

Ahn, SooJeong (2008) The Pusan International Film Festival 1996-2005: South Korean cinema in local, regional, and global context. PhD thesis, University of Nottingham.

Access from the University of Nottingham repository:

http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/10513/1/AHN_etheses_all.pdf

Copyright and reuse:

The Nottingham ePrints service makes this work by researchers of the University of Nottingham available open access under the following conditions.

This article is made available under the University of Nottingham End User licence and may be reused according to the conditions of the licence. For more details see:

http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/end_user_agreement.pdf

A note on versions:

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the repository url above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact eprints@nottingham.ac.uk

**The Pusan International Film Festival 1996-2005:
South Korean Cinema in Local, Regional, and Global
Context**

SooJeong AHN

Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

June 2008

Abstract

Despite the growing academic attention to film festivals, there has been little critical discourse about such events staged outside the West. This thesis aims to address this gap by providing a social, political and cultural exploration of the Pusan International Film Festival (PIFF) in South Korea between 1996 and 2005. The thesis utilises empirical research to reveal how the festival staked out a unique and influential position within a rapidly changing global landscape. Particular attention is paid to the organisers' use of an Asian regionalisation strategy to promote the festival locally and globally. This study claims that PIFF has gone further than any other film festival in constructing a regional identity and maintaining a strong and mutually beneficial link to its national film industry. Research into PIFF's special relationship with both the national and regional film industries uncovers the previously unexplored roles that film festivals play in film production, in addition to their traditional functions of exhibition and distribution. To place this analysis in context, the thesis examines the politico-economic factors that influenced the establishment of the festival, its programming, the project market (the Pusan Promotion Plan), and its tenth anniversary in 2005. The study argues that analysis of PIFF reveals tensions and negotiations between the "national" and the "transnational" in the wake of economic and cultural globalisation in East Asia. The thesis serves as a case study of how contemporary film festivals adjust their roles and identities to adapt to local, regional and global change.

Contents

Abbreviations	i
Introduction	1
1. Film Festivals Between the National and the Transnational	36
2. Why Pusan?: The Political Economy of a Film Festival	84
3. Making a Hub of Asian Cinema: A Regionalisation Strategy	131
4. Negotiating a Place Between Korean Cinema and Asian Cinema: Programming Politics	175
5. Re-imagining the Past: Programming Retrospectives	218
6. A Global Film Producer: The Pusan Promotion Plan	269
7. Remapping Asian Cinema: The Tenth Anniversary in 2005	312
Conclusion	361
Bibliography	368
Appendix 1. Film Festivals in Asia	
Appendix 2. Main Programme of PIFF	
Appendix 3. A Statistical Chart of PIFF (1996-2005)	
Appendix 4. An Overview of the Tenth PIFF (2005)	
Appendix 5. Pusan Promotion Plan Projects (1998-2005)	

Acknowledgments

I am indebted to many people for their encouragement and forbearance at different moments and in different places throughout this research. First of all, I would like to thank Julian Stringer for his committed supervision and invaluable support. Jonathan Watts, Iona Macintyre, Iain Roberts Smith, Thomas Jong-suk Nam, Emilse Hidalgo, and Julieta Gatti deserve a special mention for their insightful comments and practical help in reading my drafts. Many thanks to Sabrina Qing Yu, Jung-Ae Park, Richard Robinson, and to Jung Sunhyung and Yenny Satriawan for inviting me into their home and restoring my spirit and energy. My thanks also go to Nandana Bose, Serena Formica, Donna Peberdy, and Francisca Fuentes, for their friendship, and especially to Eun Young Jean, Channing Lu and to Ikumi Fushimi and Derek Soon for their generosity in the final stages of this research. I am indebted to Sister Mary Deane, Bang Eunjin and Father Joseph Seong-woo Lee for their spiritual support. I should also like to thank numerous friends and colleagues in the Korean film industry who shared their knowledge and materials. Special thanks to Derek Elley for challenging my perspectives on film festivals and to Kim Dong-Ho for his stimulating presence.

My family has lived with this thesis. Very special thanks to my husband, Oh Choon-baik, for his immense patience, love and support. While I was conducting this research in England, my two little nieces Daeun and Seun were born in Korea and their laughter has guided me through this journey. Thanks to my sister Jeong-min for tireless support by listening to all my frustrations on countless long-distance phone calls.

Funding for this research was provided in part by an Arts Postgraduate Scholarship from the International Office at the University of Nottingham in 2004.

A short version of Chapter 4 will appear as “Placing South Korean Cinema into Pusan International Film Festival: Programming Strategy in the Global/Local Context,” in *What a Difference a Region Makes: Cultural Studies and Cultural Industries in North-East Asia*, edited by Chris Berry, Darren Aoki and Nicola Liscutin. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press (forthcoming).

Chapter 5 will be published in an abridged version as “Re-imagining the Past: Programming South Korean Retrospectives at the Pusan International Film Festival,” in *Film International*, Vol. 6. (2008), a special issue on film festivals edited by Dina Iordanova (forthcoming).

Chapter 7 will also appear as “Re-mapping Asian Cinema: The Tenth Anniversary of PIFF in 2005,” in *Cinemas, Identities and Beyond*, edited by Ruby Cheung and David Fleming. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing (forthcoming).

Abbreviations

AAFA	Association of Asian Film Archives
AFA	Asian Film Academy
AFIC	Asian Film Industry Centre
AFIN	Asian Film Industry Network
AFM	Asian Film Market/ American Film Market
AFCNet	Asian Film Commissions Network
APEC	Asian Pacific Economic Cooperation
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
ASEM	Asia-Europe Meeting
BEXCO	Busan Exhibition and Convention Centre
BFC	Busan Film Commission
BIFCOM	Busan International Film Commission and Industry Showcase
DMB	Digital Multimedia Broadcasting
EFM	European Film Market
EFP	European Film Promotion
EU	European Union
FIAF	International Federation of Film Archives
FIAPF	Federation Internationale des Associations de Producteur de Films
FILMART	Hong Kong International Film and Television Market
IFFR	International Film Festival Rotterdam
IMF	International Monetary Fund
HAF	Hong Kong-Asia Film Financing Forum
HBF	the Hubert Bals Fund
HKIFF	Hong Kong International Film Festival
KF-MAP	Korean Film-Making Assistant Project
KMPPC	Korean Motion Picture Promotion Corporation
KOFA	Korean Film Archive
KOFIC	Korean Film Council
MIFED	International Film and Multimedia Market
MoMA	Museum of Modern Art
MPAA	Motion Picture Association of America
NDIF	New Directors In Focus
NETPAC	Network for the Promotion of Asian Cinema
NHK	Nihon Hōsō Kyōkai (Japanese National Broadcasting Corporation)
PiFan	Puchon International Film Festival
PIFF	Pusan International Film Festival
PPP	Pusan Promotion Plan
PRC	People's Republic of China (Mainland China)

SeNef	Seoul Net and Film Festival
TIFF	Tokyo International Film Festival
TIFFCOM	Entertainment Content Market at TIFF
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
WTO	World Trade Organisation

Introduction

This thesis examines one individual international film festival in South Korea, the Pusan International Film Festival between the years 1996 and 2005.¹ The purpose of this research is to elucidate how an individual film festival in a non-Western country has worked to position itself within the rapidly changing global film economy. The thesis identifies a series of Asian regional self-definition processes that the festival utilised to differentiate itself from its regional counterparts, such as the Hong Kong and Tokyo film festivals. Furthermore, this project also reflects the complexities brought about by the rapid transformation of the South Korean film industry which has striven to reach out to the global film market since the late 1990s.

Over the past two decades there has been a significant proliferation of new film festivals around the world. Despite the growing interest and importance of film festivals as a scholarly topic, research on film festivals has tended to focus on high profile European festivals, such as Cannes, Venice and Berlin. Little primary empirical research has been conducted to date on the subject of non-Western film festivals. As a result, the existing scholarship on this topic has largely failed to comprehensively acknowledge the different social and cultural contexts of non-

Western film festivals. In addition, it is worth noting that while the exhibition of new titles of world cinema has long been seen as a key to obtaining a high-profile for major festivals in the West, it is surprising that the relationship between non-Western film festivals and their role in exhibiting and supporting the production of “world cinema” has rarely been explored in Film Studies.

This thesis aims to address these gaps by specifically focusing on PIFF which since its inception in 1996 has rapidly emerged in the global film market as the single most significant showcase of Asian cinema. The hypothesis of this study is that PIFF’s regional approach towards East Asia, synergised by the global visibility of South Korean cinema, displays a distinct agenda and socio-cultural context different from that of Euro-American film festivals.

Moreover, PIFF’s vital role in linking with its national and regional film industries will be established as the first step to discovering the unexplored roles and functions that film festivals play in the global film economy. For example, this thesis uncovers another significant role played by film festivals - production - in addition to the roles conventionally associated with them (exhibition and distribution) by investigating the Pusan Promotion Plan, a project market run alongside the festival.² The thesis contends that PIFF provides a unique discursive site through which to understand the tensions and negotiations brought out among

local, regional and global cultural and economic forces.

To establish this argument, the Introduction begins with an overview of PIFF and the academic relevance of this study through a brief review of important existing work on this subject. Then the chapter discusses methodology and explains the structure of the thesis as a whole.

Central Object of the Research: PIFF Between 1996 and 2005

Korea's first international film festival, PIFF, is held annually in Pusan, a southeastern port that is the second largest city in Korea. Featuring a focus on Asian cinema, the first PIFF was inaugurated on September 13, 1996. From its first event, PIFF has achieved enormous success by attracting huge local audiences, around 180,000 visitors per year, and receiving positive critical response from foreign participants.³ Building upon this unanticipated success, PIFF has become the leading international film festival in the Asian region, even surpassing the Hong Kong International Film Festival (HKIFF), which for the previous twenty years had been the prime viewing forum for the latest Asian films.⁴

It is widely believed that PIFF's success coincides with an increased global interest in South Korean cinema.⁵ The international recognition of Korean cinema has mainly been achieved through the festival circuit in the West and the remarkable

growth of the national film industry since the 1990s. Consequently, the evolution of PIFF seems to be closely interrelated with the status of Korean cinema in the global economy. Alongside the importance of PIFF's intimate links with the national film industry, the festival's self-determined conceptualisation and manipulation of an Asian regional identity to approach the global market provides a distinctive case study as this systematic regional approach has not been evident at any other film festival. The thesis seeks to explore this ambivalent combination of regional and national politics brought about by global forces. While PIFF has acted as a key institution and agency for the promotion of Korean cinema, it has also attempted to brand Pusan's festival image as a showcase for Asian cinema more broadly in order to survive in a highly competitive global film market.

PIFF's unique formulation of regionalisation and its complex relationship with Korean and Asian cinema requires serious consideration and raises important questions. As the first international-scale film festival in the history of South Korea, how and why was Pusan chosen as the host city from among other possible candidates? Why did PIFF have to conceptualise a regional identity and actively build up industrial regional networks? How have PIFF and the Korean film industry interrelated over the past decade? Why did PIFF establish the Pusan Promotion Plan, a project market, and try to brand its products in the name of Asian cinema? Finally,

how does the successful establishment of PIFF help us understand the various facets of interaction among local, regional, and global forces? These specific research questions will be addressed in the following chapters.

It should be noted that these research questions were not fully in place when starting this study. Rather, they have grown organically and developed while conducting the research. For instance, the point of departure for this study was that film festivals can be thought of as pertaining to a national configuration because they have been a significant exhibition site for national cinemas and nationalistic agendas; increasingly, their function has been orchestrated and contested on a national level in response to transnational forces. However, as the research progressed, this initial question concerning the relationship between “the national” and “the transnational” at festival sites had to be modified as this binary distinction limited exploration of wider contexts. Thus the focus of this research has moved away from the relationship between distinct national and transnational forces and towards the blurring of the line between these two interlinked forces. This explains why the title of this thesis specifies the question of PIFF and South Korean cinema in local, regional, and global contexts. Bearing this in mind, this study specifically addresses PIFF’s regionalisation strategy in order to address the tensions and negotiations emerging from PIFF’s relation to the national and the regional

industries within the changing global economy.

Nature of Academic Contribution

This thesis seeks to bring to light a new perspective on the world-wide phenomenon of film festivals by placing the discussion of film festivals into a non-Western context. By focusing on one individual film festival in a non-Western region, this thesis will address the limits of previous accounts of film festivals by drawing attention to hitherto unexplored aspects of this subject. However, the focus on one selected film festival does not mean that it cannot reflect the “universality of the festival experience or the international film festival circuit as a series of related events.”⁶ As many commentators point out, the multi-dimensional nature of film festivals around the world cannot be grasped by one single approach.⁷ For example, Julian Stringer asserts:

The film festival is not one ‘thing’; no single approach (to cultural policy or any other issue) can possibly hope to untangle the many different sides of this particular phenomenon. In other words, the film festival needs to be viewed first and foremost as a multi-dimensional entity.⁸

In a similar fashion, it is not possible to draw a universal conclusion from the case of different film festivals in different geopolitical locations following different agendas. For instance, while the major western film festivals such as, Cannes,

Venice and Berlin, developed from a similar historical background after the Second World War, these respective festivals today no longer have much in common with one another. Importantly, film festivals in every corner of the world have recently attempted to transform their status, roles, and identities in order to remain competitive in a rapidly changing global film economy.

In this context, by investigating one selected film festival in South Korea over the span of ten years - a key moment in contemporary South Korean history in terms of its politico-economic and cultural transformation caused by the force of globalisation - this study is able to address the specific questions raised above. More than this, the reason why this thesis focuses on PIFF is not only because of the lack of previous work on non-Western film festivals, but also because this festival reflects wider changes both in Korean society and East Asia more generally. In other words, if film festivals are multi-dimensional entities, as Stringer suggests, this study will develop this insight by analysing precisely how such multi-dimensional aspects are formulated through the study of PIFF within the specific historical, social and cultural contexts of Korea and East Asia.⁹

Review of Relevant Studies

The topic of film festivals as a scholarly subject in Film Studies has only emerged recently. Despite the significant role that film festivals have played in global culture over the past several decades, only a few academic journals and book chapters have paid any serious attention to the phenomenon. More and more sustained projects on film festivals are becoming visible in this long neglected field.

Earlier work on film festivals largely tended to focus on the issue of discovering new cinemas. There was also a debate on cultural policy and film festivals in the British film journal *Framework* between the mid-1970s and 1980s, although this failed to develop into a sustained study.¹⁰ Bill Nichols drew critical attention to film festivals by utilising a cross-cultural examination of Iranian films at the Toronto Film Festival. Nichols' work pinpoints the way in which the cultural reception of an alien culture is achieved through the discovery process operating at film festival sites. It was in the late 1990s, however, that the key scholarship on film festivals began to emerge in conjunction with debates around the phenomenon of globalisation that were current at the time. This thesis draws upon the work of several influential scholars in particular, such as Julian Stringer, Janet Harbord, Yingjin Zhang, Chris Berry, and Kim Soyoung, all of whom have significantly contributed to theorising this subject and opening up wider and more in-depth

academic debates.

