada independente, quem é o actor principal? Seja qual for o regime que assume o poder num país que consegue afastar a dominação estrangeira, o discurso e a prática institucionais adoptam o conceito de “povo” como referência obrigatória de intenções ou de suporte. [...] Conhecer e tratar esta realidade obrigará então a que se tome consciência das relações sociais que a tecem, dos papéis e da movimentação que nela assumem os próprios actores sociais. [...] A 300 km do seu local de nascimento ou de aprendizagem da prática social, qualquer angolano se vê confrontado com dados culturais que lhe não são imediatamente apreensíveis. (Carvalho 15)

However, Ruy Duarte notes the complicated relationship between Africans and Anthropology, and how African filmmakers are highly suspicious of ethnographic cinema, mentioning the works of Jean Rouch as an example, because these tend to exoticize them, to say the least. Ruy Duarte also insists that, instead of categorically dismissing ethnographic cinema as whole, one must be aware of its different practices and possibilities. When this type of images is produced by Europeans, these can be highly problematic, but if they are made by Africans, who

are inside the culture being studied, they can be very productive, and the approaches very different. He also points out how, at that time (in the early 80s), anthropology was changing, and how even in Europe academics were starting to take their own cultures as their subject of study.

He then concludes that it was not possible in young countries like Angola to exist an ethnographic cinema, not because it was incompatible with the building of a new nation, but mainly due to the scarcity of resources, both human and technological. Therefore, an African director needs the tools offered by anthropological practices, but he cannot circumscribe his work to these, in order to reach as much public as possible—Angolan public preferably. In this sense, Ruy Duarte's cinematic vision is much in line with that of the Senegalese Ousmane Sembène: he envisions his films as a way of representing those until then misrepresented or unrepresented, having at the same time a pedagogical purpose among the diverse Angolan populations.

I will now focus on the two documentaries of the series where African traditions and western practices confront each other: *O Kimbanda Kambia* and *Pedra Sozinha Não Sustém Panela*. These two films explore concepts of nationhood more clearly, specifically: how should Angolans deal with the coexistence of such diverse, often competing, world views? This pressing question is dealt with in both documentaries, as we will see.

In *O Kimbanda Kambia*, Ruy Duarte interviews the healer of the village, and brings with him a psychiatrist, Dr. Neto. He juxtaposes the two forms of healing and points to the fact that Western medicine focuses on the individual, while in African healing it is the community that is the main focus of the healing process. Dr. Neto points out that the African concept of disease is essentially psychosomatic, and that it manifests itself through an anxiety crisis that can lead to

psychosomatic death. The role of the kimbanda is to reconcile the individual with the community, and therefore the healing process benefits both the individual and society. They also discuss the possibilities of integrating the Western and African approaches to healing, and how that could be possible to a certain extent, in spite of the fact that they come from two opposing world-views. The documentary does not create a hierarchy among these two knowledges, even though it confronts them. It does not exoticize the rituals of the kimbanda. It also manages to avoid a nostalgic longing for lost origins, which tends to be a highly problematic approach to African traditions. Furthermore, the testimony of the psychiatrist, which encourages the possibility of integrating both healing processes, cancels any chance of romanticizing imagined lost origins.

In *Pedra Sozinha Não Sustém Panela* the main subject of the film is the confrontation between two world views: that of the elders from the town of Jau and that of the students of the College of Letters of Lubango, the capital city of the province of Huíla. The film opens with one of the elders recounting to the camera how the world was created, according to the Mumuíla tradition. The elder then concludes that the younger generations do not care for those stories anymore, and that they no longer accept such knowledge. The next segment introduces the students, who comment on what the elder said. One of them condemns mysticism, blaming it for the economic divisions that affected the country, and insisting that Africans should understand things in a more material, scientific way, in a clear reference to historical materialism. Another one says that he was born and raised in a Mumuíla village, and that their traditional knowledge was very rich, and worthy of study. He suggests that science and tradition should be reconciled and coexist, as both have their own wisdom.

The students also discuss the problem of acculturation: one student argues that acculturation is rather a synthesis of African and European values, and therefore it is impossible to dissociate them. The second student views miscegenation as defining Angolan culture, emphasizing that such miscegenation did not happen only between the Portuguese and the Angolans, but also among the diverse African cultures coexisting in Angola. One of the students then concludes: “Tu queres dizer que não há culturas puras, é isso que tu queres dizer?” This question is followed by a match cut to the elders in the village, who now offer their comments on the segment with the students.

The elders note that both world views are very similar, and that the knowledge that the students take from the books, they take from their tradition. The elders emphasize that they don't rely exclusively on Divine Providence, and that the Mumuila believe in progress and in man's ability to advance. The film concludes with a plow cultivating the fields, and a hoe working the soil. The camera then travels from the ground, to a tree, to then reveal two cranes and houses under construction. In this last shot, the director makes the visual synthesis of science and tradition that had been suggested by the elders and the students.

Pedra Sozinha Não Sustém Panela presents an important discussion on national identity: how to reconcile the diverse cultural reality of Angola. The title itself points to the need of cooperation, as one rock alone does not have the strength to hold the pan on the fire. It is important to point out that the elders speak in Nyaneka-Humbe, whereas the students speak in Portuguese and in French, and these languages seem to coexist peacefully, with the voice-over discretely translating into Portuguese the other languages. Another interesting point of the film is that the interaction between the elders of Jau and the students is always mediated by the camera,

and they never meet in person—instead, they comment on the segments of the film to which they are presented. Cinema therefore fulfills its mission of uniting the national populations, serving as the emissary between each group, and bringing them together, even when they live in different geographic spaces. It is also film that creates the possibility for a mediated dialogue that can somehow find a synthesis of the coexisting world views, without imposing hierarchies or making value judgments throughout the process. The camera of Ruy Duarte creates the image of a nation that is united in its diversity, capable of grappling with different views and come to compromises through dialogue.

The documentary was the filmic genre preferred by Ruy Duarte, and it was tied to his desire to give voice to those silenced by colonialism. This format allowed those occupying a subaltern position to speak in first person, and to give their testimony and claim their right to History. The director barely intervenes in the images we see, and when there is voice-over, it is to add information that the spectator might not be familiar with, instead of trying to guide the audience through an authoritative voice. However, the figure of the director is not transparent in these films. In her essay “Can the subaltern speak?” Spivak accuses Foucault and Deleuze of making the figure of the intellectual invisible, which, instead of giving voice to the subaltern, ends up reinforcing many of the structures that they meant to criticize (Spivak, 23). Ruy Duarte avoids this trap, never erasing his interference in the making of the documentaries. In fact, he wrote extensively on the subject, and he constantly problematized the role not only of the filmmaker, but of the anthropologist, the writer, and the intellectual in general. Ruy Duarte was highly aware of the problems that might arise when one tries to represent those systematically silenced, and of the fact that he and his camera were the mediators between his subjects and the

audience. The series *Presente Angolano, Tempo Mumuila* was accompanied by a text where the director discusses this dilemma:

Nem a busca de sobrevivências culturais nem a sua subestimação. Nem a exaltação das propostas políticas nem a sua escamoteação. Uma linha de equilíbrio/ desequilíbrio entre dois dinamismos: o de um tempo mumuila e o de um presente angolano. [...] Interrogar? Nem isso. Expor apenas, talvez, e garantir ao filme uma autonomia que lhe permita simultaneamente revelar-se válido como cinema, útil como referência [...] e fiel como testemunho. Talvez assim se consiga estabelecer uma delicada zona de compromisso entre quem fornece os meios, quem os maneja e quem depõe/ se expõe perante os mesmos. (Carvalho, 14)

The role of the intellectual, and of the filmmaker in particular, is to find that *delicate zone of compromise* that guarantees, on the one hand, the co-existence of different world views, and on the other, that respects those represented by the camera, avoiding the risk of manipulating what they say. Ruy Duarte filmed what Angolans had to say, and allowed them to express their views: all his documentaries rely mostly on testimonies given directly to the camera. When he presents a group performing a ritual, like in *O Kimbanda Kambia*, it is always one of the performers that explains the ceremony, its meaning and procedures. In his films, Ruy Duarte understands that it is crucial for the intellectual to be highly aware of his role, his ideologies, and the fact that these voices are always mediated by him, and are therefore vulnerable to his possible agenda. In addition, the testimonial character of his films can be inscribed in the African oral traditions.

The films of Ruy Duarte and António Ole contributed to the shaping of an idea of nationhood that was born in the late forties with the *Mensagem* movement, and then developed during the liberation struggle. There was an effort to decolonize the minds by recovering cultural practices that had been oppressed by colonialism, but never in a nostalgic keenness for lost origins. The past was only valid if it could be integrated in the revolutionary present. The films created a new cinematic language that was capable of fulfilling these needs: the slow pacing and the careful plot development are main characteristics, even though each director leaves their clear authorial mark in their works. The films were quite successful, shown in national television, and also received attention in international film festivals. Unfortunately, with the intensification of civil war and the change of policies of the government, Angolan cinema would come to a halt in 1985, and would only start slowly recovering in 2001. Nonetheless, the films of Ruy Duarte de Carvalho and António Ole were important hallmarks in national cinema, and are still regarded as examples by those making films in present day Angola.

