

The
SOCIAL
DOCUMENTARY
in LATIN AMERICA

JULIANNE BURTON

Editor

1990

University of Pittsburgh Press

1

TOWARD A HISTORY OF SOCIAL DOCUMENTARY IN LATIN AMERICA

Julianne Burton

Beginning with a "Provisional Typology of Social Documentary," this chapter proceeds to set the evolution of Latin American social documentary in the context of parallel international developments in the medium, discussing the formative impact of specific events, figures, and technological advances. It stresses documentary's close association, in Latin America, with key historical events, political tendencies, and social movements—including the Mexican, Cuban, and Central American revolutions, populist and developmentalist ideologies, cultural nationalism, and regional solidarity. This introduction concludes with a summary of the central concerns and problematics that emerge from the historical overview and that inform the subsequent chapters in this collection.

A Provisional Typology of Social Documentary

THE FOLLOWING typology¹ attempts to map the principal modes of social documentary: documentaries with a human subject and a descriptive or transformative concern. Each of the "modes" described below is most usefully considered as an emphasis or tendency in documentary practice. Most filmmakers combine aspects of various modes in their work to achieve a particular effect, in a given cultural context, at a specific historical conjuncture.

Two groups of examples accompany the first four modes identified below: Group A invokes works that are generally available and presumably familiar to North American audiences; Group B cites specific Latin American examples. Most of the Latin American documentaries mentioned in this introductory chapter, as well as many of those discussed in chapter 3, can be located below.

EXPOSITORY MODE

Characterized by:

- voice of omniscient narrator in direct verbal address
- images of illustration
- general predominance of nonsynchronous sound

Emphasizes objectivity, generalization, economy of analysis, filmmaker's privileged knowledge.

Process of gathering and presenting that knowledge is omitted.

Examples:*

- A. *Why We Fight, 28 Up*—conventional newsreel and much television news reporting
- B. *The Sugar Mill, The Battle of Chile*

OBSERVATIONAL MODE

Characterized by:

- voice of observed in indirect verbal address
- images of observation
- general predominance of synchronous sound and long takes

Emphasizes impartiality, intimate detail and texture of lived experience, behavior of subjects within social formations (families, institutions, communities), and at moments of historical or personal crisis.

Interaction between observer and observed is kept to a minimum.

Examples:

- A. *Workers Leaving the Lumière Factory, Bitter Melons, High School, Seventeen*
- B. *Ciclón, Carlos*—for primarily technical and economic reasons, both lack synchronous sound; the former has no spoken sound track; the latter employs “indirect interviews” in voice-over.

INTERACTIVE MODE

Characterized by:

- voice of filmmaker in relation to social actors
- images of testimony and demonstration
- general predominance of monologues and dialogues with varied use of interviews in direct or indirect address

* Titles used here as examples are given in English translation except in those cases where the original foreign-language title is the more common form. Elsewhere in the text, each title is given in the original upon first mention, followed by an English translation.

Social Documentary in Latin America

Emphasizes partiality, interpretation, the lived experience of social actors as apprehended and conveyed through a process in which subjects and filmmakers are both instrumental.

Filmmakers acknowledge the determining nature of their own intervention directly or indirectly.

Latitude for self-presentation by social actors varies.

Examples:

- A. *Housing Problems, “man on the street” encounters, Chronique d'une été, Sad Song of Yellow Skin*
- B. *For the First Time, Hablando del punto cubano, Man Marked to Die: Twenty Years Later*

REFLEXIVE MODE

Characterized by:

- voice of filmmaker in metacommentary
- images of “reflection”
- predominance of strategies that generate an awareness of the cinematic apparatus

Emphasizes epistemological doubt, (de)formative intervention of the cinematic apparatus.

Construes a critical stance toward all other modes of documentary practice as a mode unto itself.

Questions conventions of representational realism as well as the status of empirical knowledge, lived experience, and processes of interactive interpretation.

Examples:

- A. *Man With a Movie Camera, Daughter Rite, Reassemblage*
- B. *Of Great Events and Ordinary People, Unfinished Diary*

MIXED MODES

Combinations of two or more of the above. Since few documentaries are pure examples of their form, this is the category in which most documentaries will fall—those from an oppositional tradition that encompasses experimentation, innovation, and marginality all the more abundantly. For example: *Tire dié, The Hour of the Furnaces, Brick-makers, Man of Leather, A Time of Daring, A Man When He Is a Man.*

Additional categories of social documentary, which overlap with one or more of the preceding modes, include, among others: ethnographic (*Man of Leather*), biographical (*Alicia*, on Cuban prima ballerina Alicia Alonso; or Luis Felipe Bernaza's cinematic biographies of “everyday Cubans”), agitational (*I Like Students*), poetic (*Letter from Nicaragua*,

Prayer for Marilyn Monroe), celebrational (*Men of Mal Tiempo*), performance (*Simpalele*), compilation (*Now, Memorias de un mexicano*), collage (*Seventy-nine Springtimes*), reconstruction (*Muerte y vida en El Morillo*), and hybridized fictional/documentary forms (*Memorias de un mexicano, Patriamada*).

* * *

Today in the United States, documentary is a vital and varied form that has, during the past decade especially, enlisted renewed interest on the part of filmmakers, audiences, and critics. This resurgence in "nonfiction" filmmaking is the product of many converging factors: the rise of independent film and video efforts; the proliferation of social movements and special interest groups that see documentary as a tool for communicating their specific concerns to a larger constituency; the growth of community television as well as educational and other alternative outlets; the increasing accessibility of new technologies, particularly video. With the enhanced visibility and versatility of American documentary filmmaking, there emerges a heightened interest in the nature and uses of documentary not only in our own society but also in other places, other times.

Nowhere have the manifestations of documentary been as multiple and their impact so decisive as in Latin America. From its inception in the mid-1950s, the New Latin American Cinema movement accorded to documentary privileged status. Socially committed filmmakers embraced documentary approaches as their primary tool in the search to discover and define the submerged, denied, devalued realities of an intricate palimpsest of cultures and castes separated and conjoined by an arbitrary network of national boundaries. This documentary impulse, and the frequent aesthetic preference for a raw realism that replicated the compelling immediacy of certain techniques of reportage, has marked much of the fictional production throughout the region during the last three decades.