The collective work of these scholars offers a useful way of theorising the link between the festival phenomenon and the global economy and it demonstrates the interrelation between festivals and the notion of “the national” in different ways: spatial economy; media event; institutional workings in operation at the festival site; all of which shall be discussed in the subsequent chapters in detail.

The above critics’ differing approaches to film festivals also indicates that the nature of film festivals is intertwined with other heterogeneous issues such as national cinemas, transnationalism and cultural politics. As discussed earlier, any mono-disciplinary approach to this subject cannot fully unpack the complexities and changing characteristics of the contemporary film festival phenomenon in a compelling way. In particular, there is a vital link between debates on film festivals and the complex subject of globalisation. Of particular relevance here are conceptions of “global cultural flows”; “disjunctures”; “space of flows”; and global cities, theorised by Arjun Appadurai, Manuel Castells and Saskia Sassen respectively.

In developing these debates on globalisation, Stringer’s work marks an important stage in the integration of discourses around film festivals into our conception of what constitutes film festivals as a scholarly topic. Stringer’s

arguments succinctly map out the key roles of film festivals on a global scale by considering the spatial relationships and organisational logics of film festivals.

Stringer's most significant contribution to the field is that he moves the debate on film festivals from the national level to cities by asserting that global cities act as nodal points on the festival circuit.¹¹ Extending his argument, this thesis explores how PIFF has utilised its particular location - the city of Pusan - geopolitically, economically and culturally, and how the festival has tried to link its distinctive festival image to the city image in order to remain competitive in the global market.

Moreover, this study of PIFF aims to further develop Stringer's argument on the festival's relation to the national film industry by investigating the close links between the dramatic evolution of PIFF and the status of the fast-growing Korean film industry.¹²

Although Stringer's emphasis on cities as nodal points provides a new paradigm in film festival studies, it is important to point out that film festivals' relation to "the national" has become more multifaceted and complex. In this respect, this thesis contends that the critical conception of film festivals requires a multi-dimensional approach since the phenomenon of film festivals is closely bound up with cultural, and socio-political transformations in the global economy, as previous works have pointed out.

Moreover, although the collective work of the above mentioned key scholars opens up possibilities for cross-cultural analysis of film festivals by offering a useful link between the festival phenomenon and the global economy, their work is based on a Euro-American context and “other” voices are lacking on this topic. Furthermore, today the international film festival landscape in every corner of the world is rapidly changing and every film festival, both in the West and non-West, is competitively interacting with local/global forces in different ways. Hence, the focus on a Euro-American context in the previous scholarship urgently requires a new paradigm that can comprehensively reconceptualise film festivals in a non-Western context. In this regard, Chris Berry and Kim Soyoung’s work provides useful insights into ways of exploring the role of the international film festival circuit and the identity of festivals within the specific political, industrial and economic dimensions of Korea and East Asia. Their approaches allow this study to move away from predominantly Euro-American perspectives towards areas which have hitherto been little explored.

This thesis seeks to elucidate how an individual film festival, named PIFF in South Korea, interacts with the global/local film economy within a series of regional self-definition processes that the festival utilised to differentiate itself from regional counterparts. The thesis therefore argues that a comprehensive study of

PIFF necessarily requires attention to the interrelationship between the festival and Korean cinema more broadly. That is, rather than opting to attend solely to the institutional logics that operate in a single cultural event in a particular area, the thesis also seeks to encompass the ongoing discussions around the contemporary Korean cinema industry and its relation to PIFF.

In this respect, Chris Berry's work is especially important. By specifically looking at Korean director Kim Ki-young, who received international recognition in the Retrospectives programme of the second PIFF in 1997, Berry suggests that for Korean cinema to be globally successful it would be necessary for "a film or a group of films to appear with characteristics that helped to establish a distinctive and appealing image as a new product, defined in national and auteur terms."¹³

This account is useful in helping to explain how PIFF attempted to brand its festival image to distinguish itself from regional festival counterparts and enter the global film market. While Berry's argument about the critical economy of the globalised art-house cinema is still based on a national framework, his recent analysis of Taiwanese cinema concerns the intersection across the national and the transnational. His reading of the "Taiwan Trilogy" provides a useful basis for understanding the tensions between the national and the transnational in researching not only PIFF but also the global film festival phenomenon in general.

Berry succinctly proposes that “the national” has not disappeared after the post-national era but still co-exists with economic globalisation.¹⁴ According to Berry, Hou Hsiao hsien’s Taiwan Trilogy invokes “a Chineseness that is trans-‘national’ in the sense of the nation-state, but national in the sense of a culture.”¹⁵ His argument beckons a larger framework within which “the national is no longer confined to the form of the territorial nation-state but multiple, proliferating, contested, and overlapping.”¹⁶ Developing his approach, this thesis argues that the two contradictory but interlinked forces - the national and the transnational - are often overlapping and in tension with each other at the site of PIFF. Furthermore, across subsequent chapters, this study shows PIFF to be a significant discursive space in which a contradictory ambivalence between the national and the transnational emerges in conjunction with the impact of economic and cultural globalisation in the Asia region.

Korean scholar Kim Soyoung’s perspective on South Korean film culture in the late 1990s is also significant. Considering “cine-mania” (cinephilia) as most directly visible in a proliferation of film festivals in that period, Kim argues that film festivals as a cultural practice have become a privileged site where the specific dynamics of Korean society can be read. Her perceptive reflection on film festivals in the historical, socio-political context of Korea has pioneered a critical analysis of

the kind of non-Western film festivals that are rarely systematically studied. In addition, by mapping film festivals so as to understand Korean cultural politics of the 1990s, Kim specifically points out that “the importance of PIFF lies in the geopolitical manipulation.”¹⁷ However, her account of the notion of “the regional,” which is conflicting but interlinked with the national, needs to be fully explored to understand the ongoing transformation of film festivals and cultural industries in East Asia because the critical concept of the regional is vaguely defined in her writing. Chapter 3 will provide in-depth analysis of this issue. Overall, Kim’s reading of film festivals has inspired this study to further develop her discussions within a larger context. Her innovative approach offers an accessible map to researchers navigating the complexities of film festivals in a non-Western region within different cultural and social contexts.

Finally, this study carefully incorporates industrial perspectives on film festivals made by trade magazines and popular writings. The empirical writings of Derek Elley, senior critic of *Variety* in particular offer useful insights into ways of thinking about festival politics and their intimate links with film industries. Elley’s industrial experience and “insider knowledge” helps broaden this thesis’ critical conceptualisation of film festivals by adding valuable economic, industrial and practical perspectives.

Methodologies

As emphasised earlier in this Introduction, the thesis contends that the multi-faceted nature of film festivals requires multiple methodologies when researching this topic. Thus, the chapter emphasised any mono-disciplinary approach to this subject cannot fully unpack the complexities and changing characteristics of the contemporary film festival phenomenon in a compelling way. In this respect, this thesis is the first book-length scholarly study of an individual film festival in East Asia based upon primary empirical evidence. Bearing this in mind, this section will illustrate why “multi-dimensional” methodologies were chosen for this particular research and how such methodologies were specifically carried out. It will also show that the deployment of these methodologies allows us to acknowledge the significance of the researcher’s position. Overall, the section aims to elaborate how the choice of this particular methodological approach enables this study to work in an interdisciplinary fashion. Before moving towards the details of methodologies, it is helpful to explain my personal background as this can demonstrate how my unique position provided methodological advantages.

Researcher’s Position and Methodology

This study initially evolved out of my own personal experience working at PIFF.

Having been employed by this organisation between 1998 and 2002, following a career in the film industry, my knowledge of PIFF and Korean cinema was already extensive before starting this research. Given the insider knowledge gleaned through my industrial experience, film festivals were for me neither glamorous events nor sites of cinematic fantasy. Rather, the film festival required highly intensive physical labour and continuous responses to contemporary political, economic and social changes at local, regional and global levels.

Furthermore, despite the consistent emphasis on Asian identity as a key instrument to promote the festival, it was apparent to me that PIFF also self-consciously considered itself a significant agent in promoting Korean cinema to the Western film market, in particular since the late 1990s. These complex and contradictory aspects of the festival prompted me to develop this research and enabled me to discover a theoretical framework for these personal interests. As I then began to position myself as a detached researcher by keeping a distance from PIFF, my initial questions regarding the festival gradually evolved into more fundamental inquiries: What are the ultimate goals of film festival studies? What has been gained by film festival studies? What is a film festival? This thesis seeks to address these fundamental questions. By closely examining how PIFF and the Korean film industry have coped with the impact of globalisation within the specific

Korean and East Asian context, this study seeks to take some first steps in understanding the complexities of film festivals not only in East Asia but also the rest of the world.

The global phenomenon of film festivals is interlinked with multiple fields, from national cinemas, global cities, spatiality and temporality to cultural industries and branding culture. Hence, this subject cannot be approached through one single dominant methodology. As Stringer points out, “[m]ulti-dimensional phenomena can only be approached via a diversity of different viewpoints, using a variety of critical resources and research methodologies.”¹⁸ In the case of PIFF and its relation to national and regional film industries, the use of multi-dimensional methodologies helps disentangle the complex relationship between the national and regional film industries in the specific politico-social context of Korea and East Asia.

When considering this research topic, therefore, it should be noted that my position has benefited from my unique background in PIFF itself. One could question whether my diverse working experience in the Korean film industry, including at PIFF, might compromise the range of this project’s scope due to my previous personal engagement with the organisation. However, I take my experience to be an advantage rather than a disadvantage in doing research on film

festivals. This is because my first-hand knowledge and insider status enabled this research to remain sustainable and to effectively achieve my research agenda. For example, it is not easy as an outsider to grasp what happens “behind the scenes” at a film festival, especially as the politics of film festivals have over recent years become much more complicated and diversified.

More importantly, my background allowed me to get access to certain primary materials which would not be available to outsiders. As a result, this thesis is grounded in my own various experiences at PIFF as well as the wider Korean film industry. Although recently film festivals in South Korea, including PIFF, the Puchon Film Festival (PiFan), and others have begun to make available their statistics and resources, such as audience numbers, budgets and details of the appointment of key committee members, through official websites, film festivals in South Korea remain reluctant to make all information available to the public. For this reason, it has been difficult to gain tangible primary materials through PIFF’s websites or publications until very recently. By benefiting from a familiarity with the inner workings of the festival and a capability to interpret those materials, this thesis therefore successfully shines a light on previously hidden areas such as, programming politics, for example, as discussed in chapter 4.

This “insider” knowledge will be balanced by an appropriate detachment and

distance, thus making the key arguments about the development and evolution of PIFF sustainable and verifiable. For instance, when I first started this research in the U.K., geographically removed from Korea where the research subject is located, this physical distance allowed me to keep a certain distance from the topic. In addition, by that point, I was no longer professionally involved with PIFF. When I subsequently participated in the tenth anniversary in 2005 for my field work, I was therefore able to achieve critical independence and successfully accomplish the aim of the research trip by successfully positioning myself as properly “detached” from the subject.

Multi-dimensional Methodologies: Combination of Ethnographic and Archival Research

This research combines ethnographic investigation including interviews and participation observation and archival research with textual analysis of primary materials. In employing this multi-dimensional approach, the thesis seeks to address a crucial gap - a lack of empirically verified research methodologies - to be found in the existing largely theoretical scholarship on film festivals. As film festivals are linked with the transformation of film industries at local, regional and global levels, this study will refer, alongside the academic work as briefly reviewed earlier, to a number of reports and writings from non academic sources, mostly international

trade magazines such as *Variety* and *Hollywood Reporter* as well as Korean newspapers. In other words, this thesis does not utilise a fixed and self-contained approach. It rather seeks, in an encompassing manner, to creatively adopt a mobile, flexible and interdisciplinary approach to follow the rapidly changing diverse festival landscape, drawing upon writings on film festivals, Korean cinema, East Asian studies, area studies and cultural studies. In so doing, this study is aware of the differing perspectives between Western and Korean literatures on approaches to the film festival phenomenon. In this respect, it is both a challenge and a benefit for this thesis to utilise this previously unexplored angle in looking at one single non-Western film festival so as to develop the debate on film festivals through a new critical paradigm. My thesis will hopefully contribute to broadening the existing perspectives on film festivals beyond an Euro-American viewpoint.

The great advantage of multi-dimensional methodologies in this study is that it can enable the researcher to relate its research founding to *practice*. It is widely believed that there is a gap between academic studies and practice in many ways.¹⁹ Martyn Hammersley argues policy or practice cannot be based on research in any exclusive sense because of the different nature of academic research and practice.²⁰ In other words, there has been a tendency that academic research can sometimes be “naive or utopian” to practice and often produce knowledge or findings at a

comparatively slow rate.²¹ In the same vein, existing largely theoretical work on film festivals may not be “sufficiently up-to-date to meet the needs of practitioners” such as film festival organisers or policymakers in cultural industries.²² However, this thesis can provide comparatively more evidence about which “policies and practices *work*.”²³ For example, chapter 6 “A Global Producer: The Pusan Promotion Plan” which uncovers a new function of festivals and its relation to the local and regional film industries can directly be implemented in practice. An analysis of Asian and Korean film projects presented and completed between 1998 and 2005 can help not only critically map out the dominant trend - co-production - in the global film industry but also practically provide film industry professionals with strategic outlook to follow the trend in the fast-growing co-production markets in the local, regional and global levels.

Overall, this approach can help us look at PIFF in terms of local, regional and global strategy rather than merely considering the festival as a media event to promote Korean cinema or as a public space to politically argue contemporary South Korean society. In short, by utilising a multi-dimensional methodology in conjunction with an interdisciplinary approach, this research aims to map out the multiple constituencies of the contemporary film festival landscape.

In this context, an ethnographical approach, as a widely used research

practice in social sciences, was utilised as one of the multi-dimensional methodologies. In order to “develop the story as it is experienced by participants”²⁴ and gain a multi-dimensional appreciation of the setting, the ethnographer must be prepared to consider many different types of data. These can be generated only through the use of multiple methods, which may include interviewing, observing, quantitative work. In this research, ethnography is mainly composed of interviews and participation observation conducted during the fieldwork in Pusan for four months between September and December in 2005. It is because during this time the tenth anniversary of PIFF, which will be argued in the final chapter as a case study, was held on 6-14, October. However, some of the personal one-to-one interviews were conducted alongside this fieldwork such as Seoul, Pusan in South Korea and London as well as Paris and Karlovy Vary. Most of those were arranged to take an in-depth look at interviewees.²⁵ Rather than sketching a range of different people, my interview focused on deliberately selected film professionals.²⁶

There are three categories in interviewing people: international critics in academic journals and industrial magazines; Korean film industry- related professionals; festival organizers and workers. Korean film industry-related professionals included policy-related people such as General Secretary of the Korean Film Commission and Korean film journalists. However, due to fast shift

in Korean film industry when conducting this research, the position of each interviewee was often overlapped. For example, Park Kwang-su was interviewed not only as a former organizer of PIFF but also as a founder of Busan Film Commission. Therefore, this division was fundamentally intended to interpret each interviewee's attitude and perspective towards Korean film industry and PIFF.

