



## The Cine Club de Colombia and Postwar Cinephilia in Latin America: Forging Transnational Networks, Schooling Local Audiences

Rielle Navitski

To cite this article: Rielle Navitski (2018): The Cine Club de Colombia and Postwar Cinephilia in Latin America: Forging Transnational Networks, Schooling Local Audiences, Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television, DOI: [10.1080/01439685.2018.1453993](https://doi.org/10.1080/01439685.2018.1453993)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01439685.2018.1453993>



Published online: 27 Mar 2018.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

# THE CINE CLUB DE COLOMBIA AND POSTWAR CINEPHILIA IN LATIN AMERICA: FORGING TRANSNATIONAL NETWORKS, SCHOOLING LOCAL AUDIENCES

Rielle Navitski

*Founded in Bogotá in 1949, the Cine Club de Colombia exemplifies the transatlantic character of Latin American cinephilia after WWII, when film societies, archives, festivals, and film schools flourished in close contact with European cultural institutions with global aspirations, including FIAF and UNESCO. Dedicated to 'improving the taste of the movie-going public' in a rapidly growing metropolis, the Cine Club de Colombia (CCC) served as a source of cultural legitimacy for an emerging middle class. The organization worked to institute an imported model of the film society, both in terms of programming (films from an emerging canon of art cinema or judged historically significant) and audience (imagined as discerning and actively engaged, an ideal indebted to the French cineclub movement). The CCC's efforts were hampered by members' resistance to these spectatorial norms and difficulties obtaining suitable programming within the local infrastructure of commercial distribution, which prompted its leadership to connect with an international network of cultural institutions to access prints. Drawing on programs and internal documents, this essay expands on recent scholarship on noncommercial exhibition beyond Euro-American contexts, arguing that the CCC's history signals the tensions between institutional norms established elsewhere and locally entrenched tastes and practices in postwar Latin America.*

---

Correspondence to: Rielle Navitski, Department of Theatre and Film Studies, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602-3154, USA. E-mail: [rnavitsk@uga.edu](mailto:rnavitsk@uga.edu)

In a program marking the 30th anniversary of the Cine Club de Colombia, the film society's leadership claimed credit for a sweeping transformation of the movie-going public, described in terms that evoke the nation's turbulent and often traumatic political history:

When the cineclub movement was initiated in Colombia in 1949, one still remembered with horror that only seven years earlier, in 1942, an infuriated audience almost destroyed the Teatro Colombia (now the Jorge Eliécer Gaitán), in Bogotá, due to the projection of Orson Welles' *Citizen Kane*, a masterpiece of cinema that nearly cleaves its history in two. Thanks to cineclubs, now familiar points of reference for the majority of spectators, destructive furor like that caused by *Citizen Kane* is no longer produced.<sup>1</sup>

Consistent with historical reports of disturbances and even vandalism among local audiences, the program's reference to a 'destructive furor' also evokes an event more deeply seared into popular memory: the Bogotazo, a popular uprising in Colombia's capital sparked by the assassination of Liberal presidential candidate Jorge Eliécer Gaitán on April 9, 1948.<sup>2</sup> Much as Eliécer Gaitán's death is registered in the renaming of the movie theater (which today houses Bogotá's Cinemateca Distrital), the program's rhetoric echoes the tendency of 'elites of both parties [Liberal and Conservative] to speak in the most extravagant and racist terms about the impossibility of civilizing the Colombian masses' in the wake of the Bogotazo.<sup>3</sup> After three decades in existence, the Cine Club de Colombia (hereafter, CCC) affirmed its success in 'imposing good cinema' and restraining the exuberant and even violent behavior of film audiences, highlighting the explicitly didactic character of the organization's cultural project.<sup>4</sup>

The CCC's self-proclaimed goal of 'improving the taste of the movie-going public' embodied the local bourgeoisie's striving for distinction (in Pierre Bourdieu's sense) as Colombia's middle classes expanded in the post-WWII era, a moment of accelerated urbanization and industrialization.<sup>5</sup> Part of a wave of new institutions of film culture – cineclubs, film archives, festivals, specialized magazines, and film schools – that emerged in Latin America in the period, the CCC's activities were nurtured by novel forms of film-related cultural diplomacy and institutions that aspired to a global reach, such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the Fédération Internationale des Archives du Film (FIAF).<sup>6</sup> While it was neither Latin America's earliest nor its largest film society, the CCC's surviving archive of programs, correspondence, and other internal documents, held by the Fundación Patrimonio Fílmico Colombiano in Bogotá, renders it a particularly rich object of study.

Like its counterparts in São Paulo, Montevideo, Buenos Aires, Caracas, and Mexico City, the CCC sought to access both material resources (funds and films) and prestige by forging transnational connections. Yet, the film society was largely reliant on the local infrastructure of commercial film exhibition for its regular screenings, limiting its efforts to attempts to institute dominant cineclub practices, which privileged repertory programming over the commercial logic of novelty. Furthermore, the CCC's programs and internal documents register spectators' reluctance to participate in the post-screening discussions and other forms of audience feedback considered fundamental to a cineclub's activities, particularly in the

French film society movement that flourished after WWII.<sup>7</sup> Even as the CCC enlisted its members to help elevate local film taste, it alternately criticized them as unruly and as passive, rather than actively engaged, in the face of the moving image. Leveraging relationships with local film distributors and international organizations, the CCC attempted to enforce an imported ideal of the cineclub defined by lively yet carefully regulated audience engagement. Exemplifying the transatlantic character of postwar cinephilia in Latin America, the CCC's history attests to the difficulties in reconciling institutional and esthetic norms established elsewhere with locally entrenched tastes and social practices.

In charting the history of the CCC in its first two decades – from its founding in 1949 to the membership and financial crisis it faced in 1969, before rallying and continuing on through the 1990s – I build on recent scholarship that examines institutional contexts of film production, distribution, exhibition, and education beyond the field's conventional focus on commercial and theatrical sites.<sup>8</sup> In particular, I expand on studies that read arbiters of film culture, including cineclubs, as nodes within noncommercial circuits that enlisted the medium in service of esthetic, pedagogical, and social aims.<sup>9</sup> With a handful of exceptions – often focused on cinema's role in colonial endeavors – the geographic scope of these studies has been limited to the United States and Europe.<sup>10</sup> While studies of the Latin American cineclub and film preservation movements exist in Spanish and Portuguese, these accounts rarely historicize the emergence of the normative concepts of 'art cinema' and 'film preservation' that guided these activities.<sup>11</sup> By contrast, I focus on how such norms were instituted, adapted, and challenged outside the Euro-American contexts where they were initially developed.

In the following, I situate the CCC within the broader trajectory of the cineclub movement in Latin America, emphasizing the institutional underpinnings and transnational connections that shaped film societies in the region. After examining the exclusionary construction of the CCC's membership and the organization's efforts to establish protocols of engaged yet carefully regulated spectatorship, I detail how the CCC's programming was shaped by strategic alignments with local commercial distributors and cultural institutions operating on an international scale, among others. Throughout, I highlight points of friction that arose as imported ideals of the film society were leveraged as a source of cultural prestige in post-WWII Bogotá.

