

INTRODUCTION: ESTATES GENERAL OF THIRD CINEMA, MONTREAL '74

MARIANO MESTMAN AND MASHA SALAZKINA

Montreal, June 2-8, 1974: some of the most important representatives of political cinema from around the world got together at the *Rencontres internationales pour un nouveau cinéma*. The list of participants included: filmmakers, producers and '68 film groups from France and elsewhere; Latin American political filmmakers and representatives of a burgeoning African cinema; film critics, historians and producers; and members from film institutes and distributors from Europe and North America, including, of course, the Canadian organizers of the conference, André Pâquet and the *Comité d'action cinématographique* (CAC). Given the sheer number and diverse backgrounds of the participants, the Montreal conference holds a serious claim to being one of the most important worldwide events in political cinema of the period.

"New Cinema"—a term that appears in the conference's name—functioned as a broad umbrella term under which diverse trends of renovation and rupture had been spreading across the world throughout the 1960s. In Montreal, this idea solidified around the notion that cinema culture's primary goal is to promote decolonization, finding its correlate in a new kind of national cinema that aimed to "democratize the structures of film," consistent with the concept of Third Cinema developed earlier by Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino. Perhaps the boldest and most ambitious goal of the gathering in Montreal was to forge or strengthen ties among politically committed cinemas in the wake of the ruptures of 1968 in Europe as well as the emergence of Third Worldist filmmaking. The idea of an "Estates-General of Third Cinema" combines two references: firstly, the events of May '68, when the French film industry united in solidarity with those who had gone on strike, occupying the IDHEC (*Institut des hautes études cinématographiques*), and when the CNC (*Centre national de la cinématographie*) established the Estates General of Cinema (*Les états généraux du cinéma français*)—a term with its roots in the French Revolution, with its subtending notion of "*cahiers de doléances*" (the collected grievances of the population which animated the first meeting of the *Estates General*); secondly, the notion of Third Cinema—whose goals of cinema as the vehicle for national liberation and solidarity among the Third World countries were shared by several projects of the period.

This introduction aims to sketch a brief history of the *Rencontres internationales pour un nouveau cinéma* as part of a larger network of leftist film culture internationally, and suggest some approaches for thinking of its significance historically and theoretically in hopes of stimulating further research and creating an ongoing conversation about its legacy.

I.

Planning for the Conference began in early 1973. The idea was André Pâquet's, who had been living in Europe for a few years prior where he attended many of the most important events representing new developments in cinema worldwide (the Berlinale, the Pesaro Film Festival, the Manheim and Leipzig festivals, and the *Journées cinématographiques de Carthage*, among others), and was in contact with alternative film groups and distributors promoting the New Cinema movements.¹

Upon his return to Montreal in April of 1973, Pâquet began working on the creation of the *Comité d'action cinématographique*, which would organize the Montreal conference the following year. The list of the Committee's members included some of the important figures in Quebec cinema of the time: Guy Bergeron, René Boissay, Marc Daigle, Fernand Dansereau, Carol Faucher, Roger Frappier, Claude Godbout, Gilles Groulx, Arthur Lamothe, Jean Pierre Lefebvre, Raymond Marie Léger, as well as Sandra Gathercole from Toronto, and Werner Aellen from Vancouver.

The committee had decided to establish itself as an autonomous group and reached a joint decision on the type of film it would promote: confronted by a powerful commercial film industry, the only option was to defend the "endangered *other cinema*" (*un autre cinéma*). To achieve this, they planned to promote a sort of "International of small filmmaking countries," that is, countries where such cinema was facing particular challenges. In this regard, Pâquet considered the exchange with similar groups worldwide to be the first, yet important, step towards finding alternatives to mainstream cinema and an important point of departure for the development of independent cinema in Quebec.

What is certain is that the committee aimed for a broader cultural convergence, more so than an ideological one, aiming to bring together many disparate elements within a wide range of progressive and leftist movements in Quebec. Unlike the trends of the more radical opposition, the aim of the committee was to draft a shared policy of "national cinema." Moreover, this "other cinema" to which they aspired was not necessarily identified as *auteur* or experimental/underground film, nor was it expected to adhere to any other aesthetic criteria. The "cinema of intervention," which Gilles Groulx had proposed as central to this formation, was defined explicitly in terms of national (rather than political or liberation) cinema, whose aim was to "return the power of decision making to the grassroots."² Alongside the importance placed on the notions of national cinema during the meetings, the organizers were intent on scheduling the conference so that it would not overlap with other international festivals; in other words, they were actively shaping the Montreal conference to be part of the global circuit of political filmmaking.³

With more than 200 participants from 25 countries, the Montreal conference was held in June 1974 at the Quebec National Library in Montreal. Debates followed presentations by Thomas H. Guback, Jean Patrick Lebel, Fernando Solanas, Simon Hartog, Guido Aristarco and Julio García Espinosa—debates in which a wide range of contemporary issues facing cinema globally was addressed by writers, critics and filmmakers. Among the issues up for debate was the question of possible alternatives to the global capitalist film industry, with a particular emphasis on the new countries of Africa (Guback), and the analysis of the structure of the British film industry and the alternative of nationalizing film in order to cede control to workers nominated by the film workers union (Hartog). There were also theoretical and historical perspectives on film language in ideological struggles (Lebel), and questions around a necessary return to Marx's original texts and methodology with a critique of vulgar Marxism and the influence of Soviet "socialist realism" in contemporary film (Aristarco). Finally, discussions on the "peripheral" cinemas also took prominence: the Cuban experience, with its achievements and challenges (García Espinosa); that of the Argentine group *Cine Liberación*; the theory of Third Cinema; and the policies of the Peronist government in relation to film (Solanas, as well as Edgardo Palleró and Humberto Ríos).