Today's Latin American artists and activists continue to embrace documentary as an instrument of cultural exploration, national definition, epistemological inquiry, and social and political transformation. Documentary provides: a source of "counterinformation" for those without access to the hegemonic structures of world news and communications; a means of reconstructing historical events and challenging hegemonic and often elitist interpretations of the past; a mode of eliciting, preserving, and utilizing the testimony of individuals and groups who would otherwise have no means of recording their experience; an instrument for capturing cultural difference and exploring the complex relationship of self to other within as well as between societies; and fi-

nally, a means of consolidating cultural identifications, social cleavages, political belief systems, and ideological agendas.

These functions go far beyond conventional conceptions of documentary as an educational medium that "simply" packages and transmits information to passive receivers. The uses of documentary in Latin America over the past three decades have redefined the social function of cinema (and video). Latin American documentarists have both appropriated and challenged transformations of the form elaborated elsewhere, as well as the technology (16mm, sync sound, Super-8, video) with which it is produced. These various documentary practices have left a deep imprint—not only on fictional filmmaking and literary discourses but also on social, political, and cultural life.

Yet in existing English-language documentary histories and theoretical-critical anthologies, references to Latin America, when indeed they exist at all, are scattered, vague, perfunctory. The single exception, Thomas Waugh's *"Show Us Life": Toward a History and Aesthetics of the Committed Documentary* (1984), dedicates five out of the seven selections in its third and final section, "Contemporaries: The Third World," to Latin American examples. Earlier books strike a very different balance.

Louis Jacobs divides *The Documentary Tradition* (1971, rev. 1979) into six periods spanning the years 1922 to 1978. The anthology's Euro-American emphasis admits Asia, Africa, and Latin America only as locations for the activity of European or American filmmakers: Mexico as site of Eisenstein's ill-fated *Que Viva Mexico!* project (1931–1932), Fred Zinneman's and Paul Strand's *The Wave (Redes)*, 1933, and Herbert Klein's *The Forgotten Village* (1941) (all fictional films with documentary dimensions); Cuba as the location of Len Giovannetti's *Cuba: Bay of Pigs* and *Cuba: The Missile Crisis* (both 1964). The presence of Alberto Cavalcanti, the only Latin American filmmaker included in the volume, is motivated not by any activity in his native Brazil, but rather by his work in France in the 1920s and especially with John Grierson in England during the following two decades. Only in Jacobs's introduction to the final section, 1970–1978, added for the revised edition, is there mention of a Latin American documentary by a Latin American director. Patricio Guzmán's three-part *La batalla de Chile (The Battle of Chile, 1974, 1977, 1979)* elicits the following paragraph:

A frankly partisan film, but impressive nonetheless, was a chronicle of the overturn of the Allende government in Chile by right-wing forces. *The Battle of Chile* (1977, [sic]) directed by a young Chilean Marxist, Patricio Guzmán, and put together in Cuba with the assistance of Chilean and Cuban associates, was an enterprise of cinematic excellence, convey-

lanas and Getino, since he favors "explanations" rather than "debate," going so far as to suggest that the lecturer record his/her comments on a disc that could accompany the film. More recently, McCall and Tyndall in *Argument* aim to create the preconditions whereby the audience can act on the social situation that the film engages. Their film has been shown to small groups followed by discussions with its makers. This experiment too is less audacious than that of Solanas and Getino, since the film is not interrupted, and the debate is only with the filmmakers.

3. Aleatory procedures are, of course, typical of art in the sixties. One need think only of "process art" in which chemical, biological, or seasonal forces affect the original materials, or of environmental art, or happenings, mixed media, human-machine interaction systems, street theater, and the like. The film formed part of a general tendency to erase the boundaries between art and life, but rarely did this erasure take such a highly politicized form.

4. The Argentinian junta paid inadvertent tribute to the revolutionary potential of photography when they arrested Che Guevara's mother in 1962, accusing her of having in her possession a "subversive" photograph. The photograph was of her son Che. See the *New York Times*, May 19, 1980, p. A10.

5. Gérard Chaliand, in *Mythes Révolutionnaires du Tiers Monde* (1976), criticizes what he calls the "macho" attitudes of Latin American guerrillas that led them to expose themselves to combat even when their presence was not required, thus resulting in the death of most of the guerrilla leaders. He contrasts this attitude with the more prudent procedure of the Vietnamese. During fifteen years of war, not one of the fifty members of the central committee of the South Vietnamese National Liberation Front fell into the hands of the enemy.

6. Should there be any doubt about the Peronist allegiances of the film, one need only remember the frequent quotations of Perón, the interviews with Peronist militants, and the critiques of the non-Peronist left. In 1971, Solanas and Getino made a propaganda film for Perón: *Perón: La revolución justicialista* (*Perón: The Justicialist Revolution*). The Cine-Liberación group which made the film, according to Solanas, served as "the cinematic arm of General Perón." During the [pro-Peronist] Cámpora administration, Getino accepted a post on the national film board. Upon Perón's death, Solanas and Getino made a public declaration supporting the succession of his wife Isabel. Ironically, the repression unleashed after her ouster was leveled as much against Solanas and Getino as against those who had been more consistently on the left.

7. The simplistic view of Perón as a fascist has been revived in many of the reviews of the Broadway production of *Evita*, with a number of critics comparing the play to the kind of spectacle parodied in Mel Brooks's *The Producers*.

14

THE BATTLE OF CHILE: DOCUMENTARY, POLITICAL PROCESS, AND REPRESENTATION

Ana M. Lopez

This essay attempts to contextualize the most ambitious documentary produced in Latin America in the 1970s by taking account of processes of cultural and ideological production and reproduction in Chile under Salvador Allende's Popular Unity coalition (1970-1973) as well as of the film's reception outside Chile. Lopez identifies a complex and apparently contradictory series of textual operations at work. Foremost among these are sequence shots and omniscient narration. She argues that the careful orchestration necessary to produce the characteristic sequence shots belies the immediate, testimonial impact of the "raw materials of the real," simultaneously inviting and obstructing direct identification with the events recorded. Similarly, the narrator's present-tense address creates continual, ironic tension because the dénouement is always already foretold. Lopez contends that a struggle over the very nature of language and representation was taking place in Chile under the Popular Unity government, a struggle involving assumptions about the transparency and immediacy of meaning which would intensify and polarize after that regime's overthrow. Lopez attempts to show how that struggle, and the subsequent experience of exile, shaped The Battle of Chile's particular mode of production and its modes of signification, creating an epic work poised between direct and dramatized, immediate and mediated modes of apprehending historical events.

We maintain that imperfect cinema must above all show the process which generates the problems. It is thus the opposite of a cinema principally dedicated to celebrating results. . . . To analyze a problem is to show the problem (not the process) permeated with judgments which the analysis itself generates a priori. . . . To show the process of a prob-

lem . . . is to submit it to judgment without pronouncing the verdict. . . . The subjective element is the selection of the problem, conditioned as it is by the interest of the audience—which is the subject. The objective element is showing the process—which is the object.