### **The Latin American film society movement and the origins of the Cine Club de Colombia**

Fostered by a range of institutions – from private clubs to universities, museums, and the Catholic Church – the emergence of Latin American film societies roughly parallels the cases of France and the UK, where an early burst of activity during the interwar period – marked by the launch of the Ciné-Club in Paris in 1920 and the creation of the London Film Society in 1925 – was followed by widespread expansion after World War II. The earliest cineclubs – in the sense of 'social organisms that provide a framework for viewing and discussing films,' in Malte Hagener's words – emerged in Latin America between 1928 and 1931.<sup>12</sup> Building

on claims of cinema's status as an autonomous art staked by early twentieth-century avant-gardes, this early wave of Latin American cineclubs was rooted in the cultural activities of local elites and galvanized by the transition to sound. The film enthusiasts who founded Rio de Janeiro's Chaplin Club, active between 1928 and 1930, staunchly defended silent cinema in its publication *O Fan*.<sup>13</sup> In Argentina, the Cine Club de Buenos Aires was formally established in 1929 under the auspices of the Asociación Amigos del Arte, dedicated to disseminating contemporary visual arts, music, and literature. The organization's membership included luminaries like Jorge Luis Borges and Victoria Ocampo, creator of the influential literary magazine *Sur*.<sup>14</sup> In Mexico, a group of cosmopolitan intellectuals associated with the literary magazine *Contemporáneos* created the Cine Club de México, also known as the Cineclub Mexicano, in 1931.<sup>15</sup>

Though film society activity was dampened somewhat during World War II, cineclubs flourished in Latin America in the period of economic prosperity after the war's conclusion, even absent the growing 16 mm distribution infrastructure for educational films and repertory programming present in the United States, for example.<sup>16</sup> Obligated to explore alternate print sources, Latin American cineclubs often amassed collections of films and founded their own archives – a precondition for participating in exchanges of prints between FIAF members – that in turn supplied growing national networks of film societies.<sup>17</sup> For example, after spearheading the creation of the Gente de Cine film society in 1946, critic and cinephile Andrés Rolando Fustiñana co-founded the Cinemateca Argentina upon the encouragement of Henri Langlois, Secretary-General of the Cinémathèque Française and a key member of the FIAF leadership. Langlois played a pivotal role in the creation of a first wave of Latin American archives, which constituted the film preservation movement's first widespread expansion outside Europe and the United States.<sup>18</sup> Across the Río de la Plata in Uruguay, noncommercial film exhibition flourished both through private efforts and government initiatives like the Cine de Arte screening series organized by the Servicio Oficial de Difusión, Radiotelevisión y Espectáculos (Official Service of Broadcasting, Television, and Entertainment) beginning in 1943.<sup>19</sup> Initially conceived as a means of financing amateur filmmaking, a group of enthusiasts created the Cine Club del Uruguay in 1948; the rival Cine Universitario emerged the following year out of the Teatro Universitario of the Universidad de la República.<sup>20</sup> The film societies became two of Latin America's most robust in terms of their longevity and the size of their membership – Cine Universitario reached a peak of 2143 members in 1957, while the Cine Club del Uruguay boasted over 2800 in the 1960s.<sup>21</sup> After creating separate film archives, the two film societies merged their collections in the Cinemateca Uruguay in 1952.

As the case of Montevideo's Cine Universitario suggests, academic settings proved fertile ground for the creation of film societies and other institutions of film culture. The Clube de Cinema de São Paulo, first organized in 1940 by students at São Paulo's Faculdade de Filosofia (College of Philosophy) and revived in 1946, fostered the creation of a film archive within the city's new Museu de Arte Moderna.<sup>22</sup> (The archive split off from the museum to become the Cinemateca Brasileira in 1956.) In Cuba, film critic José Manuel Valdés-Rodríguez taught Latin America's first university film course at the Universidad de La Habana's summer

school between 1942 and 1956. The course led to the creation of a university film archive and a screening series open to the general public in 1949.<sup>23</sup> Shortly thereafter, Valdés-Rodríguez's leadership was challenged by a group of young cinephiles – including key figures of post-Revolutionary Cuban cinema like Tomás Gutiérrez Alea and Néstor Almendros – who organized the Cine Club de La Habana and created the first, pre-Revolutionary Cinemateca de Cuba with Langlois's encouragement.<sup>24</sup> In Mexico City, growing interest in cineclubs within and beyond university settings gave rise to the Sección de Actividades Cinematográficas at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, which established the Cinemateca de la Universidad (later the Filmoteca de la UNAM) in 1959.<sup>25</sup>

Beyond these private, governmental, and academic initiatives, a number of Latin American film societies were fostered by religious initiatives that transcended national borders. In Peru, the Centro de Orientación Cinematográfica, a branch of the Office Catholique Internationale du Cinéma (OCIC), organized film series and courses in high schools and universities. OCIC's Latin American secretary, Polish lawyer and professor Andrés Ruskowsky, cofounded the Cine Club de Lima (1953–1957) and later participated in the Latin American film preservation movement.<sup>26</sup> In Brazil, Catholic film societies like the Cine-Clube de Belo Horizonte proliferated alongside a growing number of secular cineclubs in the 1950s.<sup>27</sup>

As this brief overview indicates, the founding of the Cine Club de Colombia coincided with a ferment of film society activity in Latin America, as well as an expansion of commercial film exhibition in Bogotá as the city's population grew rapidly. Close to 50 movie theaters were constructed in the city during the 1940s, resulting in a nearly fivefold increase from the previous decade.<sup>28</sup> Founded by a small group of enthusiasts led by Catalan bookseller Luis Vicens, the CCC's membership included visual artist Enrique Grau Araújo, future Nobel Prize-winning novelist Gabriel García Márquez, and writers Jorge Gaitán Durán, Otto de Grieff, and León de Grieff. These literary figures were linked with the influential magazine *Mito* (1955–1962), which brought international trends in philosophy, literature, and the arts to a local readership, a cosmopolitan orientation that the CCC shared.<sup>29</sup> Details about the immediate impetus for the CCC's founding are scarce, though one account suggests the idea emerged during German photographer Julius Meyer's visit to Bogotá.<sup>30</sup> The effort was led by Vicens – who had been immersed in French film culture during his time in Paris in the 1920s, when he worked for the magazine *La Cinématographie Française* and as an extra in Abel Gance's *Napoléon* (Société Générale des Films; France, 1927) – along with journalists Hernando Téllez and Jorge Valdivieso Guerrero.<sup>31</sup>

Meeting notes documenting the founding of the CCC in September 1949 state that the organization was defined as a non-commercial 'cultural association dedicated to improving the taste of the movie theater audience,' explicitly patterned on imported models. Vicens shared his knowledge of the 'functioning of cineclubs in various European countries,' while another attendee 'referred to the significant work of French cineclubs [and] insisted on the enormous possibilities of an Association of this type in Colombia.'<sup>32</sup> Highlighting the potential role of the CCC as a stimulus for production, Meyer commented at a later meeting that the organization's establishment 'could represent the first step in the creation of a film industry in Colombia.'<sup>33</sup> The CCC's goals, according to its statutes, went beyond 'the

presentation of special works of the Seventh art, of high artistic quality, both National and foreign, and encouraging debates on cinematic topics' to encompass support for amateur cinema and photography.<sup>34</sup>

The CCC initiated its public activities on 6 September 1949 with a screening of *Les Enfants du Paradis* (Children of paradise, Marcel Carné, Pathé; France, 1945), which had not been exhibited commercially in Colombia due to censorship. The film was prefaced by an introductory speech outlining the CCC's objectives and followed by commentary and discussion. Encapsulating the film society's often contradictory goals – to embody elevated taste while cultivating mass appeal and fostering lively debate – a newspaper account of the event noted that 'the opinions of the numerous and select public were deeply divided relative to its value' [my emphasis].<sup>35</sup> One commentator designated to respond to the film, leftist writer Jorge Zalamea, openly questioned the labor of cultural recovery in which the CCC was engaged. He declared, 'art, like old houses, has an attic where useless, unserviceable items collect; yet when the nouveaux riches enter the attic and exhume its contents, they believe they are working wonders.'<sup>36</sup> Highlighting the intertwining of social class and taste implicit in the CCC's activities, Zalamea's comments devalue the academic capital (in Bourdieu's terms) that the pedagogical activities of the cineclub would have offered the emerging middle classes by contrasting it with the social capital attached to aristocratic origins.<sup>37</sup> His remarks suggest the relative precariousness of the organizers' claims to elevated taste (and social class); perhaps as a consequence, the CCC traded on social exclusivity rather than developing a broader membership, as I detail in the following section.