It can be argued that "institutional ethnography" was used in arranging and interpreting those interviews. As Dorothy E. Smith discusses, institutional ethnography as practice is a method of inquiry that problematizes social relations at the local site of lived experience and examines how textual sequences coordinate consciousness, actions and ruling relations.²⁷ This methodology preserves their presence as subjects rather than objectifies people. Thus, the interviewees recognise that researchers are in the same world as that they are investigating. Such responses provide more opportunities "for opening up dimensions of the institutional regime that were not recognised at the outset of the project."²⁸ For example, it would have been very difficult as an outsider to understand fully the circumstance, which could be changeable and unexpected if I were not regarded as a former member of the local film community. However, at the same time, due to my position as a former "insider," it was the challenge to deal with the interviewee's skepticism towards my relationship with PIFF in conducting interviews. For instance, some of them

demanded off-the-record conversations during interviewing because they did not want their colleagues to hear about their opinions on the film industry and PIFF.

Participation observation was also conducted during the fieldwork in 2005.

From the opening night to the closing party, key programmes and side-bar events were examined in detail for the final chapter in the thesis as a case study. Among a number of special events to celebrate the tenth anniversary, however, two were paid special attention: the PPP seminar titled “Advanced Window Marketing” on 11 October at the Paradise Hotel Pusan; international conference “Asia/Cinema/ – Industry, Technology & Film Culture” held on 11-13 October at the Westin Chosun Pusan Hotel so as to:

- 1) examine the film festival-related marketing and distributing system through the PPP as the thesis devotes to this project market in a single chapter;
- 2) understand how Korean and Asian cinema are perceived internationally;
- 3) acknowledge the way in which PIFF organised these special events in a different direction (i.e. critically or industrially).

While the position as former staff provided more opportunities in interviewing people, observing both events required different skills in engaging with both speakers and audiences in the room. As one of many audiences there, regardless of my background previously involved with this organisation, I became a total *outsider*. This was one of the difficulties that I confronted in conducting interviews and participation observation which came from two different positions that I maintained

both as an insider and outsider.

Finally, archival research as one of the multi-dimensional methodologies was conducted. Being physically at “dusty” offices and rooms in itself to find relevant archival materials is a new process for many researchers. In this study, utilising archival materials was appropriate as a priority was made to use primary sources than secondary sources. It allowed me to gain a sense of “reality” about this project and better understand this topic. In a similar manner to the way in which ethnography offered, my position as former staff and industry-related background provided me with more opportunities to get access to “hidden” materials to the public.²⁹ For example, there were no actual archives in film festivals including PIFF and film companies in Korea (which will be illustrated in chapter 5 when discussing retrospectives at festivals) when starting this research in 2002. This means, archival materials were dispersed in several places and not organised at all. For example, all staff in the PIFF’s branch office in Seoul must move into the headquarter office in Pusan to prepare for the event around August every year. Furthermore, until PIFF decided to give up the festival venue in Nampo-dong area in 2005, the Haeundae office had to move into Nampo-dong where the festival venues were located. Then, the office had to move right back to Haeundae after the event. This illustrates all the materials also had to move around following people

who worked with. In addition, film festival organising committee offices did not allow researchers physically to search the computer or materials in the bookshelves or to bring their laptops into their offices. Therefore, in order to get the material that I wanted more effectively, it was necessary to establish and maintain an excellent relationship with staff, especially when I encountered sensitive materials that required professional handling or were “confidential” to outsiders. Put simply, the advantage of and difficulty in this research method provided one of the many reasons why this study could not devote to one mono methodology which is not sufficient to research this topic.

This section illustrated how specifically multi-dimensional methodologies were carried out. Interviews and participation observation and archival research were combined, together with discourse analysis as a theoretical tool. It also demonstrated that in order to address multi-faceted interdisciplinary research on film festivals, methodological approach required a number of research paradigms and conceptual understandings.

Critical Dialogue Via Festivals

As this thesis cannot aim to address all aspects of film festivals, it targets instead a few select topics, which are the most urgently required in researching this subject;

namely, the festival's vital links with film industries and its unique positioning at national and regional levels. In this regard, PIFF can be seen as a representative case study of film festivals in the Asia region more broadly as it demonstrates changing regional responses to economic and cultural globalisation. At the same time, however, PIFF remains a unique institution in terms of its self-determined construction of its regional identity and its distinctive relation to the fast growing Korean national film industry. By considering both typical and unique aspects of PIFF, the value of this research lies in its analysis of the diverse sides of contemporary film festivals such as, festivals' economic viability and their unique relations to national and regional film industries. Most importantly, this study also observes that film festivals in the global market are transforming their identities, roles and status to cope with a fast changing competitive festival landscape. This topic constitutes both the most exciting and difficult aspects of this research.

A final point to make in this Introduction is that this research on PIFF will hopefully prompt critical conversation between Western film festivals, which were always "centred" in academic discussions, and those non-Western film festivals which have recently begun to self-define themselves beyond their binary placement in the "periphery." As briefly reviewed above, the existing scholarship has centred film festivals in Western Europe, and so the debate on film festivals has not

specifically considered “other” festivals outside the West in a sustained and focused manner. In this respect, there is an urgent need to look at East Asian film festivals where national and regional film industries are rapidly emerging in the global film market. Research on PIFF can lead us to arrive at a new level of understanding concerning local, regional, and global interactions. This study will hopefully open up this critical dialogue between West and East via their respective film festivals.

Structure of the Thesis

This thesis comprises seven chapters. Chapter 1, “Film Festivals Between the National and the Transnational,” reviews the key theories and debates on film festivals by focusing on works by Stringer, Berry and Kim Soyoung, among others. Building upon the relatively little scholarly work currently available on this topic, the chapter argues that the critical conception of film festivals necessitates a multi-dimensional approach since the phenomenon of film festivals is closely bound up with cultural and socio-political transformations in the global economy. It also considers the urgent need to look at unexplored dimensions of film festivals in different locations so as to unravel the complexities of the notion of the national embedded within film festivals and the film festival circuit.

Following this conceptualisation of the theoretical framework of the study,

chapter 2, “Why Pusan?: The Political Economy of a Film Festival,” and chapter 3, “Making a Hub of Asian Cinema: A Regionalisation Strategy,” closely examine PIFF’s establishment in 1996 and this subsequent evolution across the following decade. The two chapters seek to demonstrate and understand how and why PIFF has constructed and used Asian identity as its most visible marketing strategy thus bringing to light a series of regional self-definition processes that the festival has utilised to differentiate itself from its regional counterparts in, for example, Hong Kong and Tokyo. While chapter 2 considers the successful establishment of PIFF in Pusan as the result of the motivated interests of different groups within the specific social, political and economic context of South Korea, chapter 3 shows how PIFF conceptualised and manipulated the notion of regionalisation so as to be competitive in the rapidly changing global film market. The chapter further explores PIFF’s subsequent changes and the evolution of its status and identity in relation to the local and global film industry by investigating two interlinked themes – the urban regeneration of the city of Pusan and an industrial drive to forge regional networks.

To further reveal the tensions between the national and the regional which appeared in PIFF’s formulation of regionalisation, chapter 4 and chapter 5 specifically examine festival programming. Chapter 4, “Negotiating a Place

Between Korean Cinema and Asian Cinema: Programming Politics,” analyses contemporary Korean films within the Opening and Panorama sections and argues that, while PIFF sought to serve as a showcase for Asian cinema by strongly evoking Asian identity, the festival equally strove to promote the national film industry by acting as a gateway to the global film market for those Korean films placed into prime sections.

In a similar manner to the way in which PIFF placed contemporary Korean and Asian cinema in programming, chapter 5, “Re-imagining the Past: Programming Retrospectives,” argues that PIFF strategically exploited this section to promote the festival and considers the mediation and negotiation that took place in the process of remapping classic Korean and Asian cinema. Focusing on three key Korean retrospectives, Korea’s New Wave, Kim Ki-young and Shin Sang-Ok, as well as selected Asian retrospectives, the chapter demonstrates how PIFF sought to play a key role in sanctioning old films made in Korea as a legitimate agent of memory. The festival highlighted old Asian films in these retrospectives in an attempt to justify the festival’s identity as a platform for Asian cinema. Both chapters therefore seek to illustrate how the programming of national and regional sections at PIFF is closely tied to the current political, economic and social interests of the festival and how the festival has negotiated its position within the changing

global/local festival landscape.

Chapter 6, “A Global Film Producer: The Pusan Promotion Plan,” uncovers a new function of festivals and investigates a new kind of interrelationship between the film festival and the three main sections of the film industries - production, exhibition and distribution. Focusing on the Pusan Promotion Plan, a project market in which new Asian feature film projects can seek co-financing and co-production partners, the chapter argues that film festivals today have begun to play a new role in the global film industry as “producer” by actively engaging with the production process as well as exhibition and distribution. This chapter proposes that PIFF’s regionalisation strategy was ultimately furthered and achieved by the PPP.

Finally, chapter 7, “Remapping Asian Cinema: The Tenth Anniversary in 2005,” examines PIFF’s ever increasing scale and scope by considering this year as the key moment when the festival’s development took a decisive turn by reinforcing its regional identity. The chapter illustrates PIFF’s focus on Asian identity by investigating key special events and programmes associated with the tenth anniversary festival on both industrial and critical levels. Whilst the Asian Film Industry Network (AFIN) and the Asian Film Market (AFM) show the way in which the festival accentuated its regional/industrial ties, special programmes such as Asian Pantheon, Remapping Asian Auteur Cinema 1 and Special Screening for

APEC Films further testify to PIFF's desire to act as a critical hub in the Asia region. Paying the particular attention to the Asian Film Academy (AFA), a new education programme which aimed to serve as a nodal point between the critical and industrial levels, this chapter argues that PIFF's strategic arrangement of diverse audience-friendly public events reflects the festival's awareness of its changing relationship with local audiences.

Note to Reader

All quotations from festival catalogues and newspaper reports in this thesis preserve original punctuation and spelling.³⁰

In referencing (endnotes and bibliography), this thesis uses the Documentary-Note Chicago Manual Style. In referring to an article from a journal, it uses a colon while books and chapters from books are referred to using a comma. Therefore, for instance, for two consecutive notes from the same source in citing an article from a journal, for example, the thesis uses a colon rather than a comma between "Ibid." and the page number. The following is an example:

1. Soyoung Kim, "Cine-mania or Cinephilia?: Film Festivals and the Identity Question," *UTS Review* vol.4, no 2. (1998):183.

2. Ibid.: 178.

However, in citing newspaper articles and non-academic journals, it uses a comma.

For example:

3. Dongjin Lee, "PIFF Opening," *Chosun Ilbo*, October 20, 1998, 18.

All Korean names in this thesis have been romanised according to the Revised Romanisation of Korean in 2000 by South Korea's Ministry of Culture and Tourism (e.g. *jaebol* not *chaebol*). Moreover, wherever possible, names of Korean film professionals (director, actor and producer etc.) and film titles follow the system used in *The Korean Film Database Book From 2000 to 2006* published by the Korean Film Council in 2006.³¹ Korean names are presented in Korean style, i.e. surname first, given name last, except in cases where individual authors have chosen to transliterate their name in Western form (i.e. surname last). This general rule of thumb encompasses the presentation of Chinese and Japanese names as well.

All English translations including comments, quotations and interviews taken from Korean-language material are my own unless otherwise specified.

Notes

¹ Hereafter abbreviated to PIFF. Following the revision of the Korean Romanisation system in 2000, “Pusan” became “Busan.” However, the festival committee has decided to retain “Pusan,” hence PIFF rather than BIFF. To avoid confusion, Pusan is used throughout the present thesis. However, Busan is used when referring to other relevant organisations that changed their names following the revision, such as the Busan Film Commission (BFC).

² The Pusan Promotion Plan (PPP) is a co-financing and co-production market for Asian films established in 1998 as a side bar event of the third PIFF. Each year the festival showcases a select number of Asian film projects in the development or production stages, giving out cash awards and providing an opportunity for these filmmakers to meet with prospective financiers. The PPP will be discussed in chapter 6.

³ This figure includes overseas guests. In the same year, the Tokyo Film Festival attracted around 116,000 people. John Krich, “Asia’s Upstart Film Festival,” *Asian Wall Street Journal*, April 20, 2000, 6.

⁴ As a political term, “region” usually means an integrated area beyond the nation-state, such as East Asia, Western Europe. Chapter 3 will explain this term in detail.

⁵ Jeeyoung Shin, “Globalisation and New Korean Cinema,” in *New Korean Cinema* eds. Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005), 54-55; Darcy Paquet, “The Korean Film Industry: 1992 to the Present” in *Ibid.*, 49.

⁶ Marijke de Valck, *Film Festivals: History and Theory of a European Phenomenon that Became a Global Network*, Ph.D. Thesis (Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam, 2005), 22.

⁷ Julian Stringer, *Regarding Film Festivals*, Ph.D. Thesis (Ann Arbor: UMI Dissertation Services, 2003), 11.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ See festival reports in *Framework* between 1976 -1983. “Pesaro 1: Festival Review,” Richard Allen, *Framework*, Issue 22/23, Autumn (1983): 74; “Italian Festivals,” Don Ranvaud, Issue 21 (1983): 54; “Rendezvous A Bruxelles,” Ian Christie, Issue 14, Spring (1981): 55; “Pesaro,” Paul Willemen, Summer (1981): 96-98; “Rotterdam,” Paul Willemen, Issue 20 (1983): 41-44.

¹¹ Julian Stringer, “Global Cities and the International Film Festival Economy,” in *Cinema and the City*, eds. Mark Shiel and Tony Fitzmaurice (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 139.

¹² *Ibid.* Stringer points out that just because a festival is internationally established and growing successful, it does not necessarily imply that the national film industry will follow suit.

¹³ Chris Berry, “Introducing ‘Mr. Monster’: Kim Ki-young and the Critical Economy of the Globalized Art-House Cinema,” in *Post-colonial Classics of Korean Cinema*, ed. Chungmoo Choi (Irvine: Korean Film Festival Committee at University of California, 1998), 44.