—Julio García Espinosa, “For an Imperfect Cinema”

The first impulse is to film everything that is taking place in order to later find a structure at the moviola . . . but “everything that takes place” is not really everything that is taking place. . . . What Chile represented, after all, was a sort of twentieth-century Paris Commune.

—Patricio Guzmán

IN DECEMBER 1972 Chile was in a state of chaos. As Salvador Allende’s Popular Unity coalition government (called Unidad Popular, or UP) struggled to overcome the many obstacles in the way of its “peaceful road to socialism,” a small group of filmmakers headed by Patricio Guzmán decided to undertake an ambitious project: to produce on film a testimonial/documentary record—complex, analytic, dialectical—of this national crisis and its outcome. They eventually produced *The Battle of Chile: The Struggle of a People Without Arms* (*La batalla de Chile: La lucha de un pueblo sin armas*)—a three-part, four-and-a-half-hour analysis of Chilean sociopolitical life at its most complex moment, between February and September 1973. It has been recognized as one of the best examples of politically engaged and socially conscious documentary filmmaking in Latin America. If at one end of the spectrum comprising the New Latin American Cinema documentaries we locate *The Hour of the Furnaces* (1968), the montage-based, self-reflexive analytical work by the Grupo Cine Liberación, we must place the apparent immediacy and testimonial power of *Battle* at the other end. However, this testimonial power—acclaimed by critics and audiences alike—is more complexly elaborated than is apparent on the film’s dense, informational surface. And it is precisely this textual and political density (which Guzmán himself has described as making the film heavy as a brick) that must be analyzed in relationship to the representational and political options of the Chilean sociopolitical conjuncture.

Popular Unity and the Practices and Languages of Cinematic Representation

That Popular Unity did not pay sufficient attention to the importance of cultural/ideological production and reproduction in its plans for a democratic and legal transition to socialism is by now, more

than fifteen years later, a well-documented, indisputable fact. What was missing from the UP agenda was an understanding of the crucial need for continued direct ideological struggle alongside the overt political warfare. The UP’s defeat was largely caused by its inability to exert the hegemonic ideological power necessary to maintain and develop the political majority acquired in 1970.¹ As Armand Mattelart and many others have argued, the official UP policy toward culture—“first access to culture, and *then* rupture with the existing culture”—ignored the crucial role of ideology in society by separating “the delivery of the pre-existing culture . . . from its reception by the dominated classes.”² Of course, this is not to imply that the UP did not take any measures to influence or control cultural production in Chile. However, its pluralistic and legalistic position prevented it from taking the kind of radical measures needed to counter effectively the ideological strength of antagonistic forces.³

The specific problems the UP faced with the cinema have also been well documented and analyzed.⁴ Chile Films, the official state film agency, was under UP control and supervision, but this was actually a handicap, because the political structure of the coalition (an uneasy mix of Socialists, Communists, and fractions of the Radical and Christian Democratic parties) was reproduced within the administration of Chile Films. Popular Unity had no clear policy for the cinema, and each party represented by the coalition tried to follow its own objectives and not those of the ensemble. Although the daily direction of Chile Films had been assigned to the Committee of Popular Unity Filmmakers, a group headed by Miguel Littin that had earlier proclaimed its allegiance to the UP, Chile Films’ resources were far from adequate for the task of building a new national cinema. By 1970 the facilities of Chile Films were thirty years old and in disrepair, and the agency did not even have enough funds to arrange for the installation of equipment purchased in 1969 by the previous regime. Funds for purchasing raw film stock were severely limited, causing even further restrictions on production.⁵ Furthermore, because of a “democratic guarantees” provision that prevented the UP from removing any civil servants from their jobs, incumbent bureaucrats could not be replaced by younger cineastes and technicians, and the institution was saddled with very high payroll expenses. Finally, the potential effectiveness of Chile films was further curtailed because the organization also had little control over film distribution (especially after U.S. distributors stopped exporting their films to Chile in 1971) and did not begin to alter the existing structure of commercial theatrical exhibition (through nationalization) until 1973.

Although institutional and industrial conditions were less than favorable for the development of a strong national cinema, it is important

to consider other, less direct and instrumental factors when analyzing Chilean cinema under the UP. How was the process of cinematic representation itself altered under the Popular Unity regime? How did the political and social changes made during this time affect the textual operations of its cinema? Did cinematic representation experience the same—or similar—cataclysmic changes as Chilean society in this period? These kinds of questions—in effect, addressing a sociology of cinematic representation—have rarely been addressed to the cinema produced during the Popular Unity years.

It is always difficult to assess or theorize about the relationship of texts or groups of texts (filmic, literary, or whatever) to specific socio-historical moments and struggles. As we understand cultural production in general, it is an autonomous, self-referential, and determining process, but one that nevertheless participates in the complexity of any social moment—sometimes prefiguring, sometimes following, but always participating in that sociopolitical instance.

At the risk of oversimplification, we might say that the UP years (whose impetus can be traced as far back as the 1930s) were structurally characterized by ever growing sociopolitical contradictions and polarizations. In spite of their complexity, these contradictions became increasingly more transparent in the 1970–1973 period.⁶ As Chilean society was divided into antagonistic blocks that would ultimately exhaust their ability to negotiate with one another, cultural production displayed similar structural characteristics manifested in contradictory bipolar tendencies that simultaneously depended upon and rejected the assumed transparency of meaning production.⁷ In the press of the period, for example, we find the hysterical counterrevolutionary aggressiveness of the right in *El Mercurio* versus the measured, intellectualized address of the left in the publications of the UP-controlled *Quimantú* press. In literature, the antipoetry of Nicanor Parra countered the revolutionary rhetorical poetry of Pablo Neruda. And in the cinema, the aggressive cinematic self-reflexivity of a Raúl Ruiz stood in sharp contrast to the transparency of newsreel production sponsored by Chile Films.

Caught in the interstices of these general contradictions, the cinema was also affected by its own specific history and other mediating forces at the national as well as the international level. The history of the development of the Chilean cinema before and during the UP is intimately linked with the rise of postwar and anti-Hollywood movements in Europe and the slow emergence of socially conscious modes of filmmaking throughout Latin America. As an integral part of the New Latin American Cinema that emerged from the struggling efforts of Latin American filmmakers in the early 1960s, the representational work of

the Chilean cinema must be considered in light of the representational options offered by this complex context.