### Forging an ideal audience

Particularly if compared with film societies in the United States and France, as well as Argentina and Uruguay, the CCC made only a halfhearted effort to offer mass access to alternative film programming.<sup>38</sup> In observance of international policies forbidding the sale of individual admissions to cineclub screenings – intended to ensure film societies' noncommercial status and minimize film industry backlash – the CCC's screenings were open only to dues-paying members, each accompanied by a single guest. (In practice, lax enforcement at the door allowed nonmembers to attend screenings as well). The CCC's size was restricted to 300 members, with the justification that it 'would otherwise lose the intimate character that these type of organizations should have.'<sup>39</sup> Hernando Salcedo Silva, a cultural critic who took over the leadership of the CCC after Vicens moved to Mexico City in 1960, recalled that 'there was a moment when not being a member of the Cine-club was considered in bad taste,' highlighting the film society's role as an arbiter of social status.<sup>40</sup> The simultaneously elitist and democratizing project of 'improving' the tastes of popular audiences appears to have existed alongside a desire to create and maintain a space exclusive to the intelligentsia.

Beyond its restricted membership, the CCC sought to discipline spectators in a dual sense, repressing audience behaviors viewed as undesirable while encouraging members to produce sanctioned forms of discourse on cinema, informed by awareness of film-specific esthetics and a larger body of cinematic works. Audience

decorum, along with verbal and written performances of engagement and discernment, were perceived as essential to legitimate the CCC and place it on par with its international counterparts. Programs urged members to arrive punctually for screenings and implored them not to bring more than the single permitted guest or to smoke in the auditoriums.<sup>41</sup> In addition to such minor transgressions, a 1957 program described vocal reactions from spectators who, in the face of last-minute programming changes or imperfect projection, would

manifest their displeasure with shouts and protests, which, if they are undesirable in any film screening, are worse in the case of a meeting of the Cine Club, where the spirit of camaraderie and tolerance among friends should be the norm.<sup>42</sup>

Such unrestrained reactions appear to have spilled over to the postscreening discussions in the CCC's early years. In a 1952 letter penned in French to Amy B. Courvoisier, a founding member of the Cine-Club Venezuela, Vicens wrote, 'we are at the mercy of a mob [*foule*] that does not even know what a cine-club is and which very easily slips from praise to the most ferocious criticism.'<sup>43</sup> Spectators' lack of familiarity with the cineclub's institutional model and its protocols of spectator engagement are cast in class-based terms, suggesting how divides of status and taste operative within Colombian society as a whole were reproduced within the social space of the cineclub.<sup>44</sup>

Beginning in the mid-1950s, the CCC's organizers seem to have been more troubled by viewer indifference than by unruly behavior or unrestrained reactions to films. While the CCC's leadership made periodic efforts to host postscreening discussions, facilitated by members of the steering committee or local intellectuals, these appear to have been poorly attended.<sup>45</sup> One particularly evocative January 1961 program described

melancholy results in the discussion following the screening of the film. With inexplicable anxiety, the members leave the theater as if fleeing from a disaster, without considering the necessity of expanding on the thoughts inspired by the film screened through the spectators' comments.<sup>46</sup>

Following this declaration, the CCC redoubled its efforts; brief summaries of the discussions were published in subsequent programs, but these quickly disappeared once again.<sup>47</sup> Ironically, the CCC's leadership apparently failed to model the spectatorial norms the film society was striving to enforce: a board member noted in a 1966 meeting that 'with the exception of herself, [she] had never seen any members of the Board stay for the discussions, giving in this manner a bad example to the members.'<sup>48</sup> Both programs and internal documents register a perceived divide between members who successfully embodied the ideal cineclub spectator and those who did not.

In the face of the disappointing results of postscreening discussions, the CCC's leadership shifted its focus to audience questionnaires included in its programs, but these were hardly more successful in provoking reflection from members. The questionnaires do give a sense of the schemas offered to members for evaluating films, including the quality of the cinematography, direction, and acting, and whether the viewer considered the film worthy of awards and accolades from

international festivals, signaling these institutions' pivotal role in canon formation in the period.<sup>49</sup> Although a handful of viewer comments were published in the CCC's programs, more common were reminders that 'it is an obligation of the members to respond to the questionnaires.'<sup>50</sup> One program lamented that only three out of 300 members had submitted responses, urging members to help the CCC 'achieve the principal objective of any cine-club in the world: that members critique and comment on the films that they see.'<sup>51</sup> During the late 1960s, lack of engagement with the CCC's programming – members' failure to embody the norms of vocal yet discerning spectatorship central to imported cineclub ideals – deepened into greater and greater indifference to the programming itself. In June 1969, the CCC's steering committee drafted a letter to Salcedo Silva complaining that his programming had failed to balance challenging and unusual fare with works that would appeal to members.<sup>52</sup> In the following section, I examine the CCC's offerings in light of international cineclub norms, highlighting the structural constraints and opportunities that shaped it and the local and transnational connections forged in the process.

### **Operating at the margins of commercial exhibition**

Dovetailing with emerging canons of postwar art cinema, the programming developed by the CCC in its first few months set a pattern that remained stable over the next two decades: screenings of fairly recent commercial releases, along with a smaller number of films considered historically significant. The CCC encouraged an appreciation of individual directors, actors, and national film industries, screening internationally acclaimed works of French, Italian, and US narrative cinema; a smaller number of Scandinavian, Eastern European, and Mexican features; and a sampling of educational films, documentary, and animation. The organization was quick to showcase movements like the French New Wave but comparatively slow to engage with the radical New Latin American Cinema, and the CCC's programs rarely addressed pressing national issues.<sup>53</sup> Although the organization's first two decades of operation overlap with the years of *La Violencia* (1945–1966) – a wave of conflict that stemmed from the stark divide between Liberals and Conservatives, but quickly came to encompass guerrilla and paramilitary activity and killings without apparent links to politics – direct references to the violence are conspicuously absent from the CCC's surviving programs, which were distinctly cosmopolitan rather than national in orientation.