¹⁴ Berry, “From National Cinema to Cinema and the National: Chinese-language Cinema and Hou Hsiao-hsien’s ‘Taiwan Trilogy,’” in *Theorising National Cinema*, eds. Valentina Vitali and Paul Willemen (London: British Film Institute, 2006), 148.

¹⁵ Berry, 2006, 155.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 149.

¹⁷ Soyoung Kim, “‘Cine-mania or Cinephilia’: Film Festivals and the Identity Question,” *UTS Review (Cultural Studies Review)* vol.4, no 2. (1998): 183

¹⁸ Stringer, 2003, 12.

¹⁹ Martyn Hammersley, “The Myth of Research-based Practice: The Critical Case of Educational Inquiry,” *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, vol. 8, No. 4. (October, 2005): 324-8.

²⁰ Hammersley: 324

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² He warns that there is a danger of research being turned into “an ideological tool” by policymakers and reveals “the myth” of research-based practice.” That is, research based-practice is “the idea that had led to calls on the part of government for social and educational research to provide more evidence about which policies and practices *work*.” Hammersley: 324, 328

²³ Hammersley: 324.

²⁴ Peter Woods, “Collaborating in Historical Ethnography: Researching Critical Events in Education”, *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 7, 4 (1994): 311. 309-321

²⁵ See Bibliography in this thesis for a list of the interviewees.

²⁶ Thus each interview took at least two hours.

²⁷ Dorothy E. Smith, "Institutional Ethnography," in *Qualitative Research in Action*, ed. Tim May (London: Sage, 2002), 17-19.

²⁸ Smith, 2002, 28.

²⁹ One of the rare materials is *The 10th PIFF Documentary* DVD (D&D Media, b/w, 60min., 2005) that is not for sale. I was able to get this DVD title through an executive producer of this DVD, Dong-jin Oh, who previously worked for a film magazine *Film 2.0*.

³⁰ Although I have tried to provide the exact page number(s) of newspaper reports, this has not always been possible because of the complicated research processes.

³¹ *Korean Film Database Book From 2000 To 2006* (Seoul: Korean Film Council, 2006). The system used in this publication is identical with the rules of the Revised Romanisation in 2000. This book was published by the Korean Film Council in order to establish and promote consistent listing of Korean film titles and names of directors and actors in English.

Chapter 1

Contextualising Film Festivals: Between the National and the Transnational

This thesis examines one particular international film festival in South Korea, the Pusan International Film Festival, between the years 1996 and 2005. The purpose of this research is to elucidate how an individual film festival in a non-Western country has worked to position itself in the rapidly changing global film economy through a series of processes of self-definition, such as its Asian regionalisation strategy. With this aim in mind, this chapter critically reviews the key literature on film festivals and in doing so attempts to illustrate the framework of the current research.

Film festivals, as an academic topic, have historically remained a minority interest in Film Studies. Little scholarly work on film festivals was produced until the 1990s when the global spread of film festivals became increasingly visible. Furthermore, the majority of earlier studies on the film festival phenomenon have tended to focus on the high profile major film festivals in Europe, mapping their relation to European and/or Hollywood cinema in the Euro-American context. In particular, the Cannes Film Festival has been the most frequently studied subject and is often positioned as representative of all

the others.¹ Hence, film festivals outside of Europe and their precise role have rarely been explored. The absence of “other” voices in researching film festivals poses the question: can previous Euro-American-centred academic writing truly reflect the activities of the myriad other events across the world and the larger complexities of this global phenomenon? For instance, film festivals in East Asia which have been actively interacting with their national and regional film industries, have never before been critically documented in a sustained way. By investigating PIFF, this study aims to address this gap and mark a shift in the scholarly literature by responding to the urgent necessity for an empirical investigation of film festivals in “other” parts of the world as a dynamic, complex component of global film culture.

The theoretical framework of this study has four major themes. Firstly, the chapter will review work produced from a cross-cultural perspective as a dominant tendency of writings on film festivals produced before the late 1990s. This earlier critical attention to film festivals predominantly paid attention to the “discovery of new cinemas” at Western film festivals and allowed for the interpretation of new texts according to familiar paradigms of knowledge. This tendency in the literature will be explored by reviewing the discussions raised by the British film journal *Framework* and the work of Bill Nichols. By also

including the analysis of “festival films” raised by Julian Stringer, this discussion will move onto the consideration of the role of film festivals in trafficking national cinemas. The chapter will then juxtapose Dudley Andrew’s analysis of the meaning of the “new waves” at Western film festivals with Yingjin Zhang’s investigation of the international film circuit for Chinese cinema.

The second part of the chapter will review the major works on film festivals that most prominently emerged from the late 1990s. There were significant advances in theorising film festivals from various points of view in conjunction with debates around the phenomenon of globalisation current at the time. The critical conceptualisation of film festivals argued for by Thomas Elsaesser, Janet Harbord and Stringer will be synthesised. Of particular relevance to this thesis are their perspectives on how the national and the transnational are embedded within film festival discourses.

Thirdly, in order to situate the discussion in a specifically East Asian context, the chapter will also look at works by Chris Berry and Kim Soyung. It aims to illustrate how their work is specifically relevant to this research on PIFF and South Korean cinema. Their approach allows this study to move from predominantly Euro-American perspectives towards ground which has rarely

been explored. The chapter reviews Berry's work on the international art-house film circuit and South Korean cinema and his recent analysis of the Taiwan Trilogy. Korean scholar Kim Soyoung's perspective on South Korean film culture in the late 1990s is specifically referred to in this thesis as well. Considering the "cine-mania" (cinophilia) most directly visible in the proliferation of film festivals in this period, she argues that the film festival as a particular cultural practice became a privileged site wherein the specific dynamics of Korean society may be read.

Finally, this chapter carefully includes industrial perspectives on film festivals as observed by trade magazines and popular writings. The empirical writings by Kenneth Turan and Derek Elley, in particular, offer useful insights into ways of rethinking festival politics and its links with national and global film industries. Their industrial experiences and "insider knowledge" can broaden the critical conceptualisation of film festivals to include practical, industrial and economic dimensions. Their account is also helpful to support the empirically verified approach to PIFF that this research advances.

Overall, by reviewing the key studies on film festivals, this chapter aims to reveal both the difficulties as well as the significance of researching this subject. In order to more comprehensively understand the global culture surrounding the

phenomenon of film festivals, it is necessary for existing debates to broaden their scope of study and begin to look at film festivals which exist in contexts outside the standard Euro-American paradigm. In this context, my study of PIFF will specifically elaborate on some of the neglected dimensions of film festivals. It will show how PIFF's distinctive branding initiative has been achieved by the formulation of a regionalisation strategy and interrogate the complex relations between the festival and its national and regional film industries.

The Discovery of New Cinemas at Film Festivals

As mentioned, academic research on the topic of film festivals did not produce focused and sustained work until the 1990s. Within this earliest, insufficient literature, work on film festivals tended to focus on the issue of the "discovery of new cinemas." In Britain, from the middle of the 1970s, there was a debate on film festivals among writings by Paul Willemen, Don Ranvaud and Richard Allen in the film journal *Framework*.² Under the influence of the Pesaro Film Festival in Italy, which had introduced new cinema from Latin America, these critics began to recognise that film festivals provided opportunities to experience new cinemas originating from regions traditionally thought of as, "the Other." While this debate was the first serious attempt to acknowledge the site of film

festivals as a discursive location, this argument failed to further develop to a focused critical study of film festivals.

In this respect, it was Bill Nichols who drew critical attention to film festivals. In his 1994 article “Discovering Form, Inferring Meaning: New Cinemas and the Film Festival Circuit,” Nichols discusses the film festival experience and the interpretation of culturally unfamiliar films. Specifically looking at post-revolutionary Iranian films at the Toronto Film Festival, he claims that the film festival circuit places layers of new meaning on films through their festival circulation. What he attempts to explain is, to use his terminology, the processes of “discovery of the form” and “inferring [of] meaning” that occurs at festivals. As he notes:

Films from nations not previously regarded as prominent film-producing countries receive praise for their ability to transcend local issues and provincial tastes while simultaneously providing a window onto a different culture. We are invited to receive such films as evidence of artistic maturity - the work of directors ready to take their place within an international fraternity of *auteur* - and of a distinctive national culture - work that remains distinct from Hollywood-based norms both in style and theme [...] Most forms of cinematic expressivity are minimally present. We find no magical realism, no expressionism, surrealism, collage, or bold figures of montage. Melodramatic intensities, or excess, are extremely rare, far from constituting the type of contrapuntal *system* found in Sirk or Fassbinder. Point-of-view dynamics are usually weak to nonexistent. The great majority of scenes unfold in a third-person, long-take, long-shot, minimally edited style. There is only limited use of music and

even dialogue.³

This cross-cultural approach has been useful to explain how new texts circulate at film festivals. According to Nichols' account, film festivals become a crucial means of mediation in which new cinemas are encountered. Furthermore, he clearly recognises the difficulties in acknowledging an unfamiliar culture at festivals. Being aware that the position of festival-goers ("white, Western, middle class") limits their understanding of the authenticity of "their" culture, he further points out that "the pursuit of intimate knowledge and authenticity is illusory."⁴ As he writes:

This dialectic of knowing and forgetting, experiencing strangeness and recovering the familiar, knowing that they know we know that they calibrate their information to our preexisting assumptions as we watch this process of mutually orchestrated disclosure unfold, becomes a reward in itself.⁵

Nichols' account pinpoints the ways in which the cultural reception of an alien culture is achieved through the discovery processes operating at film festivals.

While Nichols explores the process of acknowledgement of new titles from (mostly, non-Western), "others" circulated at Western film festivals as aesthetic texts, my research is more concerned with how this particular process of discovery unfolds as the result of institutional intervention and can therefore be

manoeuvred at diverse levels. In other words, this study focuses on how a non-Western festival can engage with a self-conscious awareness in this “discovery of the form” and “inferring [of] meaning.” What happens when a non-Western film festival showcases its own local films to local and global audiences? Will the process of discovery operate differently? Can non-Western festivals and audiences take up an active position in this process?

To answer these questions, Nichols’ discussion needs to be further extended. What Nichols overlooks is that this process of interpretation of new texts at film festivals is dependent on a number of different contexts. In other words, as Stringer rightly points out, film festivals are *situated* sites.⁶ In this context, Nichols’ reading of the festival circuit leaves little room for explaining how films are shown at non-Western film festivals. This thesis attempts to address this problem by orienting the focus of the discussion in a different direction. It suggests that the cultural reception of specific films is dependent on a range of different contexts: different reception contexts; different exhibition circumstances; different interests and different agendas. For instance, the thesis suggests that the particular exhibition arrangements and subsequent reception histories of Korean cinema at its own film festival - PIFF - in South Korea is different from that which is likely to be experienced at Cannes or Tokyo.

Furthermore, the above commentaries draw attention to an important question: what kinds of films are seen as demonstrating “evidence of artistic maturity” if discovered on the festival circuit?⁷ Julian Stringer attempts to address this question by defining these films, what he terms “festival films” as a new film *genre*. Developing Fredric Jameson’s term, Stringer conceptualises a festival film as a film that is “never unspooled outside of festivals, then it truly does exist in festival limbo.”⁸ Significantly, he further emphasises that a film’s cultural reception can be changed by the workings and rhetorical manoeuvrings of the particular institutions involved in a film’s exhibition and distribution.⁹ As one of the first critical looks at film festivals with a sustained critical attitude, Stringer’s work marks an important stage in the integration of discourses around film festivals into our conception of what constitutes film festivals as an academic subject. What my own PhD is grounded on are his perceptive observations about such institutional activities which strategically attempt to frame the reception of films.

The process of discovering new cinemas at film festivals is also highlighted in a recent article by Dudley Andrew. Andrew attempts to reconsider the widespread use of the term “new wave” in its relation to the European film

festivals. He suggests “[c]ritics and festival programmers continue to invoke the term because the original New Wave inundated world cinema so decisively in the ’60s that a total renewal of the art seemed imminent.”¹⁰ Differentiating the second set of new cinemas from the first new waves such as the French *Nouvelle Vague* in the 1960s, he claims that the canon formation of new cinemas at film festivals was a consequence of critics and programmers’ desire to satisfy the needs of the European film festivals which sought to define new trends in cinema in order to show them to their audiences. As he writes:

As European art cinema was moribund, desperate festivals began looking elsewhere for signs of life. And life was found in what I call the Second Set of New Waves. By the early ’80s, as if sucked into a vacuum, came films from places never before thought of as cinematically interesting or viable: Mainland China, Senegal, Mali, Ireland, Taiwan, and Iran. This second set of waves is distinct from those of the 1960s not only in their provenance but in the way they functioned in a greatly changed international system.¹¹

On the one hand, Andrew’s analysis of the meaning of new waves in film festivals in Europe after the 1980s seems to simply reconfirm that those prestigious contemporary film festivals have continued to “discover” new cinemas from “Other” parts of the world. For this reason, this argument needs to be repositioned in a non-Western context. On the other hand, this observation about a second set of “new waves” indicates that the concept of new cinemas,

and discoveries thereof, has increasingly reinforced the idea of the national as an important marketing strategy of the films. Indeed, as Nichols alluded to earlier, “new” films, which are “discovered” by Western festivals, have tended to be conceptualised as representative of distinct national cinemas.

At this point, it is necessary to point the discussion in the “other” direction.

In his 2002 book *Screening China* in 2002, Yingjin Zhang critically analyses Western influences on Chinese film production - the Fifth Generation films - through the international film festival circuit.¹² Zhang is critical of how the particular pattern of western reception to Chinese cinema, especially through festival sites, has gradually determined national filmmaking trends in the People’s Republic of China. As he observes:

As far as film audiences are concerned, western fascination with Chinese cinema may also be explained in so-called “poetic” or “aesthetic” terms [...] If we examine those Chinese films that have won major international awards in recent years, we see a narrative pattern gradually taking shape. From Zhang Yimou’s *Red Sorghum* and *Ju Dou*, Ang Lee’s *The Wedding Banquet* and *Eat Drink Man Woman*, to Chen Kaige’s *Farewell My Concubine* and *Temptress Moon*, oriental *ars erotica* as a mystified entity is fixed at the very center of Western fascination.¹³

He further points out that these “favourable reviews at international film festivals” lead to the production of more “ethnographic” films, and that “the wide

distribution of such films is translated into their availability for classroom use and therefore influences the agenda of film studies, which in turn reinforces the status of these films as a dominant genre.”¹⁴ This reception process, which includes garnishing awards at international film festivals, had a huge impact on local Chinese filmmaking, not least by establishing some Chinese film directors as “brand names” recognisable to consumers in the West. However, he argues, the success of Chinese cinema at international film festivals did not result in a boost for the local Chinese film industry. Highlighting the importance of festival, to film production and the context of cultural politics, Zhang succinctly outlines how targeting the international film festival circuit is a marketing strategy to effectively get into the global film market.

