CINERGIE 10
il cinema e le altre arti

ORIENTI OCCIDENTI

Selling World Cinema by the Pound: Disclosing the Worldist Idea of Cinema

The so-called World Cinema has become a much more recurring term than it used to be a couple of decades ago. Typing these two words on any browser grants you access to a plethora of heterogeneous contents, seemingly unrelated to each other. You can read this term in many fan-made charts, on online magazines and on *ad hoc* websites. That is to say that World Cinema is a widely used expression that now belongs to everyday language as much as it belongs to scholars and film students.

However, despite its popularity, an exhaustive definition of this term has yet to be provided. What is World Cinema, actually? *World Cinema*, Joel and Ethan Coen's short film which was meant to be part of *To Each His Own Cinema* (France, 2007), is a brilliant answer to this question: a North American rancher (Josh Brolin) enters a repertory cinema where Ceylon's *Climates* (Turkey, 2006) and Renoir's *The Rules of the Game* (France, 1939) are projected. When he finds out that *Climates* is a Turkish film, Brolin looks a bit dazed and surprised to learn that Turkish films do actually exist. But then he asks the ticket clerk about subtitles and whether any nude scenes are shown: language and exotic hedonism, probably the two most relevant issues in the common interpretation of World Cinema.

Moving away from the suggestions of Coen brothers' short film, firstly I intend to present some clear aspects of World Cinema as a category, by drawing the attention on some of the problems entailed by the definition of World Cinema through an analysis of the different fields where it is adopted – both the practical and the theoretical fields. Secondly, I also aim to point out the *liason* between World Cinema as a marketed category and World Cinema as a theory within film studies, and in particular, the touristic vocation that can be found in the worldist approach. In conclusion, I suggest that this perspective on non-Anglophone cinemas might inflect the approach to otherness through its use within international film distribution circuits.

A definition and its boundaries

Understanding what World Cinema is, has been a prickly problem for many scholars who have been struggling to explain this concept: by trying to avoid the geopolitical issues that it raises *ipso facto*, many authors have attempted to achieve a multi-polar, multi-ethnic, inclusive and polycentric perspective on global movie culture[1]. A large number of them have tried to deconstruct some of the cornerstones of film studies – mainly Hollywood-centrism, the concept of national cinema and the *West-against-the-rest* opposition – in order to approach *other* cinemas in the most comprehensive and democratic way[2]. A simple proof of that is the numerous synonyms for World Cinema: "global cinema", "films without frontiers", "border-crossing films", "transnational cinema", "transvergent cinema", "World Cinemas", "cinemas of the world", etc.

A landmark on the difficult path towards a proper conceptualization of World Cinema is Wimal Dissanayake's definition of the term[3], which firstly has brought this category to scholars' attention by suggesting a peculiar approach to these "non-Western" cinemas. According to Dissanayake, a "series of binaries" underpin the discourse of cinema in Asia, Latin America and Africa which must be necessarily addressed in any discussion about these cinematic cultures. These "binaries" are: Westernalization and Indigenization, tradition and modernity, the local and the global[4]. An inescapable dualism.

However, Dissanayake does not give any further explanation of what World Cinema is and simply refers

to it by the name of non-Western cinemas, as a whole. In addition to this lack of definition, Dissanayake's "binaries" approach contributes to the depiction of non-Western cinemas as antithesis to the Western and Hollywood cinema, which further strengthens the resistance of Western audiences to other cinemas.

Far from being outmoded, a similar perspective still seems to inform the approach to non-Western film cultures. With regard to film preservation, the *World Cinema Project*, created in 2007 by Martin Scorsese, is aimed at preserving and restoring neglected films from all over the world, except the ones from the USA and Western countries. In this case, the very act of selecting movies to be restored is shaping a global canon: it is certainly interesting that such a canon depends on the choices of a renowned Western foundation that – despite its transnational board of directors[5] – opts independently for the preservation of certain texts over others. From this perspective, the *World Cinema Project* showcases what Shanti Kumar has defined "a prevailing and dominant view in Hollywood-based film industries and Hollywood-centred film studies that demarcates the world of cinema into a very neat binary of American Cinema and other cinemas (from the Third World, developing countries, non-Western nations, etc.)."[6]

