

INTRODUCTION

Documenting Third Cinema (1968–1979): Overlooked and Little-Known Documents Around Third Cinema

Jonathan Buchsbaum and Mariano Mestman

The proposal of Third Cinema from the group Cine Liberación has had a broad impact on world political cinema since the end of the 1960s. Of course there were many films, texts, and filmmakers in those years associated with committed political cinema, a cinema of intervention, or militant cinema, throughout the world, with more or less affinity with Third Cinema and/or other experiences with similar names such as Cinema of the Third World, Third Worldist cinema or Tricontinental cinema. Nonetheless, the Argentine documentary *The Hour of the Furnaces* (June 1968), paired with the manifesto “Towards a Third Cinema” (October 1969) by Fernando Solanas (1936–2020) and Octavio Getino (1935–2012), continue to stand out as pre-eminent exemplars of political filmmaking and theory of political film. The manifesto is the best-known document of the group Cine Liberación, in which writer/filmmaker militants Getino and Solanas laid out the principles of their proposal of three types of cinema and of “cine-acción” (film action). The articles translated in this issue are three little-known but seminal documents that demonstrate how their thinking about radical filmmaking changed during the tumultuous years from the production of the film, beginning in 1966, through the years of clandestine distribution of the film and the escalation of the repression, to the violent coup d'état in 1976 installing the military dictatorship that forced Solanas, Getino, and so many others into exile. Anglophone readers have known the film and the manifesto since their completion through subtitled prints and translations of the manifesto. Many writers at the time and since have criticized aspects of the only work translated during those years, the *Manifiesto: a rigid conceptual*

schematism, difficulty in applying its analysis, and their political identification with the mass popular movement known as Peronism. The documents translated in this special issue show that Solanas and Getino in fact were constantly revising their earlier ideas, especially in response to a rapidly changing political ferment in Argentina.

First chronologically, the lengthy article by Getino and Solanas, “Cine militante: una categoría interna del Tercer Cine,” was completed in March 1971.¹ This article shows the evolution of their thinking about political cinema that led them to this formulation of militant cinema, “the most advanced category” of third cinema. In 1979, Getino wrote the essay “Algunas observaciones sobre el concepto del ‘Tercer Cine,’”² a meticulous retrospective analysis that explains the dialectic between the writings published by the group Cine Liberación and the process of clandestine distribution of the film in Argentina until the period following Perón’s return to Argentina in 1973. Also in 1979, a French collective devoted to political cinema, the newly founded French *CinémAction* group—created by Guy Hennebelle and Monique Martineau in 1978 in Paris—compiled a dossier of eleven responses to survey questions about the impact of the film and the manifesto in different countries during the decade since the explosive response to the first European screening of *The Hour of the Furnaces* at the Pesaro Film Festival (Italy) in 1968. That *CinémAction* dossier offers perhaps the most articulate and concentrated assessment of the significance of third cinema among committed film activists from all three continents.

As we have written previously about these documents, we propose here a brief presentation highlighting several questions that remain pertinent to understanding better the history of Third Cinema. At the same time, in our Photo-Essay, the many images include more specific references to the history of the film and the manifesto since they first appeared in 1968/1969 to 1979.

I. “Militant Cinema: An Internal Category of Third Cinema” (Getino and Solanas, 1971)³

In the beginning of “Militant Cinema: An Internal Category of Third Cinema,” Solanas and Getino explained that they wanted to clarify the ideas written two years earlier in “Towards a Third Cinema” (1969), where—as is well known—they defined the Third Cinema in opposition to the cinema of Hollywood (First Cinema) and sought to overcome the personalist/formalist limitations attributed to the so-called “auteur cinema” (Second Cinema).⁴ Third Cinema referred to film production linked with the anti-imperialist struggles of the people of the Third World (including the Third Worldist films produced and distributed inside the imperialist countries) and targeted in particular the

“decolonization of culture,” as culture was their particular terrain of struggle. While “militant cinema” had been mentioned in the manifesto “Towards a Third Cinema,” according to the authors it had been formulated in a confusing or imprecise way. That is why this 1971 document focused on and developed the definition of “militant cinema,” to clarify its ideas and fill in details about it in order to promote and discuss the extensive militant cinema practices as revolutionary forces appeared to be gathering strength. “Militant cinema” now referred to a type of immediate, direct intervention cinema that sought to generate discussion at a political “event,” during and/or after the projections. Thus, the notion of “film act” / “film action” (*film acto*; *film acción*), as a tool to convert the spectator into “protagonist” of the screening event and “actor” (militant) in the political process, assumed a fundamental role. The principal “hypotheses” of “militant cinema” in this document also followed from these premises: on the one hand, the essential involvement and integration of the cinema group with specific political, revolutionary organizations; on the other, and many foreign critics were unaware of this clarification, the instrumentalization of film adapted to each national liberation process.