Deviating from understandings of the film society as an alternative venue, the CCC operated out of a series of commercial movie theaters until its move to an auditorium owned by the Catholic broadcaster Radio Sutatenza in 1962.<sup>54</sup> Local branches of Hollywood studios and companies like Películas Mexicanas (the Latin American distribution wing of Mexico's Banco Nacional Cinematográfico) furnished the majority of prints screened by the CCC without cost or for a nominal fee in the first decade of the CCC's existence, and rentals accounted for a negligible percentage of the organization's budget until the early 1960s.<sup>55</sup> In return, 'the Cine Club [took] on a certain labor of promotion and dissemination' on behalf of the distributors.<sup>56</sup> In some cases, the film society hosted preview screenings of new

releases, seemingly calculated to help distributors boost their box-office potential. In this sense, the circulation of films through the CCC functioned as a 'value-adding process,' as Marijke de Valck has argued in the context of film festivals.<sup>57</sup> In a 1958 interview, Salcedo Silva was quick to align the interests of local distributors with the film society's declared objective of elevating film taste in Bogotá. He noted that the CCC actively assisted distributors in launching films seen as challenging in the local exhibition market: 'With commentary and articles in the press, and personal promotion by the members, we efficiently aid in the commercial release of a film that, in the final analysis, contributes to the establishment of good cinema among us.'<sup>58</sup>

The audience questionnaires that appeared in the CCC's programs further suggest a mutually beneficial relationship between the organization and local distributors. Prompted to engage in critical and reflective forms of film spectatorship, the organization's members were also asked to offer insight on films' commercial potential, acting as a test audience or focus group. Their input seems to have been particularly valued when a film's content was viewed as problematic for a country with an overwhelming Catholic majority. For example, a 1954 program asked spectators to provide their opinion on *Fröken Julie* (Miss Julie, Alf Sjöberg, Sandrew; Sweden, 1951), a sexually frank tale of cross-class romance and suicide based on the play by August Strindberg, inquiring 'Do you consider it to be appropriate to be presented to the Bogotá audience, and how will it be received?'<sup>59</sup> Requests for audience feedback seem to have been partly motivated by the CCC's eagerness 'to return the favor to the distributors who so kindly lend their films.'<sup>60</sup>

At the same time, programs and internal documents signal a tension between the accessibility of recent commercial releases, and the CCC's self-proclaimed goal of showcasing films its organizers judged historically significant. Meeting notes attest to the popularity of preview screenings and more risqué films prohibited by the censors with CCC members.<sup>61</sup> Even as the CCC's organizers recognized the need to attract viewers in order to stay financially solvent, particularly as the film society's ranks thinned in the second half of the 1960s, programs lamented the membership's preference for novelty over engagement with film history. One chided the membership for the poor attendance at an Orson Welles retrospective – as well as 'a very interesting program of Colombian cinema,' a rarity for the CCC – in comparison with preview screenings. For the film society's leadership, such selective viewing undercut the organization's noncommercial status and its pedagogical aims:

Giving advance screenings places the Cine Club on the level of any commercial movie theater and furthermore, *no Cine Club in the world gives advance screenings except on very special occasions* [my emphasis]. Good – or at least interesting – films should be rescreened for the purpose of evaluating their merits or defects through time. For this reason the Cine Club insists – and will continue insisting – on the rediscovery of good cinema.<sup>62</sup>

As such admonishments suggest, the CCC's reliance on commercial distributors for much of its programming and its members' preference for new releases threatened the organization's status as an elevated cultural institution. In its efforts to embody

international cineclub norms, the CCC would strive to insert itself within expanding global circuits of film culture.

### Tapping into transnational networks

The CCC's connections with postwar cultural diplomacy and cultural organizations with global designs – valorizing the medium as a form of cultural heritage worthy of preservation, in FIAF's case, or leveraging it to foster democratic discourse and capitalist development, in UNESCO's – were initiated on the local level.<sup>63</sup> Embassies offered the CCC educational films and features considered exemplary of national industries. For example, the Brazilian embassy sponsored a screening of *O Cangaceiro* (The bandit, Lima Barreto, Companhia Cinematográfica Vera Cruz; Brazil, 1953), a prestige production that was lauded at Cannes and hailed by commentators like García Márquez as an example for Latin American film industries, in that it offered international appeal by exploring eminently national themes.<sup>64</sup> The US, Canadian, Dutch, and French embassies furnished documentary and animated shorts, though often without subtitles or voiceover commentary in Spanish, a persistent source of frustration for the CCC's members.<sup>65</sup> The CCC also took advantage of less direct forms of cultural diplomacy; in 1953, the organization partnered with UNITALIA, the public relations branch of the coalition of Italian film unions (Associazione Nazionale Industrie Cinematografiche e Affini) on a Festival of Italian Cinema, while the Instituto Colombo-Alemán (Colombian-German Institute) co-sponsored a week devoted to Young German Cinema in 1968.<sup>66</sup>

In some cases, the CCC's activities intersected directly with the film-related initiatives of supranational bodies like the United Nations that, guided by 'liberal internationalism,' championed the free flow of cultural goods – often hailed in vague terms as a vehicle of international understanding – as part of a broader doctrine of free trade.<sup>67</sup> In 1955, Enrico Fulchignoni, head of UNESCO's Film Division, joined forces with the CCC to organize a small 'Festival of Art Films' (in this context, nonfiction films on art and artists).<sup>68</sup> According to an article by García Márquez in the newspaper *El Espectador*, Fulchignoni had travelled to Colombia to shoot a documentary on the Acción Cultural Popular (ACP)'s Radio Sutatenza, an initiative that distributed radio sets to rural Colombians and broadcast educational and religious programming.<sup>69</sup> This endeavor doubtless intrigued UNESCO officials, who were deeply invested in media's pedagogical potential, especially in developing nations.<sup>70</sup> Although Fulchignoni was ostensibly in Colombia to study the ACP's methods, the unequal global distribution of cultural capital became a point of contention during his visit. According to García Márquez, after highlighting the opportunities for international cooperation offered by Colombian-European coproductions, Fulchignoni breaks with this rhetoric of global solidarity to comment that 'film programs in Colombia, in general, are inferior to those of Africa,' prefaced 'with the warning that this declaration is not for publication.'<sup>71</sup> Suggestive of how international relations in the postwar period were marked by perceived national and racial hierarchies of development and progress, Fulchignoni's remark ironically would have reinforced the perceived need for the CCC's labor of cultural uplift.

Beyond its connections with individual governments and UNESCO, the CCC's leadership forged contacts with institutions of film culture across Latin America, contacts often mediated by European institutions. Shortly after the CCC's creation, Vicens wrote to the directors of the recently created Cinemateca Argentina and Filmoteca do Museu de Arte Moderna in São Paulo on the recommendation of Henri Langlois.<sup>72</sup> Langlois played a key role in cultivating the cineclub and film preservation movements on a global scale, whether due to his investment in access to films (over and above their physical preservation) or a desire to increase the number of his allies within the FIAF membership.<sup>73</sup> From early on in the CCC's history, Langlois was in close contact with its leadership: a July 1950 letter from Langlois to Valdivieso Guerrero, the cineclub's secretary, conveyed his approval of the organization's by-laws and his intentions to draw up 'a practical plan for collaboration.'<sup>74</sup> Vicens met personally with Langlois during a business trip to Paris in the winter of 1950–1951. The two agreed that the CCC could take advantage of film programs 'sent monthly to Mexico City and Caracas' – that is, to the cineclub operated by Mexico City's Institut Français d'Amérique Latine, which passed on the programs to the Cine-Club Venezuela administered by French cultural attaché Gaston Diehl.<sup>75</sup> These 16 mm programs of early French film were dispatched via the embassies in Caracas and Bogotá, though not without delays and miscommunications. Sent from Caracas in May 1952, the films appear not to have been exhibited in Bogotá until mid-1953, when the CCC screened three programs featuring works by the Lumière Brothers, Georges Méliès, Émile Cohl, Louis Feuillade, and Jean Epstein.<sup>76</sup>