Indeed, the *World Cinema Project* is not concerned with the restoration of US cinema – which is the aim of the Scorsese's Film Foundation - but only with some movies from those "neglecting" countries and regions, such as Mexico, South America, Africa, Eastern Europe, the Middle East, and Central and Southeast Asia – these are the areas of the world so far involved in the project[7]. Rather than being a criticism to the praiseworthy work of the Scorsese's Film Foundation, this is a mere observation of a way of categorizing film productions that, as a matter of fact, contributes to shaping a certain vision of cultural diversity. A vision that, along with the dual model suggested by Dissanayake, risks marginalizing non-US cinemas as such and leading to the denial of "a positive existence to all the other World Cinemas, which are thus made incapable of originating independent theory."[8]

This discloses a first feature of the category here concerned. World Cinema is a tendency to look at non-Anglophone, non-Hollywood and non-Western cinemas as alternatives and as a site of resilience to Hollywood and Western mainstream production, distribution and aesthetics. As pointed out by Stephanie Dennison and Song Hwee Lim, this peculiar tendency is specifically rooted in one part of the world:

> The first thing to note about the concept of World Cinema is its situatedness: it is the world as viewed from the West. In this sense, World Cinema is analogous to *world music* and *world literature* in that they are categories created in Western world to refer to cultural products and practices that are mainly non-Western[9].

However, it should be noted that Dennison and Lim here lump together all Western countries in the process of creation and in the use of the various *worldist* categories, while their *situatedness* usually corresponds to Anglophone countries. Nonetheless, underscoring its similarities with *world music* and *world literature* in terms of consumption, enables a deeper comprehension of World Cinema.

The Moving Chair: A touristic vocation in World Cinema

As commercial labels, these grab-bag categories gather non-English and non-Western texts that are meant to be attractive to a "situated" target market. Hence, it may be of some interest to investigate the main features of the world-products and to highlight which kind of demand they are intended to satisfy. For this purpose, a bird's eye view of the film festivals using the category of World Cinema in their programs[10] might provide an insight into worldist consumption, as such events represent "vital nodes for global film industries, business, institutions, and information."[11]

The World Cinema Amsterdam Festival was established by the Independent Art Cinema Rialto group in 2009 and is devoted to the discovery of cinema and artists from Asia, Africa and Latin America. On the official website there is a message from Raymond Walravens, director of the Rialto group and curator of the festival, to celebrate the 5th edition of World Cinema Amsterdam Festival. The following is an interesting excerpt of the message:

> Travelling around the world without having to leave the city... That's what Rialto had in mind when it initiated the World Cinema Amsterdam film festival five years ago. We knew that there were enough "film travellers" around, but realized that they rarely found what they were looking for. Apparently, there's a peculiar discrepancy between non-Western art cinema's success at various international film festivals and how many of these films actually make it to cinemas in the Netherlands. Of the 10.000 films that are produced worldwide annually, about 400 are screened in Dutch cinemas. A vast majority of these films are made in Hollywood and Europe. People interested in beautiful, award-winning films from Latin America, Asia and Africa in fact had no place to go – neither cinemas nor public broadcasters catered to their taste. Quite undeservedly, as these films' cinematographic quality absolutely justifies a better place for them on the Dutch cinema market.[12]

The quote suggests that along with providing a space for non-Western art cinema, one of the main aims of the Festival is supporting the desire of evasion from what is perceived as ordinary and familiar: foreign cinema as an easy device for travelling around the world and discovering new realities. As such, the world categories and, in particular, World Cinema seem to be regarded as a group of cultural texts characterized by extravagance and sense of bizarre so as to differ from Western aesthetic norms[13]. Hence, World Cinema is apparently conceived as an easy getaway to "other realities and places, to a product that is consumed before, during or in lieu of travels, offering the possibility of stimulating travel without leaving the comfort of home."[14] In fact, similarly to the experiential tourism[15], World Cinema products should offer an authentic portrait of other worlds to another world, satisfying the expectation of its audience that is eager to engage with the experience of otherness. Indeed, the tradability of these movies seems to be depending on their perceived authenticity as pure representations of local cultures within a globalized context.