Elsewhere I have argued that the most central representational characteristic of the New Latin American Cinema is the specific way in which the documentary and fictional modes of filmmaking were combined and transformed as filmmakers of the sixties and seventies attempted to change the social function of the cinema in Latin America.⁸ This rearticulation of the basic representational work of the cinema also took place in Chile, but in a fashion specific to that conjuncture, beginning before the UP victory and continuing after its defeat in the “exile cinemas” produced by Chileans all over the world.⁹

Although much less explicitly than in other Latin American countries, the documentary form was taken up by Chilean filmmakers in the years preceding the UP electoral victory in 1970 as a vehicle for the promotion and popularization of the Unidad Popular alliance. Documentary production began in earnest in Chile under the auspices of university cinema programs¹⁰ and university-sponsored TV stations, but it was the 1967 Viña del Mar festival that served as catalyst for the politicization and autocritique of Chilean documentary filmmakers in the context of the New Latin American Cinema.¹¹

After the 1967 Viña festival, filmmakers like Alvaro Ramírez, Douglas Hubner, Carlos Flores, and Guillermo Cahn began to use the cinema as an instrument for the analysis of contemporary Chilean social problems: infant malnutrition in *Desnutrición infantil* (Ramírez, 1969), the disenfranchised in *Hermida de la Victoria* (Hubner, 1969), *Casa o mierda* (House or Shit, Flores and Cahn, 1970) and mining problems in *Miguel Angel Aguilera* (Ramírez, 1970).

Following the style of *La hora de los hornos*, Pedro Chaskel and Hector Ríos wanted to develop a cinema that would awaken passive spectators to the injustices and problems of the Frei regime. They produced a film in early 1970 entitled *Venceremos*, the first documentary specifically affiliated with the UP. Like *La hora*, this film was designed to serve as an instrument in the struggle to bring a particular candidate, in this case Allende, to power. Other films emerged during the electoral campaign that favored the programs of Unidad Popular—for example, *Brigada Ramona Parra* (1970) by Alvaro Ramírez.

Sponsored by the Centro de Cine Experimental (headed by Sergio Bravo) and by the film department of the Central Única de Trabajadores (CUT, the principal workers’ union), most of these films were not distributed in the hostile commercial circuit. Instead, they were shown throughout the countryside, in working-class neighborhoods, and in factories. In addition to Chilean films, others, including *La hora de los hornos*, were also shown through these alternative circuits. The Chilean

working class has historically been among the most politicized of the continent, and these films served as the focus of important political debates. Overall, the stated goal of militant documentary filmmakers in Chile before Unidad Popular was to "involve the popular masses in the struggles for power and to help them rediscover Chile, giving them a new vision of the present, past, and future of their nation. This vision will be a critical one that interprets reality according to new values and that is integrated with the construction of socialism in Chile."¹²

Although highly politicized and distributed almost exclusively within alternative circuits, these early UP documentaries adhered to the tenets of traditional political documentary filmmaking. They sought to be "objective," denunciatory, and persuasive, while also calling attention to conditions that the cinema had previously not recognized or analyzed, and articulating new solutions.

After the UP's electoral victory and the reorganization of Chile Films under the leadership of Miguel Littín and the cineastes of Unidad Popular, documentary production continued, albeit in a different form. Because Chile Films was not able to assume control of Chilean distribution or exhibition, and the films it sponsored and/or produced were generally not welcomed by the commercial sector, documentary films that sought to expose and analyze contemporary social and political problems facing Chile had a difficult time finding an official outlet. Allende's electoral victory had not marked the end of the struggle for cultural and political autonomy; the documentary was being used to promote that victory and to analyze available political and practical options. Rather than denounce conditions, the documentary began to be used as a means to chronicle and analyze the Chilean political process. Over 100 documentaries were produced by Chile Films between 1970 and 1973, some of which dealt with the need to preserve Chile's natural resources, the workers' struggle to control the national economy, and the need for social and political reforms.¹³ As Zuzana Pick has argued, "Each of these films demonstrates that the Chilean documentary movement began to overcome the [idea of] documentary as memory or witness to reality and aspired to transform it into an analytical historical instrument, while [the newsreels] of Chile Films were conceived as the site for informative material and political commentary."¹⁴

El Equipo Tercer Año and Patricio Guzmán

Patricio Guzmán is among the most accomplished documentary filmmakers to emerge during the Unidad Popular years. Guzmán neither attempted to use the cinema "as a gun" nor followed the socio-scientific mode of, for example, Colombian filmmakers Marta

Rodríguez and Jorge Silva in *Chircales (Brickmakers)*. Guzmán (and the small group of filmmakers associated with him) adopted the documentary as the only cinematic form appropriate to the complex, multifaceted social and political condition of Chile during Unidad Popular. Although trained in fiction filmmaking in Spain, upon his return to Chile in 1971 Guzmán decided that what was most important was to "film the events that they [in Chile] were living at that moment. . . . You would be sitting in a cafe, working on a script, and all of a sudden a group of picketing workers with red flags would pass by. . . . How could you not film all that? Why distance oneself from that reality?"¹⁵

Guzmán and his associates undertook to film the day-to-day events of the first year of Unidad Popular; in 1971 they produced *El primer año*, a feature documentary that tried to summarize what took place in that year. Rather than rely on archival material, Guzmán and his team insisted on filming an amazing record of events, but even according to Guzmán, it is too much of a chronicle, too journalistic and commemorative, to provide an analysis of the events recorded. In fact, Guzmán's search for an appropriate mode of cinematic representation for Chile under the UP parallels the increasingly blatant contradictions of the UP conjuncture.

Although Guzmán next embarked on a fiction film project, a Chile Films-sponsored historical reconstruction of the life and legend of Manuel Rodríguez, a Chilean national hero, he once again abandoned fiction "because what was happening was more important than fiction."¹⁶ While shooting *Manuel Rodríguez*, Guzmán and his production team (which included, among others, cameraman Jorge Müller and producer Federico Elton) took to the streets to film a report of daily political activities. "No matter how interesting the *Manuel Rodríguez* project . . . it was impossible not to film what was going on."¹⁷ The streets of Chile in 1972 were physically paralyzed by a number of crippling strikes organized by anti-Unidad Popular forces, and Guzmán and his team filmed the response of the Chilean working class to this paralysis. *La respuesta de octubre (The Answer to October, 1972)* records how the working class organized itself into industrial belts (*cordones industriales*) by taking over factories that had been abandoned by their owners and managers so as to neutralize the economic chaos produced by the strikes. By Guzmán's own admission, the long series of interviews that make up the film is monotonous. The industrial belt was not an immediately visible phenomenon. "You can't see it. You can only see the facade of the factory and a sign. But it is not a parade. It isn't an inauguration or a speech or a demonstration."¹⁸ Yet through their work in this film, Guzmán and his associates began to understand how to find, visualize, and film the "invisible" events at the core of Chilean life. In fact, as the

situation worsened, the roots of the crisis were rendered increasingly visible.