The presentations by García Espinosa and Solanas, in particular, situated their respective experiences within a context that was not only Latin American but also Third Worldist. And although none of the main panels featured representatives from African cinema, the Pan African Federation of Filmmakers (FEPACI) was very active throughout the conference, with presentations by the Tunisians Férid Boughedir (a critic, theorist and scriptwriter) and Tahar Cheriaa (the founder and director of the Carthage Film Festival in 1966, the first dedicated to Arabic and African film); the Mauritanian Med Hondo (with his film *Les 'bicots Nègres' vos voisins* (1974) which was screened as part of the event) and the South African Lionel N'Gakane both of whom were living in exile at the time, in France and Britain, respectively; the Egyptian Tewfik Saleh, who had also left his homeland because of censorship, and the Algerian Lamine Merbah, coordinator of the Third-World Filmmakers Committee founded in Algiers in December 1973.

In addition to the Latin American participants mentioned above, others in attendance included Argentine Jorge Giannoni (representing the Third World Film Committee along with Merbah) and the exiled Chileans Miguel Littín (the head of Chile Films during the administration of Salvador Allende) and Darío Pulgar, who played an active role in organizing the conference. As was the case at other political film events during the period, the military coup in Chile one year earlier had become a subject of deep concern from participants.⁴ Filmmaker Mario Handler and producer/distributor Walter Achugar—both living in exile from Uruguay—were two representatives of the rich culture of

Uruguayan political filmmaking. Beyond the national context, Achugar was also an important figure in the so-called New Latin American Cinema and its international distribution on both sides of the Atlantic; he was very active at the Montreal conference and involved in many debates, collaborating in simultaneous translation and proposing practical measures to coordinate Third World filmmakers and parallel/alternative distributors in the core countries.⁵

For their part, the alternative distributors from North America and Europe played a fundamental role in the international circulation of political and militant films, with a special interest, in many cases, in Latin American and African film. Although representatives from these distributors regularly attended gatherings where they were able to enter into dialogue with one another or with filmmakers and groups, Montreal offered them a unique and unprecedented opportunity to be involved on a greater scale, including leading several of the debates. Participants in the conference included The Other Cinema (England), Tricontinental Film Center (U.S.A.), Third World Newsreel (U.S.A.) and MK2 (France), among others. While Chris Marker, who was on the invite list, was not able to attend, the highest number of representatives and variety of trends at the gathering was that of post-'68 French cinema. Inger Servolin was there to represent Marker's group (Slon/Iskra) at the Grassroots Participation workshop. Sylvie Jezequel was also there to give a presentation on CREPAC/SCOPCOLOR (*Centre de recherche pour l'éducation permanente et l'action culturelle/société coopérative ouvrière de production*), a group founded during May '68 by ORTF (*L'Office de radiodiffusion-télévision française*) professionals in order to promote community participation during conflicts, as well as training and continuous learning. In addition to giving a talk, Jean Patrick Lebel also spoke at the Social Intervention through Films workshop as a representative of the UNICITÉ, an organization founded after the strikes in May-June '68 as the propaganda wing of the French communist party. At the same workshop, filmmaker Serge Le Péron represented the Cinélutte group, one of the most active during the Estates-General. Marin Karmitz, who had made well-known films like *Camarades* (1970) and *Coup pour Coup* (1972), joined Maurice Brover to present his production studio/distributor MK2, his activity in parallel exhibitions, and his break into the commercial circuit.

The Italian presence was much smaller in numbers and did not include any filmmakers. However, the two Italians who did go to Montreal, Guido Aristarco and Lino Micciché, were key figures in '60s film culture, film criticism, and political cinema in Italy. They were also involved in the most heated debates at the conference. In addition to his work as a critic, Micciché was the founder and director of the *Mostra Internazionale del Nuovo Cinema di Pesaro*, a festival that since 1968 had become a major event on the political film calendar. In fact, several of the films and directors who had attended the Pesaro festival in 1973

travelled to Montreal in June of 1974; Pesaro 1974 (held in September) was projected as the first gathering where the proposals put forward in exchanges initiated by the different European groups in Montreal would be realized.