Indeed, in order to offer this kind of experience, the movies that are awarded, distributed and consumed under the World Cinema label must be considered by their viewers as reliable witnesses of a foreign culture and society: this might explain the thorough interest of a group of scholars in the cinematic realism and the "neorealist-like film tradition"[16] in contemporary World Cinema. Let me draw on a peculiar case. Tiago De Luca has recently attempted to assert yet again the ontological relationship between cinematic image and reality, by suggesting that the emergence of digital technology, despite being a threat to the indexicality of the medium, has made "the recording of the real, as well as its dissemination, much easier and cheaper."[17]

Based on this assumption, De Luca observes the emergence of a realistic tendency in contemporary World Cinema, a particular tendency represented by well-known directors whose work is related to "devices traditionally associated with cinematic realism, such as location shooting, non-professional actors, deep-focus cinematography and the long take."[18] This "return of the cinematic realism" in contemporary World Cinema[19] entails a great opportunity for the viewers to experience a consistent part of reality instead of its mere representation. Furthermore, this insight provides a significant shift to a distinctive manner of approaching audiovisual texts and – consequently – of conceiving the spectatorial

modes; in fact, analysing the work of directors such as Carlos Reygadas or Tsai Ming-liang, De Luca undertakes an interpretative path that widen the very limits of knowability within film studies, by pointing out and describing the possibilities of "sensory experiencing" offered by the cinematic medium.[20] However this "ethic of realism" appears to be not only a distinguishing feature of a certain type of World Cinema, but it also seems to work as a guarantee of the reliability of the cinematic medium, as a statement of the renewed authenticity of these depictions of the world offered to the spectator.

As Giorgio Avezzù has recently suggested[21], the interest placed by some scholars on this "global realism" – and generally on World Cinema as a field of study – is arguably linked to the "nostalgia for geography", namely the need of a cinema that "maps and can be mapped", made to draw an intelligible image of one world. In other words, Avezzù outlines how the worldist approach to cinema shows a prevailing concern about the geographic "knowability" of the world and of its "representability" within film historiography and criticism: a problem of spatial (re)ordering that can be summed up with the question "where is cinema?."[22] As such, World Cinema methodology represents an attempt to "reimpose an order on something that is slipping out of control"[23] and this attempt – apparently doomed to failure – is stimulated by what Avezzù names "the cartographic anxiety" and "the uncomfortable awareness of the virtualization of cinema and of the audiences"[24]. Similarly to the "cartographic anxiety" described by Avezzù, the German scholar Vinzenz Hediger believes that World Cinema can be read as a symptom of the "topological turmoil" – namely the perception of the contemporary crisis of authority and provenance – that threatens the scientific knowledge of cinema history and of film studies in general.

In addition to these intuitions, let me consider that a similar conceptualisation of this realistic tendency brings about a further consequence. It is noteworthy that, despite their political, social, geographical and aesthetic differences, a vast plethora of directors and movies from around the globe are conflated under the flag of global "realism of the senses," which is a cinematic category essentially opposed to mainstream movie productions – namely Hollywood. Despite trying to evade any cognitive binaries by adopting Nagib's "positive and polycentric approach,"[25] indeed De Luca makes a plain distinction between a "slow" tendency in World Cinema (a strand of films promoting "a contemplative viewing experience anchored in materiality and duration"[26]) and a presumably "fast cinema." By presenting the former category as an aesthetic and political reaction to "stimuli-saturation" and "technologically-mediation," De Luca gives a specific form to a counter-cinema that inhabits the world and that possesses a greater truthfulness than the commercial mainstream products. As well as Flanagan's conceptualization of an "aesthetic of slow,"[27] such arguments contribute to enhance the underlying West-against-the-Rest opposition in the very concept of World Cinema, and hence, banishing "the rest" of the cinemas to the reactive site of the alternative. To say it with Neil Archer, "the insistence on the slowness of slow aesthetics throws out the baby with the conceptual bathwater and instead of offering the whole world as lived, risks offering us merely half world."[28]