Shelving their fiction projects until the time when the country might be under more secure political control, Guzmán and his associates organized themselves to continue their work of documenting the people's struggle against fascist forces in Chile. Because they could no longer count on the support of Chile Films,¹⁹ they obtained simple equipment (an Eclair and a Nagra) from a friendly independent production outfit and raw stock from France through the generosity of cinema verité filmmaker Chris Marker. Rather than run to the streets and film indiscriminately, Guzmán and his team (now called El Equipo Tercer Año) undertook a long theoretical and methodological debate before filmmaking began. Fully conscious of the volatile state of the nation in 1972 and of impending changes, they nevertheless felt that regardless of the final outcome for Chile (whether a civil war or a coup d'état), their film would serve as a valuable historical record of those events. However, they wanted to avoid the agitational or denunciatory style of documentary they all considered typical of the New Latin American Cinema; they sought to produce what they termed an *analytical* documentary, more like an essay than explicit agitprop, which could serve an essential testimonial and analytical function for Chile and all of Latin America in future years. El Equipo Tercer Año surveyed available models of political documentary and fiction filmmaking and analyzed their methodological options. They concluded that they needed to avoid the simple chronological structure they had used in *El primer año* in order to develop a "nucleus" or dialectical approach that would pinpoint "the key areas at which the Chilean class struggle intersects." Guzmán explained:

Which are the key points through which the proletariat and the peasantry must pass in the conquest of state power? And which are the key points through which the bourgeoisie and its imperialist allies must pass in order to reappropriate that power? If you locate these fifteen or twenty battlegrounds within the larger conflict and pin them down one by one, you are going to have a dialectical vision of what is going on. This was the approach we finally agreed to use.²⁰

The extensive preproduction planning carried out by El Equipo Tercer Año would seem to contradict my assertion that sociopolitical contradictions were becoming increasingly obvious. But in fact, the "work" these filmmakers felt was necessary to filming the Chilean conjuncture in 1973 already prefigures the outcome of the crisis itself at a representational level. The ubiquitous assumed transparency of cinematic language challenged the apparent transparency of the social system, disclosing its own insufficiencies. Only the cataclysmic change

wrought by the coup d'état, the reestablishment of the hegemony of the oligarchy – would validate the Equipo Tercer Año's complex representational work.

The filming of this tremendously ambitious project took place semi-clandestinely. For as long as the Unidad Popular government retained control of the state, the filmmakers had access to events and were welcomed by workers. But to be able to document the contemporary situation thoroughly, they also had to infiltrate the right and subject themselves to physical danger by participating in all sorts of potentially violent demonstrations.

The Equipo Tercer Año was "in production" for as long as their film supply lasted. When the successful coup made it unsafe to film in the streets, they used their last reels of film to record the first televised messages of the military junta and the broadcast of the bombing of the presidential palace. Soon afterward, the members of the collective left Chile in a prearranged order and also smuggled all the footage and magnetic sound recordings for the film out of the country.²¹ After searching unsuccessfully for financial support to complete the project in France, the collective ended up in Cuba, where Alfredo Guevara of the Cuban Film Institute (ICAIC) offered all of the institute's resources and facilities (including the supervision and advice of Julio García Espinosa) necessary to complete the film.

The final product of this experience, the three-part *Battle of Chile*, stands as the epitome of the New Latin American Cinema documentary: direct, engaged, immediate, spontaneous yet analytical, and completed through pan-Latin American cooperation. In fact, no documentary of the New Latin American Cinema other than *The Hour of the Furnaces* has received more popular attention or wider international distribution.

The Critical Response

Ironically, however, *The Battle of Chile* has never been publicly shown in Pinochet's Chile. The public the film was meant to serve as an analysis of a crucial sociopolitical conjuncture has not been and cannot be its audience. Instead, *Battle* has been inserted into a number of extremely different sociopolitical milieus that have decisively affected its reception.

What is most interesting about a survey of the various critical responses to *Battle* is that regardless of their nationalities or political beliefs, most critics have failed to recognize the uniqueness of the film's representational work and have assessed the film as "pure documentary," dealing in facts, history, testimony, and so forth. For example,



The pageantry of Popular Power: *La Batalla de Chile*, part III. Credit: Patricio Guzmán

North American mass media critics uniformly hailed the film's value as a record and for the most part ignored its substantive analytical work or the complexities of its modes of address. Stanley Kauffmann wrote in the *New Republic*, "There is little critical to be said about this picture. It is merely gripping fact, well represented."²² According to Pauline Kael, "The film seems to give us only the public actions . . . and none of the inner workings."²³ And Vincent Canby in the *New York Times* and the reviewers for *Variety* were in almost complete agreement, simply classifying the film as "reportage" with an explicit Marxist bias.²⁴ European critics, although they protested less about the film's alleged "difficulty," also tended subtly to privilege its status as a documentary record over its analytical work. Even Paul Louis Thirard in *Positif* argued that Guzmán prefers to illustrate instead of explain and that this limits the effectiveness of the film.²⁵

When attempting to assess the film's impact on audiences, most critics have been overwhelmed by the film's informational density (its four and a half hours of relentless data), simultaneously claiming that its analysis is excessively detailed and that it does not provide enough background information. Beyond this point, critics have argued either that the film is cold and distancing, or the exact opposite—that it is absorbing. For example, Cuban critic Azucena Isabel argued in her



The traitorous military under intimate scrutiny: *La Batalla de Chile*, part II. Credit: Patricio Guzmán

review that the film is effective precisely because of its "conscious distancing" of all emotional impact without seeking to illustrate a specific thesis, while North American critic Rosalie Schwartz claimed that the film was "frightening in its power to absorb the viewer."²⁶

The Textual Operations of The Battle of Chile

This split critical response becomes less paradoxical when we look closely at the textual operations of the film. The film's impact—this simultaneous absorbing and distancing effect—is to a large degree determined by the fictive strategies that are invoked to represent what we necessarily recognize as important documentary footage of crucial historical events.

