CHAPTER 1

Introduction

*Cynthia Vich and Sarah Barrow*

What is it that makes Peruvian cinema of the twenty-first century distinctive and why is it worth exploring? Historically, Peru has not been renowned for its cinematic strength, and many still argue that its filmic ecosystem lacks a coherent infrastructure. Nevertheless, Peruvian cinema has recently experienced significant shifts that respond to, reflect, and in many ways challenge what is happening within its broader societal landscape. Key national scholars and critics (and contributors to this collection) Ricardo Bedoya (2015, p. 73) and Emilio Bustamante (Bustamante and Luna Victoria, 2017, p. 17) have written that whereas throughout the twentieth-century, Peruvian cinema was mostly produced and seen in Lima, the first two decades of the twenty-first century have decentered film production and spectatorship toward the rest of the country to become more genuinely national.¹ Moreover,
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many Peruvian films are achieving global visibility on the festival and art cinema circuits as well as via online platforms, such that the concept of Peruvian cinema has become part of a broader conversation within the field of Latin American film studies to do with interdisciplinarity and transnationality. In the context of film production, Peruvian directors such as Claudia Llosa, Melina León, and Alvaro Delgado Aparicio have become increasingly visible on the global stage. Furthermore, as evidence that this dynamism is not restricted to market-oriented products and processes, regional, community-based, and experimental filmmaking has significantly expanded within the last twenty years with directors like Palito Ortega Matute, Eduardo Quispe Alarcón, and Lorena Best challenging and expanding traditional cinematic practices. In sharp contrast with the state of the field only a couple of decades ago, nowadays Peruvian cinema is marked by its ample diversity.

This book, the first English-language collection of essays on Peruvian cinema, takes as its starting point the growth of cinematic production in the country during the first two decades of the twenty-first century. We wish to tie this significant upsurge to the conclusion of the twenty-year war (1980–2000) between the state and the insurgent group Sendero Luminoso [Shining Path], which gave way to the reinvention of the country within a neoliberal agenda and deliberately and prominently inserted Peru into the global marketplace. This process included changes across the whole landscape of Peruvian society—economic, political, cultural, and technological. Economically, a significant rise in the number of people who belong to the middle classes occurred, with the poverty rate falling from 52.2% in 2005 to 26.1% in 2013.2 During the century’s first decade, what has been called the “Peruvian miracle” refers to an extraordinary economic performance which displayed an annual growth of 6.1% of its GDP between 2003 and 2013, a period then followed by a slowdown to an annual average rate of 3.2% between 2014 and 2018, mainly as a result of the lowering of international commodity prices. Nevertheless, even the unprecedented macroeconomic surge, especially during the first decade, was in many ways divorced from the general welfare of Peruvians at the micro level of everyday life, and was also accompanied by one of neoliberalism’s systemic features: the persistence of high levels of inequality. In addition, the vulnerability and fragility of the emerging middle classes has been made dramatically evident in the economic crisis resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, which has also revealed that, in spite of solid economic reserves, urgently needed investment in key sectors like health was scandalously neglected.
Politically, in the late twentieth century, the return to democracy which began in a highly precarious way with the elections of 1980 and was then interrupted by Alberto Fujimori’s dissolution of Congress in 1992, was reconfirmed in 2000 with the transitional government of Valentín Paniagua (2000–2001), followed by the election of Alejandro Toledo (2001–2006). Democratically elected governments have continued ever since (Alan García 2006–2011; Ollanta Humala 2011–2016; Pedro Pablo Kuczynski 2016–2018), although corruption and criminality among elected officials have been an endemic dysfunction throughout this period, undermining the effectiveness and the meaning of democracy in the country. The fact that every single president elected since 2000 has been subject to criminal investigations or actual charges for massive corruption schemes is only one of the many faces of a highly chaotic political scenario. In the last twenty years, Peru’s systemic political precariousness and institutional weaknesses have also been fed by a debilitating lack of solid political parties, by politicians who fail to represent and respond to popular demands, and by a postpolitical cynicism which views successful economic performance at the macro level as the sole recipe for national development. In relation to this, unremitting political instability has resulted from the national economy’s acute dependence on the demands of the mining industries. In this respect, the management of local resources has been the source of persistent political conflict between indigenous and locally organized groups and foreign conglomerates backed by the state.

A further example of how massive corruption has eroded the most basic levels of political stability is evidenced by further significant upheavals within the government sphere. In March 2018, Peru’s then president (Pedro Pablo Kuczynski) resigned when secret deals between his party and politicians from the opposition were discovered in an attempt to avert a Congress-led motion for presidential vacancy. Martín Vizcarra, the second vice president, was then sworn into power for the remainder of the presidential period, that is, until 2021. Vizcarra’s projects of political reform, aimed at attacking corruption and strengthening the country’s institutions, faced extraordinary levels of obstruction from Congress in spite of being supported by 85% of the population. As a result, in September 2019 Vizcarra dissolved Congress and called for new elections for short term legislators which were held in January 2020. In addition, further accusations of corruption resulted in a failed attempt by the newly elected Congress to oust Vizcarra in September 2020.

On the sociocultural and technological fronts, since the beginning of the new century, continuing urbanization and greater access to digital
infrastructure in remote parts of the country have resulted in both an increased westernization of perspectives and a greater visibility of cultural production from different parts of the country. Nevertheless, tensions clearly remain about the balance of power and agency between the different groups that constitute the Peruvian nation, and the centralization of Peruvian culture around Lima continues to be an obstacle. On the one hand, small steps have been taken toward a more inclusive sense of national pride that encompasses greater symbolic acknowledgement of non-white identities and recognition of Peru’s diverse cultural heritage. On the other, Marca Perú, a broad government-sponsored nation-branding project that is discussed in one of the chapters in this collection, has become the hegemonic focus of discussion about the national, and operates as a technology of subjectivation stemming from late capitalism’s market logics (Cánepe Koch and Lossio Chávez 2019, pp. 17, 20). As a call to a renewed form of citizenship centered on emphasizing personal and national achievement as the opportunity to rebuild the country’s reputation both internally and on a global scale, Marca Perú has established itself as a public and moral project of “entrepreneurial epic” that governs many aspects of the lives of Peruvians (2019, p. 26). Following the logic of branding, Marca Perú has recuperated and channelled diversity, but it has also aestheticized and monetized it, limiting its possibilities of fostering a deep and significant transformation toward a more democratic society (2019, p. 29).