Poles Apart: The category and its drawbacks

Despite the intentions of going beyond those "binaries" within the agenda of World Cinema scholars, it can be noted that dualism seems to be the constant *leitmotiv* in the worldist category, a category that persistently deals with questions of inner similarities and outer differences through a dialectic of homogenisation and heterogenisation: inclusivity and distinctiveness. This is a "situated" way of approaching the different cultural expressions that animate our "shifting world,"[29] namely a globalized world inhabited by ethnic, religious and identity differences and where national and regional boundaries are increasingly blurring. In this sense, World Cinema works as a shortcut for everywhere away from Western cinematic and cultural norm. It is a lumping of texts by which it is possible to observe and

study non-Western local cinematic cultures, placing them within the global context and defining their transnational interconnectedness. Regarding this last assumption, let me quote a meaningful excerpt by Hediger:

> "World Cinema contains everything, a potentially complete set of differences, at least to the extent that these can become salient in an overarching process of transcultural communication [...]. World Cinema carries the promise of making us one with everything, transforming what basically remains a commercial good into a vehicle for an intellectual transformation [...]. [It is a] concept of cinema as a unity that underlies and contains all possible varieties of cultural difference. In a moment when established tools for defining the cultural object of cinema seem to fail, in a moment when, in particular, the concept of national cinema has lost much of its force – and when recent substitutes like "transnational cinema" fail to provide the same coherence of vision once granted by thinking of films in terms of great auteurs and great nations – World Cinema promises to re-establish the unity of the object of cinema by making it one with everything. Rather than the unity of Church of cinema, and the classic canons of the Catholic phase of cinephilia, the unity of the World Cinema phase lies in the heart of the cinephile and in her faithful recognition of cultural difference through cinema."[30]

In this respect, the "Atlas of World Cinema," a methodology proposed by Dudley Andrew for teaching World Cinema in US higher education classes, engages with cinema from a similar perspective and fosters an understanding of movies as cognitive maps: these five "views" (political, demographic, orientation, linguistic, demographical) on global movie production are essentially used for "treating foreign films systematically, transcending the vagaries of taste; taking the measure of 'the foreign' in what is literally a freshly recognised global dimension".

The examples I provided so far are meant to define and show some of the questions raised by World Cinema, regardless of the intentions of who adopts it. The concept of World Cinema as discussed above deals with cinema as a vehicle of images of foreign cultures and as a place of recognition of cultural differences. It is indeed noteworthy that conceiving the cinematic medium as a privileged and reliable eye upon other cultures seems to be a prerogative of World Cinema theories. Hence, it is arguable that this gaze on non-Western cinemas runs into the old challenge of creating a solid and stable knowledge of other cultures and traditions, organizing it in a comprehensible category to be offered to Western film classes and audiences. By that, knowledge risks to mean "a 'fact' which, if it develops, changes, or otherwise transforms itself in the way that civilizations frequently do, nevertheless is fundamentally, even ontologically stable. To have such knowledge of such a thing is to dominate it, to have authority over it."[31]

Of course I do not mean to depict an imperialist attempt of dominance in the World Cinema approach. However, it should be outlined that any effort at treating foreign movies "systematically" is, as a matter of fact, hardly compatible with the cultural differences that inhabit our world and it is ontologically impossible because its very object of investigation, the world, cannot be held inside such a narrow categorization of cinematic differences. However, World Cinema, as a methodology and as a commodity, is worth acknowledging and studying because it clearly shows the persisting constraints of a "situated" way of approaching otherness and it gives a continuous invitation to leave the field of our scientific certainty, by starting a re-flection on those underlying assumptions that still influences the understanding of cultural differences.