The most significant of these strategies is Guzmán's extensive use of sequence shots. Rather than depend on montage (like *The Hour of the Furnaces* and, in fact, most political documentaries) to organize and construct an a posteriori reading of the social and political events of this particular moment in Chilean history, the filmmakers set out to film in long takes whenever possible. They were able to do this because

of the theoretical and methodological work that preceded and accompanied the actual filming. El Equipo Tercer Año did not want to film everything that was taking place. On the contrary, they followed an original analysis that identified five crucial problems in the Chilean class struggle and filmed only those events that seemed significant within those areas. Guzmán explained in an interview:

We decided that these fronts of struggle had to be followed up and examined, and anything happening on another front had to be excluded, even if it was very interesting. Within this outline there was room for variation and improvisation. This was what we had decided to do: illustrate with images a previously proposed outline, without losing in the filming the freshness and spontaneity of life, without locking them into a set frame.²⁷

Once the outline was established, the filmmakers were able to concentrate on the aesthetics of images to a degree unusual in traditional documentary filmmaking of this kind (*témoignage*). "Once the project was clearly worked out on paper and in our heads, we could liberate our expressive capabilities, freeing the camera to make very long takes."²⁸

This explicit aesthetic decision required the complex orchestration of the filming process. Guzmán often served as the peripheral eyes of cameraman Jorge Müller, surveying the action, anticipating what was about to happen, and instructing him "to make certain movements [pans, tilts, manual cranes] that are much more readily identified with fictional than with documentary filmmaking."²⁹

In the finished film, these sequence shots so laboriously obtained serve to alter the traditional relationship between film, filmmakers, and spectators. In the narrative-fiction cinema, the sequence shot increases the image's credibility and its indirect persuasiveness. It is generally considered more "realistic" because of its apparent preservation of the unities of time and space. Its extensive use in the documentary, however, rather than emphasizing a real already ostensibly guaranteed by the documentary form, paradoxically brings the document closer to the realm of fiction. It produces a "fiction effect" which, by resisting the manipulation of editing, unmasking the manipulation or "construction" inherent in the simple act of pointing a camera.³⁰ In *Battle*, sequence shots provide a wealth of detail and evidence of the directiveness of the filming that belies the careful orchestration of the "raw" materials of the real. This is not a film presenting itself as a record of how things "really were" in Chile in 1973, as many critics have argued. It is a precise, calculated, intentionally political, Marxist dialectical analysis of those events that uses the narrative strategies of fiction as a legitimat-



Sound technician Bernardo Menz, cameraman Jorge Müller, and director Patricio Guzmán in 1973, shooting a sequence for *La Batalla de Chile*. Credit: Patricio Guzmán

ing device. By revealing the means by which the dramatic action has been structured, the sequence shot functions within this documentary as a kind of estrangement device that separates the spectator from the sheer force of rhetoric and that simultaneously suggests (because of its role in fiction) *and* prevents (because this is a documentary) simple identification.

An important example of this operation takes place early in part 1 ("The Insurrection of the Bourgeoisie") during a series of interviews that establish the mood of the people before the March 1973 elections. The filmmakers enter a right-wing apartment, pretending to be representatives of Channel 13 TV.³¹ While the microphone interviews the lady of the house, the camera, after remaining on her face for only a few seconds, takes a tour of the well-appointed apartment. What we see underlines the presumed coherence between what she says and her environment. While the woman expresses her conservative political sentiments—in a tone and diction that denote her class position—the camera shows us her furniture, her porcelain figurines, her carefully coiffed, insouciant adolescent son who lights a cigarette taken from a fancy holder resting on a fine wood table. The second-level information

provided by this sequence shot is as essential to the analysis presented by the documentary as similarly placed (and therefore underlined) information would be for the plot development of a fiction film. This presentation of information—the visual indictment of the bourgeoisie—simultaneously positions the spectator as a reader/observer of the “real” and as the observer of a preconstructed, intentional operation, directed as a fiction is directed.

Notwithstanding their fictional effect, there is no doubt that the images that assault us in *Battle* are real and that their testimonial force is great. The authenticity of the images and their ability to report directly on the events that took place in Chile in 1973 is interpreted and reorganized for the spectator not only by the sequence shots and by the smoothly invisible editing of Pedro Chaskel, but also by the voice-over narration that situates our reading of the events portrayed by the film.

This authoritarian voice-over marks the distance between this film and traditional conceptions of “direct cinema.” Although the sequence shots and the mobile framing, reframing, focus shifts, and movements within the image could code the film as “direct,” the voice-over reinscribes the filmic discourse as an authored discourse. The camera may be a “neutral” observer, but the images it produces are orchestrated and controlled by the essential contextual and explanatory information provided by this metadiscourse. Because of the directness of the images, the voice-over performs a double operation that indirectly supports the distancing effect of the sequence shots. By negating the images’ ability to stand on their own, the voice-over provides a second line of interpretation, one that is dialectical rather than objective in the traditional sense. It also establishes a specific kind of spectator and address. While the images often seem to position the spectator as a direct observer-participant in the events filmed, the voice-over distances the spectator from emotional identification and encourages a “knowing” stance. The textual operations of *Battle* position the spectator as a knowing subject—one who knows both the outcome of the struggles the film documents and the film’s status as an irreplaceable document of those struggles.

This operation is especially apparent at the beginning of part 1. The sound of jet engines and bomb explosions accompanies the credits. After the credits, the source of those sounds is identified: these are the airplanes and the bombs with which the military destroyed the Moneda presidential palace in the September 1973 coup. In long shot, we see the effects of the bombs on the palace. The voice-over—in the English-language version a woman’s voice—interjects, “In March 1973, six

months before the bombing of the Moneda Palace, the people of Chile go to the polls. . . . The political forces are divided into two sides,” as the image places us in the midst of a street demonstration. We know what the outcome will be—there is no narrative enigma in the traditional sense. In fact, the film is structured as an extensive flashback from the spectator’s present state of knowledge—signified by the newsreel-like images of the bombing of the palace that were broadcast over television as soon as the military took power.³² The events presented by the film are thus constructed as leading to a foreknown closure. The voice-over, while insisting on the present tense, always remarks on the future consequences of the events presented, thereby negating the apparent transparency and completeness of the representation. For example, early in part 1, during the presentation of the parliamentary boycott of the UP’s anti-black market policies, the narrator makes this statement:

Although the right was not able to prove anything, the accusations *would follow* their course. The blackmail would be repeated with other high functionaries of Popular Unity: either the ministers give in to the demands of the right or they *will be expelled*. . . . In every instance, a representative of the left *is going to demonstrate* that the accusations did not have any legal basis. (Emphasis added)