As far as technological advancement is concerned, the complex connectivity and “global-spatial proximity” (Tomlinson 1999, p. 3) between Peruvians and the outside world (through the widespread use of cell phones and the internet) has had an enormous effect on the way Peruvians conduct and define their lives both personally and professionally. As Kapur and Wagner have argued, referring to the global dimensions of the technological revolution, the “new technologies of communication have served as the glue and conduit of neoliberalism,” that is to say, the medium through which neoliberalism embeds itself into our everyday lives (2011, p. 1). Certainly, this has been the experience for a large number of Peruvians for whom the persistent cultural distances have been, to a certain extent, disrupted, blurred, and complicated by technology.

Neoliberalism in Peru

In our desire to contextualize twenty-first-century Peruvian cinema within the transformations brought about by neoliberalism, we acknowledge that
since the 1990s, Peru has been one of the several Latin American sites of experimentation for neoliberal reforms propelled “from above” (Gago 2017, p. 2). However, as Gago has pointed out, Foucault’s concept of governmentality allows us to understand neoliberalism as a set of skills, technologies, and practices which reveal a rationality that cannot be thought of only from above, but need to be considered as also coming from below (2017, p. 2). As “a variety of ways of doing, being and thinking that organize the social machinery’s calculations and effects,” the way that neoliberalism has unfolded in Peru provides quite a concrete example of how this rationality “is not purely abstract nor macropolitical but rather arises from the encounter with forces at work and is embodied in various ways by the subjectivities and tactics of everyday life” (Gago 2017, p. 2). In that sense, beyond its political implementation by the government, the ways in which neoliberalism has become rooted in popular subjectivities in places like Peru attests to a complex, imminent, and nonlinear functioning where it is “simultaneously contemporary and contested, reinterpreted and innovated” as well as “appropriated, destroyed, relaunched, and altered by those who, it assumes, are only its victims” (Gago 2017, p. 234).

As an example of the multiple ways through which neoliberal technologies of power operate, the ideology of entrepreneurship normalized in the country at the macro and micro levels since 1990 presents itself as an opportunity for everyone, reinforcing what since the early twentieth century has been a heroic narrative that understands migration as the first path for economic prosperity. As a “vitalist pragmatic,” the social, cultural, and economic transformations brought by migration can then be understood as one of the ways in which neoliberalism from below reveals itself as “a powerful popular economy that combines community skills of self-management and intimate know-how as a technology of mass self-entrepreneurship” (Gago 2017, p. 6). In Peru, the intense process of urbanization that has continued into the twenty-first century has resulted in a sprawling growth of cities, mostly along the coast but also elsewhere throughout the country, where the emblematic mall-plus-multiplex phenomenon has become the familiar site of an urban consumer culture shaped by the neoliberal expectations and specific habits of the growing middle classes. Indeed, as García Canclini pointed out back in 1995, since the early 1990s citizenship and the act of political participation in Latin America became reconfigured by the practices of consumption. With a degree of agency that operates mainly at the level of affect, the overriding
precariousness of Peruvian consumption-born feelings of citizenship feeds into an unregulated and thriving economy that relies on the logic of competition and individualism, counteracting a lack of formal employment with an abundance of small, mostly family-owned, independent local businesses. In this overarching context, small scale entrepreneurship coexists with a globally connected private sector which is the dominant structure of power at the expense of the persistent erosion of the role of the state and its institutions.

As a rationality grounded on an economic model, neoliberalism in Peru has been presented as a remedy for recovery after twenty years of conflict characterized by massive inflation and widespread political violence. During those years, the state proved to be completely ineffective in terms of safeguarding its people and controlling the economy, destroying citizens’ confidence in its capacity to govern. This distrust created the perfect grounds for neoliberal rationality to substitute the state with an almost fundamentalist belief in the power of the market and the private sphere to improve the conditions of society. The emphasis in this marketized environment has thus been on consumerism, on attracting global investment, and on creating a celebratory mood which strives to present a positive image of Peru to the outside world through achievements in culture, sports, and especially, gastronomy (Cánepa Koch and Lossio Chávez 2019, p. 27). These have become antidotes for the processes of memory and reconciliation that are urgently needed if Peruvian society is to rebuild and avoid perpetuating the same historic divisions that triggered the conflict.

Given that culture is, after war, the second most important sector in the neoliberal economy (Kapur and Wagner 2011, p. 1), we should then acknowledge that cinema as a set of cultural relations is more effective than economic reports as a tool to examine the impact of neoliberalism as a new phase of capitalism operating in Peruvian society. Taking as a starting point the contradictory nature of cinema as both a product of capitalism and an art form that can resist and reimagine it through specific content and formal structures, cinema both participates in and contests the neoliberal project (Kapur and Wagner 2011, p. 3; Sandberg 2018, p. 3). Indeed, one of our goals here has been to showcase films that, highlighting the wide spectrum of contemporary experience, lie at opposite ends of the ideological positioning toward the realities of the Peruvian nation as reinvented through neoliberalism. Filmmaking practices that in some aspects place themselves against capitalist rationality such as those of Eduardo Quispe Alarcón, Lorena Best and the Escuela de Cine Amazónico, are featured in this volume alongside mass
entertainment productions like those by Ricardo Maldonado and Frank Pérez-Garland, linked with corporations such as Marca Perú and Tondero.