Conclusion

Brazilian Cinema Novo was groundbreaking in establishing a new esthetic that cut away with Hollywood and opened the way to a new form of making films that could portray the realities of Latin America and its condition of dependency and underdevelopment. The films of this movement are politically engaged because they have the urgency to engage with the problems of Brazil. However, the subjective vision of the authorial figure is always at the forefront, and the filmmakers rarely sacrifice their esthetics to their politics. Therefore, the films never fall into a pamphleteering schematism, except maybe for some of the shorts of *Cinco Vezes Favela*, which was the debut of some of the filmmakers who were still in search of their esthetic and political voice. The films of the first phase of Cinema Novo tend to focus on themes that had been absent from the big screen until then: the marginal, the outcast, the disenfranchised, the rural populations, etc. The *sertão* becomes an iconic backdrop for some of the most important films of this period, such as *Vidas Secas*, *Os Fuzis* and *Deus e o Diabo na Terra do Sol*. The hunger caused by the drought becomes emblematic of the very process of filmmaking. The film *Vidas Secas* inaugurates a new esthetic that uses the scarcity of resources as a cinematic device to express what Glauber Rocha coined “the esthetic of hunger.”

The visual harshness of Luiz Carlos Barreto’s cinematography is a statement against the studio films of Hollywood, and also against the Brazilian *chanchadas*, that emulated the North-American studio model. By creating a new esthetic, the directors of Cinema Novo are also proposing a new way of seeing the country, of thinking about Brazil and its problems, with a decolonized gaze that is more adequate to the national realities. The films of this period also

meditate questions of national identity, both esthetically and politically. They denounce the problems of Brazil, its dependency towards the US and Europe, its neocolonial situation, and the inequalities between rich and poor. However, Ana López has pointed out that the Latin American early texts and films defending a political cinema that denounce oppression, colonialism, and neocolonialism “signaled a naive belief in the camera’s ability to record ‘truths’” (Martin 20). The first phase of Brazilian Cinema Novo, that went from 1960 to 1964 (the year of the military coup), is a great example of this naiveté; the films of the second phase of this movement deal precisely with the realization of this naiveté, and the filmmakers have a bitter confrontation with the fact that denouncing the realities was not enough to change them.

The military coup of 1964 brought the country and the Cinema Novo directors to a stalemate. They realized that their political aspirations were naive and that their dream of creating a better country had suddenly come to an end. The films of the second phase of the movement are frequently analyses of the failures of the Left. The structure of the films becomes fragmentary, ambiguous and desperate. The complexity of the films mirrors the complexity of the political situation and the sentiment of being in a dead end. The military coup was the main cause for the stalemate, but the directors realize that the intellectual Left also had failed and had its share of responsibility. The films delve obsessively into those issues, trying to find a way out of the impasse, but usually the feeling of hopelessness overcomes everything else. Even though the films of this phase share the same thematic, the esthetic diverges from film to film, as each director looks for a different way to express a situation that even they find difficult to come to terms with.

In 1968 the hardline military dictatorship takes over, censorship increases, and filmmakers can no longer directly approach the political situation. They resort to allegory, and in some films cannibalism becomes an important metaphor for Brazil, but each film uses cannibalism in a personal way, sometimes with different meanings. The filmmakers also realize that one of the failures of the films of the early 1960s was that they spoke about the people, but they rarely managed to speak directly to the people. The directors will now try to make films that are more appealing to the general public, and conquer larger audiences. *Macunaíma* was the most successful film of the time and it proved that it was possible to make popular cinema without giving up on quality or ceding to basic plots and escapist themes.

The dictatorship had also been a reality in Portugal since the early 1930s. With the outbreak of the war in the colonies in the 1960s, and with the increasing pressure of the international community for Portugal to decolonize its territories, the Portuguese government felt the need to invest in propaganda to defend its presence in Africa. Salazar insisted that Portuguese colonialism was different from other colonialism because the Portuguese wanted to integrate the Africans in the Portuguese society and also because the Portuguese has a particular ability to adapt to the tropics and to other cultures. The lusotropicalism theories of the Brazilian Gilberto Freyre became central to the defense of the Portuguese presence in Africa. In fact, Brazil was presented as the example of the success of Portuguese colonialism: the Portuguese had managed to civilize the Latin American nation to the point that it became independent. The African nations occupied by the Portuguese would follow a similar process, until they were ready to become independent. Portuguese colonial cinema relies mostly on documentaries, but there were some fiction films that repeated the same ideas. However, some directors were critical of the way the

Estado Novo regime treated the local populations, and tried to pass that message in their films. Most of them were censored or completely forbidden. However, these films never defended the independence of the African territories, and only criticized the way the policies were put at work.

On April 25, 1974, the mid and lower ranks of the military, weary of the fascist regime and against the colonial war, led the revolution that returned democracy to the country. The revolution was a moment of euphoria to the nation freed from forty years of dictatorship. The Portuguese filmmakers saw the revolution as the opportunity to create a new cinema, a decolonized cinema that opposed to the Hollywood film industry, which suffocated national cinema. Their plight was in many ways similar to that of the directors of Brazilian Cinema Novo. In fact, Glauber Rocha came to Portugal right away, to film the revolution, and participated in the collective film *As Armas e o Povo*. The motto was “filmar e mais filmar,” create a visual archive of the revolution, and use the films to discuss the new nation, the political choices ahead, and the challenges that the new process obviously brought. This need to film everything privileged the documentary, but most filmmakers did not give up on their authorial print in the films. The concept of *cinéma d’auteur*, created in Europe, was too important for the filmmakers of the April cinema.

The April revolution also led to the independence of the African territories. When independence came, Mozambique and Angola had already understood the political importance of cinema. During the liberation war against the Portuguese, the liberation armies felt the need to counter Portuguese propaganda and show to the world that they were not terrorists, that they had the support of the local population and that their work went beyond guerrilla warfare, as they brought schools, healthcare, and other services to the liberated areas. The liberation armies did

not have any film equipment nor personal trained to film, so they invited foreign filmmakers to document their struggle. Even though these films were made by foreigners, they depicted the point of view of the Angolans, Mozambicans and Bissau-Guineans living in the liberated areas.

When independence came, both MPLA and FRELIMO had realized the extraordinary power of cinema in mobilizing the masses. Samora Machel, the President of Mozambique, was particularly enthusiastic about film and he immediately created the Mozambican National Film Institute, which was the second most important cultural project of his government. If the liberation cinema can be considered Third Cinema, the films of the Mozambican INC are more ambiguous. They were state-sponsored and adopted the point of view of the government. However, the directors claim that they had complete freedom to film what they wanted, even though the Institute had guidelines that should be followed in the making of each film. The filmmakers declared that they believed in the political project, and that not siding with the government meant being accomplice to the pressures of the apartheid regimes of South Africa and Rhodesia. The documentary was the privileged genre. With the outbreak of the civil war in 1977, the situation in Mozambique was complicated, and this affected national cinema. In 1984, with the entry of the World Bank to help the country financially, the INC began to slow down, and the death of Samora Machel in 1986 just made the situation of the INC more dire.

In the case of Angola, when the government of the MPLA took over power, the country was already at civil war. The government made some investment in national cinema, and the Angolan Popular Television was the main film producer of the period. However, Angola never managed to match Mozambique in the creation of a film institute that could support national cinema. However, two filmmakers, António Ole and Ruy Duarte de Carvalho, stood out and

made a series of documentaries in the years after independence. Therefore, the cinema in Angola was closer to a *cinéma d'auteur* than to the institutional cinema of Mozambique.

During the two decades that I cover in my dissertation, a lot of exchanges between filmmakers occurred that influenced the modes of making cinema, political cinema in particular. However, even when those influences were not so visible, a global trend influenced every context. The technological advances were definitely an important factor: the invention of lightweight cameras and the possibility of recording direct sound made it possible to direct films “com uma câmara na mão e uma ideia na cabeça,” as Glauber Rocha famously declared. These new cameras allowed film to leave the studios, gave more freedom to the filmmakers and democratized, to a certain extent, the possibility of filmmaking. On the other hand, the 1960s and the 1970s saw the rise and fall of several dictatorial regimes, and this was particularly important in the lusophone context. This was the period of the Cold War, which had a tremendous impact on a global scale. The antagonism between Left and Right was exacerbated by the political conjuncture, and filmmakers felt the need to reflect upon the situation and to use their films to express their convictions—and their doubts—regarding the political convulsions of the period. In some contexts directors believed that film could intervene in the political events and start a revolution. However, many of them soon realized that art was not enough to give rise to a revolution. The best examples of this realization are the films of the second phase of Cinema Novo, that I analyzed here. Some Brazilian filmmakers, like Glauber Rocha and Nelson Pereira dos Santos, understood that cinema could instead analyze and expose the complex state of affairs, and therefore open new avenues to think about politics and the possibility of revolution.

Notes

¹ For more information on the wider context of Third World cinema please refer to Teshome Gabriel's *Third Cinema in the Third World: The Aesthetics of Liberation*.

² I am not including the films that Glauber Rocha groups in the chapter of the Bahian cycle because they share a set of characteristics that set them apart. They have many aspects in common with the films of the first phase of Cinema Novo, but they also tend to be more conservative both esthetically and thematically.

³ For a more detailed description of this period please refer to Johnson and Stam 19-30.

⁴ According to Cacá Diegues, “Um dos maiores equívocos, entre tantos outros criados a propósito do Cinema Novo, é o de pensar que não tínhamos nenhum interesse pela técnica cinematográfica, que não nos incomodávamos com ela. Muito pelo contrário, foi o Cinema Novo que introduziu a moderna tecnologia audiovisual no Brasil, a partir dos inícios dos anos 1960. Assim como sem os modernos microfones mais sensíveis não haveria bossa nova, sem o negativo de maior sensibilidade e as leves câmeras europeias não haveria Cinema Novo” (97).