With an affinity that arose from the specific demands of their national cinemas, an association made up of groups that represented the so-called “small countries” of Europe (with which Quebec aligned itself) voiced a need to be involved in their respective state-run film institutions. Groups from Holland, Portugal, Finland, Denmark, Switzerland, Belgium and Sweden all played an important role in the event, participating in the debates and signing the resolutions. Micheline Creteur (from *Unité de Distribution-FACT*, Belgium) and Carl Henrik Svenstedt (from *Film Centrum*, Sweden) were entrusted with the final statements representing the “small countries” of Europe (and Quebec), and ensuring their continuing collaborations.

The list of Canadian participants, particularly those from Quebec, is naturally the longest. Critics, independent filmmakers, government representatives of participatory film projects and people working in opposition cinema from across Canada attended the conference or expressed their solidarity. Filmmakers like Arthure Lamothe, Fernand Dansereau, Jean Pierre Lefebvre and Gilles Groulx were there along with other committee members, as well as Martin Duckworth and Maurice Bulbulian, two important figures in the National Film Board's program Challenge for Change/*Société Nouvelle*. Other participants included representatives of important state-run and independent film institutes of Quebec (and, to a lesser extent, from all of Canada), as well as several members of the *Association des réalisateurs de films du Québec* (Quebec Filmmakers Association). Several of these figures played prominent roles in the conference workshops: Dansereau (who had created in 1967 the *Groupe de recherches sociales*, generally considered the predecessor of the *Société Nouvelle* and of *Vidéographe*) coordinated the “People's participation” workshop; and Lucien Hamelin (from the *Conseil québécois pour la diffusion du cinéma*) coordinated one on “How films are shown.” This wide spectrum of Canadian groups at the Montreal conference is evidence of its openness to independent entities, more radical groups, and government institutions alike.

II.

Many of the debates and controversies which took place during the meeting are particularly interesting in so far as they can be seen as symptomatic of the variety of issues facing world political cinema at this moment in time. Because the Montreal conference brought together a wide range of the representatives of the Global Left, debates on Marxism, “real socialism,” and alignment with the U.S.S.R. were inevitable. This first appeared in a debate between a critic

from the French communist party, Jean Patrick Lebel, and the Italian Lukácsian critic Guido Aristarco; later, it continued in a severe polemic between Aristarco and French Third Worldist critic Guy Hennebelle on the one hand, and Cuban filmmaker Julio García Espinosa on the other. This debate on the risks of triumphalism and the positive heroes in political cinema rapidly shifted to the question of the alliance between Cuba and the U.S.S.R.

Another objective of the Montreal conference was to provide an opportunity for an international exchange of information about films and distribution. Even this was a source of debate: between the reformist stances—intervention by public institutions—and the alternatives, who were willing to consider the “system gaps” or oppositional revolutionary projects. At the time of the conference, there was already an established circuit of film festivals and alternative distributors in the First World who released political films from the Third World. Representatives from some of the most important alternative distributors traveled to Montreal, as we mentioned. The documents from the conference reveal tensions here as well: Latin American producers and filmmakers accusing certain distributors of not fully reimbursing them for the profits obtained from their films and instead using this money to strengthen their own alternative circuit of film distribution. In addition, the film distributors or film centers of the so-called “small countries” (Belgium, Switzerland, Sweden, Portugal, etc.; also Quebec) reproached the stronger distributors (like the French MK2, founded by Marin Karmitz) of “brokering” the circulation of Third World films in the First World.

The experience of Canadian documentary film, particularly the Challenge for Change/*Société Nouvelle* program of the legendary National Film Board, was at the center of the polemic at the “Cinema as a tool for social change” workshop. There, Jean-Marc Garand (invited to report on the activities of the *Société Nouvelle*) was attacked by Gilles Groulx (a member of the organizing committee of the conference) about the NFB/ONF censure, and Françoise Girault (*Comité d'information politique-CIP/Champ Libre*), who took a more radical stance, characterizing the policy of the National Film Board and its programs as part of a “depoliticization” characteristic of the “cultural apparatuses of advanced capitalist society.”

Finally, some of the debates centered on the controversy regarding the particular difficulties facing Latin America: notably, after the presentation by Fernando Solanas, some important figures of the New Latin American Cinema entered into a harsh discussion about the Peronist government film politics in Argentina.

III.

The importance of the Montreal meeting for political cinema worldwide is evidenced by its immediate widespread reception both in the main international film journals of the time and in two books that dedicated pages to the encounter.⁶ However, the meeting has since been largely overlooked by film historians.⁷ Many of the meeting's documents were initially compiled in 1975, thanks to the laudable efforts of André Pâquet and the CAQ, and published in four volumes titled *Rencontres internationales pour un nouveau cinéma Cahier 1: Projets et Résolutions*, *Cahier 2: Répertoire des groupes*, *Cahier 3: Conférences / textes / bibliographie*, and *Cahier 4: Dossier de presse*. The audiovisual recordings of the event, however, remained unavailable until last year. In total there were fifty-one reels with a duration of approximately thirty minutes each, although only forty-eight have been preserved, with the other three considered lost (there may be more, unacknowledged, in personal or public archives). Although the audiovisual recordings of the talks and debates are not organized or laid out as a single discourse, essay, or manifesto—the type of documentary source we are more accustomed to—they nevertheless transmit very *vivid* aspects of this history. In this regard, this source is extremely valuable because it allows us to reconstruct and revise understandings of events that have been neglected or only partially addressed in film historiography.