The end of the second decade of the new century provides a fruitful opportunity to highlight the parallel developments between cinema and society in Peru during this period. We believe that dynamism (in terms of outburst in productivity) and instability (in terms of the fragility and precarity of the infrastructure for cinema in the country) are the most prominent features that link both spheres. The close relationship between cinema and the neoliberal economy in particular is highlighted through shared patterns of heightened productivity and success, always haunted by a structural vulnerability and volatility that threaten to undermine any optimistic predictions for long term prosperity. Peru’s economic successes in the midst of its political instability during this period are in sync with the relatively high output of a national cinema that is nevertheless constrained by a fragile infrastructure that makes its future look very uncertain.

**Cinema Regulation**

Within the cinematic milieu, the structural forces underlying the tension between dynamism and instability arise in large part from the repeated attempts at creating an overarching legal framework. The nation’s film legislation (Ley de la Cinematografía Peruana 26370), in place from 1994 until December 2019, had already proven obsolete given that it was created before the impact of the digital revolution on all aspects of film production, distribution, exhibition, and culture. After many years of heated debate, a controversial proposal for new legislation (Proyecto de Ley 3304/2018) was drafted and presented to Congress in early 2019, resulting in preliminary approval, but its progress was then stalled due to the dissolution of Congress in September of that year. Unexpectedly, and without public discussion, President Martín Vizcarra issued an emergency decree (Decreto de Urgencia 022-2019) in December 2019 which—at the time of publication—still needed approval by the new Congress that was reinstated in March 2020. This situation further underlines our hypothesis that in Peru, the relationship between political, economic, and cinematic developments is inextricable.

The most notable strength of the new cinema decree is the tripling of the funding available for film, between thirty and forty percent of which has now been ring-fenced exclusively for regional productions.
This signals a crucial further step toward the decentralization of Peruvian cinema, which we believe will make it more genuinely representative of the nation. The stability from knowing there is a defined budget for film production could also result in more formalized structures overall. However, while this decree was being debated as a project in Congress, it generated controversy where many criticisms were highlighted. Among these, there remained concerns that the structure of competition and decision-making about the allocation of the funding awards is still to be linked to the political will of the government in power. Moreover, one of the most problematic issues expressed by local film critics has been the law’s failure to include any measure that would “complete the cycle of cinematic production” (Delgado 2019). By this, we refer to the lack of any concrete steps to ensure that Peruvian films have dignified access to local commercial screens (Bedoya 2019). Local filmmakers currently face an overarching precarity with regard to unpredictable scheduling, poor information-sharing, non-existent formal publicity, and systematic exclusion from processes relating to the distribution and exhibition of their work.

From our perspective, one of the new law’s greatest weaknesses is that it does very little to address the persistent issue of lack of opportunities for women in all areas of cinematic activity. For much too long, Peruvian cinema has been little more than a closed club that privileges men, and for this to change, bolder measures should be implemented at the institutional level. In addition, the new legislation suffers from the institutional fragility of its governing body, the *Ministerio de Cultura*, whose inefficiency has been notorious due to its debilitating instability caused in part by the constant changes in its leadership (for example, at least thirteen different Ministers in the last ten years). As has been pointed out by Wiener (2020), the decree also highly benefits the commercial sector, failing to make any statements related to screen quotas and tying funding to box office success. Finally, we note that no guidelines are provided to reduce the damaging effects of systematic informality when hiring cast and crew members.

Several commitments to important initiatives are mentioned in the decree, among them the need: to provide audiovisual literacy instruction in schools; to offer professional training in different areas of audiovisual craft; to support Peruvian cinema internationally; and to promote alternative exhibition venues and indigenous cinema. The problem is that
no detail is given as to how these will be implemented or resourced. No mention is made of plans for the creation of a much needed public film school. A reference is made acknowledging the importance of the existing national film archive, but no solid plan is given for the creation of a proper *cinemateca* that would have a more wide-ranging remit to conserve and give generalized access to Peruvian cinema. We believe a new approach to implementation and resourcing is urgently required to address the historical situation of powerlessness that has left Peruvian filmmakers unprotected and at the mercy of the unpredictable forces of the market. A truly all-embracing legal framework is vital to embolden and empower those whose work advances film as an art form rather than as a commercial product.

Despite the proposed regulatory system, many Peruvian filmmakers remain reliant on external funding in a way that is similar to the economy’s strong dependence on foreign investment. As part of the neoliberal paradigm, these external funding sources encourage fierce competition while at the same time emphasize age-old representational demands on Peruvian filmmakers. This burden of representation, which could be seen as “veiled neocolonialist pressure” (Rueda 2020) or as “neoliberal forms of censorship” (Sandberg 2018, p. 10) dictates what a film should look like, influencing themes and aesthetics, and facilitating “cliqued and exotized views of Latin American landscapes, cultures and people” (Sandberg 2018, p. 10). Despite these pressures, many Peruvian filmmakers have managed to preserve their cultural and artistic integrity while at the same time participating in global festival circuits. Some have also achieved this through finding alternative representational forms and by creating informal distribution networks and exhibition platforms.

**Revisiting the National**

Within a worldwide environment of transnational practices which disrupt borders in all aspects of film culture, the debate about whether it is still appropriate to think in terms of a national paradigm for cinema continues to resurface. While acknowledging that “the concept of national cinema is more an aspiration than a reality” (Poblete 2018, p. 18) and has been a much debated topic in metropolitan film studies, we also recognize that cinematic culture continues to play an important role in the creation of nations as “imagined political communit[ies]” (Anderson 1983, p. 6), helping to shape “shared memories of a constructed past” (Hayward in Hjort and Mackenzie 2000, p. 90). However, rather than seeking out
images of coherence and consensus, national cinema increasingly responds to the diversity of experiences that exist within any single nation. Still, as Poblete argues citing Rosen, national cinema is “always the result of a theoretical effort, positing it as a relatively unifying object, even when the goal is showcasing its complexity” (2018, p. 21). Indeed, despite the acknowledged degree of artificiality of the concept, this book nevertheless takes national cinema as an important framing device that allows us to connect a specific cultural object such as cinema with particular developments in Peruvian society at a moment when the diversity of Peruvian identity, at least discursively, is in the process of acquiring greater social, cultural, economic, and political value. Through the curation of this volume, we want to make visible not only that the decentralization of Peruvian cinema is the most distinctive phenomenon of the period, but also that film from Peru has diversified into a wide range of cinematic practices and products. This diversification has allowed for a more varied appreciation of the many subjectivities that co-exist across the boundaries of what is generally understood as Peru. In that spirit, we wish to point out the importance of sub-national dynamics, including those of indigenous cultures and languages, that are increasingly visible in Peruvian cinema today.