Langlois's efforts to integrate the CCC into an international network of film-related institutions extended to the creation of an associated film archive, the Filmoteca Colombiana (later renamed Cinemateca Colombiana).<sup>77</sup> In 1955, Vicens designated García Márquez as the Filmoteca's representative at the FIAF conference held in Warsaw; armed with detailed instructions, García Márquez achieved the Filmoteca Colombiana's acceptance as a provisional member.<sup>78</sup> By this time, the CCC's leadership was in contact with the founding members of FIAF's Sección Latinoamericana (Latin American Pool), instituted to facilitate the exchange of prints and the coordination of activities between archives in the region.<sup>79</sup> Latin America thus became a laboratory for FIAF's attempts in the 1950s to expand international access to film prints by creating regional networks for their diffusion.<sup>80</sup> The Latin American Pool also acted as a catalyst for greater intraregional cooperation, although member archives' limited resources hampered joint initiatives. In 1965, the Cinemateca Colombiana found itself forced to turn down the Cinemateca Argentina's offer to sell new prints of 'fundamental films' held in its collection at cost, due to lack of funds and an unfavorable exchange rate between Argentine and Colombian pesos.<sup>81</sup> The Cinemateca Colombiana did receive a small number of prints on indefinite loan from Yugoslav, Polish, and Soviet archives in the 1960s, although political restrictions sometimes interfered with their entry into the country.<sup>82</sup>

As a consequence of these constraints, the Filmoteca Colombiana often relied on local distributors, local intellectuals, and national and transnational corporations to build its collection, an endeavor the CCC deemed 'an initiative of such importance for any cultured country.'<sup>83</sup> In 1955, *Mito* helped fund the acquisition of

*Time in the Sun* (assembled by Marie Seton using footage from Sergei Eisenstein's unfinished *Que Viva México*; US, 1939) by soliciting donations from subscribers.<sup>84</sup> The CCC also enlisted corporate sponsors like the airline Avianca, which agreed to donate a film to its archive.<sup>85</sup> Similarly, the US/Canadian oil company Esso sponsored a screening of Robert Flaherty's docu-fiction *Louisiana Story* (Standard Oil of New Jersey; US, 1948), which became part of the Cinemateca Colombiana's collection.<sup>86</sup> (Poet Álvaro Mutis, head of public relations for Esso in Colombia and a close friend of Vicens, may have facilitated the screening and donation).<sup>87</sup>

Despite these efforts, in 1966 the collection of the Cinemateca Colombiana comprised only 15 films.<sup>88</sup> Nevertheless, during the 1960s the archive was furnishing prints on a small scale to other cineclubs, high schools, universities, and, in one case, an impoverished informal community (referred to as a *barrio de invasores*).<sup>89</sup> The organization both drew on and worked to expand institutional networks of film culture, fostering the creation of film societies in the cities of Barranquilla, Cali, and Medellín, among others.<sup>90</sup> Together with poet Álvaro Cepeda Samudio of the Cine Club de Barranquilla, Salcedo Silva founded the short-lived Federación Colombiana de Cineclubes in 1960.<sup>91</sup> Apparently, Cepeda Samudio lost the organization's statutes in a taxi, putting a temporary halt to the venture (it was revived in the 1970s).<sup>92</sup> The federation was likely modeled on European bodies like the Fédération Française des Ciné-Clubs, whose yearly meetings were attended by CCC delegates in 1954 and 1955.<sup>93</sup>

By the late 1960s, the CCC was apparently becoming a casualty of its success in fostering film society activity. The Bogotá cineclubs emerging in academic settings, such as the Universidad Nacional's Ocho y Medio, appear to have been powerful competition. Their commitment to debating film's political aspects (even to the exclusion of its esthetic qualities) diverged sharply from the CCC's approach.<sup>94</sup> The CCC's membership dropped by more than half between March 1965 and June 1969, declining from 315 to 137 members; income from dues plummeted as film rental costs increased.<sup>95</sup> The organization managed to survive by scaling back on its screenings and rebuilt its membership in the 1970s, though it struggled to reach the desired complement of 300.<sup>96</sup> As late as 1999, the CCC was still operating, at least in name, under the auspices of Bogotá's Cinemateca Distrital (which was created in 1986).<sup>97</sup> The CCC's longevity signals its impressive – if partial – success in defining a distinct space within the local landscape of commercial and noncommercial exhibition, if not in enforcing the pedagogical model of the cineclub that underpinned its activities.

## Conclusion

The history of the Cine Club de Colombia reveals how film society norms established abroad were instituted and challenged in the local context, to the point of being met with resistance – or simply indifference – from the public. At the same time, it illuminates an extensive if often fragile web of connections linking Latin American cineclubs and archives with international institutions. The case of the CCC thus offers a finer-grained account of what Dudley Andrew calls the 'federated phase' of global film culture corresponding to the post-WWII period, an

epoch marked by film-related activities that were national in scope, but intimately intertwined with global initiatives like FIAF.<sup>98</sup> The challenges faced by the CCC highlight points of friction in these transnational alliances, both in terms of the material conditions that weighed particularly heavily on Latin American cineclubs and archives – communication difficulties, unfavorable exchange rates, a scarcity of subtitled prints – and the extent to which the French model of the cineclub functioned as a ‘misplaced idea’ in the region, rather than growing out of local social and political realities.<sup>99</sup>

As I have suggested, the success of the CCC’s endeavors in its first two decades was limited both by structural constraints and by its conflicting impulses towards elitism and the democratization of film culture. Lacking ready access to sources of repertory programming, the CCC was reliant on the very system of commercial film distribution from which it sought to distinguish itself. The limitations of this approach pushed the organization to pursue local partners, each with distinct promotional and diplomatic aims, and to connect with cultural institutions with an international scope, which envisioned Colombia and other Latin American nations as fertile ground for their global designs. As the case of the CCC makes clear, organizations like FIAF worked to regulate film culture on an international scale – setting, for example, the terms of noncommercial exchange of film prints – even as they fostered institution-building and regional cooperation in the Latin American film society and film preservation movements. Ultimately, the sourcing of film prints proved less problematic for the CCC than the forging of an idealized film public that was limited in number, embraced repertory programming, and demonstrated discerning spectatorship through written and verbal critiques. The persistence of these elusive ideals – used to shore up the CCC’s cultural legitimacy and to draw internal divisions of class and taste within the membership – signal how the organization’s labor of cultural uplift reinforced social and global hierarchies, even as it charted transnational connections.

## Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Jorge Moreno, Rito Alberto Torres Moya, and Mónica Andrea Melo Cely of the Fundación Patrimonio Fílmico Colombiano, as well as Sergio Becerra Venegas, Juan Sebastián Ospina León, Marta León, Jairo Ospina, and Bíbata O’Mara.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

## Funding

This work was supported by a Faculty Ambassador Travel Grant from the Latin American and Caribbean Studies Institute at the University of Georgia, made possible by a Title VI National Resource Center Grant from the US Department of Education.