Viewed from this angle, further questions are raised in relation to the study of PIFF: how is the recently growing interest in and popularity of Korean films different from that of Chinese cinema at western film festivals? What parallels exist between the success of Korean cinema at the global film festivals and the case of Chinese cinema in the early 1990s? Is the spotlight on Korean cinema just another case of the “discovery” by the West of a national cinema that has reached so-called “artistic maturity”? Or is it rather the successful achievement of another refined type of “ethnographic approach”? In attempting to answer

these questions, this thesis takes a different direction by precisely centring the discussion on PIFF. While Zhang focuses on Chinese cinema circulated and received through the international film festival circuit, this study does not specifically concern itself with the representation of Korean cinema at Western film festivals. Instead, the focal point of this thesis is to elucidate how an individual film festival in South Korea interacts with the global/local economy by navigating a series of processes of self-definition and self-positioning. By doing this, the thesis aims to broaden existing perceptions of film festivals by placing PIFF within a particular East Asian context.

The National and the Transnational

As illustrated above, the notion of “the national” in film and media studies has been closely bound up with the discourse of film festivals. A number of clear instances of the use of the national as a concept and category can be observed at international film festivals. This is because the historical emergence of festivals was closely aligned with regeneration projects focused at and on national levels in various European countries. Certainly, the origins of European film festivals such as Venice, Berlin and Cannes clearly show that festivals were created on the basis of national developments.¹⁵ It is widely believed that film festivals have

served as “a kind of parliament of national cinema” or an Olympics of films, as Thomas Elsaesser notes, comprised of host and participant nations.¹⁶ Does this mean that notions of the national still persist at film festivals despite the recent influx of transnational finance, technologies and the global circulation of media and transnational corporations? Indeed, many scholars have tried to address this complicated relationship between concepts of the national and film festivals.

Thomas Elsaesser, who examined how film festivals operate as a competition system among nations to explain the international circulation of New British Cinema in the 1980s, attempts to reframe and chronicle both the cultural and industrial dimensions of film festivals in European contexts in his recent publication *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood*.¹⁷ For Elsaesser, the film festival system is neither a form of Olympics nor a Parliament of delegates to the United Nations as he had once asserted. Instead, he claims that film festivals no longer operate upon “agreed, measurable standards of achievement.”¹⁸ Drawing upon a compendium of discourses, spreading out on all sides around film festivals, and originating in areas as diverse as creative industries, taste-making processes, branding strategies, globalisation and festival politics in major western film festivals, he outlines the cooperative and conflictual dynamics of film festivals operating within the texture of the

competitive global film festival landscape. Such a discussion contributes to providing a fuller view and revealing the hidden historical points of this field within the power relationships operating within Europe. According to Elsaesser, film festivals in Europe are the key to unpacking the political and cultural practices of European cinema. Depicting the historical vicissitudes of film festivals in Europe, he argues that the locations of film festivals have to be read “symptomatically in relation to their history, politics and ideology.”¹⁹ Overall, he attempts to conceptualise film festivals in Europe by focusing on “political consideration[s]” as one of the distinctive characteristics of film festivals.

It is noticeable that Elsaesser tries to encompass non-European contexts to explain European cinema’s renewed global position and linkages with other parts of the world. For example, he asserts that the importance of Pusan lies in its location outside of Europe and North America and he outlines that PIFF has become the “portal” for a first contact with other “new” Asian cinemas in the 1990s.²⁰ As he writes:

Pusan, the main film festival in South Korea, was also the result of a “political” gesture in that it began by copying the very successful HKIFF, and then subsequently played a major role in reviving Korean filmmaking as a national cinema. Yet for many Western visitors, put off by the sheer size of the Hong Kong festival, Pusan also became the portal for a first contact with the other “new” Asian cinemas in the 1990s.²¹

For Elsaesser, just as the Berlin Film Festival is clearly defined as resulting from political developments in the wake of the Cold War, Pusan in South Korea, taking place as it does in a divided nation in East Asia, is simply categorised as a political event. This perspective is problematic as it expunges from consideration a variety of factors that affect the establishment of a film festival in non-European areas. Political factors can only ever be one of the many complicated contexts around the establishment and evolution of Pusan, as will be further investigated in the following chapter. Overall, although Elsaesser attempts to reframe notions of the national within film festivals by looking at the diverse constituencies of film festivals, his analysis is so firmly centred in Europe as to render it insufficient to reflect film festivals outside Europe.

Another significant problem with his analysis is the absence of critical consideration of Eastern Europe. While he argues for an understanding of the close linkages between the film festival circuit and European cinema, film festivals and the cinematic backdrop in East and Central Europe are completely neglected. Within this context, Dina Iordanova's comprehensive study of the cinematic traditions and cultural politics of the Eastern European region, including Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovakia, is significant as

her work attempts to discover and develop a missing point in the study of film culture in Europe. In her most recent article, “Showdown of the Festivals: Clashing Entrepreneurships and Post-communist Management of Culture,” Iordanova examines how economic and cultural viability can play a role in the decline and rise of film festivals by providing an empirical study of two festivals in the mid 1990s from a regional rather than a national angle.²² She carefully looks at the particular case of the Karlovy Vary Film Festival in the Czech Republic. Since the Cold War, this festival, along with the Moscow Film Festival, has been one of the most important international venues within the former “Eastern Bloc.” However, its existence was recently put at risk by an attempt to replace it with a new festival in Prague, the capital city of the Czech Republic. Her original study not only provides fresh insight into this field but also raises fundamental questions about the current understanding of film festivals as located within a contradictory position at the intersection between art and commerce.

Spatial Effect, Media and Audience

Despite the different approaches to and analyses of film festivals discussed above, the authors’ collective work largely indicates that film festivals bring out

clusters of different issues, from national cinemas and transnationalism to local practices on industrial, cultural and political levels, which are overlapping and interlinked. Hence, the nature of festivals around the globe, which are intermingled with other different issues, necessitates a multi-dimensional approach to the study of film festivals. In other words, any mono-disciplinary approach cannot fully unpack the complexities and changing characteristics of the contemporary film festival phenomenon in a compelling way. In this context, certainly, discourses on film festivals have been prompted by the rise of the global circulation of media and dramatic transformations of technology within global capitalism. All major work seems to rely on theories of globalisation, in particular those of Arjun Appadurai, Manuel Castells and Saskia Sassen, which focus on conceptions of global cultural flows, space of flows and global cities, for example. This chapter will now identify their impact on the discussion about film festivals and will illustrate how these arguments are relevant to this thesis.

Although his work does not directly speak to the phenomenon of film festivals in particular, Arjun Appadurai's framework for exploring disjunctures and differences in the global cultural economy is useful in explaining the role of film festivals in the global economy. Appadurai argues that current global cultural flows "occur in and through the growing disjunctures among

ethnoscapes, technoscapes, financescapes, mediascapes, and ideoscapes.”²³

Appadurai’s account makes it clear that any discussion of film festivals should include an analysis of the disjunctures within and between these various “scapes,” not to mention other facets and locations of social, technological, economic, cultural, and political operations. This framework also helps to explore the changing networks and productions in East Asia in their global and local interactions. For example, PIFF’s reliance on a strategy of regionalisation for promoting the festival and positioning itself on the global stage is related to the political, economic and cultural changes in the region wrought by disjunctures in the global economy as theorised by Appadurai.

Janet Harbord attempts to conceptualise film festivals in the disjunctions between the festival as marketplace and as a forum of aesthetic evaluation. By drawing on globalisation discourses of “spatial effect” and “cultural flow” from Castells and Appadurai, Harbord describes film festival sites as a mixture of temporality and spatiality, which creates added value for films and constructs them as examples of “material hybridity.”²⁴ As she articulates:

The ‘network’ of global commerce creates linkages between sites, creating centres and peripheries, eclipsing other spaces altogether. More than the hybrid mixing of goods and cultures, the festival as marketplace provides an exemplary instance of how culture, and cultural flows, produce space as places of flows, in Castells’s terms.²⁵

Harbord's dissection of "spatiality" and "temporality" casts important questions on the discourse of film festivals. On the one hand, she underlines the significance of the spatial for understanding festival events wherein the conflicting and opposing values of commerce and art co-exist. On the other hand, her contextualisation of the temporal aspect of film festivals contributes to an explanation of how the hierarchical structure of the premiere system and cultural values are constituted. Viewed from this perspective, festivals effectively "enclave a film, seal it off from general release and, further, restrict it to circulation among and between festivals."²⁶

Harbord's investigation of the role of journalism and media at festival sites, which up until now had been relatively overlooked in this field, helps to extend the critical discussion to the cultural and industrial dimensions of festivals. For Harbord, film festivals can be perceived as a discursive but exclusive place which predominantly depends upon the particular mediating activities of journalism through which the meaning and value of film as text is reproduced at festivals sites.

However, Harbord's argument also raises questions. As she does not precisely define the journalism and media activities she is referencing, it is not possible to distinguish their different roles at festivals. Their role in the process

of adding value should be more specifically discussed. For instance, film critics who write for prestigious film journals and broadcasters who report on the appearance of Hollywood stars at festivals act as different kinds of mediators, constructing very different kinds of discourses. Additionally, as their importance at film festivals have grown over recent years, a hierarchical categorisation has been created for the accreditation of film journalists and media representatives.²⁷

In the wake of their increasing visibility at festivals, their activities seem to be increasingly institutionally controlled and negotiated. Although Harbord emphasises the close links between texts circulated at festivals and the role of journalism and the media as producer and mediator, such a link is not explicitly established through empirical research in her writings. How do the media specifically interact with film industries at the festivals?

Importantly, the performance of film festival participation in industrial terms becomes a crucial practice in the global film industry. For film industry professionals, including film critics, journalists for trade magazines, and sales agents and distributors, the process of festival participation - from registration, travelling to and attending exclusive screenings, parties and press conferences to activities of negotiating, purchasing and selling new titles - has become a significant part of industrial practices. Working practices in the industry are thus

also very much shaped to follow the annual festival calendar. Although this thesis does not substantially discuss the role of journalism and media in film festivals, it attempts to reflect this industrial dimension of the film festival experience by carefully considering different voices from the global and local press at PIFF.

Finally, one of the crucial limitations of Harbord's argument is the absence of any acknowledgement of the role of the festival audience at film festival sites. According to her analysis, film festival sites become an exclusive, limited space far from the public audience. By excluding the role of festival audiences who participate in and influence film festivals to varying degrees, her overall analysis remains theoretical and can operate only at a general level of explication. In this respect, Marjike de Valck's recent work is worth noting as she empirically constructs a complex argument for the relationship between festival audiences and cinephile culture at European film festivals.²⁸ De Valck attempts to understand the recent proliferation of film festivals by considering film festivals as sites of new practices of cinephilia. She casts light on the exploration of European film festivals by turning her focus from festival programmers in the 1970s, driven by cinephile passions and an ideology of political participation, to the festival director of the 1990s, who has become a professional cultural

entrepreneur managing the various constituencies of the festival network - a particular focus of interest that has been rarely examined in academic discourse on film festivals.²⁹ However, despite her emphasis on the significance of networks, the absence of non-European film festivals within these networks shows a crucial weakness and contradiction in her approach. The global phenomenon of film festivals and their multi-dimensional function cannot be explained without serious consideration of non-Western events.

Global Cities and Institutionalisation

Amongst existing work on film festivals, Julian Stringer's is most relevant to this thesis. His writings on diverse aspects of film festivals form one of the backbones of this study. Stringer's arguments perceptively map out many of the key roles of film festivals on a global scale by considering the spatial relationships and organisational logics, of festivals. His influential 2001 article "Global Cities and the International Film Festival Economy," introduced a new perspective into the discourse surrounding film festivals. Identifying the important relation between cities and the international film festival circuit in a "global space economy," he argues that cities are nodal points on the festival circuit.³⁰ Stringer redefines the widely used term "international film festival

circuit” by suggesting that it refers to “the existence of a socially produced space unto itself, a unique cultural arena that acts as a contact zone for the working-through of unevenly differentiated power relationships - not so much a parliament of national film industries as a series of diverse, sometimes competing, sometimes cooperating, public spheres.”³¹

It is significant that Stringer contextualises a critical link between international film festivals and global cities as this account enables the previous debates surrounding film festivals, which largely relied on the notion of the national, to move into a new context - cities in the global space economy. Mapping out the uneven power relationships between festivals and cities in historical and social contexts both in Europe and other parts of the world, Stringer further navigates the terrain comprised of the key roles of film festivals within the exhibition and distribution system, and he observes that “expansionism” and “a sense of stability” are crucial components of the recent film festival phenomenon. He also outlines a common strategy amongst many festivals to market and project a city’s own “festival image” within the global space economy.³² Importantly, what Stringer attempts to do is to further explicate the logic of film festivals, which he pursues by including in his interrogation different kinds of film festivals in different regions (such as film

festivals in East Asia), and to unravel the complexities of the film festival phenomenon beyond a limited Euro-American framework. He tries to avoid risks inherent in ignoring developments outside of the Euro-American paradigm by referring to diverse examples, such as Korea, India and Hong Kong, as he carefully navigates the broad, complex and heterogeneous landscapes which film festivals create.

From this perspective, it is important for this research on PIFF to more concretely discuss these diverse aspects of film festivals. This thesis examines how PIFF utilises its particular location - the city of Pusan - geopolitically, economically and culturally and it discusses how it has tried to link its distinctive festival image to the city's image in order to remain competitive in the global market. Over the past ten years, PIFF has self-consciously constituted its festival image as a representative of the region of Asia and dramatically expanded its scale, responding to the transformation of the national and the regional industries. Moreover, this study of PIFF aims to further develop Stringer's argument concerning the particular relationship between the film industry and film festivals. For instance, Stringer observes that just because a festival is internationally established and is becoming successful, this does not necessarily mean that its associated national film industry will follow suit.³³

However, an understanding of the particular relationship between industry and festival needs to be specifically developed as the evolution of PIFF is closely related to the fast-growing popularity of Korean films in the global economy.

Furthermore, Stringer's argument about the importance of cities as nodal points enables his analysis to include the larger context of transnational festival cultural politics beyond the national framework. However, this does not mean that the film festival system no longer operates according to concepts of the national. As Stringer points out, hierarchical relations between the centres (major European festivals) and the peripheries (the rest of the festivals in "other" parts of the world) still exist and power relationships at contemporary film festival sites are reinforced in different ways. This suggests that film festivals and notions of the national are interacting with each other in more complicated ways than previously imagined. Therefore, this topic should be reconsidered from a new direction. Bearing this in mind, this thesis attempts to approach this topic by specifically investigating, across subsequent chapters, the institutional workings which frame the exhibition, reception and production of films and their linkages with the national and regional film industries through consideration of PIFF's programming politics and film markets.