Throughout its history, the biggest challenge for Peruvian cinema has been securing a national audience. In that sense, following Poblete’s understanding of audiences within given countries “as interpretive communities based on shared practices of reception, cultural competencies, and vernacular sensibilities” (2018, p. 17), we believe that one of the main obstacles faced by Peruvians is their sense of appreciation for cinema as a legitimate form of cultural expression. Overarchingly, cinema reception in Peru is mostly understood as a form of entertainment. Echoing Poblete’s general affirmation about the Latin American context, Peruvian national film is similar in that it has never enjoyed “the benefits of the formal and systematic cultural inculcation nor the training in [national] ways of reading or seeing that school provided for literary texts” (2018, p. 18). In other words, in general, the Peruvian education system still gives the sense that literature is the place where the national imaginary is formed; and so Peruvian cinema, in common with others across the continent, has not enjoyed thorough instruction at schools or universities. This has limited the sociopolitical impact of cinema, since films that question and criticize different aspects of Peruvian society are mostly seen by a small, educated elite. Furthermore, because of the expensive nature of film
production (something that has recently been partly reversed by new and cheaper technologies), producing cinema has been limited to members of that same elite, with their work often criticized for not resonating with audiences of different social backgrounds. Since this has slowly been changing in the last twenty years, our selection of films aims to highlight some of the range of new voices that are coming through from different cultural, gender, and socio-economic identities. From the perspective of reception, this has triggered a degree of audience expansion which is evident through the alternative spaces for film-viewing that have developed throughout the country in recent years. Small, producer-led festivals (such as the Festival de Cine Hecho por Mujeres, the Transcinema Festival Internacional de Cine, the Festival de Cine de Trujillo (FECIT) and the Festival de Cine Peruano en Lenguas Originarias), as well as cineclubs and independent showcases led by film critics (such as the former Cine Club de la Universidad de Ciencias y Humanidades, El Galpón Transcinema in Lima, and the Cine Club Amaru in Ayacucho) have been crucial in reaching out to wider spectatorships. In addition, initiatives such as the Grupo Chaski’s Microcines project, the work of Docuperú, and the proliferation of online platforms such as Cineaparte, have given opportunities for many more people to experience film culture beyond the space of the multiplex theater. While these alternative exhibition spaces work tirelessly to enhance the appreciation of Peruvian and international cinema by local audiences, and to bridge the gap between critically engaged and artistically sophisticated films and the general public, the fact remains that the exclusion of most national art and independent films from reasonable access to mainstream theaters continues to perpetuate the marginalization of Peruvian cinema as a legitimate site for national identification and sense of belonging.

A DIVERSE CINEMATIC LANDSCAPE

Because we wish to emphasize that the growth of Peruvian cinematic production in the first two decades of the twenty-first century is closely linked to Peru’s insertion into the neoliberal model, the relationship of film production and intended audiences with market dynamics has been the guiding principle for the decisions we have made about the categorization of the films discussed in this collection. Consequently, the first distinction we wish to make is between those films which have embraced market logics, functioning as commodities both in the commercial and
in the art markets, and those that have not had this imperative as their primary objective. Informed by the elasticity, porosity, and the different levels of precariousness that characterize the Peruvian filmmaking milieu, our aim is not to provide a rigid taxonomy, but a useful and ample set of tools to address the complex functioning of the nation’s current filmmaking and consumption. We believe that despite the problematics of any categorization, it is productive to think about how cinema aligns with but also transcends clear-cut boundaries, and to acknowledge there are slippages between categories. These happen when the originality of hybrid forms disrupts intended classifications and reveals new perspectives despite the tendency of market logics to label products in a way that orients them toward specific audiences. For this reason, rather than understanding our categories as fixed, we want to use them as a strategic approach that recognizes that several of the films discussed in this volume could easily be placed in more than one group.

**PART I: THE MARKET DYNAMICS OF PERUVIAN CINEMA**

Within our first overarching category we have identified three broad sections. All of the films in these sections have a common objective of achieving success, whether profit in the commercial market or prestige in the film festival and art cinema circuits. We have adopted this framework that privileges the way the films attract an audience and attain visibility because despite the variety of this first category, their primary intention is to be recognized within some kind of market context. Furthermore, the division of this first general category into three sections arises in part from the different production structures of the films, their means of circulation and exhibition, and the primary audiences for which they have been produced.

We have named the first section within this category of market-oriented films “**Big budget production for local entertainment.**” This group of essays comprises critical approaches to films produced by national companies whose main objective is to develop for-profit entertainment cinema, and whose audiences are centered in Lima and other major cities in Peru. These films do not yet demonstrate the existence or viability of a film industry given that there are very few and relatively new major production companies (such as *Tondero* and *Big Bang Films*), whose products remain fairly limited in scope. However, the central role of the production company as author, together with the emphasis on profit, private finance,
and genre, signal in that direction. The new habits and tastes of emerging consumers of these films have resulted in a considerable rise in attendance at mall-based multiplexes as part of a broader entertainment experience (Bedoya 2015, pp. 26–27). By adopting some of the most classic thematic approaches of the commercial industry system (such as depoliticization, historical simplification, romantic storylines, recognizable casting, and predictable content), these films emulate those produced by Hollywood majors (Ortner in Castro 2017, p. 20). In terms of distribution, these projects are linked at an early stage of production to a distributor, usually a representative of a Hollywood firm for Peru, who guarantees that they will receive a similar treatment to that enjoyed by Hollywood films in local theaters. Essentially, this entails screenings in accessible and well-equipped theaters at popular times, and payment directly to the producer (Bedoya 2015, p. 69). This relatively sophisticated and more robust distribution infrastructure has obvious positive effects on achieving high audience numbers and greater visibility for these films as compared with the other types discussed in this book.