## Notes

1. Program, September – October 1979, Fundación Patrimonio Filmico Colombiano, Bogotá (hereafter, FPFC). Documents from the collection are uncatalogued. All translations are the author's except where noted.
2. On disturbances in movie theaters in the 1920s and 1930s, see Luis Alfredo Barón Leal, 'Los cinemas bogotanos: Los edificios de la hechicera criatura', in *Bogota filmica: Ensayos sobre cine y patrimonio*, ed. Sergio Becerra Venegas (Bogotá: Instituto Distrital de las Artes, 2012), 153–4. On unruly audiences in the 1910s, see Juan Sebastián Ospina León, 'Films on Paper: Early Colombian Cinema Periodicals, 1916–1920', in *Cosmopolitan Film Cultures in Latin America, 1896–1960*, ed. Rielle Navitski and Nicolas Poppe (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2017), 39–65.
3. Marco Palacios, *Between Legitimacy and Violence: A History of Colombia, 1875–2002*, trans. Richard Stoller (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006), 142.
4. Program, September – October 1979, FPFC.
5. Acta de Constitución del Cine Club de Colombia, September 2, 1949, FPFC. Bourdieu's analysis plays on multiple, interrelated connotations of 'distinction': as esthetic discernment; as refinement linked to socioeconomic class and education (what Bourdieu influentially called cultural capital), and as the act of distinguishing between social groups by means of divergent expressions of taste. Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984), 56. On the Colombian economy during wartime and the postwar period, see Palacios, *Between Legitimacy and Violence*, 116–7, 123, 127.
6. For a preliminary survey, see Paul A. Schroeder-Rodríguez, *Latin American Cinema: A Comparative History* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2016), 129–31.
7. Kelley Conway, "'A New Wave of Spectators": Contemporary Responses to *Cléo from 5 to 7*", *Film Quarterly* 61, no. 1 (2007): 38–47.
8. On educational and other nontheatrical contexts, see Charles R. Acland and Haidee Wasson, eds., *Useful Cinema* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011); and Devin Orgeron, Marsha Orgeron, and Dan Streible, eds., *Learning with the Lights Off: Educational Film in the United States* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
9. Malte Hagener, *Moving Forward, Looking Back: The European Avant-Garde and the Invention of Film Culture* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007); Malte Hagener, ed., *The Emergence of Film Culture: Knowledge Production, Institution Building, and the Fate of the Avant-Garde in Europe, 1919–1945* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2014); Haidee Wasson, *Museum Movies: The Museum of Modern Art and the Birth of Art Cinema* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005); Marijke de Valck, *Film Festivals: From European Politics to Global Cinophilia* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007); Cindy Hing-Yuk Wong, *Film Festivals: Culture, People, and Power on the Global Screen* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2011); Dana Polan, *Scenes of Instruction: The Beginnings of the U.S. Study of Film* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007); Lee Grieveson and Haidee Wasson, eds., *Inventing Film Studies*; and Peter Decherney, *Film and the Culture Elite: How the Movies Became American* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005).

10. Lee Grieveson and Colin McCabe, eds., *Empire and Film* (London: British Film Institute, 2011); Lee Grieveson and Colin McCabe, eds., *Film and the End of Empire* (London: British Film Institute, 2011); Nadine Chan, 'Making Ahmad "Problem Conscious": Educational Film and the Rural Lecture Caravan in 1930s British Malaya', *Cinema Journal* 55, no. 4 (2016), 84–107. On film education in Latin America, see Irene Rozsa, 'Film Culture and Education in Republican Cuba: The Legacy of José Manuel Valdés Rodríguez', in *Cosmopolitan Film Cultures in Latin America, 1896–1960*, ed. Rielle Navitski and Nicolas Poppe (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2017).
11. On the concept of film heritage, see Caroline Frick, *Saving Cinema: The Politics of Preservation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010). Book-length studies of Latin American film societies include Eugenio Hintz, *Algo para recordar: La verdadera historia del Cine Club del Uruguay* (Montevideo: Ediciones de la Plaza, 1998); Jaime E. Costa and Carlos Scavino, *Por amor al cine: Historia de Cine Universitario del Uruguay* (Montevideo: Taller Gráfico Impresos Flograf). On film preservation in Latin America, see Fausto Douglas Corrêa Júnior, *A Cinemateca Brasileira: das luzes aos anos do chumbo* (São Paulo: Editora UNESP, 2010); Carlos María Domínguez, *24 ilusiones por segundo: La historia de Cinemateca Uruguaya* (Montevideo: Cinemateca Uruguaya, 2013); Janet Ceja Alcalá, 'Imperfect Archives and the Principle of Social Praxis in the History of Film Preservation in Latin America', *The Moving Image* 13, no. 1 (2013): 66–97; and Fabián Núñez, 'Notas para un estudio sobre a Unión de Cinematecas de América Latina', *Significação* 42, no. 44 (2015): 63–81.
12. Hagener, *Moving Forward, Looking Back*, 78.
13. See Ismail Xavier, *Sétima arte, um culto moderno: O idealismo estético e o cinema* (São Paulo: Editora Perspectiva, 1978), 199–263.
14. Fernando Martín Peña, 'Amigos del cine', in *Amigos del Arte, 1924–1942*, ed. Patricia M. Artundo and Marcelo E. Pacheco (Buenos Aires: Museo de Arte Latinoamericano de Buenos Aires, 2008), 59–63.
15. 'Fundación del Cineclub', *Contemporáneos*, April/May/June 1931, 187–9. See also Manuel González Casanova, *¿Qué es un cine-club?* (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1962), 15–6.
16. On 16mm distribution, see Gregory Waller, *Projecting the Promise of 16mm, 1935–1945* in *Useful Cinema*, ed. Charles Acland and Haidee Wasson (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011), 125–48; on the role of the Museum of Modern Art in forging this infrastructure in the United States, see Wasson, *Museum Movies*, 149–84.
17. On the case of the Cinemateca Argentina, see Meeting notes, Primer Congreso de Cinematecas Latinoamericanas (First Conference of Latin American Cinémathèques), Punta del Este, Uruguay, January 27, 1955, 4, Arquivo Histórico da Cinemateca Brasileira, São Paulo (hereafter, AHCB); meeting notes, Sección Latinoamericana de la FIAF, Congreso de São Paulo, February 22, 1956, 2, AHCB.
18. Christian Dimitriu, 'La Cinemateca Argentina: Entrevista con Guillermo Fernández Jurado', *Journal of Film Preservation* 74, no. 75 (2007): 15–34.
19. Mariana Amieva, 'Cine Arte del SODRE en la conformación de un campo audiovisual en Uruguay. Políticas públicas y acciones individuales', *Cine*