⁵ It is important to notice that it was the model followed by the studios that was being criticized, not its existence. Nelson Pereira dos Santos underscored the importance of the existence of these studios: “Vera Cruz was an achievement of Brazil, it was our first film industry, a collective achievement. So everyone fought for what they thought Vera Cruz should be, not over its existence as such” (quoted in Johnson 7).

⁶ The southern part of Rio de Janeiro is where the middle and upper classes live, close to the ocean. The northern part of the city is inhabited by the poorer social classes, and usually frowned upon by those living in the south of Rio.

⁷ The scene with Norma Bengell being photographed/ filmed at the beach lasts about four and a half minutes, and Guerra's camera ends up doing the same visual exploitation that Jandir and Vavá did. The spectator watches a long scene of the woman trying desperately to hide her body with her hands. It is a violent scene, intended to be so by the director to prove a point—the exploitation of the female body for profit—but at the same time giving the traditional male spectator the opportunity to enjoy violence against a naked woman. Therefore, the film ends up perpetuating the same type of violence that it wanted to criticize.

⁸ Randal Johnson points to the importance of the usage of documentary images in this film in his book *Cinema Novo X 5*. For more information check pp. 95-96.

⁹ Ruy Guerra studied in Paris at IDHEC, and the French *nouvelle vague* was a major influence in his first feature, in particular Godard's *Breathless*. The commodification of modern life within capitalism was also a theme present in the works of the French directors of the *nouvelle vague*.

¹⁰ Mozambique, the home country of Ruy Guerra, was also colonized by the Portuguese at the time, and Ruy Guerra, before going to Paris, had been in jail, arrested by PIDE, the Portuguese fascist police, for opposing the regime.

¹¹ *Couro de Gato* won several prizes before being incorporated to *Cinco Vezes Favela*, namely at the Obberhausen Festival in Germany and at the Sestri-Levante Festival in Italy.

¹² Cf. *The Wretched of the Earth*.

¹³ The film began to be directed by Luis Paulino dos Santos, who also wrote it. In the middle of the filming, he abandoned the project, and Glauber Rocha, who was also the producer, took over the direction. Even though Rocha stated in different occasions that he did not consider it his own film, it was signed by him, and his authorial mark is strongly present in the final work. For further reading, please refer to Johnson, 121-122.

¹⁴ About his own film, Rocha states the following in “Origens do Cinema Novo”: “Não cabe aqui analisar *Barravento*, de minha autoria; quem melhor o situou foi Jean-Claude Bernardet em comentário na *Revista Brasiliense*, quando conclui: ‘*Barravento*, como filme experimental, tem uma importância fundamental na filmografia brasileira, e o que importa não é que seja cinematograficamente, mas socialmente experimental’” (*Revisão* 139).

¹⁵ Even when the plot was set in communities where the majority of the population is historically black, films tended to cast more white actors. This trend has prevailed to nowadays, and it is still a pervasive problem both in Brazilian film and television.

¹⁶ The subject is developed in *The Wretched of the Earth*, in particular in the chapter “On National Culture” (Fanon 145-180).

¹⁷ *O Pagador de Promessas* belongs to the Bahian cycle (1959-1963), which Glauber Rocha separated from the origins of Cinema Novo in *Revisão Crítica*.

¹⁸ *Quilombo* was the name given to the communities of slaves who had escaped slavery in Brazil, from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century.

¹⁹ The manifesto was first presented in Italy in 1965, and a few months later on published in Brazil and translated into French.

²⁰ The same is true about other forms of dominance, namely colonialism. It is important to have in mind that Ruy Guerra is Mozambican, and in 1964 the African country was still a Portuguese colony that was beginning its armed struggle against its colonizer.

²¹ *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil* was published in 1963, a year before *The Guns* was released, where she pointed out that the Holocaust was possible because of a bureaucratic system where many of the perpetrators of genocide were just following orders from their superiors.

²² “Violence can this be understood to be the perfect mediation. The colonized man liberates himself in and through violence. This praxis enlightens the militant because it shows him the means and the end” (Fanon 44). “But it so happens that for the colonized this violence is invested with positive, formative features because it constitutes their only work. This violent praxis is totalizing since each individual represents a violent link in the great chain, in the almighty body of violence rearing up in reaction to the primary violence of the colonizer. [...] The armed struggle mobilizes the people, i.e., it pitches them in a single direction, from which there is no turning back” (Fanon 50).

²³ For more information please refer to Moniz Bandeira. *O Governo João Goulart: as Lutas Sociais no Brasil, 1961-1964*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1977. Print.

²⁴ In the novel Macunaíma represents the “three races,” black, white, and indian. He also turns white in this scene because that is what happens in the novel.

²⁵ *Feijoada* is a typical Brazilian dish made with rice, black beans, and dried meat. It is common that groups of family and friends get together on a weekend to have a *feijoada*.

²⁶ These interviews, along with later interviews from 1938, are published in *Entrevistas de António Ferro a Salazar*, edited by Fernando Rosas.

²⁷ According to Fernando Rosas, who organized the 2003 edition of *Entrevistas de António Ferro a Salazar*, the figure of Salazar that is patent in these interviews is a creation of António Ferro. They are not a transcription of the conversation with Salazar, but rather a staging of such conversation, undertaken by Ferro: “Ferro desempenhou-se desta magna e, para el, decisiva tarefa como se fora uma peça de teatro. Não toma apontamentos das conversas com Slazar, retém ideias e encena-as. Na realidade, como o próprio deixa entender, não estamos, em rigor, perante a transcrição de uma entrevista, mas de um discurso teatralizado, de um diálogo onde laboriosamente se trabalham as ideias e o perfil do Chefe. O jornalista não é neutro nem jornalista” (Rosas XVI).

²⁸ In 1968 it was renamed as Secretaria de Estado da Informação e Turismo (Vieira, *Cinema no Estado Novo* 12).

²⁹ For more information on the subject, refer to Piçarra, *Azuis Ultramarinos* pp. 51-55.

³⁰ In 1961, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs would also send a French translation of *O Luso e o Trópico* to the Portuguese missions abroad (cf. Cláudia Castelo, “O Luso-tropicalismo e o Colonialismo Português Tardio”)

³¹ In this context, Salazar also proclaimed an isolationist positioning, which was summarized in the motto “Proudly alone.” In a speech given on February 18, 1965, Salazar stated: “Sei que em espíritos fracos o inimigo instila um veneno subtil com afirmar que estes problemas não têm solução militar e só política e que todo o prolongamento da luta é ruinoso para a Fazenda e inútil para a Nação. [...] Combatemos sem espectáculo e sem alianças, orgulhosamente sós.” in “Orgulhosamente Sós,” Fundação Mário Soares, Available: <http://www.fmsoares.pt/aeb/dossiers/dossier15/pdfs/B-03.pdf>, 08/02/2014.

³² Piçarra borrows the term “imagined man” from João Mário Grilo’s *O Homem Imaginado. Cinema, Acção, Pensamento*, Lisboa: Livros Horizonte, 2006. Print.

³³ For further information on these newsreels, please refer to *Azuis Ultramarinos. Propaganda Colonial e Censura no Cinema do Estado Novo* (Lisboa: Edições 70, 2015), *Salazar Vai ao Cinema: o Jornal Português de Actualidades Filmadas* (Coimbra: Minerva, 2006), and *Salazar Vai ao Cinema II: a Política do Espírito no Jornal Português* (Lisboa: DrellaDesign, 2011), all of them from Maria do Carmo Piçarra. The Portuguese Cinematheque has recently released a series of DVDs containing all the newsreels from *Jornal Português*.

³⁴ This crisis was stirred up by the United Nations pressure to decolonization: on December 14, 1960 the United Nations, led by the African and Asian nations, adopted the resolution number 1514, where it established that “all peoples have an inalienable right to complete freedom, the exercise of their sovereignty, and the integrity of national territory, *Solemnly proclaims* the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.” In 1961, with the Baixa de Cassanje revolt on January 4, and the attacks to the São Paulo prison on February 4, the colonial war began in Angola, and it would soon spread to the other African territories occupied by Portugal (Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde in 1962, and Mozambique in 1964).

³⁵ “O CITA foi criado pelo Decreto-Lei n.º 42 194, de 27 de Março de 1959. Administrativamente, dependia do governo provincial e estava sob orientação e coordenação da AGU [Agência Geral do Ultramar]. As suas competências eram divulgar a província, estimular actividades no campo da cultura popular e promover a pártica do turismo. O diploma discriminava, como incumbência directa, ‘o intercâmbio cultural e artístico com a metrópole, promovendo a exibição recíproca de filmes.’” (Piçarra and António 25)

³⁶ Moçâmedes was renamed Namibe after the independence.

³⁷ It refers to the cult towards Our Lady of Fátima.

³⁸ renamed Huambo after independence.

³⁹ Maria do Carmo Piçarra explains this influence in chapter 1, part II of *Azuis Ultramarinos*.

⁴⁰ General António de Spínola had an important role during the colonial war in Guinea-Bissau, serving as Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces in 1968 and 1972. He would become critical of the colonial war, and believed that the end of the conflict was the only way out for Portugal. He defended that giving some autonomy to the colonized territories was the only solution that would allow Portugal to keep its colonies—he was strongly opposed to decolonization. During the Carnation Revolution, Marcello Caetano, who had replaced Salazar since 1968, declared that he would only concede power to Spínola, and therefore the General became President for a few months. On September 30, 1974 he resigned because he did not agree with the left turn taken by the government nor with the policies that granted complete independence to the colonized territories. He would end up exiled in Brazil, after participating in a counter-revolutionary movement that attempted a coup on 11 March, 1975.