The first chapter in this section, by Carolina Sitnisky, takes the romantic comedy genre as a strategy for commercial success and analyzes four films by Frank Pérez-Garland. Within the bounds of film as entertainment, she argues for the substantial advances that this genre has made toward developing a national audience by establishing an affective connection with the spectators grounded in nostalgia and locally recognizable features. Jeffrey Middents continues the discussion on nostalgia in relation to audience development with his chapter on the relationship between ¡Asu Mare! (2013), Peru’s biggest commercial filmic success with three million spectators, and the nation branding campaign Marca Perú. Concerned with the internal and external framing of Peru on screen, Middents discusses Peruvian national cinema’s historical neglect of the comedy genre and emphasizes how ¡Asu Mare! fulfills some of the goals of Marca Perú: to brand the country by identifying its competitive identity in the global market, and to provide an example, through its protagonist, of how to be a twenty-first-century Peruvian.

The second section, “Regional low budget drama,” presents analyses of films made by individual directors as part of small independent production companies whose films are shown mostly in local venues outside Lima and where profit, albeit low, is one of the main guiding forces. Regional film in general has been acknowledged as the most significant development in Peruvian cinema since the late 1990s (Bustamante and Luna Victoria 2017, p. 17; Bustamante 2018, p. 443) and in this section we
focus on those regional films with a specific eye on commercial success and a local audience. These mainly profit-oriented films have been part of a wider phenomenon of video production that Alfaro has named “Peruwood,” comparable to similar developments in Hong Kong and China, in India (Bollywood) and Nigeria (Nollywood) (2013, p. 72). Alfaro further notes that more accessible DVD technology has facilitated the development of a new market with content that until recently had been marginalized from the audiovisual industry in Peru (2013, p. 71). This technological shift has contributed to a decentering of how and by whom Peruvian cinema is now produced and perceived. In general, regional filmmaking, which relies on informal, self-financed, and artisanal arrangements, has thrived during recent decades; this collection aims to make that informality more visible and to acknowledge its value.

Writing specifically about the distinctive features of regional cinema, Bustamante and Luna Victoria have emphasized that these films have introduced new subjectivities, scenarios, cultural practices, and experiences that were previously absent from Peruvian screens (2017, p. 25). As has been further noted by these scholars (2017, pp. 34–40), the specific production context of these films tends to be characterized by directors who operate as small entrepreneurs, often investing their own money and fighting against pirates who will produce several versions of the same film. Their financing strategies include holding acting workshops for which they charge a fee and at the same time cast their actors. They also save money by avoiding writing detailed scripts, filming during daytime over many months or even years depending on when money is available, and using personal computers with free-to-download editing software for post-production. Sometimes they apply for and secure government funds, but this is still rarely the main source of funding.

Exhibition for these films is largely itinerant. Bustamante and Luna Victoria (2017, pp. 43–50) explain that each director often personally travels with the original copy in order to avoid piracy across cities and towns where films are shown. These tours usually last several months and so require the filmmaker to make a substantial economic investment (in cash and time), something that not all can afford. Films are screened in locations such as municipal halls, school auditoria, and even outdoors. Entry fees are charged, and although it is difficult to get a precise sense of audience numbers due to the relatively informal nature of the activity, they are thought to be extremely high, with some of the directors claiming to have reached several hundreds of thousands of spectators. What has made
these large audience numbers possible is that until recently in regions such as Ayacucho, for example, there were no multiplexes. In the region of Puno, where the main city of Juliaca was once referred to as “the Hollywood of the Andes” (Bustamante 2016, n.p.), the production of this type of regional film declined after the multiplex opened.

Among these commercially oriented regional dramas, the two most popular genres have been horror and melodrama. Especially in the case of Ayacuchean filmmakers, these films combine Hollywood conventions with content and narrative structures taken from oral Andean tradition. Thematically they are quite diverse, incorporating issues of power and agency, historical memory, and local societal norms and taboos, among others.

Emilio Bustamante’s chapter analyzes the connections between the Ayacuchean film Bullying maldito, la historia de María Marimacha (2015) by Mélinton Eusebio, and American horror and B-series films. He provides an intriguing reading that also draws on extra-filmic sources, such as the poster and the Peruvian legend of María Marimacha, which were used in order to appeal to the local Ayacuchean audience. Through interweaving these and other transtextual connections, he presents a possible interpretation of the ambiguous return of the protagonist after her death at the end of the film. In her chapter on the making of La maldición del Inca (unreleased), Martha-Cecilia Dietrich reflects on the precarious conditions that have made it impossible for this film to be completed after its eighth year in production. She also discusses this film’s rewriting of history through its attempt to change the perception of Ayacuchanos from being victims of history to becoming its heroes. In a region that was so brutally exposed to the violence of the armed conflict, and where a climate of disempowerment remains, the heroic figure of the film’s protagonist allows for the possibility of imagining a different contemporary reality. In Chapter 6, María Eugenia Ulfe adopts an anthropological perspective to explore the conditions, the modes of production, and the circulation of La casa rosada by Ayacuchean director Palito Ortega Matute. She uses the concept of “cultural intimacy” to analyze Ortega Matute’s highly artisanal and familial approach to filmmaking, which thus establishes a distinctive emotional connection with the local Ayacuchean audience, triggered by their own memories of the ways that the city experienced the conflict.