Battle’s overall flashback structure—emphasized by the fact that part 3, “Popular Power,” is structured as a flashback-within-the-flashback look at the October 1972 crisis from the people’s perspective—engages the spectator as a participant in the process of making and recording this particular history. The filmmakers’ self-reflexivity in the first five minutes of part 1 further contributes to this mode of address. After the shots of the bombing of La Moneda, we are thrown into the midst of a demonstration, where the hand-held camera bounces from one face to another, from one placard and excited shout to the next. In the background of the chanting and singing, we hear the technical commands of the filmmakers: “Sync . . . clapboard . . . ready? go! . . . over here, ‘Flaco!’”³³ We see their bodies, especially Guzmán as interviewer holding the microphone, moving among the demonstrators, approaching different individuals, trying to get out of camera range. After several of the cuts in this first sequence, a new shot begins as the camera focuses on a hand tapping the mike to mark the beginning of a take and then quickly reframes or refocuses to approach the subject of the interview. Their privileged location at the beginning underscores the priority accorded to the process of filming the events that mark the crucial “nodal” points of the Chilean class struggle at this historical mo-

ment. Furthermore, they introduce the spectator to the historical process and to the process of recording/writing that history as a witness and spectator-participant.

This sense of "history in the making" is further emphasized in the conclusion of part 1 and the beginning of part 2. The Equipo Tercer Año made use of the dramatic footage obtained the day of the *tancazo* (the aborted coup of June 1973) by an Argentine TV cameraman (Leonardo Henricksen) who filmed his own death as he was threatened and finally shot by an army officer. Part 1 ends abruptly, with the turbulent images recorded by the camera falling from the hands of the dying Henricksen. The narrator explains: "Not only did he film his own death. He also filmed, two months before the final coup, the true face of the fascist Chilean military. The imperialist strategy enters its final phase." And in the background, we hear someone's voice screaming, "Watch out! Watch out! Get out of here!" Part 2 ("The Coup d'État") begins with this same footage and voice-over commentary (but without the background voices). The end of Henricksen's final sequence is joined to a sequence filmed by the Equipo Tercer Año cameraman who, from the other side of the street, witnessed the event.

The development of *Battle* follows the logic of fictive discourses. Each element of the film, especially in parts 1 and 2, is part of a cause-and-effect chain leading to the eventual denouement of the September coup d'état that ends part 2. As Guzmán himself has acknowledged, the filmmakers "probed reality to find in it a narrative line."³⁴ The film unfolds by establishing a series of events that demand responses from the right and from the left. From the pre-electoral survey of attitudes on both sides, the film takes us through the elections, to the increasingly desperate responses of the right, to the left's responses to the right's increasing sabotage activities, and so forth. Because the collective's goal was to present a dialectical analysis, they emphasized conflict, thus bringing the film closer to the traditional structuration of fictional dramas.³⁵ Their efforts to show events as they unfolded and to juxtapose one series of events to another generate audience expectations that are fulfilled by the subsequent development of the film. Thus the actions filmed are transformed into dramatic actions in the classic sense.

One of the expectations emphasized by the inexorable logic of the cause-and-effect chain, by the introductory sequence, and by the audience's prior knowledge of Chilean events, is the triumph of the right in the September coup d'état. This knowledge and this expectation, fulfilled at the end of part 2, color the filmmakers' and the spectators' relationship to the sequence portraying the right. The iconography and activities of the right – the arm bands and military insignias – are sin-



The price of documentary witness: an Argentine cameraman records his own summary execution at the hands of mutinous Chilean troops in *La Batalla de Chile*. This sequence concludes part I and initiates part II. Credit: Patricio Guzmán

ister, echoing Nazi and the Ku Klux Klan rallies. Their victory at the end of part 2 is, for the film, a pyrrhic one. Although in effect the coup d'état ends the drama, the film continues and finds another locus for dramatic introspection within the left itself rather than in the very visible and ostensibly straightforward conflict between the left and the right. Ultimately, part 3 demonstrates that the militancy of the Chilean people was not sufficiently tapped by the *via democrática* of Unidad Popular.

The narrative logic underlying this tripartite structure also clearly marks the film as an a posteriori representation, particularly one inflicted by exile, neither within the UP conjuncture nor totally outside it. More than other films begun in Chile and finished elsewhere, *The Battle of Chile* highlights the cataclysmic representational/linguistic/ideological effects of the coup d'état and of exile. For those who remained in Chile after the coup, language and representation became suspect: treacherous, deceiving, veiled. Those outside, caught in the time warps of exile, tended to remain within the assumed linguistic and ideological transparency of the UP conjuncture.³⁶ *The Battle of Chile* is poised between these two conditions: a document shaped by transparency and immediacy that also questions the systems producing these meanings and inscribes a necessarily questioning spectator within its midst.

NOTES

1. For an interesting analysis of the Chilean debacle from a Gramscian perspective, see John Hoffman, *The Gramscian Challenge* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984).

2. "Entretien avec Armand Mattelart," *Cahiers du Cinéma*, nos. 254-55 (1974-75), trans. and rpt. as "Interview with Armand Mattelart," in *Chilean Cinema*, ed. Michael Chanan (London: BFI, 1976), p. 78.

3. For an extensive analysis, see Armand Mattelart, *Mass Media, Ideologies and the Revolutionary Movement* (Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press, 1980). See also Gabriel Smirnow, *The Revolution Disarmed* (New York: Monthly Review, 1979).

4. See, for example, *Chilean Cinema*, ed. Chanan; Francesco Bolzoni, *El cine de Allende* (Valencia: Fernando Torres Editor, 1974); and *Re-visión del cine Chileno*, ed. Alicia Vega (Santiago, Chile: Editorial Aconcagua-CENECA, 1977).

5. Zuzana Pick, "Le cinéma chilien sous le signe de l'Union Populaire: 1970-1973," *Positif* 155 (1974), 35-41.

6. As Raúl Zurita has convincingly argued, this is apparent first of all within language itself as the growing sociopolitical dislocation in Chile forced oral expression and conversation to become increasingly transparent and self-evident: "One understands . . . because one is in disagreement and language becomes more transparent as the intermediary space of negotiation narrows"

(p. 301). See Raúl Zurita, "Chile: literatura, lenguaje y sociedad (1973-1983)," in *Fascismo y experiencia literaria: reflexiones para una reanonización*, ed. Hernán Vidal (Minneapolis: Institute for the Study of Ideologies and Literature, 1985), pp. 299-331.