⁴¹ The Portuguese colonial government had been preparing for the installation of a Television Network. However, regular broadcast only began in the transition to independence, in October 1975.

⁴² Tourism came mostly from South Africa and Rhodesia, the two neighboring countries that had apartheid regimes at the time and were important allies with the Portuguese colonial regime. In fact, most of the Mozambican economy depended on these two countries.

⁴³ He made an agreement with the South African newsreel *African Mirror*. Since Mozambique did not have developing laboratories, he sent the films to be developed in South Africa. In 1965 Melo Pereira created his own laboratory in Lourenço Marques. Courinha Ramos, the other film producer working in Mozambique, also had his own laboratory, but its equipment was old (Convents 293).

⁴⁴ In a personal interview, Camilo de Sousa recounted that many of these peasants, often illiterate and most likely with little access to propaganda in the metropole, ended up mixing with the African populations, and interracial marriages became quite frequent. This was a problem for the Portuguese government, that had sent these farmers to guarantee that whites held more power than blacks, and to stop the advancements of the Frelimo troops that lived across the river (Personal Interview, July 2013).

⁴⁵ In 1964 José Elyseu coordinated *Decisão de Continuar* (33 minutes), a second version of the 1962 documentary, re-edited and with added images from Mozambique.

⁴⁶ Fernando Pessa became one of the most famous and charismatic TV presenters in Portugal. He had his first appearance in 1957 and continued his work as a TV reporter throughout the eighties. He usually presented a *fait-divers*, always with a comic, sometimes ironic tone.

⁴⁷ All the comedies of this period were set in a small space, usually a neighborhood in Lisbon, like Alfama or Castelo, where everybody knew each other and where they all got along as a family. If we think of the image conveyed by Salazar as the father of the nation, this idea of family (one of the main values of the Estado Novo ideology, along with the Church) makes even more sense.

⁴⁸ The Portuguese Cinematheque has different copies with discrepancies, in terms of editing and duration. The archives of the Cinematheque identify the film as being from 1968, but in a session on the film held on July 9, 2015 on the Portuguese Cinematheque it was confirmed that it was finished on 1969.

⁴⁹ There is a website with more information on the past and present of the company. It can be consulted here: www.diamangdigital.net

⁵⁰ The book was written in English, which indicates that the target audience was the international community.

⁵¹ In the session at the Cinematheque mentioned in the previous note, some of the participants who lived at the Diamang confirmed that the film was not accurate, and that there was a lot of segregation, and the African workers did not have the working conditions publicized in the documentary. One of the people present at this discussion was Adriana Adringa, a Portuguese journalist that lived at Diamang during her teenage years, because her father was an employee of the company. Adringa declared that it was a deeply stratified society, not only between blacks and whites, but among whites themselves.

⁵² Soba is the name given to the traditional leaders in Angola.

⁵³ The film was allowed to be screened in Mozambique, but it was forbidden in Angola. In Portugal, it was never released, but it had a distributor, Astória Filme (Piçarra 296). In spite of its prohibition in Angola, the film was screened at Cine Teatro Ruacanã, according to the daughter of António de Sousa (Piçarra 305-306).

⁵⁴ Known in Portuguese as Palanca, an animal that only exists in Angolan territory and it became a symbol of the country. The national football team is known as “os palancas negras” and the main national airline, TAAG, has the same animal as a symbol.

⁵⁵ After independence Cuca was nationalized and Manuel Vinhas lost the company to the Angolan state. He was also the owner of Sagres in Portugal and Skol in Brazil. After the April revolution in 1974, he returned to Portugal, but was also forced to leave the country and exile in Brazil, since he was accused of being a *latifundiário*, or large estate owner. For more information, consult <http://www.dn.pt/pessoas/interior/manuel-vinhas-cervejas-e-arte-1157069.html>

⁵⁶ The censored version was the only one to have survived, and it is held by the archives of the Portuguese Cinematheque. From the parts cut by the censors, only 11 minutes of it survived, and these short bits are screened in the end of the film, in the rare occasions that it was shown to the public. The film can also be seen in this format on youtube: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sPIaaXtEYcc>

⁵⁷ Some texts say that Faria de Almeida was inspired by direct cinema, or use direct cinema and *cinéma vérité* interchangeably. I follow the definition given by Kuhn and Westwell at the *Oxford Dictionary of Film Studies*, where they distinguished one genre from the other: “Direct cinema is to be distinguished from *cinéma vérité*. Although the terms are widely used interchangeably by scholars and critics, strictly speaking they reference divergent philosophies of documentary filmmaking, and these in turn reflect distinct national styles— that might be characterized as the ‘American School’ as against the ‘French School’. While *cinéma vérité*’s aim is to induce self-revelation on the part of the film’s subjects, that of direct cinema is unobtrusively to observe and allow life to reveal itself.”

⁵⁸ This nickname, “os bifos/ as bifas” was also used in Portugal to refer to the tourists of Northern Europe, especially the British. The name means “steaks,” and it was adopted because the tourists with light skin would become red under the sun, like a steak. The color differentiation points to a racial grading, as the Portuguese were not as white as the South Africans, whose origins were from the North of Europe.

⁵⁹ In an interview, Faria de Almeida pointed to the influence of Varda’s cinema: “Eu gostei imenso dos trabalhos da Varda e, é claro, o *Cléo das 5 às 7*, é um filme que tem a ver com a guerra da Argélia. Pronto, vai ter ao colonialismo. Como os dois filmes que fiz em Inglaterra.” (Piçarra 243)

⁶⁰ Patrícia Vieira analyses these films in depth in her book *Portuguese Film, 1930-1960. The Staging of the New State Regime*.

⁶¹ In fact, Somar Filmes produced another fiction feature film, *Deixem-me ao Menos Subir às Palmeiras*, directed by Lopes Barbosa in 1972. However, I include this film in chapter 3 because I consider it part of the liberation cinema produced in Mozambique. The film was immediately forbidden by censorship, and it would only be screened publicly after the independence.

⁶² He had to have been in Lisbon in order to take the ship that would bring to Mozambique. As we have seen, Lisbon was not the space of modernity. It was the African cities colonized by the Portuguese that stood for that modernity.

⁶³ “O senhor é mesmo verdadeiro?” Portugal being a small country, it makes sense to travel in a donkey, but in such a vast territory as Mozambique the idea seems absurd. As Tiago Baptista pointed out, “O automóvel e o avião tinham, em Angola—tal como em Moçambique—uma importância que não tinham na metrópole porque só eles permitiam vencer distâncias muito maiores entre espaços populacionais muito isolados entre si” (Tiago Baptista in Piçarra and António, vol. 1 76).

⁶⁴ The so-called Discoveries are the historical moment when Portugal feels it is at the center of the world, and that it is somewhat of a big potency (even if the rest of Europe never recognizes that). *The Lusiads*, one of the foundational epic poems of the nation, sing the deeds of the Portuguese when they “conquered” the sea. As Almeida Garret noted, the Portuguese discovered the world and then became unemployed—which translates our inability to adjust to a present where we haven’t been able to overcome our semiperipheral position towards Europe. In fact, our nostalgia for the colonial past is still at work in our country. For instance, the Expo 98’s main theme was the oceans, and in the following years this theme was frequently repeated in major cultural events. *Tabu*, the 2012 film by Miguel Gomes, illustrates in a brilliant way the Portuguese nostalgia for its colonial past.

⁶⁵ There were obviously many exceptions to this rule. It is important to note that many descendants of the Portuguese joined the liberation armies to fight for independence, and some of them were even part of the governments of the MPLA and of Frelimo. However, they considered themselves Mozambicans and Angolans, not Portuguese. Some of these became prominent writers and intellectuals in their countries: Mia Couto, Ruy Duarte de Carvalho, Luandino Vieira, are examples of that.

⁶⁶ *Chaimite*, 1953, dir. by Jorge Brum do Canto, also depicts Mozambicans, since it tells the story of how Mouzinho de Albuquerque defeated Gungunhana, the last emperor of the Empire of Gaza (Mozambique). It portrays them as blood thirsty savages who were dominated by the heroic and good-hearted Portuguese. Unfortunately, I do not have the time to expand on this film in here, but it is almost an epic that sings the deeds of Mouzinho, and that draws influences from *Gone with the Wind*, by Victor Fleming (1939): the good, obedient black vs. the bad, rebellious one, and the attachment to the land and to what it produces. Their main crop is also cotton, as in Fleming’s movie.

⁶⁷ The film was released on April 11, 1974, two weeks before the Revolution. The title can be roughly translated as *Bourgeois, Idlers, Sometimes*.

⁶⁸ The recent diplomatic crisis with the Angolan government illustrates how the Portuguese are uncomfortable with Angola having enough economic power to buy important companies in Portugal. Another example that is related with this fear to be absorbed by former colonies is the Orthographic Agreement; the majority of the Portuguese opposed to it, arguing that we shouldn't have to accept most of Brazil's forms, and there are still active movements trying to stop the Agreement, which is already a passed law.

⁶⁹ I could not get the exact year, but it was produced in the early 70's.