The third section, “Art film for festival circuits,” operates within the specific niche market of international film festivals and their production and circulation contexts across national and regional borders. Due to the
limited state support, this type of filmmaking has grown to depend on the festival ecology in multiple ways, benefitting from funding schemes that normally come from European sources with specific thematic and formal expectations. In common with other small cinemas around the globe, what speaks to the underlying fragility of contemporary Peruvian art cinema is the tension between the visibility garnered in the festival milieu and the difficulty in achieving recognition on the domestic front. Despite the prestige of festival awards, Peruvian art films have not generally succeeded in securing the trust of national exhibitors who are reluctant to offer them appropriate slots because they lack faith in these films’ capacity to appeal to local audiences beyond a small, educated middle-class section of the population. As a consequence, Peru has neither a systematic production context, nor a sustained national audience for its art cinema.

But what is art cinema? The concept defies categorization by its very nature. Our understanding of it aligns with Rosalind Galt and Karl Schoonover’s approach, which emphasizes its hybridity, elasticity, and impurity (2010). Rather than focusing on a fixed set of specific characteristics, we propose that art film appeals to the tastes of a specialized international audience, has a commitment to high-quality production values, and displays a thematic translatability that crosses cultural frontiers and expands the exhibition networks allowing for greater economic return. As Thomas Elsaesser (2005) and Tamara Falicov (2013) have argued from a reception studies perspective, art cinema is that which “screens and succeeds in art cinemas” (quoted in Couret 2018, p. 241). Art films are often perceived as elitist in that they are intellectually and aesthetically challenging, and historically they have been the most prominent in academic scholarship. Still, following Nilo Couret, it is crucial to keep in mind that any criteria for conferring the status of art cinema changes over time and that, as a shifting discursive category, art cinema maps onto many context-specific geopolitical frameworks (2018, pp. 236–237). Corresponding with the hegemonic neoliberalism of contemporary Peru, the nation’s art cinema has become a valued commodity as part of its participation in the film festival ecology.

Thematically, in Peru as throughout Latin America, art film is mostly an “identity-based first-person cinema” (Lazzara 2016, p. 24 in Sandberg 2018, p. 13) focusing on smaller stories about single characters and everyday issues often located in private and family settings. In contrast with the politics of oblivion adopted by mainstream society in the specific post-conflict context of Peruvian neoliberalism, the subject of memory
has become almost symbiotic with the very notion of art cinema in the country. This can clearly be seen in the number of contributions about this topic in this volume: Rueda on *Paraíso* and *NN*; Bedoya on short films about memory and recent political conflicts; Bernedo on *La última tarde* and *La hora final*; Hibbett on *La teta asustada*, *Paloma de papel*, *Volver a ver*, and *La casa rosada*; and Protzel on *Mariposa negra*, *La hora azul*, and *Magallanes*.

By focusing on the materiality of the situations presented in the films *Paraíso* and *NN*, Maria Helena Rueda’s chapter points out how the director opens up his films to global interpretations, without depriving them of their local contextual meaning and weight. Focusing on the agency of spaces and objects in both films, she analyzes how these concepts are integral to human interaction and to the resilience of the characters in their attempts to overcome what appear to be hopeless circumstances. Ricardo Bedoya’s chapter on recent short films presents a case study of five examples which deal with memory of the Peruvian armed conflict as well as with some of the political clashes of recent years between the state and local communities regarding mining activity. He highlights the importance of the short format in that it allows directors to showcase a certain trajectory in terms of market appeal and development of their aesthetic language. In her chapter, Alexandra Hibbett refers to the political blockages of Peruvian memory cinema, and uses the concept of duty-memory to reflect on film’s capacity to have an impact on general society. She identifies five blockages: the tension between film as industry or art; the difficulty of portraying Andean subjects with integrity; the attempt not to undermine the agency of victims in the process of representation; the highly centralized Peruvian film industry; and the risks of tackling the topic of political violence in what is still a highly polarized context. Javier Protzel’s chapter suggests that cinema seems to be the principal way that literature is now consumed in twenty-first-century Peru. By looking at three films based on Alonso Cueto’s novels, he analyzes the transition between literary and cinematic languages, as well as the treatment of memory in relation to the armed conflict. In her chapter on *La última tarde* and *La hora final*, Karen Bernedo identifies the different approaches to representing the character of the insurgent in Peruvian fiction cinema. By considering the limitations of production and exhibition of this type of film, she also highlights its challenges as part of the contemporary Peruvian debate about memory of the conflict.
Even though allegorical fiction is the defining feature of most of the films mentioned above, the pressing need to connect with audiences has encouraged many Peruvian art films to adopt and adapt genre conventions: fictions like *NN* and *Magallanes*, among others, are examples of the hybrid creativity of Latin American art filmmaking, which Gerard Dapena has connected to this continent’s fundamentally transcultural nature. In his view, the very permeable line between art and genre cinema mirrors to a certain extent the distinctively regional processes of transculturation (2018, p. 151). In addition, the prominent revisiting of the armed conflict on Peruvian screens indicates a turn to cinema as a space for the political, but with the notable limitation that this act of reckoning has mostly been the concern of a small segment of society, namely, the artistic and intellectual spheres.

While over half the chapters in this section deal with the issue of memory about the armed conflict, it is important to highlight that the diversity of Peruvian art film embraces multiple other topics that make the local translatable on a global scale. Maria Chiara D’Argenio’s contribution, for example, discusses how *Wiñaypacha*, a regional film in the Aymara language, deploys slow film aesthetics that cater to the tastes of festival audiences worldwide. She also argues that this film overcomes indigenista conventions and reframes Andean indigeneity through a focus on intimacy. Meanwhile, Sarah Barrow’s chapter considers the cinephilic aspects of Omar Forero’s cinema that seem to define him as a “global auteur” (Elsaesser 2016). His work has been compared by critics with the likes of Payne, Kiarostami, Alonso, and Costa, and this contribution highlights the aesthetics of slowness, disruption and austerity that Forero adopts to articulate the impact of neoliberalism on northern Peru. Finally, Daniella Wurst’s analysis of two shorts by another global auteur, Claudia Llosa, combines a discussion about the links between the cinematic and touristic gazes in their representation of the “other” with an exploration of how neoliberal mandates bring constraints and opportunities to the filmmaker as artist.