In 2012 Mariano Mestman found these recordings in the Cinémathèque québécoise archives. Thanks to the kindness and collaboration of André Pâquet and Jean Gagnon—director of collections at the Cinémathèque—a digital transfer of thirty-two of the forty-eight tapes was made. They are now available in DVD for public consultation in Montreal and Buenos Aires (at the Cinémathèque québécoise and in the *Archivo Audiovisual del Instituto de Investigaciones Gino Germani* of the University of Buenos Aires).⁸

The first research dedicated to the Montreal meeting, as well as some documents, and a DVD with three hours of audiovisual recordings were published in the summer 2013/14 volume of the journal *Red de Historia de los Medios* (Buenos Aires).⁹ These materials were then presented and discussed in April 2014 at a symposium organized by Luca Caminati and Masha Salazkina at Concordia University (Montreal). The idea for this dossier, to assemble in-depth research on the themes and problems debated during the meeting, emerged from that encounter.

Given the obvious historical significance of this meeting, the goal of this dossier is not merely to celebrate the historically situated vision of international solidarity this event emblemized. The audiovisual materials in particular draw our attention to a very particular embodiment of camaraderie that it entailed, which now raises a lot of uncomfortable questions. As most of the guests were representatives of key cultural institutions (however revolutionary some of

them may not have been in their relationship to the status quo), their status is clearly reflected in the highly ritualized official language and setting, as well as in the social, cultural and racial make-up of the participants. What is perhaps most striking now is its exclusion of women, many of whom are only visible as interpreters at the debates, and rarely on stage, even though this was a critical time for the women's movement internationally and in the national cinemas represented in Montreal—including both Canada and Quebec.¹⁰ But however flawed the vision of tricontinental unity for political cinema presented here is, it nonetheless offers a rich counterpoint to both our contemporary understanding of the dynamics of transnational exchange inevitably tied to global capital, as well as many of our assumptions about the fragmented and even isolated (and at times intentionally isolationist) phenomena of political film movements of the period, and even more specifically, of how this political context plays out in a Quebec that had also been politically moved by the emancipatory forces of the time.

The issues that emerge in the course of this event, which this dossier seeks to explore, are ones that constitute the matrix of the continuing debates, both historically and theoretically, on political cinema and international solidarity. Key themes are: the tensions between location, national, and global interests and motivations; the role of the state as at once a guarantor of support for national cinemas and as a potential source of repression and exclusion; the inescapability of Cold War structures in shaping socialist and radical discourses; and the cultural and historical distinctiveness of the liberatory discourse in different geopolitical areas and under different hegemonic pressures. However, the question of how to approach this moment of cultural history is open to interpretation. Within contemporary scholarship, the militant model of cultural imperialist critique, which governs both the discourse and the various political platforms represented at Montreal '74, is no longer a dominant conceptual paradigm within which to conceptualize either the specific geopolitical constellations or the broader theoretical problem of the emancipatory potential of cinema and media. This paradigm has since been upstaged in contemporary critical discourse by various competing models of globalization, soft power, cultural hybridity, creolization, and transcendence. From our vantage point, forty years later, both the language and the goals of the participants of this event may seem naïve, misguided, limited, or simply no longer applicable to the realities of political struggles today. Nonetheless, the project of international cooperation, which seeks to bypass the hegemonic economic and/or political structures governing film production, exhibition and circulation—be it major film festivals and their granting agencies, mainstream distribution companies, or, indeed, state channels—has more appeal than ever now that alternative informal paths for digital media circulation are so commonplace. In that, many of the goals of the *Rencontres* reflect the very utopian potentiality of film and media as truly democratic means of expression which informs so much of the

contemporary way of thinking about media—while also posing key problems surrounding, in particular, the roles that cultural and state institutions should play in this process.

Within the field of film history, the research on the *Rencontres* may present a unique chance to contribute to a number of important recent developments in our discipline. One such example is its significance for the history of Quebec film culture. While the ideas of national cinema are central to the identity and history of cinema in Quebec, the documents from the *Rencontres* reveal a different historical conception of this notion, one rooted in a much more cosmopolitan and internationalist vision of solidarity—a movement which Quebec at the time was seen as a part of and wanted to be identified with. How much of the solidarity was based on misidentification is worth exploring—and the short-lived nature of this event, as well as the historical amnesia that surrounds it, may be a testament to that. The pieces in the dossier touch upon this tension, and together with the original materials from the event, provide ample grounds for further investigation. The emphasis placed on the “New Cinemas” more broadly, and Third Cinema more specifically as an internationalist/global phenomenon at the heart of this encounter, is also necessary. It not only serves to demonstrate the transnational aspect of many of the movements which have traditionally been represented as national or continental, but it serves to restage the broader geopolitical tensions inherent in these formations, without ever undermining the power of the local historical milieu.