Hence, to take this challenging path I suggest looking closely at the rhetorical discourse of World Cinema and at its semantic. Beyond the polycentrism and the democratic and multicultural approach

enthusiastically embraced by World Cinema scholars, there are some recurring words and expressions within academic literature, such as "exploration," "travelling," "discovery," "unfamiliarity," "journey." These terms, on the one hand, seem to confirm the "cartographic anxiety" or "topographic turmoil" behind the worldist theory; while, on the other hand, this intention of "exploring a wide variety of cinemas set within their cultures"[32] seems to wink at the touristic vocation of World Cinema and at those "film enthusiasts keen to explore a wider range of world cinema."[33] Indeed, this attitude can stimulate the interest of many readers and lend a "commercial edge to a range of educational and academic initiatives – many new courses, and even degree programmes, on world cinema."[34] However, conceiving the diversity of cultural expressions as a touristic experience into otherness might even be attractive and represent a valuable marketing tool for university courses, but it contributes to seeing non-Western movies as a group of cinemas that must be discovered and recognized in order to be seen – and maybe even exist: this sounds like a denial of any form of autonomy to what is perceived as a mysterious land, as a place that needs to be discovered, explored, studied and then drawn upon a map. But World Cinema is, first of all, cinema. It is so regardless of its Western explorers.

Moreover, taking such an approach risks to fosters a form of self-exoticization among non-Western directors, who struggle to cater for international markets and festivals by emphasizing stereotypes of otherness. "World Cinema," as Thomas Elsaesser has suggested, "is always in danger of conducting a form of auto-ethnography, and promoting a sort of self-exoticization, in which the ethnic, the local or the regional expose themselves, under the guise of self-expression, to the gaze of the benevolent other, with all the consequences that this entails."[35] Let me assert that these "consequences" and the limits raised by these conceptualizations of movie productions and film culture are not bound to academic and theoretical debates. On the contrary, they might inflect indirectly the way audiences, moviegoers and film students perceive and access the diversity of cultural expressions within movie culture.

With respect to film distribution, the VoD platforms and the content aggregators[36] offer several causes to reflect on how the organisation of cultural texts affects their visibility and accessibility and, ultimately, their understanding by potential spectators[37]. In this case the interest is placed in the cataloguing systems adopted by on-demand services and in the way they organize movies from around the world. Here the questions: since these platforms are expected to enhance the availability of niche products and even their profitability – as promoted by Chris Anderson[38] – how does Netflix, "a service for the world's best content for the world's citizens,"[39] deal with World Cinema?[40] Is World Cinema treated as a genre in order to offer a next viewing suggestion? And which side of the world will see these movies and how?

Andrea Gelardi

Notes

1. During the last decade many authors have joined World Cinema studies, celebrating the richness and diversity within non-Western film cultures and underpinning the need of a democratic approach to global film culture. As examples of this outstanding interest see: Shohini Chaudhuri, *Contemporary World Cinema: Europe, the Middle East, East Asia and South Asia*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh 2005; Linda Badley, R. Barton Palmer and Steven Jay Schneider (eds.), *Traditions in World Cinema*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh 2006; Stephanie Dennison and Song Hwee Lim (eds.), *Remapping World Cinema*, Wallflower Press, New York 2006; Aristides Gazetas, *An Introduction to World Cinema*, McFarland & Company, Jefferson 2008; David Martin-Jones, *Deleuze and World Cinemas*, Continuum, London-New York, 2011; Lucia Nagib, Chris Perriam and Rajinder

Dudrah (eds.), *Theorizing World Cinema*, I.B. Tauris, London-New York 2012.

2. Lucia Nagib, "Towards a positive definition of World Cinema," in Stephanie Dennison and Song Hwee Lim (eds.), *op. cit*, pp. 30-37

3. Wimal Dissanayake, "Issues in World Cinema," in John Hill and Pamela Church Gibson (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to Film Studies*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1998, pp. 527-534. The essay has been re-edited in John Hill and Pamela Church Gibson (eds.), *World Cinema: Critical Approaches*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2000, pp. 143-150.

4. *Ivi*, p. 143

5. http://www.cinetecadibologna.it/en/restaurare/worldcinema (accessed on 16 June 2016).

6. Shanti Kumar, "Regional Cinemas and Globalization in India," in Karin G. Wilkins, Joseph D. Straubhaar and Shanti Kumar (eds.), *Global Communication: New Agendas in Communication*, Routledge, New York-Abingdon 2014, p. 87.

7. http://www.film-foundation.org/world-cinema?sortBy=title&sortOrder=1&page=1 (accessed on 14 June 2016)

8. Lucia Nagib, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

9. Stephanie Dennison and Song Hwee Lim, "Situating World Cinema as a Theoretical problem", in Stephanie Dennison and Song Hwee Lim (eds.), *op. cit.*, p. 1.