In sum, we wish to highlight that the success of the films in these three sections, whether functioning as artistic commodities or as products for commercial consumption, is strongly connected to the country’s contemporary economic landscape. The broad principle which connects and distinguishes the three sections in this first part is the common need to perform according to the logic of the market.
PART II: OUTSIDE THE DYNAMICS OF THE MARKET

The second overarching category that frames Peruvian cinema of the twenty-first century comprises those films that refuse to be understood, presented, or experienced as commodities inserted in circuits of profit or prestige. As such, they display an antagonistic relationship toward that type of cinema that depends on market forces, and they inhabit alternative spaces where they make different demands of their spectators. Focusing on practices that emerge from a different logic and understanding of the role of film, the studies included in this section allow us to make visible that part of Peruvian cinema that often otherwise remains unaccounted for.

Ranging from fiction, documentary, and hybrid variations all outside conventional film lengths, these works are made by independent film-makers with purposes related to community-building, agency, self-representation, and the disruption of power relations. They circulate mainly via a growing but quite fragile network of informal cineclubs and alternative venues. Some of these exhibition opportunities have secured a measure of public or private economic support, but they remain examples of the precarious interplay between dynamism and instability that we have identified as being at the heart of contemporary Peruvian cinema.

Apart from their circulation in local venues, the films discussed in the chapters in this section have embraced the advantages brought by new online platforms, which allow for global spectatorship and the subsequent emergence of transnational connections. In some cases, these films have transcended the local context and entered a wider space of exposure through small, niche festivals that tend not to be linked to major funding initiatives.

Cynthia Vich’s chapter focuses on the films and cinematic practices of Eduardo Quispe Alarcón, an experimental filmmaker whose low-budget and artisanal mode of producing, distributing, and exhibiting cinema locates itself fiercely outside market forces. Mapping his place in the field of Peruvian cinema, the chapter discusses the international influences that shape Quispe Alarcón’s aesthetic, thematic, and anti-industrial choices in relation to his engagement with the local filmmaking milieu and his understanding of the political dimension of cinema as a vehicle of inquiry, resistance, and rehumanization. In Chapter 16, Claudia Arteaga examines the Escuela de Cine Amazónico’s training, production, and circulation processes, and analyzes two short films produced by their students. She
presents an understanding of cinema as a way of constructing micropolitical spheres for building a sense of belonging, arguing that ECA’s films depart from the usual paradigm of indigenous versus mestizo. In this context, audiovisual language becomes a tool for reflection by indigenous communities on questions of identity. Finally, Isabel Seguí’s chapter critically approaches independent female-led non-fiction projects through analysis of the filmmaking practices of Diana Castro, creative producer of films and festivals, and Lorena Best, director, teacher, and organizer. Seguí draws on oral history from a feminist perspective as a method through which to propose a non-hierarchical film culture that is alternative to commercial and art film logic, and to challenge male-dominated cinephilic paradigms.

**Final Thoughts**

In our attempt to map contemporary Peruvian film according to the categories proposed, this project does not arise from an essentialist belief that any film itself has intrinsically stable features; rather, we wish to highlight cinema’s role in forging multiple social relationships and interactions with space and place. Our desire has been to provide an original perspective from which to observe how economic and political transformations are expressed and discussed in the cinematic sphere. We have set out to showcase the tensions between the commercial and artistic, the local, the regional, the national, and the global, as well as the different relationships between filmmakers and their audiences. This book has been designed to provide a vibrant dialogue that includes and respects a variety of disciplinary approaches within a spirit of debate that embraces different points of view. Unlike traditional scholarly studies of film that tend to focus on well-known box office hits or festival-type art cinema, this volume provides a novel take on Peru’s wide array of filmic production and on the country’s intricate conditions of distribution and circulation, giving equal value both to highly visible and successful features, and to alternatively produced, lesser known works.

Until the present time, scholars of Peruvian cinema have had very limited access to resources: most of the scholarship on this topic is located in articles that are scattered across a range of academic journals, edited volumes on Latin American cinema, print magazines, and online publications. There are only a handful of book-length studies on Peruvian cinema in particular, and among them, those written in English focus on quite specific topics and do not set out to offer such a wide-ranging
picture of cinema in Peru today. The most recently published monograph in the English language, Sarah Barrow’s *Contemporary Peruvian Cinema: History, Identity and Violence on Screen* (I.B. Tauris, 2018b), explores how Peruvian films represent and respond to the political violence of the country’s internal armed conflict between 1980 and 2000. While it offers an essential contribution to the field, it specifically focuses on the relationship between cinema and the armed conflict, and is centered on films made up until 2003. Prior to that, the first book-length publication on Peruvian film in English was Jeffrey Middents’ *Writing National Cinema: Film Journals and Film Culture in Peru* (Dartmouth College Press, 2009). This study on film culture is distinctive due to its emphasis on the key role played by *Hablemos de cine* [Let’s Talk About Film], a Peruvian film journal published during the 1960s and ’70s which developed a transnational perspective within Peruvian film criticism.