The place of Montreal ’74 in the history of film festivals and other forms of international institutional exchanges also deserves a careful consideration. It points to a radically different historical and cultural/political genealogy of film festival studies, one that has largely been ignored by the ever-growing output in this area. Much of the literature on film festivals focuses on the more presentist and commercial aspects of these events, and its historical dimensions tend to be limited to its European trajectory (Venice, Cannes, etc.). Redrawing the film festival map to include the constellation to which the Montreal meeting belonged, which included both Third World and Third Worldist festivals from the 1950s through the 1980s (as well as, more broadly, the socialist bloc ones from the period, not only Moscow and Karlovy Vary, but also Leipzig and Tashkent, which formed part of this network), draws attention to the need for a more historical and culturally nuanced approach to film festival history and an understanding of complex geopolitics beyond the traditional categories of contemporary modes of globalization.

The material here also draws attention to a largely underexplored area of film studies: the histories of alternative distribution networks around the world—beyond the contemporary phenomenon of digital and Internet-based circulatory paths. Because of the largely local orientation of the existing studies of this topic, transnational approaches to it have been scarce. The history of Montreal ’74 provides

a rare opportunity to bring some of these local histories together in relation to each other. This methodological focus allows scholars to bring the studies of distribution networks within larger economic and cultural contexts, but also draw attention to the way they have been constitutive of interpersonal networks, where the role of personal friendships and individual relationships emerges with striking force. It is, finally, this dialectic between the institutional contexts for many of these exchanges and the power of affective ties which shape and propel them that provides another interesting site of theoretical investigation of the Montreal material.

The short scholarly essays gathered in this issue are intended to provide some basic background of the most prominent participants (Canadians, North Americans, French, British, Italians, Africans, and Latin Americans amongst others) who took part in the meeting at Montreal in June 1974, and draw attention to some of its key debates. The dossier also includes an extensive interview with two of the event’s organizers, André Pâquet and Carl Faucher, and the final resolutions adopted during the encounter. In addition, and parallel to the publication of this volume, the Cinémathèque québécoise made some of the documents of the conference available as part of an online dossier curated by André Pâquet.¹¹

Together with the archival materials and interviews, the essays gathered here begin to reconstitute a rich and varied tapestry which formed this event and point to some important larger questions and directions which are yet to be fully explored, making this special issue an invitation to a dialogue: to be continued.



Fig. 1: Cahier 1 / Notebook 1 of the *Rencontres internationales pour un nouveau cinéma* published in 1975. (Courtesy of André Pâquet.)



Fig. 2: Programme of the *Rencontres internationales pour un nouveau cinéma*. (Courtesy of André Pâquet.)