7. Interestingly, Stuart Hall finds a similar phenomenon in his analysis of the relationship of the photomagazine *Picture Post* to wartime Great Britain, a society undergoing a revolutionary transformation and crisis akin to that of Chile under the UP. See Stuart Hall, "The Social Eye of *Picture Post*," *Working Papers in Cultural Studies* 2 (Spring 1972), 71-120.

8. See Ana M. Lopez, *The New Latin American Cinema* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 1991), chap. 20.

9. For an extensive filmography and analysis of the Chilean exile cinema, the "cinema of resistance," see the special issue of *Literatura Chilena* 8, no. 1 (1984).

10. Among university programs, the most important was that of the Catholic University in Santiago. Other centers of experimental/political cinematic activity were the Cine Club Universitario, the Centro de Cine Experimental, the Cinemateca Universitaria, and the Cine-Club Viña del Mar. The visit of Dutch documentarist Joris Ivens in the early 1960s (when he filmed his *Valparaíso*) was also an important stimulus to the young filmmakers who worked with him and attended his seminars.

11. The 1967 Viña del Mar festival represented a first step in the collaborative process of creating a new, pan-Latin American cinema. The importance of this event was officially recognized at the 1987 International Festival of New Latin American Cinema in Havana, with a complete retrospective of the films shown at Viña two decades earlier.

12. Declarations collected by the editors of *Cine y liberación*, cited by Bolzoni, *El cine de Allende*, p. 38.

13. Chile Films also produced many newsreels analyzing current events, but these newsreels, like their documentaries, provoked the anger of the established commercial sector and even, in some cases, fights in the theaters. See Zuzana Pick et al., "Chili," in *Les cinémas de l'Amérique Latine*, ed. Guy Hennebel and Alfonso Gumucio Dagrón (Paris: l'Herminier, 1981), p. 206.

14. Zuzana Pick, "La imagen cinematográfica y la representación de la realidad," *Literatura chilena: creación y crítica* 8, no. 1 (1984), 36. A subsequent version appears in chapter 5.

15. Pedro Sempere, "Cine contra el fascismo: conversación con Patricio Guzmán," in Sempere and Guzmán, *Chile: el cine contra el fascismo* (Valencia: Fernando Torres, Editor, 1977), p. 54.

16. The historical film was itself planned as a kind of documentary of the popular rewriting (and ideologically motivated deformation) of the legend of the nineteenth-century Chilean hero Manuel Rodríguez (see *ibid.*, pp. 60, 75).

17. *Ibid.*, p. 69.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 72.

19. Chile Films had been paralyzed by internal problems and the U.S. blockade that made the importation of raw film stock impossible.

20. Julianne Burton, "Politics and the Documentary in People's Chile: An

Interview with Patricio Guzmán on *The Battle of Chile*," in *Cinema and Social Change in Latin America: Conversations with Filmmakers*, ed. Burton (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), p. 55.

21. Cameraman Jorge Müller was not able to leave the country. He was arrested by the military police and like many of Latin America's "disappeared," he is assumed dead, though his fate has never been made public.

22. Stanley Kauffmann, "The Battle of Chile," *New Republic*, 21 January 1978, rpt. in *Before My Eyes* (New York: Harper and Row, 1980), pp. 303-04.

23. Pauline Kael, "The Battle of Chile," *New Yorker*, 23 January 1978, p. 82. This is by far the most thorough critical review available in the North American mass press.

24. See Vincent Canby, "Guzmán Documentary," *New York Times*, 13 January 1978, sec. C7, p. 1; Holl., "La batalla de Chile - II: el golpe de estado, *Variety*, 14 July 1976; and Cart., "La batalla de Chile - III," *Variety*, 17 May 1980.

25. See Paul Louis Thirard, "En la historia. Ya," *Positif* (1977), rpt. in Guzmán and Sempere, *Chile: el cine contra el fascismo*, pp. 201-03. This volume also reprints other reviews, including Luis Marcorelles's glowing assessment of the film for *Le Monde*.

26. Azucena Isabel, "El golpe de estado," *Bohemia*, 24 September 1976, rpt. in Guzmán and Sempere, *Chile: el cine contra el fascismo*, pp. 194-96; and Rosalie Schwartz, "Battle of Chile," *PCCLAS Proceedings* 6 (1977-79), 261.

27. Zuzana Pick, "Interview with Patricio Guzmán," *Cinettracts* 9 (1980), 30. The five fronts of struggle identified by the Equipo Tercer Año were the control of production and distribution, the counteroffensive by revolutionary forces, the transformation of the relations of production, the ideological fight in education and information, and the battle plan. These five areas were identified in what was essentially the shooting script, published as "Guión esquema del filme," *Cine Cubano* 91-92 (1977), 49-51; rpt. in Patricio Guzmán, *La Batalla de Chile* (Pamplona: I. Peralta Ediciones/Editorial Ayuso, 1977); trans. and rpt. by Christine Shants in *Cinettracts* 9 (1980), 46-49.

28. Julianne Burton, "Politics and the Documentary in People's Chile," *Socialist Review* 35 (1977), 49, rpt. in *Cinema and Social Change*.

29. *Ibid.*

30. "A film using the sequence-shot is still a communicative instrument that signifies on other levels as well as that of direct representation (which in itself is already incomplete and intentional; it is still a work in which the place occupied by the signifiers is the support and root of the place occupied by the signified, by the diegesis" (Gianfranco Bettetini, *The Language and Technique of the Film* [The Hague: Mouton, 1968]; rpt. in *Realism and the Cinema*, ed. Christopher Williams [London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980], p. 221).

31. Channel 13 was the principal TV station controlled by the right.

32. This sequence of the bombing of La Moneda is one of the few not actually filmed by the Equipo Tercer Año. Another crucial sequence not filmed by them is the ending of part 1, the cameraman's filming of his own death. See Sempere, "El cine contra el fascismo," p. 97.

33. "Flaco" was Jorge Müller's nickname.

34. Pick, "Interview with Patricio Guzmán," p. 30.

35. See Mayra Vilasis, "Comunicación y dramaturgia en el cine documental," *Cine Cubano* 105 (1983), 61-66, for an analysis of dramaturgy and the documentary.

36. This phenomenon has been well documented. For a journalistic account, see Ariel Dorfman, "The House That Neruda Built," *Village Voice*, 13 December 1981, pp. 59-68. For an analysis of how this "silencing" and "shrouding" of expression has redefined the nature of art in Pinochet's Chile, see Nelly Richard, *Margins and Institutions: Art in Chile Since 1973*, a special issue of *Art and Text* 21 (1986). See also the essays collected in *Fascismo y experiencia literaria*, ed. Vidal.