These revised definitions of militant cinema were being constructed in dialogue with Latin American and European militant film practices since 1968 (even before), as well as during the production (1966–1968) and especially the first clandestine distribution (1968–1970) of *The Hour of the Furnaces* in Argentina. In fact, “Cine Militante” speaks about the Group Cine Liberación and the more than 25,000 spectators in clandestine projections of its film in only eight months of 1970 in Argentina. While that figure may not necessarily be accurate, given the difficulty of verifying the exhibition of the film in the parallel distribution circuits, there is no doubt that 1970 was an important year in relation to the organization of the film distribution activities of group Cine Liberación.

In fact, the clandestine exhibition of the film during the Argentine military dictatorship (1966–1973) had begun after the return of Getino and Solanas from abroad between 1968 (after its powerful first European screening at the Pesaro Festival in Italy) and early 1969. At the beginning, the distribution took place in Argentine largely in the space created around the most combative of two large national union federations, which opposed the dictatorship of General Juan Carlos Onganía and in which students, intellectuals, priests of the poor, and activists converged with this sort of workers vanguard.⁵ But the primary groups responsible for the projection of the film in the country (those organized in a more systematic fashion) would form during 1969, catalyzed by national uprisings such as the Cordobazo and the Rosariazo,⁶ or by the impact of the film at Latin American conferences like the First Muestra de Cine Documental Latinoamericano (Mérida, Venezuela, September 1968) or primarily the

Encuentro de Realizadores Latinoamericanos at the Festival of Viña del Mar in Chile at the end of October 1969, a gathering attended by radical filmmakers of the so-called New Latin American Cinema and students from film schools (in Argentina, Chile).⁷

This first exhibition experience (1968–1970) provided the background for the two features of militant cinema noted above from the 1971 document: the link of the cinema group to a mass movement (Peronism, in Cine Liberación's case) and the instrumentalization of film in the revolutionary process. In previous articles—some of which we draw on here—we analyzed this dialectical dynamic between the film distribution practices and theoretical formulations elaborated by the Cine Liberación Group during those initial years, and we highlighted the increasing importance attached both to militant cinema and to the “Militant Cinema” document in that task.⁸

This dynamic (theory-practice) led to what the authors call the “openness” or “provisional nature” of both the Third Cinema and militant cinema formulations. Despite its sometimes strict definition of the three types of cinema, this document recognizes that in Argentina the bases of the decolonization proposals of Third Cinema (“our cinema”) were already present in the first and second cinema. Similarly, the document invokes two other important issues: “national culture” (“a national and popular culture under construction”) and the question of “the people” as legitimating militant cinema.⁹ Of course topics like the goal of the film—national liberation—that distinguish a film as Third Cinema were also present in the far better-known manifesto “Towards a Third Cinema.” But in later texts, like this one of 1971, Solanas and Getino go so far as to claim that the same film may fall into different categories depending on its screening context. Thus, for example, for them, the *Battle of Algiers* (Gillo Pontecorvo, Italy/Algeria, 1966) may be considered reformist in Europe but could serve a revolutionary function in Latin America.¹⁰ Based on such assertions, there are no normative revolutionary forms for Third Cinema. The political framework and institutional supports (the revolutionary parties or movements) are the key determinants. If the form of the film is not determinant but the purpose, and if that purpose is fundamentally political, then filmmaking must be part of an active political struggle. Furthermore, the article shows a deep familiarity with political filmmaking in other parts of Latin America, reinforcing their emphasis on the importance of local analysis and initiative.

In this way, the second part of the 1971 document, referring to the practice of militant cinema, discusses the production-distribution-instrumentalization of the films. There is a general interrogation that rejects the “independence” of the production of militant cinema (as well as any aesthetic prescription) in order to underline that its formal choices of language depend on the conjuncture and

context in which it is made and that its “language is not revolutionized within the language itself, but from its instrumentalization for the transformation and liberation of our peoples.” With this Group Cine Liberación’s revised vision, a better sense emerges of their ideas about uniting cinematic creation with film distribution and political intervention.¹¹