Of those works written in Spanish, Ricardo Bedoya’s books stand out as the most comprehensive and wide-ranging. His vast contribution has laid the foundations for film scholarship in Peru. Among his publications, the book which coincides with the timeframe of this volume is *El cine peruano en tiempos digitales* (Fondo Editorial de la Universidad de Lima, 2015), which presents an extensive panorama of all the Peruvian films released between 1996 and 2015. It includes an analysis of a significant selection of those films along with a discussion of their contexts of production and exhibition in a digital age. The second most important scholarship about Peruvian cinema of recent years is Emilio Bustamante and Jaime Luna Victoria’s work on films made outside Lima, questioning the status of the capital city as a hub for national filmmaking. *Las miradas múltiples: el cine regional peruano* (Fondo Editorial de la Universidad de Lima, 2017) is a two-volume compendium that introduces the reader to the filmic production of Peru’s provinces. It covers the period post-2000 and comprises technical information on regional films, as well as valuable original interviews with the directors. There is also *El Perú desde el cine: plano contra plano* by Liuba Kogan, Guadalupe Pérez Recalde, and Julio Villa Palomino (Universidad del Pacífico, 2017). Although it contains valuable analyses of some Peruvian films and their production and distribution contexts, this collection of essays nevertheless does not provide a curatorial structure and an overarching introductory text that frames the cinematic landscape in relation to the social, economic, and political context of contemporary Peru. It should also be noted that Isaac León Frías, one of the founding editors of *Hablemos de cine*, has
published a collection of his essays named *Tierras Bravas: cine peruano y latinoamericano* (Fondo Editorial de la Universidad de Lima, 2016) in anthological format, and Violeta Núñez Gorritti has produced four encyclopaedic volumes that each focus on Peruvian cinema at distinct historical periods up to 1950. Finally, other significant works published in Spanish about Peruvian film which focus on specific cinematic forms and industry perspectives include Giancarlo Carbone’s two texts *El cine en el Perú el cortometraje: 1972–1992* (Fondo Editorial de la Universidad de Lima, 2007) and *El cine en el Perú: 1897–1950: Testimonios* (Fondo Editorial de la Universidad de Lima, 1991); Mauricio Godoy’s monograph *180º gira mi cámara: lo autobiográfico en el documental peruano* (Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú, 2013), Pablo Malek’s *Enfoques, discursos y memorias: producción documental sobre el conflicto armado interno en el Perú* (Gato Viejo, 2016); and Mónica Delgado’s *María Wiesse en Amauta: los orígenes de la crítica de cine en el Perú* (Gafas Moradas, 2020).

In our desire to build on this existing scholarship, *Peruvian Cinema in the Twenty First Century: Dynamic and Unstable Grounds* offers an examination of a wide variety of forms of filmmaking and their corresponding modes of production, distribution, and exhibition. Furthermore, our text combines the work of English and Spanish speaking scholars from different parts of the world and from a range of academic disciplines. Our book distinguishes itself from all previous works in that it offers a rigorously curated view of contemporary Peruvian cinema in its thematic and stylistic diversity, with an emphasis on how this cinema positions itself within or outside different markets in the current neoliberal context. The articles have been selected and arranged taking into account the place of the films they discuss within the four different sections that subdivide the two overarching categories that we have devised as ways of understanding the organizing force that market logics currently have on the landscape of cinema in Peru.

As a final note, we wish to highlight that because the traditional Peruvian cinematic canon has been largely male-centered, we are conscious that scholarship needs to acknowledge further the range of work by women that exists in the field. Several of the chapters in our volume have a specific focus on films or production contexts led by women, but we certainly hope that future scholarship on Peruvian cinema will take this exploration to greater lengths. We are encouraged, however, by the high number of female scholars from Peru, the United States, the United Kingdom, and Europe who have participated in this project. As the first academic book in English that offers a broad critical panorama of the state
of contemporary Peruvian cinema, this volume opens up multiple direc-
tions for future research on what remains a relatively small but powerful
contributor to the global film landscape. It provides inquiries into the
diversity of modes of filmmaking currently being developed in Peru,
showing how the global debates around cinema are played out on and
off-screen in a distinctive national context.

Notes

1. This shift toward a more inclusive understanding and practice of Peru-
vian cinema has incorporated locations, experiences, cultural practices,
and artistic sensibilities previously absent from national filmic productions
(Bustamante and Luna Victoria, 2017, p. 25).
2. This is equivalent to 6.4 million people escaping poverty during that period.
Note that the “poverty rate” refers to the percentage of the population
living on US$ 5.5 a day. See: <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/
peru/overview>.
3. Ironically, these first elections came after a twelve-year military dictatorship,
and saw the first recognized act of the war with the burning of the ballot
boxes in Chuschi, Ayacucho.
4. As we explain in more detail further on, Peru’s current president since
2018 is Martín Vizcarra, who came to power after Kuczynski was obliged
to resign.
5. As Bedoya (1995) and Barrow (2018a) have noted, the increased dynamism
of Peruvian cinema has taken shape despite what has been acknowledged
as its “stop-start development.”
6. Our understanding of this parallelism is inflected by an acknowledgement
that it can also be uneven in terms of temporal alignment, given that times
of economic crisis have sometimes triggered the most creative responses
from individual filmmakers in Peru. We further acknowledge that outbursts
of productivity have never resulted in any systemic stability that allows
for the continuity of a diverse production of Peruvian cinema, nor in the
development of any related infrastructure. Within the discussion about the
feasibility of a Peruvian film industry, we believe that Alvaray’s concept of
“creative industries” (2018, p. 263) which emphasizes the proliferation of
independent production companies and distribution outlets, is the most
appropriate to characterize the multifaceted ecology of Peruvian cinema.
7. The new decree was published in its entirety through the news media on
8 December 2019, including in El Peruano in the section on “Normas
Legales” (pp. 3–9). Detailed information about the lack of public discussion
before its issue as well as on the absence of acceptable levels of transparency
in ongoing preparations for its implementation, are given in Wiener (2020).
8. The problem with these figures is that in practice, the percentage has been reduced: in the previous proposal, the minimum amount allocated to regional cinema was 40%; in the decree, it is 30% (Bustamante 2020).

9. This turn (or return) to the political is of a very different nature and motivation to the political filmmaking of the New Latin American Cinema (NLAC) movement of the 60s and 70s, which placed itself in a “third” space of opposition to the commodification of both mainstream and art cinemas. It should be noted that Peruvian cinema, with some notable exceptions, never fully adopted the ideological and aesthetic framework of the NLAC.
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