⁷⁰ Even though the PCP was an illegal party during the Estado Novo, it was the main opposition to Salazar's regime, and had many people living underground and fighting for the end of fascism in Portugal.

⁷¹ *Deixem-me ao Menos Subir às Palmeiras*, directed by Lopes Barbosa in 1972, is highly critical of colonialism and unveils the working conditions of the black individual in Mozambique. However, the film could not be screened at the time and the director had to flee Mozambique after the PIDE screened it. This is considered the first Mozambican fiction film, and not a Portuguese colonial film, so I will discuss it in the second part of this work.

⁷² The word is more commonly spelled "senzala," but it can have both spellings.

⁷³ In *Portugal e o Futuro*, Spínola declares: "Contamo-nos entre o número daqueles que propugnam a essência do Ultramar como requisito da nossa sobrevivência como Nação livre e independente." (234); "Haveremos de continuar em África. Sim! Mas não pela força das armas, nem pela sujeição dos africanos, nem pela sustentação de mitos contra os quais o mundo se encarna. Haveremos de continuar em África. Sim! Mas pela clara visão dos problemas no quadro de uma solução portuguesa." (236); "Defendemos, por isso, uma solução do problema nacional baseada numa ampla desconcentração e descentralização de poderes em clima de crescente regionalização de estruturas político-administrativas dos nossos Estados africanos, num quadro de raiz federativa." (240)

⁷⁴ In the wake of decolonization, Portugal received about half a million Portuguese returning from the occupied territories in Africa. Many of the Portuguese living in the colonies had to flee with just their personal belongings. For instance, in Mozambique, the government said that anyone was welcomed to stay, as long as they abided by the new laws. The rest had 24 hours to leave and could only bring with them 20 kilos of luggage—the "24/20," as it became known (Adringa 11). The majority of the Portuguese feared for their lives and decided to leave. The airports in Maputo and in Luanda had people camping there for weeks, waiting for the next available flight to "return" to a country where many had never set foot. When they arrived to Portugal, they had to face not only economic hardships, but also a lot of prejudice. They were considered second class Portuguese because they were born in Africa. They were also received with hostility because they were the ones "colonizing," and much of the blame of colonialism was directed at them. Furthermore, because the colonies were more liberal socially, their lifestyles were frowned upon, especially in regards to women. In *Volta: Memória do Colonialismo e da Descolonização* Sarah Adamapoulos writes about the process and includes a series of testimonies from the "retornados," as they became known.

⁷⁵ The cooperatives were Cinequanon, Cinequipa and Centro Português de Cinema. Grupo Zero was also an important cooperative at the time.

⁷⁶ A farm that includes a house, and fields that may be cultivated or not.

⁷⁷ His father was Veit Harlan, one of the most famous filmmakers of Hitler's Third Reich. His most famous film was *Jud Süß*, an infamous anti-semitic film.

⁷⁸ *Linha Vermelha* is a documentary of 2011 that investigates the conditions in which the film *Torre Bela* was made, and the impact that Harlan's documentary has had on the memories of the occupation of the *quinta*.

⁷⁹ "A memória sobre a Torre Bela tinha sido construída através do filme, ou, por outras palavras, a Torre Bela era o que era por causa do filme do Harlan" (Daney 6).

⁸⁰ The book of forty four poems recreated many of the heroic national myths of the past, from the "discoveries" to the disappearance of King Dom Sebastião.

⁸¹ João César Monteiro uses references to Murnau's *Nosferatu* in many of his later films, as for example in *Recordações da Casa Amarela*, where, in a sequence, João de Deus, an alter-ego of the director played by himself, rises from a grave just like Count Orlok in *Nosferatu*. In his future works, João César Monteiro will identify himself with Count Orlok—for instance, in many of his films his name as an actor is Max Monteiro, a clear reference to Max Schreck, the actor who played Count Orlok in Murnau's film. João César Monteiro's physical appearance reinforces those comparisons. However, *Que Farei Com Esta Espada* is one of his earlier films where this connection is not yet present, and *Nosferatu* is used solely to criticize the presence of NATO in the Tagus river.

⁸² It was also translated as *The Ghosts of Alcácer Quibir*.

⁸³ Sérgio Godinho is one of the most influential popular musicians in Portugal.

⁸⁴ The landscape of the *planície alentejana* (the plains of Alentejo) is similar to that of the Brazilian *sertão*, as both are dry and with little vegetation. The film of José Fonseca e Costa emphasizes this resemblance, quoting the film of Glauber Rocha.

⁸⁵ in Octavio Getino, *The Cinema as Political Fact, Third Text*, 25:1, 2011. 41-53.

⁸⁶ In Angola the UPA/ FNLA (União das Populações do Norte de Angola/ Frente Nacional de Libertação de Angola), and the UNITA (União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola) also had a central role in the liberation war in that country.

⁸⁷ The legal category of *assimilated citizen* (*assimilado*) required that an African individual fitted a series of requirements, among them being able to speak Portuguese “correctly,” have acquired a series of habits deemed appropriate, and have a job that paid well enough for him to support himself and his family. The existence of this category served as proof of the Portuguese “civilizing mission,” used to justify Portuguese colonialism to the international community (Cabaço, 113-115).

⁸⁸ In Lourenço Marques, the capital of Mozambique, Império was the first movie theater built only for blacks. Located by the Estrada de Angola, on the way to the airport, its name was quite emblematic of the colonial project behind it.

⁸⁹ This copy was provided by the Cape Town cineclub (Convents, 229). Many of the films screened in Mozambique came from partnerships with South African cinemas and distributors. Even though such collaboration had its benefits, it also had its limitations: “A dependência do movimento cineclubista em relação à África do Sul do apartheid, incluindo a censura, cria dificuldades no que concerne a certas películas inglesas e americanas cujo circuito em Moçambique é assegurado por firmas distribuidoras daquele país” (Convents, 234).

⁹⁰ Camilo de Sousa is a Mozambican film director who had an important role in the INC. He directed many pieces for the *Kuxa Kanema* newsreel, and some of the most known documentaries of the post-independence period, such as *Ofensiva*, that I will explore in the second part of this chapter. He was also part of the FRELIMO liberation army in Cabo Delgado.

⁹¹ Unfortunately, I was not able to access these three short films.

⁹² In a personal interview, Camilo de Sousa remarked that everyone went religiously to the movie theaters whenever a new film was showing.

⁹³ Luandino Vieira is one of the most well known Angolan writers. He fought with the MPLA army during the liberation war, and was arrested by PIDE for his subversive activities, having spent about 11 years (1961 to 1972) in Tarrafal, the most famous Portuguese prison camp, located in Cabo Verde. Two of his short stories were also adapted to the big screen by Sarah Maldoror, and these became two of the most iconic films of the Lusophone liberation cinema, which I analyze in this chapter.

⁹⁴ In 1958, in Lobito, the local cineclub organizes the 1st Contest of Amateur Cinema of Lobito, that would have a second edition in the following year. A decade later, in 1968, they organize the first international festival, Festival Internacional de Cinema de Amadores do Lobito (it had other editions in 1970, 1972, and 1974) (Paulo Cunha in Piçarra and António, vol. 2 50).

⁹⁵ António Cardoso (1933-2006) was a white Angolan writer and one of the founders of the Luanda cineclub. He was arrested by PIDE in 1959 and 1961, and spent more than 10 years in the prison camp of Tarrafal.

⁹⁶ The French New Wave is a great example of this, with such iconic films as Godard's *Breathless*, Truffaut's *400 Blows* or Bresson's *Pickpocket*. See Shohat and Stam, 265-266.

⁹⁷ First President of Angola and leader of the MPLA.

⁹⁸ Second President of Mozambique, and a historical member of FRELIMO.

⁹⁹ In a personal interview, Camilo de Sousa highlighted this idea various times.

¹⁰⁰ In *O Povo Organizado* (Robert Van Lierop, 1976), for instance, the voice-over remarks that Mozambican art is not isolated in museums, libraries or commercial packages, while we see images of the traditional dances.

¹⁰¹ Samora Machel, like many of his fellow soldiers were FRELIMO, went to Algeria to receive military training. However, a Mozambican model soon became predominant: "Initially, they were very much influenced by the Algerian revolution, but very soon the Mozambican 'model' asserted itself. Once the armed struggle began, it was the reflections upon their own experience which were to be decisive. This is not to say that there were not powerful intellectual influences on the evolving thought of Samora Machel. Notably in his role as a political military leader, he studied profoundly the theory of people's war in the works of General Giap, genius of the Vietnam war, , and of course the classic texts of Mao Zedong" (Munslow, 13).

¹⁰² At the time, he stayed with Polly Gaster and Margaret Dickinson in Nairobi, who also had an important role in Mozambican liberation cinema (Minter 9).

¹⁰³ <http://kora.matrix.msu.edu/files/50/304/32-130-13A4-84-32-130-13A4-84-Bob%20Van%20Lierop%2010-22-11.pdf>

¹⁰⁴ Eduardo Mondlane died before *A Luta Continua* was filmed. He was allegedly murdered by the Portuguese police in February 3rd, 1969, with an explosive mail package that had a bomb hidden in a book, in FRELIMO headquarters in Dar es Salaam.

¹⁰⁵ The majority of the text of the documentary can be found in an article published by Robert Van Lierop in the journal *The Black Scholar* (Robert Van Lierop. "Mozambique: the Struggle Continues." *The Black Scholar*. 5.2 (1973): 44-52. Print.)