II. “Some Observations on the Concept of ‘Third Cinema’” (Getino, 1979)

In the following years both filmmakers returned to these topics and to their own experiences with Third Cinema and militant cinema. Probably one of the most interesting writings is Getino’s essay “Some observations of the concept of Third Cinema.” He begins by identifying “the three main theoretical materials” of those initial years: 1) the lengthy responses by Getino and Solanas to questions posed by *Cine Cubano*, 1969, with the title “La cultura nacional, el cine y *La hora de los hornos*,” where Third Cinema is mentioned for the first time (according to Getino);¹² 2) the 1969 *Tricontinental* article “Towards a Third Cinema”; 3) the document “Militant Cinema: an internal category of Third Cinema” (1971).¹³ Placing each text in its moment of writing and explaining the different uses of the same or similar terms, Getino returns to the main subjects addressed with Solanas in these and other texts from 1968 to 1973: a) “cultural neocolonialism in Argentina”; b) “film dependency”; c) “Third Cinema”; and d) “Militant Cinema.” If at the beginning the first two themes were more prominent in Cine Liberación writings or interviews, Third Cinema and Militant Cinema subsequently became more prominent in the group’s thinking. Getino analyzed these questions in detail, following the interconnection between the texts and the political process and the militant film distribution practices in Argentina. In fact, the section headings used by him for the initial parts of the 1979 document (such as “National space as generator of practice and theory,” “Practice as generator of theory”) underline this dynamic between the texts and the experiences of the group work. Dividing Cine Liberación’s history into three stages, Getino explains that from 1971 to 1974 (i.e., until the death of President Perón on July 1, 1974), militant cinema assumed a greater importance for the authors, as the mass movement grew to demand the return of General Perón to Argentina (who returned to the government in October 12, 1973).

Getino relates that in those years the Group also began new film projects for a wider audience (also for “commercial circuits”), in parallel to the continuation of the militant cinema that shared the popular mobilizations against the military government, when the group Cine Liberación moved “closer to the people” and to the Peronist party. Although Cine Liberación identified with Peronism during the making of *The Hour of the Furnaces* and the film clearly

displays this political identity, especially in its second and third parts, only in 1971 did the group strengthen its relations with Perón. At the end of June of that year, Solanas and Getino (helped by Gerardo Vallejo)¹⁴ interviewed Perón during a week in Madrid (where he was in exile) and edited his long testimony into two documentary features (*Perón, la revolución justicialista* and *Actualización política y doctrinaria para la toma del poder*), used by the Peronist organizations in the campaign for the return of Perón to Argentina after 16 years of exile. That experience definitely aligned Cine Liberación with the political position of General Perón, not just with the leftist part of the Peronist movement. The group always maintained that these new documentaries with Perón's testimony should be used by "all" sectors of the Movement, those aligned with a more "orthodox" Peronism as well as those representing Peronist tendencies of the left Revolutionary Peronism. Getino returns to the role of Perón as he (and Solanas) described it in "Cine Militante," where they wrote that "the current power of Peronism lies in the synthesis of these two tendencies incarnated in the figure of Perón, who keeps intact the political unity of the people confronting the principal enemy."

Cine Liberación's increasingly close link to Peronism throughout the group history¹⁵ was forged in tension, of course, with other leftist parties in Argentina (and elsewhere, as we will see). Influenced by the developments at the end of World War II, the communist and socialist Argentine parties joined with conservatives and oligarchic parties to oppose Perón in the 1945 national election, where he was elected president of the country for the first time and established a popular government that granted new and extensive social rights to the poor and the working class in the countryside and the cities. Although a few political leaders from the Argentine left or progressive movements of the time occupied institutional positions in the Perón government between 1946–1955, those parties eventually rejected his government and supported or did not oppose the 1955 military coup d'état. In the years of his exile, Perón presented himself as developing a "pendular" politics in relation to diverse tendencies in his movement, each tendency finding something to hang onto in Peronism. During these years (1955–1973), while there were no free elections in Argentina because the main political party, Peronism, couldn't participate, it developed the so-called *Resistencia Peronista*,¹⁶ and the Peronist revolutionary tendencies (the Peronist left). For them, as well as for Cine Liberación, Peronism was proposing a type of socialism, which was at times called "national"; that is, it was perceived as the "national way" to socialism, a path taken at the same time by national liberation movements in many countries of the Third World. Thus, when Cine Liberación filmed the interviews with Perón in 1971 in Madrid, Perón's harsh criticisms of the military government indicated that he considered all forms of resistance

legitimate, including the guerrilla action which was at its height at that moment, both by New Leftist Marxist groups and Peronist leftist groups. If the striking final shot to the first part of *The Hour of the Furnaces*, then, with its still image of Che's dead face sustained for several minutes, was consistent with this position, the 1971 documentary films link—according to Cine Liberación—the historical radical situation to the return of Perón to Argentina.

During the 1960s in Argentina, there was a reconsideration of the historical phenomenon of Peronism by intellectuals. Solanas and Getino participated in that process and maintained that during the making of *The Hour of the Furnaces*, they had experienced a “transition” from the intellectual left to Peronism. For all of these reasons, the relationship of Cine Liberación with Perón was identified as a revolutionary one. But other groups on the left refused to support Perón's return—from Franco's Spain!—as a political solution against the military government. Critics and other leftist filmmakers (in Argentina and other places) questioned the “Peronist” option of the Cine Liberación group, like the group Cine de la Base in Argentina or other Latin American filmmakers in Chile or Uruguay, for example. Conversely, those who did accept Cine Liberación's Peronist identity considered that the Argentine working class was identified with Peronism and with the resistance to the rightist or social-democrat governments that followed Perón's fall in 1955.