In this regard, Liz Czach's work on the Toronto Film Festival and the

Canadian film industry helps us to understand the relationship between a national industry and its associated festival.³⁴ Czach specifically argues that festival programming contributes to the formation of a national cinema by drawing on Pierre Bourdieu's idea of cultural capital - what she calls "critical capital"- by examining Canadian films at the Toronto Film Festival.³⁵ Her analysis offers opportunities to extend the discussion to other relevant factors that may influence the selection of particular national films, such as the role of festival programmers, awards and the premiere system, and the festival's interrelation with its national film industry. This thesis will explore these issues in detail as they relate to PIFF in chapter 4.

Discussions of the institutionalisation and the organisational working of film festivals within a global industry broadens perspectives on film festivals. For instance, Stringer's work on commercialism and film festivals in his "Raiding the Archive: Film Festivals and the Revival of Classic Hollywood" breaks new ground in this field. If Harbord identifies the conflicting and contradictory asymmetry of forces such as art and commerce at festival spaces, Stringer articulates how these two different forces work upon one another at particular festival sites in a compelling way. While his earlier argument pertaining to global cities and festivals focuses on the importance of the festival

circuit as an alternative exhibition venue for new titles, his later study reveals that the film festival also provides a significant location for displaying “old” films. Specifically, in this article he sharply points out the cooperative relationship between the marketing strategies and release timetables of Hollywood studios’ home video and DVD re-releases and the programming of the retrospective sections on American film at the London Film Festival between 1988 and 2001. Crucially, a key form of institutional engagement at the London Film Festival involves the presence of the Hollywood studios themselves.³⁶ In short, his research explores a neglected aspect of film festivals in relation to strategies for the articulation of memory.³⁷ Providing a detailed account of important distinctive features of film festivals, Stringer’s research opens up possibilities for a comparative study in this field. I explore how old Asian and Korean films are exhibited and received at PIFF Retrospective programmes in chapter 5.

Finally, while Stringer emphasises the growing role and impact of film festivals at the levels of exhibition and distribution, it is also necessary to explore another neglected function of film festivals, increasingly visible within the global film festival system: production. Film festivals now constitute a key location for the advance previewing of new films which are not yet produced but

will be completed in the near future. More and more festivals have started to create project film markets. For example, the Pusan Promotion Plan at PIFF and CineMart at Rotterdam have played a significant role in producing new films and branding them as their own products. In short, this aspect of film festivals underpins the increasingly interventionist role played by film festivals in the production sector of the global film market. This thesis will reveal this hidden, overlooked role, namely the festival as “global producer,” in detail and through empirical methodology in chapter 6.

Film Festivals in the East Asian Context

To provide a comprehensive reading of PIFF within the specifics of the East Asian context, this research critically refers to works by Chris Berry and Kim Soyoung. In his article “Introducing ‘Mr. Monster’: Kim Ki-young and the Critical Economy of the Globalized Art-House Cinema,” Berry discusses the function of the international film festival circuit and its critical standards. The premise of his argument is that the international film festival circuit operates on the basis of national cinemas and *auteurs*. He specifically looks at the case of Korean director Kim Ki-young, who received international recognition through the Retrospectives programme at PIFF in 1997. Pointing out that Korean cinema

had previously not been able to establish its own distinctive image as a national cinema which would enable it to differentiate itself from Japanese and Chinese cinema, Berry attempts to interrogate how notions of “excess” and “violence” have impeded Korean cinema’s international circulation. He suggests that for this circulation to increase it would be necessary for “a film or group of films to appear with characteristics which helped to establish a distinctive and appealing image as a new product, defined in national and *auteur* terms.”³⁸ What he proposes is that Kim Ki-young’s films exhibit a potential ability to break into the international film world and thereby establish a distinctive image for Korean cinema, as his films show a different kind of excess acceptable to international audiences, what Berry calls “analytic excess.”³⁹ According to Berry, Kim’s unique, distinctive style fits the critical organisation of the international art-house circuit which seeks films by *auteur* directors with a noticeable style and national distinctiveness.⁴⁰ Berry’s investigation of the relations between the international film festival circuit and specific Korean film texts, which had never previously been explored, allows us to further the discussion of film festivals and Korean cinema and effectively pinpoints the critical position of Korean cinema in the global art-house market in the 1990s.

This thesis takes Berry’s argument in a slightly different direction.

Although he presents the example of Kim Ki-young's reception at PIFF, rather than at Western film festivals, his observations are based on the reception of Western audiences who participated in this event. Hence, PIFF itself is not considered as the specific exhibition context within Berry's work. This means that culturally and locally specific arrangements, which can effect the reception of Kim's films in diverse ways, are ignored in his analysis. This question precisely indicates the difference between Berry's discussion and my approach in this thesis. This research is more concerned with understanding PIFF, rather than Korean cinema itself. It explores how PIFF attempts to frame the local, regional and global reception of Korean cinema by utilising various institutional arrangements such as programming politics and promotional strategies. More specifically, this thesis looks at PIFF as both a mediator of and a prime showcase for Korean cinema in the global market. In this context, the position of PIFF in this research is related to Berry's argument about Korean cinema in a different but interlinked way. In his article, Berry states:

For over a decade now, Korean filmmakers have targeted the film festival circuit, sending out retrospectives of new films in search of a "breakthrough" into the international film world. And for almost as long, international film critics have nominated Korean film as the next Asian cinema likely to make that breakthrough. But so far, it has not quite happened.⁴¹

A few years on after this observation was made, this situation has changed. A clear recognition of contemporary Korean cinema became globally visible in response to several works by Park Chan-wook, Kim Ki-duk and Hong Sang-soo among others. What this thesis attempts to explore is how PIFF is engaged with this new-found global attention on regional, national and international levels.

While Berry's argument in the abovementioned article is based on examining film festivals within a national framework, his recent analysis of Taiwanese cinema concerns the intersection of the national and the transnational. Although he does not discuss film festivals and Korean cinema specifically, Berry's reading of the "Taiwan Trilogy" is useful in understanding the complexities of the national and the transnational when researching PIFF and the film festival phenomenon in general. The point that Berry makes is that the national has not disappeared in the current post-national era but instead still exists within the forces of economic globalisation. He claims that "our current era seems to feature *both* rising economic globalisation and rising political nationalist tensions."⁴² Berry argues that Hou Hsiao hsien's Taiwan Trilogy invokes "a Chineseness that is trans-'national' in the sense of the nation-state, but national in the sense of a culture."⁴³ Reframing these films within the tensions operating within a national conjuncture, he suggests that the trilogy

articulates a vision that accommodates a tension between both belongings. His argument beckons us toward a larger framework within which “the national is no longer confined to the form of the territorial nation-state but is multiple, proliferating, contested, and overlapping.”⁴⁴

Following and developing Berry’s analysis, this thesis sees PIFF as positioned between the national and the transnational. It argues that these two contradictory but interlinked forces are often overlapping and in tension with each other as evidenced by PIFF. Modifying Berry’s framework, the thesis claims that film festivals can be a crucial means to reveal this tension between the national and the transnational. Film festivals have acted as a significant exhibition site for national cinemas and nationalistic agendas and increasingly their function has been multiplied and amplified on the national level. At the same time, however, the transnational is also permeated throughout the contemporary dynamics of film festivals as they operate within the forces of economic globalisation, transnational finance and technologies. Within this context, this thesis attempts to define PIFF as a discursive space wherein the contradictory ambivalences of the relationship between the national and the transnational appears in conjunction with the impact of economic and cultural globalisation in this region. For example, regionalisation and expansionism are

distinctive modalities apparent in PIFF that have accompanied the global spread of film festivals over the past decade. Furthermore these two tendencies demonstrate PIFF's dual goals - one towards the establishment of a regional identity and the other towards the promotion of the national film industry. Importantly, both of these goals are closely related to the transformation of national and regional film industries which have been searching for the "breakthrough" of their cultural products into the global film market.

Finally, this chapter reviews the work of Kim Soyoung who specifically argues for an understanding of film festival politics and questions of identity within the particular historical, socio-political situations that arose in conjunction with globalisation in South Korea. In her article "Cine-Mania or Cinephilia: Film Festivals and the Identity Question," Kim explains that the film festival phenomenon in Korea can be seen to have resulted from "cinephilia and globalphilia via an emphasis on local politics."⁴⁵ In her analysis, film festivals in Korea were widely seen as a key site of new social groups' cultural practice, wherein political concerns gave way to cinematic ones.⁴⁶ More concretely, she aligns the discussion of the film festival with the particular Korean context to address the tensions that arose between ideological and cultural tendencies invoked by *Segyehwa*, the official version of globalisation and economic

liberalisation launched with the establishment of the civil government in 1991.⁴⁷

As Kim writes:

The international-scale film festivals in particular thrive on the manifold manifestations of the global and the local and the national and the local. The local is a fragmented site contested by central and newly formed local governments. As noted above, film festival provides a condensed space where different interests and ideologies all come into play at the contested intersection of residual authoritarian and emergent democratic modes. The negotiations and compromises between the state, the corporations, the intellectuals and the audiences betray how the different social forces are contesting with one another in this historical conjuncture.⁴⁸

Kim's argument provides a crucial clue to understand the cultural politics of contemporary Korean society, especially to acknowledge the complicated structure of articulation working through the various film festivals, and to explore the issue of globalisation in Korea. For her, the whole organising process of the film festival, as a distinctive cultural process, unveils "blockages, grey areas, niches and points of compromises, as well as a possible direction towards alternative or oppositional platforms."⁴⁹ Her perceptive reflection on film festivals within the historical, socio-political context of Korea pioneered a critical analysis of non-Western film festivals that had not previously been systematically studied.

To properly read the phenomenon encompassed by the rise of film

festivals in Korea in the late 1990s, Kim identifies three categories of film festivals there: festivals driven by a combination of the participation of the state, local governments, corporations, and intellectuals; corporate-sponsored festivals; and festivals organized by activist groups. The focus of Kim's discussion in particular is on the third category; namely film festivals such as the Women's Film Human Rights Film Festival and the Queer Film Festival which have been organised by both established and relatively new activist groups. Also, it is important to understand the implication of the shift in Korean society and cultural politics that occurred in Korea between the 1980s and the 1990s, and which was a crucial moment for the nation in terms of its social formation and self-redefinition.

In a social formation where state intervention into every aspect of people's lives is still highly visible, even the second kind of festival needs to compromise with the power of the state exerted through censorship and exhibition laws. The third kind of festival relatively is autonomous from the state and the corporate sector. Therefore, it provides an interesting example of how the new social movement of the nineties is taking tentative steps away from the preceding eighties social movement that was pivoted on the labour movement.⁵⁰

Following her categorisation and mapping of film festivals layered onto an understanding of Korean cultural politics in the 1990s, Kim aptly points out that the importance of PIFF lies in its geopolitics.⁵¹ According to this argument, the

programme “A Window on Asia Cinema,” for example, is an attempt to locate the city of Pusan as a new focus for Asian cinema. In short, the particular regional identity promoted by this programme - in competition with its regional counterparts, the HKIFF, for instance - has been strategically developed to promote Asian identity in a way that will enable it to reach globally.⁵²

Overall, Kim’s argument about the particular social status accorded to Korea between the 1980s and the 1990s is perceptive and important to comprehensively understand the global phenomenon of film festivals not only within Korea but also across the world. Furthermore, although her work specifically deals with the different social/cultural realities in which Korean society is rooted, and their relations with film festivals in Korea, her critical analysis can open up constructive discussion about diverse aspects of other film festivals that are contradictory and in constant processes of negotiation with one another.

However, Kim’s argument also poses several questions. First, the categorisation that she originally developed needs to be updated and should be made to reflect the changing characteristics of film festivals at various levels. As there have been many subsequent rapid social, cultural and political shifts in Korea since her original investigation in the late 1990s, there are inherent

limitations in Kim's theory's ability to fully explain the current variety of film festivals with only these definitions and categorisations. For instance, the Women's Film Festival, which was a minor festival organised by feminist activists at the time of its launch in 1990s, has more recently, and within the space of only a few short years, become one of the major festivals in the country and is firmly positioned in Korea with stable sponsorship from the corporate sector and positive support from the general public. Despite receiving relatively less financial support, the Human Rights Film Festival has also posited itself as a different kind of public event with a clear festival identity. These two examples suggest that the initial identities and socio-political aims of these particular film festivals have become diluted over time as they became increasingly well-established in Korean society as a result of their reception by the public audience, funding bodies and the media.

Also problematically, although Kim briefly delineates the development and promotion of a particular vision of regional identity as a strategic concept of film festivals, using the particular vision of Asian identity pushed by PIFF as an example, the significance of regional frameworks in looking at film festivals is not profoundly explored in her argument. The critical recognition of "the regional" is vaguely implied and thus the critical concept of the regional which

is conflicting but interlinked with the national needs to be more fully explored to understand the ongoing transformation within film festivals and cultural industries in East Asia. The conceptualisation of the regional will be discussed in detail in chapter 3.

Despite these limitations, Kim's reading of film festivals has inspired this study to further develop her discussions within a larger context. Her innovative approach offers an accessible map to researchers navigating the complexities of film festivals in non-Western regions within many different sociocultural contexts. Just as Kim built an argument based on the significance of regional identity in festival politics in conjunction with globalisation, as exemplified by PIFF's vision of Asian identity, my study focuses on how this manifestation of regional identity has been initiated through PIFF's successful entry to the global economy over the past ten years. Kim was interested in thinking about film festivals organised by activist groups as a means to interrogate Korean society in the 1990s. Moreover, this thesis focuses on PIFF, the most rapidly expanding film festival in East Asia, which reflects the transformation not only of Korean society but also of the whole of the East Asian region as a social, industrial and cultural entity. In looking at PIFF in this context, this research does not limit its scope to Korea. Rather, to effectively elucidate the whole process of cultural

globalisation in this region, including Korea, the thesis is concerned with PIFF in the East Asian context of historical, political and cultural globalisation.

Industry and Politics

As a final part of this chapter, this section briefly reviews non-scholarly writings on film festivals. As discussed above, film festivals are intertwined with the transformation of film industries at local, regional and global levels. To comprehensively understand the complexities of the film festival phenomenon, this study will refer, across the thesis, to a number of reports and writings from non academic sources, mostly industry magazines such as *Variety*, *Hollywood Reporter* and Korean newspapers. Among these, texts by Kenneth Turan and Derek Elley deserve specific mention in order to place them more fully among the key arguments of the research.