¹⁰⁶ This massacre will be the main theme of one of the most important movies of the Mozambican National Film Institute, directed by Ruy Guerra in 1979 and entitled *Mueda, Massacre e Memória*.

¹⁰⁷ In fact, Portugal, just like any other colonial power, had been using those divisions since the early days of their presence in the territory, rousing such animosities to their benefit, making enemies and allies among the different tribes, following the old motto of "divide and conquer."

¹⁰⁸ This was in fact one of the causes for the civil war of 1977-1992, even though other reasons were as important to the conflict, namely the interests of the white supremacist regimes of Rhodesia and South Africa, that saw in FRELIMO's socialist government a threat to their political stability.

¹⁰⁹ "Long Live FRELIMO," "Independence or Death," "The Struggle Continues."

¹¹⁰ Van Lierop intended to make three documentaries about Mozambique, but for lack of financial support, among other reasons, the third one never happened

¹¹¹ The AK47, the hoe, and the book also appear in the Mozambican flag, with a star in the background.

¹¹² António de Spínola was Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the Portuguese Guinea from 1968, and again in 1972.

¹¹³ The same was true for the other liberation parties (PAIGC) in Angola, Cape Verde, São Tomé and Príncipe and Guinea-Bissau.

¹¹⁴ The title of this documentary was in English originally, whereas Van Lierop's titles were both in Portuguese.

¹¹⁵ The documentary stated that, in Angola, one in two children died, and that in Guinea-Bissau 99% of the population was illiterate.

¹¹⁶ *Esplendor Selvagem*, a 1972 film by António de Sousa, is a great example of that exoticizing gaze. *Gentes que Nós Civilizámos* (1944), by António Lopes Ribeiro, is another good example.

¹¹⁷ "Rhodesia, reacting to the alignment of Mozambique with the international community against white settler rule, escalated its military operations from 'search and destroy' incursions into the Zimbabwean sanctuaries in Mozambique and Zambia, to open military expeditions into Mozambique in which economic targets and human settlements were attacked. Tete was perhaps most affected by this new war. Sometimes these operations assumed the cover of Mozambican resistance against the new regime. In the last year of colonial rule, Rhodesia's Central Intelligence Organization (CIO) and Mozambique's Portuguese Security Police (DGS) sought to launch black pseudo-guerrilla units, called *Flechas*. Caught by the sudden end of the war in Mozambique, the CIO sought to convert these units into pseudo-guerrilla groups which would resist the new government. Most probably, they also integrated demobilised members of the *Grupos Especiais* (mostly African 'Special Groups' created by the colonial regime to fight FRELIMO) who were being harassed by FRELIMO, and former members of the numerous small nationalist groups in Tete. This process is an important element behind the creation of RENAMO, the anti-FRELIMO movement which would become so notorious in the following decade" (Coelho 64).

¹¹⁸ That was not the case of those living in Maputo and Beira, since they used to go to the cinema before independence. This concern aimed mostly at the rural population, who had had so far little or no contact with film. Since film was an important medium for the education of these populations, the directors always had them in mind when planning their films.

¹¹⁹ Personal interview, September 2013. In her documentary *Kuxa Kanema*, Margarida Cardoso focuses on his appearances in the newsreels.

¹²⁰ Nowadays the INC is known as INAC—Instituto Nacional do Audiovisual e do Cinema.

¹²¹ The main cinemas designed specifically for black people were Império (the main one) and Espada (open-air) (Camilo de Sousa, personal interview).

¹²² Personal interview, Gabriel Mondlane, Maputo, July 31, 2013.

¹²³ At this time, many of the people drafted to the army were going to fight against the Rhodesian troops. The government of Ian Smith led several attacks against Mozambique, who supported the Zimbabwe African National Liberation Army (ZANLA), which operated from Mozambique.

¹²⁴ Murilo Salles, a Brazilian filmmaker who arrived to Mozambique with Ruy Guerra in 1977, described how the Institute had an impressive collection of cinema, offered by many directors that supported the cause of FRELIMO, and that would ask their producers to send copies to the INC. He recalled spending hours seeing films in the moviola of the Institute, and that the Institute had all the films by Dziga Vertov, Eisenstein, the entire *Nouvelle Vague*, Russian cinema, etc. Therefore, the students had access to an ample collection of films, which they viewed and discussed during their training, and that helped them becoming familiar with cinematic language and with the possibilities of film.

¹²⁵ She is the author of *Behind the Lines*, that I analyzed in the previous chapter.

¹²⁶ According to the Unicef website, *machamba* is "a family owned piece of land for subsistence and minimal 'cash-crop' agriculture." <http://www.unicef.org/mozambique/Youth_Profile_study_-_Feb2005.pdf>

¹²⁷ Murilo Salles began his career in cinema with the Brazilian film director Bruno Barreto, and he worked as director of photography in *Dona Flor e Seus Dois Maridos*. He later became a director, and his first feature film was *Estas São as Armas*.

¹²⁸ Miguel Arraes de Alencar was governor of Pernambuco, elected in 1962 with the support of the Brazilian Communist Party and the Socialist Democratic Party. With the military coup of 1964 his position as governor was revoked and he and his family were forced into exile, and they moved to Algeria. His son, Augusto Arraes, was an important businessman who supported FRELIMO in many ways during this period, for instance by creating fake capitalist companies that would buy medicines and other basic needs goods, which Mozambique had trouble acquiring due to the embargo it was suffering for being a Communist country. It was also Augusto Arraes who helped bringing Jean Rouch and Jean-Luc Godard to Mozambique.

¹²⁹ Luís Bernardo Honwana is the author of *Nós Matámos o Cão Tinhoso* (*We Killed Mangy-Dog and Other Stories*, 1964), considered a touchstone of Mozambican contemporary narrative. At the time of Murilo Salles' visit to Mozambique, he was also the Secretary of Samora Machel, and he was the one who facilitated all the materials Salles' needed to make his film.

¹³⁰ Murilo Salles had a past as an editor in Brazilian cinema, which was quite helpful in *Estas São as Armas*.

¹³¹ According to Pedro Pimenta, "the Mozambican masses couldn't see cinema before Independence," since the Portuguese had no interest in giving access to it to the large majority of the population (Taylor n. pag.).

¹³² Mouzinho de Albuquerque was a Portuguese cavalry officer that defeated and captured Gungunhana, Emperor of Gaza, and was able to silence African resistance against Portuguese colonialism in Mozambique during late nineteenth century. He was nominated Governor of Mozambique from 1896 to 1897. He is one of the heroes of the colonial film *Chaimite*, that is analyzed on the chapter about colonial cinema.

¹³³ "As nossas aspirações não teriam sucesso só por força das boas intenções."

¹³⁴ Licínio de Azevedo's latest movie, *Virgem Margarida* (*Virgin Margarida*, 2012) tells the story of a young girl who is a virgin and who is taken to an education camp with other prostitutes. The story takes place in 1975.

¹³⁵ Even though Ruy Guerra became one of the main influences at the INC, he was never its President, despite what some bibliography says—cf. Diawara, pp. 95.

¹³⁶ Among them were, besides Murilo Salles, Jean-Luc Godard, Celso Lucas and José Celso Martinez Corrêa. He also brought Licínio de Azevedo, who became the most renowned Mozambican film director, even though he was born in Brazil, but who never left Mozambique since he went there with Ruy Guerra.

¹³⁷ The number of deaths is still in dispute. FRELIMO claimed that six hundred Mozambicans were killed, whereas the Portuguese authorities claimed that only fourteen people died.

¹³⁸ According to Murilo Salles (personal interview), Guerra brought with him most of the crew to film in Mozambique, which lead to clashes with those in charge of the INC, namely with Polly Gaster, who favored the participation of the students of the INC to be part of the crew. He also brought a lot of highly sophisticated cameras that returned with him to Brazil (Polly Gaster, personal interview).

¹³⁹ Much of the bibliography on the INC and on *Kuxa Kanema* tend to conflate both as if they were different names of the same project. However, all of those who were part of the Institute emphasized the importance of distinguishing *Kuxa Kanema* from the rest of the films produced in this context (Polly Gaster, Camilo de Sousa, Gabriel Mondlane, personal interviews).

¹⁴⁰ Even though print language, namely newspapers, and literature, did not reach as many Mozambicans as did radio and cinema, it had nonetheless an important impact in the role of imagining the nation. However, it reached mostly a more educated population, whereas the lower social strata was more impacted by the other two media.

¹⁴¹ Alberto Graça is a Brazilian director and producer, born in the state of Minas Gerais. He directed, among others, *O Dia da Caça* (2000), *Memories of Fear* (1979) and *Entre a Dor e o Nada* (2015).

¹⁴² Vera Zaverucha is a Brazilian producer and she was nominated the director for Ancine (Agência Nacional do Cinema) in 2011. And she helped creating the Audiovisual law in Brazil. She was also part of Embrafilme from 1982 to 1989.

¹⁴³ The *Kuxa Kanemas* were filmed in 16mm and blown up to 35mm to be screened at the movie theaters. Mobile cinema used 16mm copies since they were easier to transport.

¹⁴⁴ It was Francis Ford Coppola who helped breaking that boycott in terms of cinema, sending *Apocalypse Now* to the INC, and then mobilizing other directors and producers to send their films to Mozambique. Coppola became familiarized with Mozambican cinema and their political situation after Camilo de Sousa and other members of the INC went on tour to American universities to show their films and to talk about the INC project. They screened *Mueda* in San Francisco, and Coppola was a personal acquaintance of Ruy Guerra. The American director couldn't be at the screening, but sent an agent to represent him and to create a cooperation with the Institute. *Apocalypse Now* became the first American film being screened in post-independence Mozambique, and the first screening was full of diplomats wanting to see the film, which had been forbidden in many countries (Camilo de Sousa, personal interview).