CONFERENCES	PROGRAMME	FILMS
Entrée libre		Admission: 75¢
<p>Dans le but d'ouvrir les Rencontres à la participation du public, des CONFÉRENCES-DEBAT seront présentées, par différents spécialistes ayant apporté une réflexion particulière sur les questions que pose la pratique du cinéma dans la société contemporaine. Ces conférences se dérouleront tous les matins à 10h00 et seront accessibles gratuitement au public.</p> <p>LUNDI 3 JUIN — THOMAS H. GUBACK</p> <p>BEHIND THE SHADOWS ON THE SCREEN — SOME NOTES ON THE AMERICAN FILM INDUSTRY AND ITS WORLD MARKET.</p> <p>A survey of the economic and political structure of American production and distribution, and an examination of some cultural consequences for film-making in countries around the world.</p> <p>MARDI 4 JUIN — JEAN PATRICK LEBEL</p> <p>LE CINÉMA DANS LA LUTTE IDEOLOGIQUE</p> <p>L'auteur de "Cinéma et Idéologie" pose la question: dans quelles limites et sur quelles bases peut-on concevoir une pratique matérialiste du cinéma?</p> <p>MERCREDI 5 JUIN — FERNANDO SOLANAS</p> <p>CINEMA, CULTURE ET DECOLONISATION</p> <p>Conférence donnée par le réalisateur du film "La Hora de Los Hornos" et auteur du manifeste "Hacia un Tercer Cine".</p> <p>JEUDI 6 JUIN — SIMON HARTOG</p> <p>THE NATIONALISATION OF MAE WEST IN THE LAND OF COCHAIGNE</p> <p>Mr. Hartog will speak on the limits and the possibilities of the concept of nationalisation. He was Chief-Researcher for the Report on the Nationalisation of Cinema in Great Britain, published by the Association of Cinematograph and Television Technicians.</p> <p>VENDEDI 7 JUIN — GUIDO ARISTARCO</p> <p>(TITRE A COMMUNIQUER)</p> <p>Guido Aristarco est un critique et théoricien de cinéma italien. Tour à tour défenseur et critique du Mouvement Néo-réaliste, il publie entre autres: "Storie delle Teoriche del Film" (1951), "Il Cinema Italiano del Dopoguerra" (1949) et récemment en France "Marx, le Cinéma et la Critique de Film". En 1947, il collabore au scénario de "Il Sole Sorge Ancora de Aldo Vergano". En 1952, il fonde la revue "Cinema Nuovo" qu'il dirige depuis.</p> <p>SAMEDI 8 JUIN — CONFERENCE À CONFIRMER</p> <p>LES CONFÉRENCES-DEBAT SE DEROULENT AVEC SYSTEME DE TRADUCTION SIMULTANEE EN FRANCAIS ET EN ANGLAIS. (THERE WILL BE SILMULTANEOUS TRANSLATION IN ENGLISH AND FRENCH FOR THE LECTURE-DEBATES.)</p>	<p>DIMANCHE 2 JUIN</p> <p>20h00 — AVANT PREMIERE DE NOUVEAUX FILMS QUEBECOIS</p> <p>LUNDI 3 JUIN</p> <p>19h00 — DIE LETZTEN HEIMPOSAMENTER. Yves YERSIN (Suisse) 1972-73, 105m.</p> <p>Les Derniers Passammentiers, s.t.f.</p> <p>À travers le portrait d'un métier en voie de disparition, ce film montre l'asservissement et l'exploitation d'une population soumise à la division du travail.</p> <p>21h45 — O MAL AMADO, Fernando MATOS SILVA (Portugal) 1973, 105m.</p> <p>Le Mal Aimé, s.t.f.</p> <p>Tourné dans un quartier de Lisbonne, ce film constitue une tentative d'intégration à la réalité portugaise d'aujourd'hui. C'est le portrait d'une jeunesse sacrifiée par une guerre coloniale interminable qui profite plus aux impérialismes multinationaux qu'au Portugal.</p> <p>MARDI 4 JUIN</p> <p>19h00 — THE HOUR BEFORE DAWN, Richard MORDAUNT (Grande Bretagne) 1969-72, 190m.</p> <p>This film was made in Ireland and covers the period from July 1969 to July 1973. It is a day to day record of the emergence of socialism in the North, a socialism that has emerged in direct response to the brutality of British imperialism and the necessity to survive and combat it.</p> <p>21h45 — OG MYNDIGHEDERNE SAGDE NEJ, Lyngre ARKALYK et Per KIRKEBY (Danemark, Groenland) 1972-73, 90m. And the Authorities Said Stop, s.t.f.</p> <p>The closing of a mine by the Danish Government in a small village of northern Greenland results in the 'deportation' of an entire population to the main city dominated by Danish society, its rules and life style. In portraying the inhabitants and their forced emigration, the film shows how these people become aware of their colonized situation.</p> <p>MERCREDI 5 JUIN</p> <p>19h00 — LAUKAUS TEHTAALLA, Erko KIVIKOSKI (Finlande) 1973, 90m.</p> <p>Coup de Feu dans l'Usine, s.t.f.</p> <p>L'histoire d'un ouvrier d'un certain âge, amené étape par étape dans ses relations ouvrières à poser un acte violent. A travers les milliers d'une grève, face à un syndicat désintéressé, le film retrace dans un style direct et précis, le conflit d'intérêt entre travail et capital.</p> <p>21h45 — LA CAGE AUX OURS, Marian HANDWERKER (Belgique) 1974, 88m., v.o.</p> <p>Trois générations confrontées apprennent à reconnaître leur ennemi. Cet ennemi qui est-il? N'est-ce pas le même qui a fermé les mines du grand-père? Lance le gendarme contre les mineurs? Qui ouvre des super-marchés? Dépossède le père et tire les ficelles de tous les destins?</p> <p>JEUDI 6 JUIN</p> <p>19h00 — EMITAL, Ousmane SEMBENE (Sénégal) 1971, 95m.</p> <p>Dieu du Tonnerre, s.t.f.</p> <p>La scène se passe dans un petit village du Sénégal en Casamance. Nous sommes en pleine guerre impérialiste. Des dizaines de milliers d'Africains sont allés mourir sur les champs de bataille européens pour défendre la France. En Afrique, c'est la famine; cependant chaque famille est tenue de fournir à l'administration coloniale la moitié de sa récolte de riz.</p> <p>21h45 — EL CORAJE DEL PUEBLO, Jorge SANJINES (Bolivia) 1971, 90m.</p> <p>Le Courage du Peuple (La Nuit de San Juan), s.t.f.</p> <p>Ce film relate le massacre d'ouvriers en grève le 24 juin 1967 en Bolivie. Ce document veut arracher à l'oubli des événements qui ne doivent pas être effacés... Arracher à l'oubli des situations historiques essentielles, des noms qui doivent rester inscrits au livre de la justice du peuple.</p> <p>VENDEDI 7 JUIN</p> <p>19h00 — LA TIERRA PROMETIDA, Miguel LITTIN (Chili) 1973-74, 90m.</p> <p>The Promised Land, s.t.f.</p> <p>Based on historical events in Chile in the 30's, this vast historical fresco is a testimony of the struggle of the Chilean people. 