In 1979, “Some Observations . . .” alludes to this whole process when it speaks of revising prospectively the film and writing projects for Cine Liberación in these years. The reader can follow more of this history in the texts accompanying the images in the Photo-Essay in this issue. But the main interest of this 1979 Getino essay, as noted above, is that it contextualizes the previous texts and shows the evolving theoretical work in the years that follow the Manifesto “Towards a Third Cinema.” In this sense, Getino recalls this experience as a positive one. While he acknowledges, for example, that in the first texts “a verbal guerrillerism that at times can be confusing” and the proposal of an “international cine-guerrilla” may not have been successful expressions, he cautions that those tangents should not distract from the foundations of the analysis.

III. “The Impact of ‘Third Cinema.’ Results of an International Survey” (1979)

As is well known, also in the following years ideas around Third Cinema circulated in new manifestos, meetings, and proposals in different places.¹⁷ In an interesting essay on the “changing geography” of Third Cinema, Michael Chanan (1997), one of the few to refer to these later writings of Cine Liberación that confirm the “provisional nature” of the group's ideas and formulations, examined the history of the film and the Manifesto “Towards a Third Cinema,”

identifying some of the modifications of the original definitions of the three types of cinema, the connections of the film with parallel movements in different countries, and the “transnational function” of Third Cinema. Chanan also addressed the fraught intellectual encounter of Third Cinema with Eurocentric thinking at the Edinburgh conference of 1986.¹⁸

The third document in our special issue addressed the history of the manifesto and the film in many countries during that first decade of existence (1968/1969–1979) in the form of a survey. For a special 1979 issue of the French journal *Revue Tiers Monde* (edited by Yvonne Mignot-Lefebvre), Guy Hennebelle, Monique Martineau, and their group CinémAction prepared a dossier on the influence of “Towards a Third Cinema” and *The Hour of the Furnaces* around the world. As the reader will see in our introductory comments for the document, the survey translated here is the third part of a dossier titled “L’influence du ‘troisième cinéma’ dans le monde.” The first part presents a precise background of the Third Cinema and the Third Cinema Manifesto where the group CinémAction identifies “the three historic merits of the Manifesto”: its conception in coordination with practice (the production, distribution, and exhibition of *The Hour of the Furnaces*); its elaboration in the context of a national culture; its adoption of a universalist thrust and a programmatic value that allowed it, no doubt for the first time in history—according to CinémAction—for a Latin American source, to influence filmmaking in other countries. The second part of the dossier proposes a selection of 15 “salient” excerpts from the Manifesto, which CinémAction analyzes showing their historical interest and, at the same time, including the revisions proposed by Solanas and Getino in the years that follow the Manifesto.

In this framework, the three sets of questions posed by Hennebelle’s *CinémAction* group for the survey were very precise:

- Was *La hora de los hornos* distributed in your country? Did it spark controversies? What were they? If yes, did the film contribute to establishing a network of alternative distribution?
- Was the Manifesto “Towards a Third Cinema” published, translated if needed, in your country? Did it provoke debates, arguments? Which ones?
- What did you think at the time of the publication of the Manifesto and what do you think of it today? Does it seem still pertinent?

The survey displays varying reactions from a diverse group of respondents to the proposals of Cine Liberación in each country or region. The survey participants pointed to certain dialogue with other manifestos (Boughedir),

debates around intervention cinema (Pâquet, Hennebelle), or to read the promotion of incipient alternative distributors (Crowdus, Schumann), at least in France, the United States, Canada, Germany, the Arab and African world.

The survey includes responses from eleven different countries or regions. Several kinds of criticism were shared by several of the writers. Some found the schema of the three cinemas overly rigid, on the one hand, and wondered how to categorize films belonging to only one or the other cinema, on the other. Some deemed certain ideas or expressions (like the “guerrilla cinema”) unsuitable for the years that followed, just as at the same moment as the survey (1979), Getino acknowledged the same questions and explained the changes of the group reflection in successive documents (as we saw above in the “Some Observations” article). A few critics also mentioned having listened to or read Solanas changing some earlier ideas both in public meetings or interviews, and they recognize the Cine Liberación’s revisions we mentioned. Hennebelle also remembers that the Manifesto was proposed from the beginning as “a sketch of an hypothesis.” Perhaps for many of the critics, the evolving theoretical work of Solanas and Getino (compiled in their 1973 book, for example) was not widely available during the 1970s (as it is still not). Peter Schumann, who wrote a book on Latin American filmmaking and was quite sympathetic to the third cinema project, commented that Solanas and Getino in their work after the film and manifesto had done nothing to “justify or explicate the theory contained in the Manifesto,” though as we have seen, Getino and Solanas did exactly that in articles and interviews in the preceding years, as the two other articles in our dossier demonstrate. In any case, Schumann welcomed the round table “Cinéma d’Auteur or cinéma d’intervention” in the first issue of *CinémAction*, “in which Solanas provided some explanations on this subject,” and considered that “perhaps he (Solanas) should take them up again and establish a new version of the Manifesto concentrating on the definition of the three cinemas.” Guy Hennebelle, who organized the survey and promoted debate on ideas raised by third cinema in his several books and articles, acknowledged that “we cannot affirm that the third cinema in a strict sense has exerted a great influence in France.” Yet he also recalled that “if this Manifesto has had less status than other more developed theories, it has clearly had more effect at the practical level. Implicitly, it has served as a base, as elsewhere, for several strains of militant cinema, born, as we said above, of the films and events of May 1968.”