10. intentionally chose to refer only to those Film Festivals using World Cinema category in their programs. In these cases, in fact, the criteria used to inform the selection of movies imply a distinct separation between national and *rest-of-the-world* directors. For instance, by 2005 the Sundance Film Festival introduced the World Cinema Dramatic Competition, the World Cinema Documentary Competition and the International Short Films: three competitions dedicated to non-US directors only. How stated in the official website, the intent of this initiative is "discovering of new films and new voices from around the world. Celebrating independence, creativity and risk-taking, the Sundance Film Festival plays a vital role in identifying emerging international talent and connecting them with audiences and industry in the United States" (http://www.sundance.org/festivals/sundance-film-festival/about9 (accessed on 12 March 2016). Although the opening the gate of US Film Festivals to directors from around the world represents a great achievement, there is still a neat division between the North American film industry and all the others.

11. Cindy Hing-Yuk Wong, *Film Festivals: Culture, People, and Power on the Global Screen*, Rutgers University Press, London 2011, p. 1

12. http://www.worldcinemaamsterdam.nl/pdf/WCA2014_catalogus_A5_web.pdf (accessed on 10 June 2016)

13. This assumption, by implying categories such as exotic and extravagance, could be charged of neglecting the resident cultural diversity in contemporary societies in a discussion of the festival reception, and so producing an oversimplification and homogenization of the audiences. Regarding this issue see Sadiah Qureshi, *Peoples on Parade: Exhibitions, Empire, and Anthropology in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago 2011. Nevertheless it is important, once again, putting in evidence the situatedness of the use of this concept and its marketing inner workings, so as to understand some of the limits of World Cinema.

14. Denilson Lopes, "Global cinema, World Cinema," in *Revista da Associação Nacional de Programas de Pós-graduação em Comunicação*, vol. 13, n. 2 (May-August 2010), p. 3.

15. Experiential tourism is a form of tourism in which customers are interested on experiencing a country, a city or a particular place by getting to know its history, people and culture. Experiential travelling is meant to "sink you deep into whatever world you're visiting, pushing a vacation toward anthropology" (Ginia Bellafante, "New Frontier for Tourists: Your Home," in *The New York Times*, July 6, 2012). For further clearing on experiential tourism see John L. Gattorna, *Insights in Strategic Retail Management*, MCB University Press, Bradford 1985.