¹⁴⁵ Eusébio, the most famous player during Salazar's regime and one of the best players in the history of football was born Mozambican, later gaining Portuguese nationality and he became a Portuguese national hero, still revered today.

¹⁴⁶ Samora Machel was the son of a prosperous farmer and the grandson of one of Gungunhana's warriors.

¹⁴⁷ The attack took place in Matola in February 14, 1981, and it aimed at destroying the ANC headquarters, as well as the building where Onkhoto we Sizwe (MK), the armed wing of the ANC exiled in Mozambique, had its premises.

¹⁴⁸ I cannot precise the date of the film, but the President of Mozambique was Joaquim Chissano, so it had to be directed after Samora's death.

¹⁴⁹ Even though RENAMO never won the elections for Presidency, it did win elections for local governments

¹⁵⁰ According to Camilo de Sousa, the Heritage Foundation had a center in Maputo where they helped children who were forced by RENAMO to become soldiers, giving them psychological treatment while studying the consequences of war trauma in these children. FRELIMO soon discovered that this foundation had another center on the region controlled by RENAMO, where they helped training children soldiers, studying the psychological effects of such training in these children (Camilo de Sousa, personal interview).

¹⁵¹ According to report from the World Bank, "Mozambique obtained considerable fast-disbursing assistance from the World Bank in the period 1984-2002." cf. Brendan Horton, pp. 9 <http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2011/02/14/000356161_20110214024127/Rendered/PDF/596220NWP01pub1X358288B0prsc1moz1cs.pdf>

¹⁵² There was a strong suspicion that this fire was set on purpose to destroy the archives, but it only destroyed the commercial deposit, leaving the archives intact. Rumors circulated for a long time saying that important material was destroyed, which was not true. Such suspicions were never proved, but the rumors that it was on the interest of FRELIMO to destroy the INC still circulate.

¹⁵³ According to José Mena Abrantes, Asdrúbal Rebelo was another important director of this period (17, 21). Unfortunately, I was not able to find and to watch his films, and therefore I am not including him in this essay.

¹⁵⁴ For more information refer to Thomas Collelo. (1991) *Angola: A Country Study*. Washington, D.C: The Division, pp. 100-101, available in http://cdn.loc.gov/master/frd/frdcstdy/an/angolacountrystu00coll_0/angolacountrystu00coll_0.pdf, date of access 07/02/16.

¹⁵⁵ Even though Angola achieved independence through an agreement with the Portuguese government, I believe that we can call the process of independence in Angola (and in the other African territories colonized by the Portuguese), a *revolution*. Thomassen defines revolution as a process that implies, among others, these elements: “It involves a rapid, basic transformation of a society’s political structures. It is an effort to transform not just the political institutions but also the justifications for political authority in society, thus reformulating the ideas/values that underpin political legitimacy. This effort is accompanied by formal or informal mass mobilization and non-institutionalized actions that undermine authorities. Such actions take on highly theatrical forms enacted in public space that is appropriated via ‘street politics.’” (683) in Thomassen, B. (July 2012) “Notes towards an Anthropology of Political Revolutions” *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Volume 54 (Issue 03): 679-706, available in <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayFulltext?type=1&fid=8638160&jid=CSS&volumeId=54&issueId=03&aid=8638158>, date of access 07/02/16

¹⁵⁶ Even though there was a stalemate in the national cinema panorama, some films appeared during these two decades, even if some of the Angolan filmmakers had to emigrate or if some of the films were directed by foreign filmmakers, as José Mena Abrantes pointed out (“Cinema” 26-29).

¹⁵⁷ The use of voice-over was one of the most common devices used in all types of documentary. Nonetheless, António Ole and Ruy Duarte de Carvalho used it in different ways, with different purposes: in Ole’s films it was often used to emphasize a poetic tone, whereas in the case of Ruy Duarte it was mostly used either to translate other languages into Portuguese, or to contextualize a given scene to the audience.

¹⁵⁸ As a film director, he chose Ruy Duarte as his authorial signature, and I will be referring to him as such from now on.

¹⁵⁹ This book has recently been republished as a chapter in *A Câmara, a Escrita e a Coisa Dita... Fitos, Textos e Palestras*, from Livros Cotovia (2008). In the second version, the title was reduced to “Cinema e Antropologia para Além do Filme Etnográfico,” losing therefore the political connotations conveyed in the first edition. I choose to use here the first version because it retains the political partisanship that permeated his films of the 1970s.

Works Cited

- Abrantes, José Mena. *Cinema Angolano: um Passado a Merecer Melhor Presente*. Luanda: IAC, 1986. Print.
- . "Cinema Angolano: um Passado com o Futuro Sempre Adiado." *Angola: o Nascimento de uma Nação*. Vol. III. Ed. Maria do Carmo Piçarra and José António. Lisboa: Guerra & Paz, 2015. 15-46. Print.
- Adringa, Diana. Prefácio. *Voltar: Memória do Colonialismo e da Descolonização*. By Sarah Adamopoulos. Lisboa: Planeta, 2012. Print.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 2006. Print.
- Andrade-Watkins, Claire. "Portuguese African Cinema: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives: 1969 to 1993" in *Research in African Literatures*, Vol. 26, No. 3, African Cinema (Autumn, 1995): 134-150. Print.
- Barbosa, Joaquim Lopes. Personal Interview. 31 July 2013.
- Barlet, Olivier. *African Cinemas: Decolonizing the Gaze*. London: Zed Books, 2000. Print.
- Bernardet, Jean-Claude. *Brasil em Tempo de Cinema: Ensaio Sobre o Cinema Brasileiro de 1958 a 1966*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2007. Print.
- Benjamin, Walter, Howard Eiland, and Michael W. Jennings. *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings — Volume 4, 1938-1940*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003. Print.
- Cabaço, José Luis. *Moçambique: Identidade, Colonialismo e Libertação*. São Paulo: Editora UNESP, 2009. Print.

---. Personal interview. 13 September 2014; 9 October 2015.

Cabral, Amílcar. *A Arma da Teoria: Unidade e Luta*. Vol. 1. Lisboa: Seara Nova, 1976. Print.

Cardoso, José. “Entrevista—Cineasta José Cardoso: Para Fazer Cinema é Preciso Ver.” 13 Nov.

2012. <<http://jorgejairoce.blogspot.com/2012/11/entrevista-cineasta-jose-cardoso-para.html>> 20 May 2016.

Carlson, Terence. “*Antônio das Mortes*.” *Brazilian Cinema*. Eds. Randal Johnson and Robert Stam. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995. 169-177. Print.

Carvalho, Ruy Duarte. *O Camarada e a Câmera: Cinema e Antropologia para Além do Filme Etnográfico*. Luanda: INALD, 1984. Print.

Castelo, Cláudia. “O Luso-tropicalismo e o Colonialismo Português Tardio.” *Buala*. 5 March 2013. Web. 12 May 2016. <<http://www.buala.org/pt/a-ler/o-luso-tropicalismo-e-o-colonialismo-portugues-tardio>>

Coelho, J P. B. “State Resettlement Policies in Post-Colonial Rural Mozambique: The Impact of the Communal Village Programme on Tete Province, 1977-1982.” *Journal of Southern African Studies*. 24.1 (1998): 61-91. Print.

Comitini, Carlos, and Amílcar Cabral. *Amílcar Cabral. A Arma da Teoria*. Rio de Janeiro: CODECRI, 1980. Print.

Companhia de Diamantes de Angola: Breve Notícia Sobre a sua Actividade em Angola. Lisboa: A Companhia, 1963. Print.

Convents, Guido. *Os Moçambicanos Perante o Cinema e o Audiovisual: uma História Político-Cultural do Moçambique Colonial até à República de Moçambique (1896-2010)*.

Mozambique: Dockanema, 2011. Print.

Costa, José Filipe. *O Cinema ao Poder! A Revolução do 25 de Abril e as Políticas de Cinema entre 1974-1976: os Grupos, Instituições, Experiências e Projectos*. Rio de Janeiro, Guimarães: LVC edições, Nós Por Cá Todos Bem, 2015. Print.

---. *Linha Vermelha*. Lisboa: Alambique, 2011. Film.

Cowans, Jon. *Empire Films and the Crisis of Colonialism, 1946-1959*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2015. Print.

Daney, Serge. Booklet. "A Etnografia Militante de Thomas Harlan." *Linha Vermelha*. By José Filipe Costa. Lisboa: Alambique, 2011. Film.

Davidson, Basil. *In the Eye of the Storm: Angola's People*. Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday, 1972. Print.

Diawara, Manthia. *African Cinema: Politics & Culture*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992. Print.

Dickinson, Margaret. "Flashbacks from a Continuing Struggle." *Third Text*. 25.1 (2011): 129-134. Print.

---. "An Editor in Mozambique." *Third Text*. Vol. 25, No.1 (2011): 135-136. Print.

Diegues, Cacá. *Vida de Cinema: Antes, Durante e Depois do Cinema Novo*. Rio de Janeiro: Objetiva, 2014. Print.

Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Trans. Richard Philcox. New York: Grove Press, 2004. Print.