A second criticism concerned the film’s political commitment to Perón. Several critics noted that screenings of the three parts of the film (four hours and twenty minutes) projected only the first part of 90 minutes. That part raises issues of neocolonial culture in Latin America and the servile posturing of oligarchic and intellectual elites in Argentina, a critique shared by many at

the time. The second part of the film presented an argument for the importance of Perón for working class and revolutionary forces then growing rapidly to challenge state power in Argentina. That movement eventually did succeed in its mass mobilization demanding the return of Perón to Argentina. For many on the left, especially in Europe but also elsewhere, Perón's personalist politics was mired too deeply in a dangerous populism and demagoguery. Most of these comments in the dossier come from European critics, but Brazil's Sergio Muniz asked "how one could reconcile the national-populism of Perón, such as it presented itself in the country between 1955 and 1972, and a more effective revolutionary politics."

We have already sketched some of the background to this controversy over Perón in the previous section. Yet this debate occurred largely in the international sphere, where there were many polemics around this aspect of the film in film meetings and journals during the decade. Solanas and Getino addressed the Peronist question also in international interviews during those years, at times in this journal.¹⁹ When the Spanish film journal *Nuestro Cine* interviewed Getino in 1969 and asked him about the reasons for the film's defense of Perón, and why after its premiere at Pesaro 1968 and in other festivals (such as Karlovy Vary in Czechoslovakia, Manheim in Germany, or Mérida in Venezuela) only the first part had been screened (i.e., the least Peronist one), the Argentinean filmmaker offered some details and finally answered: "We do not understand Peronism without Perón [...] for us, at that stage, Perón could be for Argentina what Castro has been for Cuba."²⁰ Also, in early 1969, Solanas provided probably the strongest commentary on his position about the issue, from the history of the Peronist movement. He stated: "So, once and for all, what is our position on Peronism? In these historical circumstances, it has signified a great step forward in the process of national liberation, a process which is not over . . . but which offers some possibilities for development for a vast proletariat and a very profound anti-imperialist, anti-oligarchic, class consciousness. Peronism [...] is a mass movement objectively revolutionary because it contains the objectively revolutionary Argentinian forces whose social and political demands are passing through a profound revolution."²¹

The controversies over Peronism reflect a broader point, which actually dramatizes one of the fundamental and consistent claims of Solanas and Getino. Repeatedly, the dossier participants point out that the political context of their respective countries differed from that of Argentina when the film and manifesto were issued. Argentina was living a convulsive and violent mass movement (Peronism) that would eventually seize state power, and the filmmaker/theorists participated in and contributed to the growth of the movement; they were not marginal activists operating like those described by the Québécois André

Pâquet in Montreal as “dogmatic and sectarian” guaranteeing their marginality or confined to small ineffectual ghettos.

Several dossier respondents spoke of the relative tolerance in Europe, what Marcuse called “repressive tolerance,” blunting their political filmmaking effectiveness in their social-democratic contexts. That is no doubt why F  rid Boughedir can cite the geographical breadth and theoretical energy behind the work of Arab and African filmmakers and thinkers in his contribution, for many of those countries had achieved their independence only recently. Although the idea of the Third Cinema by Cine Liberaci  n definitely contributed to dialogue and conferences between African and Latin American political filmmakers in events such as the famous Third World Filmmakers Meeting in Algiers (1973) and their second meeting in Buenos Aires (1974), Boughedir also added that “the Latin American continent certainly has been colonized and neocolonized economically and politically, but it has not known a brutal rupture of identity that Africans and Arabs have endured, subjected to total colonization.”

In one important sense, the work of Solanas and Getino depended on one central claim in the Manifesto, and in all of their work: “The existence of masses on the worldwide revolutionary plane was the substantial fact without which those questions could not have been posed.” The repression of the state since mid-1974, i.e., under the last period of a new Peronist government, and the later coup d’  tat in March 1976, ended the political radicalization and hopes for social change in Argentina. A wave of military dictatorships swept across Latin America in the 1970s, disappearing many filmmakers and intellectuals, driving others into exile, including Solanas and Getino. Because that mass movement no longer existed by 1979, the pertinence of their film and manifesto were harder to appreciate for all the Worlds represented in the dossier.