1930 was the start of a change in the social order, a time for political crisis and turmoil.</p> <p>21h45 — ATTICA, Cinda FIRESTONE (U.S.A.) 1974, 80m., v.o.</p> <p>This film is an account of the prison revolt in Attica, New York, in September 1971. It is a detailed study of the causes and effects of the savage attack launched by the army and police against the prisoners and their hostages.</p> <p>SAMEDI 8 JUIN</p> <p>20h00 — LES BICOTS NEGRES: VOS VOISINS, Med HONDO (Mauritanie) 1974, 190m., v.o.</p> <p>Un film qui veut signifier le rôle du cinéma dans le contexte historique africain. Fait avec des travailleurs émigrés en France, cette fresque documentaire "anti-carésimienne" se veut un tableau du conflit entre le néo-colonialisme et la situation de classe du Tiers-Monde.</p> <p>Chaque programme sera complété par des films de court ou de moyen métrage. Pour des raisons de souplesse, afin de conserver une certaine actualité et à cause de l'importance de certains documents soumis à la dernière minute, il est possible que certains films annoncés ne soient pas montrés. Ils seront alors remplacés par des nouveaux films qu'apporteront les participants aux Rencontres.</p>	<p>LUNDI 3 JUIN</p> <p>19h00 — DIE LETZTEN HEIMPOSAMENTER. Yves YERSIN (Suisse) 1972-73, 105m.</p> <p>Les Derniers Passammentiers, s.t.f.</p> <p>À travers le portrait d'un métier en voie de disparition, ce film montre l'asservissement et l'exploitation d'une population soumise à la division du travail.</p> <p>21h45 — O MAL AMADO, Fernando MATOS SILVA (Portugal) 1973, 105m.</p> <p>Le Mal Aimé, s.t.f.</p> <p>Tourné dans un quartier de Lisbonne, ce film constitue une tentative d'intégration à la réalité portugaise d'aujourd'hui. C'est le portrait d'une jeunesse sacrifiée par une guerre coloniale interminable qui profite plus aux impérialismes multinationaux qu'au Portugal.</p> <p>MARDI 4 JUIN</p> <p>19h00 — THE HOUR BEFORE DAWN, Richard MORDAUNT (Grande Bretagne) 1969-72, 190m.</p> <p>This film was made in Ireland and covers the period from July 1969 to July 1973. It is a day to day record of the emergence of socialism in the North, a socialism that has emerged in direct response to the brutality of British imperialism and the necessity to survive and combat it.</p> <p>21h45 — OG MYNDIGHEDERNE SAGDE NEJ, Lyngre ARKALYK et Per KIRKEBY (Danemark, Groenland) 1972-73, 90m. And the Authorities Said Stop, s.t.f.</p> <p>The closing of a mine by the Danish Government in a small village of northern Greenland results in the 'deportation' of an entire population to the main city dominated by Danish society, its rules and life style. In portraying the inhabitants and their forced emigration, the film shows how these people become aware of their colonized situation.</p> <p>MERCREDI 5 JUIN</p> <p>19h00 — LAUKAUS TEHTAALLA, Erko KIVIKOSKI (Finlande) 1973, 90m.</p> <p>Coup de Feu dans l'Usine, s.t.f.</p> <p>L'histoire d'un ouvrier d'un certain âge, amené étape par étape dans ses relations ouvrières à poser un acte violent. A travers les milliers d'une grève, face à un syndicat désintéressé, le film retrace dans un style direct et précis, le conflit d'intérêt entre travail et capital.</p> <p>21h45 — LA CAGE AUX OURS, Marian HANDWERKER (Belgique) 1974, 88m., v.o.</p> <p>Trois générations confrontées apprennent à reconnaître leur ennemi. Cet ennemi qui est-il? N'est-ce pas le même qui a fermé les mines du grand-père? Lance le gendarme contre les mineurs? Qui ouvre des super-marchés? Dépossède le père et tire les ficelles de tous les destins?</p> <p>JEUDI 6 JUIN</p> <p>19h00 — EMITAL, Ousmane SEMBENE (Sénégal) 1971, 95m.</p> <p>Dieu du Tonnerre, s.t.f.</p> <p>La scène se passe dans un petit village du Sénégal en Casamance. Nous sommes en pleine guerre impérialiste. Des dizaines de milliers d'Africains sont allés mourir sur les champs de bataille européens pour défendre la France. En Afrique, c'est la famine; cependant chaque famille est tenue de fournir à l'administration coloniale la moitié de sa récolte de riz.</p> <p>21h45 — EL CORAJE DEL PUEBLO, Jorge SANJINES (Bolivia) 1971, 90m.</p> <p>Le Courage du Peuple (La Nuit de San Juan), s.t.f.</p> <p>Ce film relate le massacre d'ouvriers en grève le 24 juin 1967 en Bolivie. Ce document veut arracher à l'oubli des événements qui ne doivent pas être effacés... Arracher à l'oubli des situations historiques essentielles, des noms qui doivent rester inscrits au livre de la justice du peuple.</p> <p>VENDEDI 7 JUIN</p> <p>19h00 — LA TIERRA PROMETIDA, Miguel LITTIN (Chili) 1973-74, 90m.</p> <p>The Promised Land, s.t.f.</p> <p>Based on historical events in Chile in the 30's, this vast historical fresco is a testimony of the struggle of the Chilean people. 1930 was the start of a change in the social order, a time for political crisis and turmoil.</p> <p>21h45 — ATTICA, Cinda FIRESTONE (U.S.A.) 1974, 80m., v.o.</p> <p>This film is an account of the prison revolt in Attica, New York, in September 1971. It is a detailed study of the causes and effects of the savage attack launched by the army and police against the prisoners and their hostages.</p> <p>SAMEDI 8 JUIN</p> <p>20h00 — LES BICOTS NEGRES: VOS VOISINS, Med HONDO (Mauritanie) 1974, 190m., v.o.</p> <p>Un film qui veut signifier le rôle du cinéma dans le contexte historique africain. Fait avec des travailleurs émigrés en France, cette fresque documentaire "anti-carésimienne" se veut un tableau du conflit entre le néo-colonialisme et la situation de classe du Tiers-Monde.</p> <p>Chaque programme sera complété par des films de court ou de moyen métrage. Pour des raisons de souplesse, afin de conserver une certaine actualité et à cause de l'importance de certains documents soumis à la dernière minute, il est possible que certains films annoncés ne soient pas montrés. Ils seront alors remplacés par des nouveaux films qu'apporteront les participants aux Rencontres.</p>