- Documental* 6 (2012), n.p. [http://revista.cinedocumental.com.ar/6/articulos\\_01.html](http://revista.cinedocumental.com.ar/6/articulos_01.html) (accessed August 28, 2016).
20. Costa and Scavino, *Por amor al cine*, 9–18.
  21. *Ibid.*, 48; and Hintz, *Algo para recordar*, 75.
  22. Melo Souza, *Paulo Emílio no Paraíso* (Rio de Janeiro: Editora Record, 2003), 300–4; Corrêa Júnior, *A Cinemateca Brasileira*, 102–14. Frick briefly notes Langlois’s influence in the Latin American film archive movement in *Saving Cinema*, 128.
  23. Rozsa, ‘Film Culture and Education in Republican Cuba’, 298, 311–14.
  24. Emmanuel Vincenot, ‘Germán Puig, Ricardo Vigón et Henri Langlois, pionniers de la Cinemateca de Cuba’, *Caravelle* 83 (2004): 11–42.
  25. González Casanova, *¿Qué es un cine-club?*, 16–20. See also Jaime M. Pensado, *Rebel Mexico: Student Unrest and Authoritarian Political Culture During the Long Sixties* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013), 174–9; and Gabriel Rodríguez Álvarez, *Manuel González Casanova: Pionero del cine universitario* (Guadalajara: Universidad de Guadalajara, 2009), 20, 31–2.
  26. Guido Convents, ‘Resisting the Lure of the Modern: Catholics, International Politics, and the Establishment of the International Catholic Office for Cinema (1918–1928)’, in *Moralizing Cinema: Film, Catholicism, and Power*, ed. Daniel Biltereyst and Daniela Treveri Gennari (New York: Routledge, 2015), 19–34; and Ricardo Bedoya, ‘El Cine Club de Lima’, *Contratexto* 17 (2009), 175–82.
  27. José Américo Ribeiro, *O cinema em Belo Horizonte: do cineclubismo à produção cinematográfica na década de 60* (Belo Horizonte: Editora Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, 1997), 47–50, 94–103, 157–62.
  28. Barón Leal, ‘Los cinemas bogotanos’, 136; see also Andrés Avila Gómez y Alfredo Montaña Bello, ‘Salas de cine en Bogotá (1897–1940): la arquitectura como símbolo de modernización del espacio urbano’, *Amérique Latine Histoire et Mémoire. Les Cahiers ALHIM* 29: 15, <http://journals.openedition.org/alhim/5230>.
  29. Carlos Rivas Polo, *Revista Mito: vigencia de un legado cultural* (Medellín: Editorial Universidad de Antioquia, 2010).
  30. ‘Cine Club: Criticar es aprender’, *Semana*, March 22, 1954.
  31. Juan Diego Caicedo González, ‘Langostas, libros y cine’, *Ensayos: Historia y teoría del arte* XVIII, no. 26 (2014), 66.
  32. Acta de Constitución del Cine Club de Colombia, September 2, 1949, FPFC.
  33. Acta de la Asamblea General de Socios del Cine Club de Colombia, September 6, 1949, FPFC.
  34. Estatutos del Cine Club de Colombia, FPFC. The CCC organized a contest for amateur photographers in 1950.
  35. Luis Guerrero, ‘Cineclub’, *El Liberal* (Bogotá), September 8, 1949. Unpaginated press clipping, FPFC.
  36. Luis Guerrero, ‘Cineclub’. According to Hernando Salcedo Silva, Zalamea’s objections to the film were rooted in Marcel Carné’s collaboration with the Vichy regime during WWII. Caicedo González, ‘Langostas, libros, y cine’, 67.
  37. Bourdieu, *Distinction*, 81–92. Bourdieu notes that cultural forms like cinema that have not yet fully been legitimated by the educational system offer a particularly compelling investment for those with reduced social capital (87).
  38. See Conway, “‘A New Wave of Spectators’”, 40–1; and Charles Acland, ‘Classrooms, Clubs, and Community Circuits: Cultural Authority and the Film

- Council Movement, 1946–1957’, in *Inventing Film Studies*, ed. Lee Grieveson and Haidee Wasson (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008), 149–181.
39. Fernán Torres León, ‘La Cinemateca Colombiana será centro distribuidor para el Norte de América’, *El Tiempo*, undated/unpaginated press clipping [1959], FPFC.
  40. Alberto León, ‘Entrevista a Hernando Salcedo Silva’, *Cine* 9 (1982): 70.
  41. Program, June 27, 1950, FPFC; program, August 11, 1953, FPFC; program, November 6, 1956, FPFC.
  42. Program, April 11, 1957, FPFC.
  43. Letter from Luis Vicens to Amy B. Courvoisier, July 18, 1952, FPFC.
  44. I am indebted to Juan Sebastián Ospina León for his insights on this point.
  45. Program, January 18, 1955, FPFC.
  46. Program, January/February 1961, FPFC.
  47. Program, February 1961, FPFC; program, March 1961, FPFC.
  48. Program, October 7, 1966, FPFC.
  49. For example, see program, May 24, 1955, FPFC; program, March 16, 1954, FPFC.
  50. Program, March 16, 1954, FPFC. CCC members offered a handful of comments on Luis Buñuel’s *Robinson Crusoe* and Russell Rouse’s *The Thief*. Program, August 9, 1955, FPFC; program, March 21, 1957, FPFC.
  51. Program, July 5, 1955, FPFC.
  52. Acta de la Junta Directiva del Cine Club de Colombia, June 19, 1969, FPFC.
  53. New Latin American Cinema began to gather momentum in the mid-1960s, but it was not until 1971 that the CCC offered a program of ‘Latin American political cinema’. Program, February 1971, FPFC.
  54. Program, January/February 1963, FPFC.
  55. Although the CCC’s financial records are incomplete, existing documents suggest shifts in distributors’ policies during the late 1950s and 1960s. A treasurer’s report to the CCC’s general assembly made no reference to funds spent on film rentals between October 1951 and September 1952. Informe del Tesorero del Cine Club de Colombia a la Asamblea General Ordinaria, September 30, 1952, FPFC. Three years later, the organization was devoting only 1.5% of its budget to rentals. Informe del Tesorero a la Asamblea General, October 18, 1955, FPFC. By the early sixties, film rentals accounted for a much greater proportion of the CCC’s expenses – approximately 13% in 1963 – a trend that continued during the decade. Relación de los gastos del Cine Club de Colombia, January 15, 1964, FPFC.
  56. Letter from the Cine Club de Colombia (unsigned) to Francisco Jaramillo, October 2, 1951, FPFC.
  57. de Valck, *Film Festivals*, 125–30.
  58. ‘Nueve Años del “Cine Club”: Entrevista con el Secretario General.’ Unidentified press clipping, September 1958, FPFC.
  59. Program, March 23, 1954, FPFC.
  60. Program, February 16, 1954, FPFC.
  61. Acta de la Junta Directiva del Cine Club de Colombia, March 31, 1965, FPFC; Acta de la Junta Directiva del Cine Club de Colombia, June 10, 1966, FPFC; Acta de la Junta Directiva del Cine Club de Colombia, March 3, 1967, FPFC;