Epilogue

With technological and political changes, militant cinema collectives no longer occupy the center of media theory and practice committed to radical political change, though of course collective media work and organizing continue.

While manifestos and statements emerged from countries in the Third World, none achieved the same renown as Third Cinema. We hope that these translations, one of which Getino deemed one of the most important theoretical statements of the Cine Liberaci  n Group, will demonstrate more emphatically the key relationship between the experience of producing and especially distributing *The Hour of the Furnaces* and the continually evolving reflection and revision of their theoretical ideas first sketched out in the *Tricontinental* version of “Towards a Third Cinema.” Getino and Solanas insisted on the

provisional nature of both the film's production/distribution/exhibition and the theory. The documents here trace the itinerary of theory. The less well-known distribution history went through similar revisions. The original manifesto specifically empowered presenters to stop the film for debate, to change the order of the reels according to the circumstances, to show only parts of the film. Even the finished film remained "provisional." Thus, despite the emphasis on the national circumstances and national culture in the film and the writing, Solanas and Getino succeeded in stimulating robust international debate and essential polemics over the future of radical filmmaking throughout the world. If the media have become more immaterial, the need for change remains concrete. And materialist.

Acknowledgements

This *Framework* issue would not have been possible without the support of many people whom we thank sincerely for their interest and generosity.

Drake Stutesman invited us to publish this material in *Framework* in the interest of making these texts on Third Cinema available, as they have been previously either unpublished or published incompletely in English. Drake offered helpful suggestions at every step of the way.

The families of Octavio Getino and Fernando Solanas helped us to get the approval for the translation and publication of "Militant Cinema: An Internal Category of Third Cinema." At the beginning of October 2020, thanks to the support of Victoria Solanas, we were able to contact her father by email. Fernando Solanas sent us, through the secretary of the Argentina Delegation at UNESCO, a first agreement to continue our exchange, which was not possible because only a few days later Solanas contracted the COVID-19 virus in Paris and did not recover. Octavio Getino helped us some years ago when we attempted a first (unsuccessful) edition of the text in 2011. Subsequent to his death, his daughter Estela Getino also offered her kind collaboration on the idea of publishing the other text of her father, "Some Observations on the Concept of Third Cinema."

Monique Martineau Hennebelle and Yvonne Mignot Lefebvre agreed to allow us to translate the responses to the survey on the influence of *The Hour of the Furnaces* and the manifesto "Towards a Third Cinema" included in the dossier "L'impact du troisième cinéma dans le monde," by the *CinémAction* group, published in the special issue of *Revue Tiers Monde* entitled "L'impact des films d'intervention sociale." Sébastien Layerle (Université de Paris 3) facilitated our contact with Monique. Sébastien edited with Monique a special issue of *CinémAction* (n.166, 2018) that included a full compilation of his texts and

two fascinating essays about Guy Hennebelle during his “Algerian experience” between 1965 and 1968 in the daily *El Moudjahid*. Regretfully, *CinémAction* ended publication in 2019. Les éditions Corlet continue to distribute most of the issues, with the exception of the first ones hosted in friendly journals. See cinemaction-collection.com.

The translation of the three texts from Spanish and French was overseen by Jonathan Buchsbaum from beginning to end, with significant participation of other colleagues. “Militant Cinema: An Internal Category of Third Cinema” was translated largely by Lisa Jarvinen (Department of History, La Salle University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania), thanks to the support of Professor Masha Salazkina (Concordia University, Montreal). “Some Observations on the Concept of Third Cinema” was translated originally by Christian Pageau (Universidad Nacional del Nordeste, Argentina). Jonathan Buchsbaum translated the dossier on “L’impact du troisième cinéma dans le monde,” with help from Christian Pageau and Don Siegel. Eric Holt-Gimenez helped complete the translation of “Some Observations on the Concept of Third Cinema.” Thanks to Cecilia Lacruz for additional help with translations. Both guest editors of this dossier made final corrections on the translations.

Pablo Guallar kindly helped with various photographs. Most of the photographs come from the forthcoming documentary on Octavio Getino that Pablo directed with Micaela Montes Rojas and that has the working title of *Crónicas de un exilio* (2021).

This issue is dedicated to the memory of Octavio Getino (1935–2012), Fernando Pino Solanas (1936–2020) and Guy Hennebelle (1941–2003), artisans of Third Cinema and militant cinema across the world.

Jonathan Buchsbaum teaches in the Media Studies Department at Queens College, City University of New York. His work has often covered political filmmaking. He has written three books: *Cinema Engagé: Film in the Popular Front* (1988); *Cinema and the Sandinistas: Filmmaking in Revolutionary Nicaragua* (2003); *Exception Taken: How France Has Defied Hollywood’s New World Order* (2017).