Fonseca e Costa, José. Interview. "Os Demónios de Alcácer Quibir." Youtube. Web. 25 April 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_m9vot6PbIs>

- Freyre, Gilberto. *Integração Portuguesa Nos Trópicos. Portuguese Integration in the Tropics*. Lisboa: Tipografia Minerva, 1958. Print.
- . *O Mundo que o Português Criou: Aspectos das Relações Sociais e de Cultura do Brasil com Portugal e as Colónias Portuguesas*. Lisboa: Livros do Brasil, 1950. Print.
- Gabriel, Teshome H. *Third Cinema in the Third World: The Aesthetics of Liberation*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1982. Print.
- Gaster, Polly. Personal Interview. 5 August 2013.
- Grilo, João Mário. *O Cinema da Não-Ilusão: Histórias para o Cinema Português*. Lisboa: Livros Horizonte, 2006. Print.
- Harlan, Thomas. Interview by Paulo Branco, Serge Daney, and Thérère Giraud. "Entrevista a Thomas Harlan. *Cahiers du Cinéma*, 1979." Trans. Frederico Ágoas. Booklet. *Linha Vermelha*. By José Filipe Costa. Lisboa: Alambique, 2011. Film.
- Horton, Brendan, *Poverty Reduction Support Credits: Mozambique Country Study*. Web. <http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2011/02/14/000356161_20110214024127/Rendered/PDF/596220NWP01pub1X358288B0prsc1moz1cs.pdf>
- Johnson, Randal, and Robert Stam. *Brazilian Cinema*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995. Print.
- Johnson, Randal. *Cinema Novo X 5: Masters of Contemporary Brazilian Film*. Austin, Tex: University of Texas Press, 1984. Print.
- Kuhn, Annette, and Guy Westwell. *A Dictionary of Film Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. Internet resource.

- Lionnet, Françoise, and Shu-mei Shih. *Minor Transnationalism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2005. Print.
- Lopes, Fernando. *Fernando Lopes - Profissão: Cineasta*. Org. Maria João Madureira. Lisboa: Cinemateca Portuguesa, 2014. Web. 29 April 2007. <https://issuu.com/nunorodriguesdacosta/docs/fernando_lopes_artigos>
- Macey, David. *Frantz Fanon: A Biography*. London: Verso Books, 2012. Print.
- Machel, Samora, and Barry Munslow. *Samora Machel, an African Revolutionary: Selected Speeches and Writings*. London: Zed Books, 1985. Print.
- Manji, Firoze, and Bill Fletcher. *Claim No Easy Victories: The Legacy of Amilcar Cabral*. Daraja and CODSRIA, 2013. Print.
- Martin, Michael T. *New Latin American Cinema*. Vol. I. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1997. Print.
- McEwan, Cheryl. "Building a Postcolonial Archive? Gender, Collective Memory and Citizenship in Post-Apartheid South Africa." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 29.3 (2003): 739–757. Web.
- Minter, William. *Interview to Robert Van Lierop*. New York, April 16, 2004. <<http://kora.matrix.msu.edu/files/50/304/32-130-13A4-84-32-130-13A4-84-Bob%20Van%20Lierop%2010-22-11.pdf>>
- Mondlane, Gabriel. Personal Interview. Maputo, July 31, 2013.
- Mowitz, John. "Algerian Nation: Fanon's Fetish." *Cultural Critique*. (1992): 165-186. Print.
- Owen, Hilary. "Engendering the Aesthetics of Solidarity in Lina Magaia's 'Dumba Nengue.'" *Luso-Brazilian Review*. 39.2 (2002): 79-90. Print.

- Pereira, Álvaro Santos and Pedro Lains, "From an Agrarian Society to a Knowledge Economy? The Rising Importance of Education to the Portuguese Economy, 1950-2009." *Higher Education in Portugal 1974-2009: A Nation, a Generation*. Ed. Guy Neave and Alberto Amaral Dordrecht: Springer, 2012. Internet resource.
- Pessoa, Fernando, and Fernando C. Martins. *Mensagem*. Lisboa: Asírio & Alvim, 2004. Print.
- Piçarra, Maria do Carmo, and Jorge António. *Angola: o Nascimento de uma Nação*. 3 vols. Lisboa: Guerra e Paz, 2013-2015. Print.
- Piçarra, Maria do Carmo. *Azuis Ultramarinos: Propaganda Colonial e Censura no Cinema do Estado Novo*. Lisboa: Edições 70, 2015. Print.
- Rocha, Glauber. "An Esthetic of Hunger." *Brazilian Cinema*. Eds. Randal Johnson and Robert Stam. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995. 68-71. Print.
- . *Revisão Crítica do Cinema Brasileiro*. São Paulo: Cosac & Naify, 2003. Print.
- . *Revolução do Cinema Novo*. São Paulo: Cosac & Naify, 2004. Print.
- Rosas, Fernando, ed. *Entrevistas de António Ferro a Salazar*. Lisboa: Parceira A.M. Pereira, 2003. Print.
- Ross, Kristin. *Fast Cars, Clean Bodies: Decolonization and the Reordering of French Culture*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1996. Print.
- Salles, Murilo. Personal Interview. 19 August 2014.
- Sant'Anna, Affonso R. *Análise Estrutural de Romances Brasileiros*. Petrópolis: Editora Vozes, 1974. Print.
- Sanches, Manuela Ribeiro. *'Portugal Não é um País Pequeno: Contar o 'Império' na Pós-Colonialidade*. Lisboa: Livros Cotovia, 2006. Print.

- Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. "Between Prospero and Caliban: Colonialism, Postcolonialism, and Inter-Identity." *Luso-Brazilian Review* 39.2 (2002): 9-43. Print.
- . *Pela Mão de Alice: o Social e o Político na Pós-Modernidade*. 8th. ed. Porto: Afrontamento, 2002. Print.
- Schefer, Raquel. "Re-constitutions. On *Mueda, Memória e Massacre* (*Mueda, Memory and Massacre*), by Ruy Guerra," in *Le Journal de la triennale*, No. 4 (2012): 38-40.
- . "Fictions of the Liberation Struggle: Ruy Guerra, José Cardoso, Zdravko Velimirovic." *Kronos*. 39.1 (2013): 298-315. Print.
- . "O Nascimento de uma Imagem. *Mueda, Memória e Massacre*, de Ruy Guerra (1979)." *Buala*. 2 July 2011. Web. 1 July 2015. <http://www.buala.org/pt/afroscreen/o-nascimento-de-uma-imagem-mueda-memoria-e-massacre-de-ruy-guerra-1979#footnoteref1_pbytn0l>
- Schwarz, Roberto. *Misplaced Ideas: Essays on Brazilian Culture*. London: Verso, 1992. Print.
- Shohat, Ella, and Robert Stam. *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media*. London: Routledge, 1994. Print.
- Simões, Rui. (2013) *António Ole*. Portugal: Real Ficção Cinevideo & Multimédia.
- Solanas, Fernando, and Octavio Getino. "Towards a Third Cinema." *New Latin American Cinema*. Vol. I. Ed. Michael T. Martin. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1997. 33-58. Print.
- Sousa, Camilo. Personal Interview. 19 July 2013.
- Spínola, António. *Portugal e o Futuro: Análise da Conjuntura Nacional*. 3rd. ed. Lisboa: Arcádia, 1974. Print.

- Spivak, Gayatri. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Can the Subaltern Speak?: Reflections on the History of an Idea*. Ed. Rosalind Morris and Gayatri Spivak. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010. Print.
- Stam, Robert. "Eurocentrism, Afrocentrism, Polycentrism: Theories of Third Cinema." *Otherness and the Media: The Ethnography of the Imagined and the Imaged*. Eds. Hamid Naficy, and Teshome H. Gabriel. Chur, Switzerland: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1993. 233-253. Print.
- . *Tropical Multiculturalism: A Comparative History of Race in Brazilian Cinema and Culture*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1997. Print.
- Taylor, Clyde. "Book Review: O Povo Organizado (The People Organized)." *The Black Scholar*. 11.5 (1980): 81-82. Print.
- . "Interview with Pedro Pimente: Film Reborn in Mozambique." *Jump Cut*, no. 28, April 1983, n. pag. Web. June 10 2015.
- Taylor, Richard. *Film Propaganda: Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany*. London; New York: Croom Helm; Barnes & Noble, 1979. Print.
- Tréfaut, Sérgio. *Outro País*. Lisboa: Alambique, 2014. Filme.
- Ukadike, Nwachukwu Frank and Flora Gomes. "In Guinea-Bissau, Cinema Trickles down: An Interview with Flora Gomes" in *Research in African Literatures*, Vol. 26, No. 3, African Cinema (Autumn, 1995): 179-185.
- Ukadike, Nwachukwu Frank. *Black African Cinema*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994. Print.

Viany, Alex, and José C. Avellar. *O Processo do Cinema Novo*. Rio de Janeiro: Aeroplano Editora, 1999. Print.

Vieira, Patricia. *Cinema no Estado Novo: a Encenação do Regime*. Lisboa: Colibri, 2011. Print.

---. *Portuguese Film, 1930-1960: The Staging of the New State Regime*. Trans. Ashley Caja. New York: Bloomsbury, 2013. Print.

Xavier, Ismail. *Allegories of Underdevelopment: Aesthetics and Politics in Modern Brazilian Cinema*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997. Print.

---. *Sertão Mar: Glauber Rocha e a Estética da Fome*. São Paulo, Brasil: Brasiliense, EMBRAFILME/ Secretaria da Cultura/ MEC, 1983. Print.