16. Regarding the realist and neorealist tendency in World Cinema studies see: William V. Costanzo, *World Cinema through Global Genres*, John Wiley & Sons, Oxford 2014; Laura E. Ruberto and Kristi M. Wilson, *Italian Neorealism and Global Cinema*, Wayne State University Press, Detroit 2006; Lucia Nagib, *World Cinema and the Ethics of Realism*, Continuum, London-New York 2011; Saverio Giovacchini and Robert Sklar, *Global Neorealism: The Transnational History of a Film Style*, University Press of Mississippi, Jackson, 2011.
17. Tiago De Luca, *op. cit.*, p. 185.
18. *Ivi*, p. 183.
19. Lucia Nagib and Cecìlia Mello (eds.), *Realism and the Audiovisual Media*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke 2009.
20. As far as concern the originality and the possibilities offered by De Luca's proposal, such as materiality and sensoriality in contemporary realist World Cinema, it is certainly interesting reading these issues under the light of Non-Representational theories; regarding this topic see Nigel Thrift, *Non-Representational Theory: Space, Politics, Affect*, Routledge, New York-Abingdon 2008, and Daniel Casebeer, *Border Crossings and (Re)crossings: The Post-representational Turn in Social Cartography*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 2016.
21. Giorgio Avezzù, "Film History and 'Cartographic Anxiety,'" in Alberto Beltrame, Giuseppe Fidotta and Andrea Mariani (eds.), *At the Borders of (Film) History: Temporality, Archaeology, Theories*, Forum, Udine 2015, pp. 423-430.
22. Although the so-called cartographic paradigm is a marginal issues in this dissertation, this topic represents a vast field of research for some scholars who are contributing to the disclosure of a fundamental characteristics of the cinematic medium; as examples of this tendency, see Teresa Castro, *Le Pensée cartographique es images. Cinéma et culture visuelle*, Alèas, Lyon 2011 and, for a more focused approach on diegetic maps, see Tom Conley, *Cartographic Cinema*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis 2007.
23. Giorgio Avezzù, *op. cit.*, p. 426.
24. *Ivi*, p. 425.
25. Tiago De Luca, *op. cit.*, p. 14.
26. *Ivi*, p. 183.
27. Matthew Flanagan, "Towards an Aesthetic of Slow in Contemporary Cinema," *16:9*, vol. 29, no. 6 (November 2008), http://www.16-9.dk/2008-11/side11_inenglish.htm (accessed on 20 June 2016).
28. Neil Archer, "Speeds of Sound: On Fast Talking in Slow Movies," in *Cinema Journal*, vol. 55, n. 2 (Winter 2016), p. 135.
29. Arjun Appadurai, "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy", *Theory, Culture & Society*, Vol. 7 (1990), pp. 295-310
30. Vinzenz Hediger, "What Do we Know When We Know Where Something Is? World Cinema and the Question of Spatial Ordering," http://www.screeningthepast.com/2013/10/what-do-we-know-when-we-know-where-something-is-world-cinema-and-the-question-of-spatial-ordering/ (accessed on 14 June 2016)
31. Edward Said, *Orientalism*, Pantheon Books, New York 1978, p. 32.
32. The excerpt quoted is from the editorial presentation of the *Tauris World Cinema Series*, an editorial line created by the UK and US publisher I. B. Tauris.
33. Stephanie Dennison and Song Hwee Lim, *op. cit.*
34. Grant Catherine and Annette Kuhn (eds.), *Screening World Cinema: A Screen Reader*, Routledge, London 2006, p. 1.
35. Thomas Elsaesser, *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood,* Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam 2005, p. 510.

36. Generally, the term “aggregator” refers to a web site or a software that collect, reorganize and distribute contents to network operators. In some cases, these aggregators also manage other processes such as the acquisition of rights for distribution, the encoding or the transporting of contents to video service providers. Some examples of aggregators for online video distribution are 3Vision, Diva, Endavo Media, Federal Hill Communications, Kmax Brothers and Under the Milky Way.
37. For a general perspective on academic essays about contemporary movie distribution, see Alisa Perreb, “Rethinking Distribution for the Future of Media Industry Studies,” *Cinema Journal*, vol. 52, no. 3 (2013), pp. 165-171. For a more specific discourse on how digital distribution systems regulate the access to texts and contents, see Ramon Lobato, “The Politics of Digital Distribution: Exclusionary Structures in Online Cinema,” *Studies in Australian Cinema*, vol. 2, n. 2 (February 2010), pp. 167-178.
38. Chris Anderson, *The Long Tail: Why the Future of Business is Selling Less of More*, Hyperion, New York 2006.
39. http://mediadecoder.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/12/06/netflixs-chief-sees-hbo-as-its-main-rival/ (accessed on19 June 2016)
40. Regarding this line of inquiry, it is significant looking to a series of workshops held at Queen’s University of Belfast, between June 2012 and September 2013, entitled *World Cinema On-Demand: Film Distribution and Education in the Streaming Media Era.* During these workshops, some scholars from different UK universities considered the impact of formal and informal streaming services on the distribution, consumption and the teaching of World Cinema, that these specialists conceptualize as non-Hollywood cinema and as “cinema of the periphery.” For more information about this project and the main issues discussed during the workshops see https://worldcinemaod.wordpress.com/ (accessed on 20 June 2016) and see also Alexandra Kapka, “World Cinema On-Demand: Film Distribution and Education in the Streaming Media Era,” *Alphaville: Journal of Film and Screen Media*, n. 6 (Winter 2013). As a first questioning about World Cinema in VoD platforms see Stefano Baschiera, *Streaming World Genre Cinema,* http://framescinemajournal.com/article/streaming-world-genre-cinema/ (accessed on 24/06/2016).