Mariano Mestman is a Researcher at the National Council of Scientific Research (Argentina) and at the University of Buenos Aires, where he teaches. Books: *Del Di Tella a Tucumán Arde. Vanguardia artística y política en el 68 argentino* (2000, with A. Longoni); *Pueblo, masa y multitud en cine y televisión* (2013; with M. Varela); *Estados Generales del Tercer Cine. Los documentos de Montreal* (2014); *Las rupturas del 68 en el cine de América Latina* (2016).

NOTES

1. The article did not circulate before its first publication in Octavio Getino and Fernando E. Solanas, *Cine, cultura y descolonización* (Mexico: Siglo XXI, 1973).
2. Octavio Getino, "Algunas observaciones sobre el concepto del 'Tercer Cine'" (1979), in *A diez años de 'hacia un tercer cine'* (Mexico: Filmoteca UNAM-colección Textos Breves 2, 1981). The book included one other text by him ("El cine como parte de los Proyectos de Liberación") and the revised Spanish version of "Towards a Third Cinema." The original essay (that we translate here) was re-edited in a slightly different version (with some little changes), in Octavio Getino, *Notas sobre cine argentino y latinoamericano* (México: Edimédios, 1984). The only English version available previously came from this last edition translated as "Some notes on the concept of Third Cinema" by Timothy Barnard and Alfredo Marchevsky, in *Argentine Cinema*, ed. Tim Barnard (Toronto: Nightwood Editions, 1986) and Michael Martin, *New Latin American Cinema* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1997). Most of the Anglophone scholars on Third Cinema quoted the text from the English version. Unfortunately, this English translation leaves out more than half of the original Spanish original version (1979), including a series of remarks on what Getino says about the main texts of the first years and on the permanent feedback between theory (writings) and practice (militant exhibition). In those missing pages, Getino devotes several paragraphs to develop what, he wrote, was "perhaps not sufficiently clear ten years earlier," in particular, the role of militant cinema.
3. A few years ago we prepared a translation of some parts of "Militant Cinema" for a *Third Text* journal special issue (2011). For various reasons, that edition had many errors, and we encourage readers to refer to this revised translation instead. Some years later, thanks to Professor Masha Salazkina's (Concordia University) help, Lisa Jarvinen finished the translation of the other parts of the document and helped us complete this translation of the whole text in this issue.
4. Octavio Getino and Fernando Solanas, "Hacia un Tercer Cine," *Tricontinental*, Organisation of Solidarity with the Peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America (OSPAAL), 13 (October 1969). With versions in Spanish, English, French, and Italian. The Spanish version of this original text was revised and was widely accessible in the revised form first published in the first issue of the Mexican film journal *Cine club*, in October 1970.
5. It was in this orbit of the Confederación General del Trabajo de los Argentinos (better known as CGT de los Argentinos) that some members of the group Cine Liberación—Getino, Gerardo Vallejo, and Nemesio Juárez—experimented briefly with filmed newsreels, known as the "Cinema Reports of the CGT," between the end of 1968 and the beginning of 1969.
6. On May 29 and 30, 1969, the largest popular uprising of the period, known as the *Cordobazo* took place in Argentina. The event occurred in the city of Córdoba, a center of recent, abrupt industrial development headed by the automobile sector, with a largely young

industrial working class. The Cordobazo uprising consisted of a strike and street protest led by workers and students (with the support of the general population) for better working conditions and against the military regime in power at the time; it included the occupation of some zones of the city by the demonstrators until their recuperation by the army the following day. The Cordobazo was considered a point of inflection in the struggles of that period. There were other similar (maybe less heavy) uprisings that year in other cities, like Rosario.