- and Acta de la Junta Directiva del Cine Club de Colombia, June 19, 1969, FPFC.
62. Program, August 2, 1960, FPFC.
  63. On film societies and civic responsibility, see Acland, 'Classrooms, Clubs, and Community Circuits', 69–75; on cinema as a vehicle of capitalist development, see Zoë Druick, 'Reaching the Multimillions: Liberal Internationalism and the Establishment of Documentary Film', in *Inventing Film Studies*, ed. Lee Grieveson and Haidee Wasson (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008), 81–102.
  64. Program, June 30, 1954, FPFC; Gabriel García Márquez, 'Estrenos de la semana: *O cangaceiro*', *El Espectador*, July 3, 1954, 5, reprinted in *Obra periodística vol. 2: Entre cachacos I* (Barcelona: Bruguera, 1982), 228.
  65. Acta de la Junta Directiva del Cine Club de Colombia, December 3, 1965, FPFC; and Acta de la Junta Directiva del Cine Club de Colombia, June 9, 1967, FPFC.
  66. Program, November 11, 1953, FPFC; and program, February–March 1969, FPFC.
  67. Druick, 'Reaching the Multimillions', 69–75.
  68. Program, March 15, 1955, FPFC.
  69. The documentary in question is *Sutatenza, un mensaje de paz* (Sutatenza: a message of peace, 1955). Gabriel García Márquez, 'Un director italiano en Bogotá', *El Espectador*, March 19, 1955, 9. Reprinted in *Obra periodística vol. 3: Entre cachacos II* (Barcelona: Editorial Bruguera, 1982), 534–7.
  70. Zoë Druick, 'UNESCO, Film, and Education: Mediating Postwar Paradigms of Communication,' in *Useful Cinema*, ed. Charles R. Acland and Haidee Wasson (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011), 81–102.
  71. García Márquez, 'Un director italiano en Bogotá', 537.
  72. Luis Vicens to director of Cinemateca Argentina, May 26, 1950, FPFC; Luis Vicens to director of the Filmotheca de São Paulo [*sic*], May 26, 1950, FPFC; P.M. Bardi to Luis Vicens, June 22, 1950, FPFC.
  73. Frick, *Saving Cinema*, 105–6; and Corrêa Júnior, *A Cinemateca Brasileira*, 108.
  74. Letter from Langlois to Jorge Valdivieso Guerrero, July 6, 1950, FPFC.
  75. Letter from Luis Vicens to Gaston Diehl, October 29, 1952, FPFC.
  76. Letter from Amy B. Courvoisier to Luis Vicens, June 27, 1952, FPFC; program, September 1954, FPFC. Internal documents suggest that the prints, or copies of the prints, may have been kept and circulated by the CCC; see *Actividades de la Cinemateca Colombiana en el mes de octubre, 1965*; FPFC.
  77. Salcedo Silva later noted that the archive was founded 'by Luis Vicens at the behest of the director of the Cinemathèque Française Henri Langlois.' Acta de la Junta Directiva del Cine Club de Colombia, April 29, 1966, FPFC.
  78. 11th Congres[s] of the International Federation of Film Archives, Warsaw, 26–30 Septiembre [*sic*], Decisions. 11. FIAF Archive, [http://www.fiafnet.org/images/tinyUpload/History/FIAF-Archives/Digitized%20docs/Congresses/1955\\_Warsaw\\_Congress\\_Decisions\\_Red.pdf](http://www.fiafnet.org/images/tinyUpload/History/FIAF-Archives/Digitized%20docs/Congresses/1955_Warsaw_Congress_Decisions_Red.pdf) (accessed May 24, 2017); Rito Alberto Torres Moya, 'García Márquez: cinéfilo, cineclubista, crítico de cine y representante del primer archivo filmico del país', <http://patrimoniofilmico.org.co/123abc/index.php/documentos-y-publicaciones/documentos?start=17> (accessed July 10, 2015).

79. Letter from Eugenio Hintz (Cinemateca Uruguay) to Catherine Duncan (FIAF), August 11, 1955, Cinemateca Uruguay. On the activities of the Latin American Pool, see Fausto Douglas Correa Júnior, 'O Cinema como instituição: A Federação Internacional dos Arquivos de Filmes, 1948–1960' (Ph.D. diss., Universidade Estadual de São Paulo, 2012), 59–72.
80. Frick, *Saving Cinema*, 106.
81. Informe sobre la XIV Asamblea Ordinaria del Cine Club de Colombia, October 28, 1965, FPFC. The Latin American Pool effectively ceased to exist in 1960, when its members left FIAF in solidarity with the departure of Langlois and the Cinémathèque Française. Latin American film archives organized themselves into the Unión de Cinematecas de América Latina in 1965. Núñez, 'Notas para um estudo sobre a Unión de Cinematecas de América Latina', 66.
82. In 1965, Colombian customs official sent a print of Sergei Eisenstein's *Alexander Nevsky* from the Gosfilmfond back to the USSR. Informe sobre la XIV Asamblea Ordinaria del Cine Club de Colombia, October 28, 1965, FPFC. Acta de la Reunión de la Junta Directiva del Cine Club de Colombia, March 31, 1965, FPFC.
83. Program, September 6, 1955, FPFC. An anniversary program credits distributors Cine Colombia (which handled prints for Hollywood majors), Artistas Unidos (United Artists), and Francia Films for donating to the collection. Program, September 1958, FPFC.
84. Program, November 22, 1955, FPFC; 'Chaplin y Eisenstein', *Mito* I, no. 4 (October/November 1955): 277.
85. Program, November 9, 1955, FPFC.
86. Program, May 24, 1955, FPFC.
87. Septimus [pseud. Gabriel García Márquez], 'Los elementos del desastre', *El Espectador* (Bogotá), March 21, 1954, 8. Reprinted in Jacques Gilard, ed., *Gabriel García Márquez: Obra periodística vol. 2 – Entre cachacos vol. I* (Barcelona: Editorial Bruquera, 1982), 131–5.
88. Inventario de Películas de Cinemateca Colombiana, May 26, 1966. FPFC.
89. Program, September/October 1962, FPFC; Actividades de la Cinemateca Colombiana en el mes de octubre 1965, FPFC; Actividades de la Cinemateca Colombiana en el mes de noviembre, 1965, FPFC.
90. In Cali, the Cine Club Tertulia, a precursor to the well-known Cine Club de Cali founded in 1970, was active in 1959. Letter from Luis Vicens to Maritza Urdinela, March 15, 1959, FPFC; program, Cine Club de Medellín, May 1966, FPFC.
91. Letter from Hernando Salcedo Silva to Álvaro Cepeda [Samudio], March 15, 1959, FPFC; program, November/December 1960, FPFC; Juan Diego Caicedo González, 'Los cineclubes bogotanos: Siguen actuando las manos del padre Hernando Salcedo Silva', in *Bogotá filmica: Ensayos sobre cine y patrimonio*, ed. Sergio Becerra Venegas (Bogotá: Instituto Distrital de las Artes, 2012), 249.
92. 'Gabo y los camajanes de la Cueva', *El Tiempo*, January 13, 2002, <http://www.eltiempo.com/archivo/documento/MAM-1360831>.
93. Ronald Shields, 'Film Society Conference in France', *The Film Society Magazine*, October 1954, 27–8; 'Marly – Federation Representative Ronald Shields Reports', *The Film Society Magazine*, September/October 1955, 27.

94. Caicedo González, 'Los cineclubes bogotanos', 245–7; and Nelson Antonio Gómez Serrudo and Eliana Bello León, *La vida del cine en Bogotá en el siglo XX: Públicos y sociabilidad* (Bogotá: Universidad Javeriana, 2016), 51.
95. Acta de la Reunión de la Junta Directiva del Cine Club de Colombia, March 30, 1965, FPFC; Acta de la Reunión de la Junta Directiva del Cine Club de Colombia, June 19, 1969, FPFC.
96. Program, May/June 1969, FPFC. In 1977, the CCC possessed 150 stable members and an additional fifty who participated more intermittently. Acta de la Junta Directiva del Cine Club de Colombia, February 12, 1970, FPFC; and Umberto Valverde, *Reportaje crítico al cine colombiano* (Bogotá: Editorial Toronueva, 1978), 266–7.
97. Program, December 15, 1999, FPFC.
98. Dudley Andrew, 'Time Zones and Jet Lag: The Flows and Phases of World Cinema', in *World Cinemas, Transnational Perspectives*, ed. Nataša Đurovičová and Kathleen Newman (New York: Routledge, 2010), 69–75.
99. Roberto Schwarz, *Misplaced Ideas: Essays on Brazilian Culture*, trans. John Gledson (New York: Verso, 1992).

---

#### Notes on contributor

**Rielle Navitski** is an assistant professor of Theatre and Film Studies at the University of Georgia. She is the author of *Public Spectacles of Violence: Sensational Cinema and Journalism in Early Twentieth-Century Mexico and Brazil* (Duke UP, 2017) and the coeditor (with Nicolas Poppe) of *Cosmopolitan Film Cultures in Latin America, 1896–1960* (Indiana UP, 2017). Developing comparative approaches, her research focuses on the role of (audio)visual media in forging public spheres in Latin America. Her current book-length project charts the networks connecting Latin American and European institutions of film culture (cineclubs, archives, festivals, specialized magazines, and film schools) in the post-WWII period.

---