Kenneth Turan's book, *Sundance to Sarajevo: Film Festivals and the World They Made*, is based on his own festival experiences as a reporter and jury member.⁵³ In particular, his inclusion of film festivals in the U.S. - Sundance and ShoWest - and his investigation of their relation to the Hollywood industry constitutes good understanding of the mechanics of the film festival circuit beyond the European context. Identifying film festivals as an industrial entity,

Turan categorises them according to a system of what he terms their festival agendas. His system consists of four kinds of agendas: business agendas (Cannes, Sundance and ShoWest); geopolitical agendas (Havana, Sarajevo and Midnight Sun); aesthetic agendas (Pordenone, Lone Pine and Telluride); and political agendas. This categorisation suggests a couple of important points in relation to this study. Above all, the scope of this system of categorisation is very limited. As this categorisation is dependent upon Turan's own experience, he includes only those festivals that he has actually attended. It is surprising not to find any film festival in East Asia, such as Hong Kong, Tokyo or PIFF, classified within Turan's system, especially considering that he has attended Cannes and other prestigious film festivals for more than ten years as an international press delegate. While this gap can be taken as indicative of the low standing of East Asian film festivals in discussions about festivals generally, Turan's lack of attention to the significance of festivals in East Asia indicates that his own observations are not able to reflect the complex multi-modality of the global film festival phenomenon.

In order to highlight the politics of film festivals in the East Asian context, Derek Elley's writings are particularly relevant to this study. Elley's work on film festivals and East Asian cinema is based on his journalistic work as a

specialist of East Asian cinema. He has written about a range of topics related to this thesis in both the international trade magazine *Variety* and the Korean film magazine *Cine21*.⁵⁴

It is noticeable that while many popular writings praised the success of Korean cinema at major Western film festivals from the late 1990s, Elley consistently pointed out the negative impact of the festival circuit on the Korean film industry. To illustrate this, he often utilises a comparative approach: PIFF versus the Hong Kong International Film Festival (HKIFF), the Korean film industry versus the Taiwanese film industry, and the relation of each of these to the international film festival circuit. Elley argues that as the HKIFF saw its high profile decline from the mid - 1980s on, when films produced in East Asia began to be premiered at Western film festivals, PIFF could encounter exactly the same danger. He also asserts that the Korean film industry should not assume that success on the festival circuit will alter the industry as a whole, and that it should bear in mind that the success of Taiwanese filmmakers in international film festivals was not connected to subsequent development in national filmmaking. However, his use of comparisons in looking at two very different cases (those of Korean cinema and Taiwanese cinema or HKIFF and PIFF) relies on too simplistic an assumption that all film festivals and all national film industries in

East Asia operate according to the same logic (in relation to their Western counterparts in particular) and therefore that their futures will be the same. Film industries in Korea, Hong Kong and Taiwan experience different specific situations and cannot be collectively analysed using any single perspective. On the other hand, as Elley's position as a Western-based critic with insider knowledge of the global film industry for twenty-five years suggests, his observations on the Korean film industry and international festival circuit do accurately reflect the way the Korean film industry perceives itself and responds to the reception it has received to date in the West. For example, Elley's article "Korea, Beware! Ten Myths about the International Film Festival Circuit" poignantly reveals the current trend apparent in the Korean film industry when films have been spotlighted at global film festivals.⁵⁵ As he writes:

The hard reality of all this is that stories in South Korea's media about this or that film attending a festival and winning prizes, or laudatory reviews by specialised critics in foreign media, gives a false impression of South Korean cinema's international standing. [...] For filmmakers: concentrate on your home and regional markets and treat the festival circuit as a bonus, not as an end in itself (beware the Taiwan experience!). For sales companies: accept the most suitable - not necessarily the most "prestigious" - invitation for a film, and let word of mouth and your impressively organised industry do the rest. And for South Korean audiences: continue supporting your own cinema to give it a strong financial basis of its own, rather than be dependant on the shifting tastes and local concerns of festival programmers and foreign buyers. Western filmmaking has never

looked East for "validation" and Korean cinema should not do the reverse. It's rich enough, inventive enough and exciting enough not to need it.⁵⁶

Overall, Turan's and Elley's writings, which are based on their experiences in the film industry and resultant "insider knowledge," can fill gaps which academic research can overlook. This thesis considers the global film industry as a practical, industrial and cultural practice.

Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed existing studies on festivals to elucidate the current critical context of film festivals and to illustrate the complexities involved in researching this topic. The strengths and limitations of existing studies necessitate the development of a new paradigm that can comprehensively reconceptualise film festivals held in non-Western contexts.

The critical conceptualisation of film festivals requires a multi-dimensional approach since the phenomenon of film festivals is closely bound up with cultural and socio-political transformations in the global economy. In a small but influential number of publications on festivals, the majority of commentators attempt to unravel the complexities of the notion of the national embedded within festivals and the festival circuit. The first part of this chapter

critically reviewed these key arguments, focusing on the work of Bill Nichols, Thomas Elsaesser, Julian Stringer and Janet Harbord. Their work demonstrates the interrelationship between festivals and the national in different ways: global networks; spatial economy; media event; programming politics; and cinephile culture.

If their collective work on film festivals opens up possibilities for a cross-cultural analysis of film festivals, offering a useful way of theorising the link between the festival phenomenon and the global economy, for a clear understanding of PIFF as it relates to other film festivals in East Asia, the chapter looked to Chris Berry and Kim Soyoung's work. Their writing provides useful insights into ways of exploring the role of the international film festival circuit and the identity of festivals within the specific political, industrial and economic conditions in Korea. It also helps to explain PIFF's regionalisation strategy as an attempt to establish itself as a distinctive "brand." The chapter has tried to illustrate how their studies are relevant to this research which explores PIFF's active self-positioning within rapidly changing global/local dynamics.

This thesis does not attempt to address the broad spectrum of complexities associated with film festivals all over the world, nor is it able to be fully representative of all East Asian film festivals. However, the chapter has sought

to broaden perspectives on the worldwide phenomenon of film festivals by placing the discussion of film festivals into a non-Western context. This is something that has long been overlooked in discussion of film festivals. Despite the growing critical attention being paid to film festivals and diverse approaches to their study, neglect of the specific social contexts of non-Western film festivals and the substantial absence of empirical approaches are crucial limitations found throughout existing film festival studies. In this respect, this thesis will extend recent academic work on film festivals and draw attention to unexplored aspects of this important subject.

Notes

- ¹ Kieron Corless and Chris Darke's recently published book also focuses on the politics of the Cannes Film Festival. *Cannes: Inside the World's Premier Film Festival* (London: Faber and Faber, 2007).
- ² See the Introduction.
- ³ Bill Nichols, "Discovering Form, Inferring Meaning: New Cinemas and the Film Festival Circuit," *Film Quarterly* 47. 3, Spring (1994):16, 21.
- ⁴ *Ibid.*: 20.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁶ Julian Stringer, "Global Cities and the International Film Festival Economy," in *Cinema and the City*, eds. Mark Shiel and Tony Fitzmaurice (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 137.
- ⁷ Nichols, 1994: 16.
- ⁸ He defines festival limbo as a strange cultural zone "between the heaven of international distribution and the hell of not making it to film festivals in the first place." Stringer, *Regarding Film Festivals*, Ph.D. Thesis (Ann Arbor: UMI Dissertation Services, 2003), 150-151.
- ⁹ Stringer, 2003, 198.
- ¹⁰ Dudley Andrew, "Waves of New Waves and the International Film Festival" in *Asia/Cinema/Network: Industry, Technology, and Film Culture*, The Tenth Pusan International Film Festival Symposium Programme Booklet (Pusan: the Tenth PIFF, 2005), 256.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*
- ¹² Yingjin Zhang, *Screening China: Critical Interventions, Cinematic Reconfigurations, and the Transnational Imaginary in Contemporary Chinese Cinema* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002), 33.
- ¹³ Zhang, 2002, 28.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 35.
- ¹⁵ Marjike de Valck discusses the international film festival circuit and cinephile culture based on her research on four major European film festivals in her PhD thesis. Marjike de Valck, *Film Festivals: History and Theory of a European Phenomenon that Became a Global Network*, Ph.D. Thesis (Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam, 2005).
- ¹⁶ Thomas Elsaesser, "Images for Sale: The 'New British Cinema,'" in *Fires Were Started: British Cinema and Thatcherism*, ed. Lester Friedman (London: UCL Press, 1993), 52-69.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁸ Thomas Elsaesser, *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005), 98.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 84.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, 84-85.
- ²² Dina Iordanova, "Showdown of the Festivals: Clashing Entrepreneurship and Post-Communist Management of Culture," *Film International*, vol.4. issue 23, October (2006): 36.
- ²³ Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 37.
- ²⁴ Janet Harbord, *Film Cultures* (London: Sage, 2002), 60.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, 60-61.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, 68.
- ²⁷ Marjike de Valck, 2005, 155. For further discussion of the role of the media in festivals, see De Valck 2005, 135-175.
- ²⁸ Marjike de Valck, "Drowning in Popcorn at the International Film Festival Rotterdam?: The Festival as a Multiplex of Cinephilia," in *Cinephilia: Movies. Love and Memory* eds. Marjike de Valck and Malte Hagener (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005), 97-109.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*
- ³⁰ Stringer, 2001, 139.
- ³¹ *Ibid.*, 138.
- ³² *Ibid.*
- ³³ *Ibid.*, 139.
- ³⁴ Liz Czach, "Film Festivals, Programming, and the Building of a National Cinema," *The Moving Image* 4.1 (2004): 82. [online] Available at: http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/the_moving_image/v004/4.1czach.html. (accessed September 19,

2006).

³⁵ Czach employs the term “critical capital” to refer to the value that a film accrues through its success on the festival circuit. For instance, a film’s critical capital is accrued and often determined through the film’s placement within the festival structure as well as through being screened at prestigious film festivals such as the Cannes Film Festival.

³⁶ Julian Stringer, “Raiding the Archive: Film Festivals and the Revival of Classic Hollywood,” in *Memory and Popular Film*, ed. Paul Grainge (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), 90.

³⁷ Stringer, 2003, 82.

³⁸ Chris Berry “Introducing ‘Mr. Monster’: Kim Ki-young and the Critical Economy of the Globalized Art-House Cinema,” in *Post-colonial Classics of Korean Cinema*, ed. Choi Choong-moo, 39-47. (Irvine: Korean Film Festival Committee at the University of California Press, 1998), 44.

³⁹ Berry, 1998, 42.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 46.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 40.

⁴² Chris Berry, “From National Cinema to Cinema and the National: Chinese-language Cinema and Hou Hsiao-hsien’s ‘Taiwan Trilogy’,” in *Theorising National Cinema*, eds. Valentina Vitali and Paul Willemsen (London: British Film Institute, 2006), 148. “Taiwan Trilogy” is composed of three films: *A City of Sadness* (1989), *The Puppetmaster* (1993), and *Good Men, Good Women* (1995).

⁴³ Berry, 2006, 155.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 149.

⁴⁵ Soyoung Kim, “‘Cine-mania or Cinephilia’: Film Festivals and the Identity Question,” *UTS Review (Cultural Studies Review)* vol. 4, no. 2. (1998):183.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*: 178.

⁴⁷ *Segyehwa* is the Korean term for globalisation, first formally introduced by President Kim Young Sam in 1994. *Segye* means “world” and *hwa* is “becoming” in Korean. President Kim’s *Segyehwa* campaign was an economically oriented project, focusing on equalising national development in every sector to the level attained by developed nations. Soyoung Kim, “Cine-mania or Cinephilia: Film Festivals and the Identity Question”: 185; Jeeyoung Shin, “Globalisation and New Korean Cinema,” in *New Korean Cinema*, eds. Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005), 54-55.

⁴⁸ Soyoung Kim: 176.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*: 175.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*:183.

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ Kenneth Turan, *Sundance to Sarajevo: Film Festivals and the World They Made* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002)

⁵⁴ Derek Elley, senior critic of *Variety*, has written about Korean films and film festivals based on his experience at numerous film festivals around the world. Interestingly, since 2002 he has been a regular contributor to the “International Journalist’s Club” in *Cine21*, the Korean weekly culture magazine, along with Darcy Paquet (*Screen International*), Stephen Cremin (Udine Far East Film Festival in Italy) and Adrien Gombeaud (*Positif*). Their writings have been translated into Korean for Korean readers. This is an interesting situation in Korea as this column has provided Korean readers and local film critics with a rare opportunity to acknowledge foreign critics’ perspectives on Korean cinema and film festivals on a regular basis.

⁵⁵ His account of ten “misunderstandings” of the international film circuit includes: Film festivals are truly international events; Winning a prize is the most important thing; Festival heads are experts in world cinema; Cannes is the ultimate pinnacle to aspire to; Cannes showcases the best of world cinema every year; Toronto and Sundance are the gateways to the North American market; Being in competition is the most important thing; The director knows best; South Korean cinema is “hot,” so the festival circuit is its oyster; Local success = festival invitations. Derek Elley, “Korea, Beware! Ten Myths about the International Film Festival Circuit,” *Cine21*, February 6, 2004. [online] Available at www.cine21.com. (accessed October 10, 2006).

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

Chapter 2

Why Pusan?: The Political Economy of a Film Festival

The previous chapter critically reviewed the existing literature on film festivals and emphasised the importance of empirical research to place the debate about film festivals into a non-Western context. As this thesis is an extended study of one individual international film festival in South Korea, this chapter looks at the history of the establishment of PIFF. By examining the socio-political factors surrounding its establishment, the chapter aims to demonstrate that PIFF's success should be understood as resulting from negotiation amongst divergent groups of people with very different interests but all operating within the specific social, political and economic circumstances of Korea during the period.

The first annual PIFF was inaugurated on September 13, 1996 in Pusan, South Korea's second largest city. With a focus on Asian films, this initial event attracted around 180,000 visitors, and screened 171 films from thirty-one countries over nine days.¹ Since this first unanticipated, overwhelming, qualitative and quantitative success, PIFF has gone on, in a relatively short period of time, to become the leading international film festival in the Asian region, even surpassing the Hong Kong International Film Festival (HKIFF), which for the previous twenty

years had been the top viewing forum for the latest Asian films.² Its rapid growth also threatened the position of the Tokyo International Film Festival, which has been categorised as an A-level festival.³ Being the first international film festival in South Korea, PIFF has achieved a firm position in the region both at the local and at the global levels.

Despite the significance of its success and the growing importance of the festival's role both locally and globally, there has been no in-depth academic attempt to examine how PIFF was established and what this means to Korean society and the Korean film industry as a whole. Rather, PIFF's success tends to be taken for granted as either a mere reflection of young Koreans' enthusiasm for cinema or as a natural consequence of the newly emerging Korean cinema in the global film market during the 1990s. Lacking sustained, verifiable research, however, these simplified assumptions have failed to fully explain the complexities of this particular phenomenon.