Fig. 3: Programme of the *Rencontres internationales pour un nouveau cinéma*. (Courtesy of André Pâquet.)

NOTES

- For more complete information, see Andre Habib's interview in this issue.
- "Rencontres internationales du Québec pour un nouveau cinéma. Procès verbal de la réunion du 6 septembre 1973," Montreal, mimeo, 7 pp. Personal Archive of André Pâquet. Reprinted in Spanish in Mariano Mestman, ed., "Estados Generales del Tercer Cine: Los Documentos de Montreal 1974," *Rehime: Cuadernos de la Red de Historia de los Medios 3* (2013/2014): 99-107. Accessible at www.rehime.com.ar.
- Ibid.
- Pedro Chaskel, the director of the exiled Cinemateca Chilena (in Havana), also signed the shared statements.
- Although they were not as involved in the debates, the following Latin American film figures were also there: Colombian Carlos Álvarez, independent Mexican directors Carlos González Morantes and Sergio Olhovich, and the Brazilians Cosme Alves Neto and Affonso Beato, although it could be said that the vast culture of Cinema Novo of the sixties was not fully represented at the conference.
- The two books are: Andrés Linares, *El cine militante* (Madrid, Castellote Editor, 1976 [1974]) and Guy Hennebelle, *Les cinémas nationaux contre Hollywood* (Condé-sur-Noireau [Calvados]: C. Corlet; Paris: Cerf, 2004). For the coverage in the journals and newspapers at the time see the following reviews: Gary Crowds, "The Montreal 'New Cinema Conference,'" *Cineaste* 6.3 (June 1975): 26-28; Pierre Verroneau, "Montréal 1974," *Positif* 164 (December 1974): 28; Lino Micciché, "Gli Incontri di Montreal" *Cinema* 60 14.97-98 (1974): 1-4; André Pâquet and Guy Hennebelle, "À Montréal: pour un nouveau cinéma," *Afrique-Asie* 61 (July 1974): 51-53; Guy Hennebelle "Contre le cinéma Hollywoodien et contre le cinéma d'auteur: le troisième cinéma," *Contre Champ* 1 (March-April 1974): 13-23; Guy Hennebelle and Daniel Serceau, "Cinéma militant," *Écran* 31 (December 1974): 45; Pierre Billon, "Montréal: Les 'états généraux' du troisième cinéma," *Cahiers du Cinéma* 253 (October-November 1974): 42-47; John Hess, "Montreal Report: *Rencontres internationales pour un nouveau cinéma*," *Jump Cut* 2 (July-August 1974): 22-23.
- At best, it has been cited in relation to other issues, as is the case with Michael Chanan's discussion of Julio García Espinosa's presentation at the *Rencontres* in Michael Chanan, *Cuban Cinema* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), 332-334. But even such references are few and far between.
- The cost of the transfer was financed with funds from the Research Project of the National Council for Scientific and Technical Research (Conicet, Argentina); "Historical inflections in the Images of Masses: Issues of Visual Representation and Archives," directed by Mariano Mestman.
- Mestman, "Estados Generales del Tercer Cine: Los Documentos de Montreal 1974."
- There were just ten women officially invited to the meeting, some of them participating in panels, workshops or at the final plenary, like the above-mentioned Françoise Girault (Quebec), Micheline Creteur (Belgium), Sylvie Jezequel (France) and Inger Servolin (France). The largest group that included women represented the independent cinema of US, whose participants, among others, were Christine Choy and Sue Robeson from Third World Newsreel and Julia Lesage, co-editor of *Jump Cut* (and a professor at University of Illinois at Chicago Circle).
- <http://collections.cinematheque.qc.ca/dossiers/rencontres-internationales-pour-un-nouveau-cinema/>