7. On Merida 1968, see María Luisa Ortega, “Mérida 68. Las disyuntivas del documental,” in *Las rupturas del 68 en el cine de América Latina*, ed. Mariano Mestman (Buenos Aires–Madrid: Akal, 2016). On Viña del Mar 1969, see the retrospective account by its director Aldo Francia, *Nuevo cine latinoamericano* (Santiago: CESOC Ediciones ChileAmérica, ARTECIEN, 1990).
8. Jonathan Buchsbaum, “A Closer Look at Third Cinema,” *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television* 21, no. 2 (2001): 154–166; Jonathan Buchsbaum, “One, two . . . Third Cinemas,” *Third Text* 25, no. 1 (January 2011): 13–28; Mariano Mestman, “La exhibición del cine militante. Teoría y práctica en el grupo Cine Liberación,” in *Cuadernos de la Academia núm. 9*, ed. Luis Fernández Colorado (Madrid: Academia, 2001); Mariano Mestman, “Third Cinema / Militant Cinema: At the Origins of the Argentinean Experience (1968–1971),” *Third Text* 25, no. 1 (January 2011): 29–40. In the *Third Text* article Buchsbaum discussed differences between two “original” versions of the Manifesto. Ignacio Del Valle has discussed both versions and compared them with an earlier unpublished “draft” document he found at the Cuban Cinemateca, named *Cine de la descolonización*. Ignacio Del Valle, I. “Hacia un tercer cine: del manifiesto al palimpsesto,” *El ojo que piensa: Revista del cine iberoamericano* 5 (2012): 3–6.
9. As many writers have noted, the question of “national culture” is one of the fundamental influences of Franz Fanon. In fact, the Group Cine Liberación’s first international theoretical intervention in the debate over national, decolonized culture appeared in a long article in *Cine Cubano* 56/57 (March 1969): “La cultura nacional, el cine y *La hora de los hornos*.”
10. Octavio Getino y Fernando Solanas, “Apuntes para un juicio crítico descolonizado,” *Revista Cine del Tercer Mundo* 2 (1970): 73–100.
11. Although definitions of militant cinema were specified in this 1971 document—as we quoted—it is important to point out that some notions or reflections covered in this document were also introduced in the Spanish version of “Towards a Third Cinema” (October 1970), i.e., the second one, in order to highlight the debates to encourage cinema that intervenes in events and that takes action.
12. *Cine Cubano* 56/57 (March 1969).
13. He describes it as a text prepared in Buenos Aires for a Viña del Mar (Chile) Encuentro de Realizadores Latinoamericanos scheduled for March 1971, following the 1967 and 1969 ones. That meeting never took place.

14. Gerardo Vallejo, from Tucumán (Argentina), was a key member of the group. The images from Tucumán workers' struggles in *The Hour of the Furnaces* come from his footage. The second main documentary film produced by Cine Liberación was his *El camino hacia la muerte del Viejo Reales* (1971).
15. As *The Hour of the Furnaces* seemed to show, as a whole revolutionary third worldist film. On the film in its 50th anniversary: Javier Campo and Humberto Pérez Blanco, eds., *A trail of fire for political cinema*, (London: Intellect, 2018).
16. With Perón's departure in 1955, the workers' movement was reorganized into the "Peronist Resistance," which carried out a broad range of activities, from agitation and union activism to sabotage of production; some groups even took on armed struggle at the end of the 1960s. Since 1955, Peronism meant for the working class the tight coordination among activism, resistance, and workers organization. During the decade, this early resistance movement was divided between those who maintained a revolutionary stance and a powerful union bureaucracy. Both were united only by Perón's leadership. For a full account of Peronism, the working class, and the Resistencia Peronista in those years, see Daniel James, *Resistance and integration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
17. For a good collection of many of the Latin American and African manifestos, see Scott MacKenzie, *Film Manifestos and Global Cinema Cultures: a critical anthology* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014).
18. Michael Chanan, "The Changing Geography of Third Cinema," *Screen* 38, no. 4 (1997). Chanan also refers to the Ethiopian scholar Teshome Gabriel (based professionally at UCLA in the US) who provided an African perspective and adaptation. Many scholars have discussed Third Cinema at some length, notably Robert Stam and Ella Shohat, *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media* (New York: Routledge, 1994); Teshome Gabriel, *Third Cinema in the Third World: The Aesthetic of Liberation* (Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1982); James Pines and Paul Willemsen, eds., *Questions of Third Cinema*, (London: BFI, 1989); Anthony R. Guneratne and Wimal Dissanayake, eds., *Rethinking Third Cinema* (New York: Routledge, 2003). Some have tried to adapt its program to later conjunctures. Mike Wayne explored the dialectics between First and Third Cinema in order to rethink "generic transformation" for the political, revolutionary cinema in an historically new, different period: Mike Wayne, *Political Film: the Dialectics of Third Cinema* (London: Pluto Press, 2001). Recently, Alejandro Pedregal extended Wayne's reflections to consider the possibilities of a counterhegemonic cinema today, also linking it to Latin American testimony discussions. Alejandro Pedregal, *Film & Making Other History: Counterhegemonic Narratives for Cinema of the Subaltern* (Helsinki: Aalto University publication series, 2015). In his doctoral dissertation, Christian Pageau analyzed the links between Cine Liberación's original proposals and the documentaries directed by Solanas in the two decades prior to his death in 2020: "Pensamiento-praxis nacional y popular en la producción de Fernando "Pino" Solanas (1968–2016)" (PhD diss., Universidad Nacional del Nordeste, Argentina, 2017).

19. See the interview with Solanas in *Framework* 10 (Spring 1979): 35–38.
20. Interview with Getino by Augusto Martínez Torres and Miguel Marías in Madrid, May 1969, in *Nuestro Cine* 89 (September 1969): 40–47.
21. Interview with Solanas by Louis Marcorelles, in *Cahiers du Cinéma* 210 (March 1969): 60.