As many commentators have noted, a film festival is more than a mere site for the screening of films. It is a place of business, of marketing within a specific system of "institutional assumptions, priorities, and constraints."⁴ Each festival has a unique cultural policy background and organisers are motivated to establish it for specific reasons. For this reason, particularly in relation to the proliferation of

globally-scaled film festivals in South Korea, as Kim Soyoung aptly points out, investigating the establishment of film festivals in South Korea can cast a revealing light on Korean cultural politics in the 1990s.⁵ In her influential article “Cine-mania or Cinephilia: Film Festivals and the Identity Question,” Kim outlines four factors that have contributed to the rise of film festivals in South Korea. They consist of cine-mania, the Korean version of cinephilia; the enactment of a local self-government system; a shift in the site of Korean activism from the politico-economic to the cultural sphere; and the *Segyehwa* project as argued in the previous chapter.⁶ She further suggests that the prominence of international film festivals in Korea, such as PIFF, has emerged at a time of political and cultural rupture between two different periods. She explains that this phenomenon can be seen as resulting from “cinephilia and globalphilia via an emphasis on local politics.”⁷ In this regard, the in-depth examination of specific factors surrounding the establishment of PIFF can effectively hold a mirror up to the larger transformations of Korean society in the mid 1990s.

International film festivals have appeared to bring national film cultures into the world cinema system, attracting foreign guests to cities and revenue to national film industries.⁸ Julian Stringer argues that the growing importance of international film festivals should be understood in relation to the spatial economy of global

cities in the highly competitive global economy. Stringer claims that international festivals have become a solid component of today's global city as they help to boost the local economy and "rejuvenate the value of urban space through the mobilization of global interests."⁹ Moreover, to interrogate how each festival strategically positions itself within the uneven power differentiations of the global economy, he suggests that film festivals should be considered in their own locations, within their particular national context. As he states:

Pusan provides an interesting case study in that it has been self-consciously modelled (as a showcase for Asian cinema in the region) along the lines of the existing highly successful Hong Kong annual event. As Soyoung Kim has pointed out, Pusan is attempting to mobilize a sense of local identity around its festival as part of a wider initiative, on the part of Korea's newly inaugurated local governments, to challenge the legacy of the 'Seoul Republic', or the heavy industrialization of Seoul which proceeded on the whim of the authoritarian, centralized government regime of the 1980s. As such, the festival has sought to attract financial investments to the city, its beaches, and the Pusan Yachting Centre in Haundae, away from the national capital, Seoul. As such an example suggests, a particularly important question concerns the status of international film festivals in postcolonial societies, and particularly in postcolonial global cities.¹⁰

This observation suggests that film festivals such as PIFF, a non-Western one, can more clearly illustrate how film festivals interact with other political, social and economic factors to build up a distinctive festival identity and to survive both local shifts and the increasingly competitive global economy. From this perspective, in

order to analyse Pusan's case, this chapter probes where and how PIFF was established. It also identifies some of the leading actors in the political, economic and social situation in South Korea at the time. As the first international-scale film festival in the history of South Korea, how and why was Pusan chosen as the host city from among other possibilities in 1996? How did PIFF reconcile the tension between the state and local authorities driven by a decentralisation policy? How did PIFF benefit from the particular conditions in Korea during this negotiation process? Finally, how does the successful establishment of PIFF help us understand the various facets of interaction between the local and the national?

In answering such questions, this chapter is divided into two parts and explores some of the crucial factors in political economic terms. Part 1 introduces information specific to the Korean context in order to aid the reader to develop a better understanding of the complex processes surrounding the establishment of PIFF. First, the chapter traces the Korean film industry's evolution, focusing on the 1980s and the specific sociopolitical context in Korea at the time. In doing so it aims to show how the Korean film industry has been largely dependent on sociopolitical shifts in Korea. Second, it moves on to explore the particular historical backdrop of the city of Pusan in relation to Japanese colonization and the Korean War. By looking at the Korean film industry and Pusan from a historical

perspective, the chapter aims to illuminate how the establishment of PIFF is intrinsically related to the politico-economic transformation of Korean society which itself was intimately bound up in processes of compressed industrialisation and the subsequent state-led drive towards globalisation. Bearing this situation in mind, it will be argued that while the enactment of a local self-government system is a key element prompting PIFF's establishment, the intra-provincial conflict (Korean regionalism) between *Yeongnam* and *Honam* also supported its establishment.¹¹ Lastly, it will be shown that the successful inauguration of PIFF benefited from a vacuum period in the national government in the late 1990s. Formed at a juncture of two different periods, specifically two governing regimes, PIFF's establishment was propelled by the particular social atmosphere at the time which, driven by compressed industrialisation and *Segyehwa*, encouraged local initiatives.¹²

Part 2 focuses on the specific processes involved in establishing the first event in the mid-1990s. First, the chapter unearths the key roles that founding members played in the process of negotiating different local and national interests around the time of inauguration. The second part of the chapter investigates the founding members' efforts in reshaping Pusan as "a city of cinema" as well as the different motivations the local authorities and local entrepreneurs brought to their

involvement with PIFF. In doing so, it intends to expose the complex constitution of three elements: the distinctive structure used in organising the festival; the different roles played by members of the founding group; and the particular local conditions in Pusan which necessitated compromise along the way. Second, it interrogates how local commercial forces have responded to the establishment of the festival in their city. Third, Part 2 presents the ways in which PIFF has negotiated state regulations such as censorship and the banning of Japanese films. Rather than being restricted by these thorny issues, the PIFF committee has utilised these regulations as a means to effectively promote the event. Thus, the general argument presented is that PIFF, as it is currently constituted, is the result of an ongoing process of negotiation and renegotiation of its position and identity between the local and the national. Hence, the establishment of PIFF should be understood within the context of the multitude of factors which have contributed to the event itself and the transformation of the Korean film industry as a whole.

Part 1

The Korean Film Industry before the 1990s

The development of the Korean film industry is inseparable from the political,

social and economic situation of contemporary Korean society. Despite a history of colonization, war and economic recovery, Korea - as a nation-state - has remained a “blank and unimagined space” for the West.¹³ In a similar vein, Korean cinema was virtually unseen outside Korea until very recently. This was partly because the vast majority of Korea’s early film footage was destroyed either during the period of Japanese colonization (1910 - 1945) or the subsequent Korean War (1950 - 1953). Censorship is another key factor that inhibited the local evolution of Korean cinema as well as its ability to garner global attention. During the Japanese occupation, censorship and economic restrictions on the film industry severely hampered indigenous film production.¹⁴

The Korean War divided the country into South and North Korea along the 38th parallel. Subsequent to the military coup in South Korea in 1961, the government of President Park Chung Hee fused severe political oppression with unrestrained economic growth. Until the 1980s, this right-wing military regime enforced a strict political and ideological agenda that stifled the film industry. For example, President Park introduced the 1962 Motion Picture Law to keep the film industry under tight control.¹⁵ As a result, the industry developed slowly and exhibited a general lack of vitality during the 1970s and early 1980s, even though the regime founded the Korean Motion Picture Promotion Corporation (KMPPC)

and the Korean Film Archive (KOFA) to revitalise the industry in the early 1970s.

The Motion Picture Law was revised several times but government intervention continued to cripple film production.

Meanwhile, the post-war industrialisation drive by the military regime was accompanied by heavy centralisation in Seoul. This unbalanced regional policy was developed to mirror the Japanese strategy of concentrating resources on limited land in order to organise and manage industries within the space constraints presented by the geography of Korea.¹⁶ In line with this strategy, the regime created industrial clusters mostly in the outskirts of Seoul and the Southeastern provinces in the 1970s. Rapid economic growth was maintained by policies requiring the suppression of the most basic civil and labour rights. An opposition movement emerged, initially led by university students and intellectuals, which soon came to emphasise the *Minjung*, that is, working class Koreans.¹⁷ After Park's assassination in 1979, the savage suppression of the Gwangju Uprising brought *Minjung* to the forefront of the opposition. Therefore, the Gwangju Uprising possesses potent historical meaning within South Korean society.¹⁸ It is also highly significant for the Korean film industry as it is from this generation of students, those who were involved in or witnessed the uprising, that some of Korea's most influential contemporary film directors have emerged.¹⁹ Park Kwang-su's film *Chilsu and Mansu* (1988) and

Jang Sun-woo's *A Petal* (1996), for example, reflect the political and social issues that dominated this period. Gwangju, the regional capital of the southwestern province (Honam), came to signify "resistance" and left-wing politics.²⁰ Conversely, Pusan, the regional capital of the Yeongnam Province, became associated with privilege and right-wing politics in the popular imagination.

Throughout the 1980s, the government gradually eased the laws governing the production and release of films, partly in an attempt to bring the 1988 Olympic Games to Seoul. In 1988, the Film Act²¹ finally abolished the quota system and established the "right to artistic freedom," by enabling a diverse range of films to be produced and by officially removing political censorship of film content.²² Numerous small production companies thus began operating without official permission from the state and began to produce films. In these ways, the status of the Korean film industry has been enormously influenced by political and social turbulence in Korean society.

A History of Pusan

Mark Jancovich suggests that to fully understand a particular city, its character, history and location "within the global relations of economic, political and cultural power" must be taken into account.²³ As Jancovich states:

The spatial organisation of social relations therefore means that one must be careful about how one envisions place. Instead of autonomous and authentic sites of meaning, every place is defined through its relation to other places. [...] The identities of places are therefore both mobile and multiple. They are inevitably composed of internal conflicts and contradictions, and hence there are competing meanings and definitions of any place as different social groups struggle over it. In other words, any place will be experienced differently by different social groups and will inevitably change over time.²⁴

These observations indicate that to better understand the establishment of PIFF in the Korean context, it is essential to scrutinise the diverse narratives surrounding Pusan. It also proves helpful to analyse how these narratives reflect Pusan's unique positioning within a web of political and socio-economic relations and local, national and global factors. As a port city in the Southern part of Korea, Pusan was, for centuries, not considered a culturally favoured destination. While it has a politically privileged right-wing representation, as will be argued, it also has the flawed image often associated with a heavily industrialised port city. Bearing in mind the negative image and perception of the city, it is worth questioning how Pusan, as a post-colonial global city and a non-capital city in a divided nation, managed to host the first international film festival in Korea in 1996.

Historically, the geographic significance of Pusan has grown in importance along two dimensions: its relationship with the outside world, especially with

neighbouring Japan, and its relationship with its southwestern counterpart in Korea, Gwangju. Specifically, throughout the colonization period, Pusan emerged as an important place from the Japanese point of view and it grew significantly in size, as it became the gateway from both Japan and the Western world to Korea. In fact, as Pusan faces Japan, for centuries its geographical position inspired frequent attacks from the neighbouring Japanese, who have made a habit of invading and terrorising the peninsula.²⁵ In contrast to Japan, which modernised rapidly during the nineteenth century, Korea sealed itself off from the rest of the world despite western pressure to engage.²⁶ In 1876, however, the Japanese forced the Pusan port to open for trade. In 1904, Japan began building a railway north to transport troops to fight the Russians and it annexed Korea in 1910. During the next decade, the Japanese built wharfs and modernised the port to aid their northwards expansion. It was not until the end of the Pacific War in 1945, that Korea again achieved its independence.

The geopolitical importance of Pusan continued after Japan was defeated in the Second World War. In 1950, the Korean War broke out and Seoul was occupied. During the war, Pusan became the temporary South Korean capital and the last southern defensive position against North Korea. As the second largest city, with a population of over four million, Pusan was South Korea's principal port and continued to dominate the export trade, with more than half of all overseas

shipments passing through it. In this context, the position and meaning of Pusan changed. In short, it becomes apparent that as the role Pusan, as a port city, played geographically, industrially and strategically has changed, the importance of the meanings associated with the city have also shifted.

However, although Pusan was the second largest city in the country and its geopolitical importance was growing, Seoul, the capital of Korea, has long been extremely central in every sector of Korean society. Korean socialist Kang Myung-goo succinctly outlines the character of centralisation in Korea. He states:

Historical experiences of powerful centralization, colonialism, and the state-led rapid economic growth, all have contributed to the enduring impact on the formation of a highly centralised state.²⁷

It is most apparent how Pusan was perceived within this view when, for example, several meetings at the governmental level took place to discuss which city should host a planned new film festival in the early 1990s.²⁸ At those meetings, Pusan was not considered a potential candidate at all. Instead, Seoul and Jeju Island - Korea's most famous resort - were prioritized as potential candidates mainly because of the potential benefits of investment and tourism. Under those conditions, several questions can be raised, such as: how was Pusan chosen from among other cities which may have initially been more obvious choices and which groups helped make this happen? The following discussion attempts to address these questions. It will

look at the particular regional issues unique to Korea in conjunction with debates around the condensed localisation and globalisation drive (namely *Segyehwa*) at the time of the shift between the two regimes.

Inter-Provincial Relations in Korea and PIFF

The various dimensions – political, economical, and emotional – of the “regional issue” (*jiyeok munje*) in South Korea have been among the most debated topics in the country’s recent history. This is due to this issue’s close relationship with the contemporary political, economic and cultural hierarchy in South Korea. Regional rivalries, more precisely the conflict and discrimination between Honam and Yeongnam resulting from differences in economic development and a regionally based party system, are constantly pointed to as being peculiarly extreme in South Korea. Some of the implications of this strong regional sentiment are expressed by

Kim Wang-Bae:

Although *jiyeok gamjeong* [*sic*] is substantively different from racial discrimination in multiethnic societies, in the context of South Korea’s ethnic homogeneity, regional discrimination exhibits comparable traits.²⁹

Kang Myung-goo also describes Korean regionalism as “a stepchild of centralised authoritarian development which has taken an additional aspect of territorial management by the state.”³⁰ For example, in 1987, when the two democratic party

leaders Kim Young-Sam and Kim Dae Jung ran simultaneously for the presidency, their rivalry was translated into an extreme inter-regional antagonism between their respective home regions (Yeongnam vs. Honam) which ended up splitting the democratic vote and allowing the election of former military general Roh Tae-Woo instead.

The unbalanced policy included a national and international transportation infrastructure, such as highways and port development. A modern expressway and transportation corridor was constructed, linking Seoul to Pusan via Daejeon and Daegu. This set the tone for a regional transportation plan that developed along a specific spatial pattern, connecting on one end Seoul, the capital, and at the other Pusan, the gateway port city to Japan and the Pacific. As a result, the clustering of industries in Korea was organised along the development corridor linking Seoul and Pusan, a city located at the tip of Southeast Korea. This led to a bipolar fixation of heavy industrial clusters in the southeast region counter-balancing a similar concentration in the Seoul metropolitan area.

In addition to this uneven development in the industrial infrastructure, another crucial factor that helped win Pusan the festival may be its regional and political importance. As the regional capital of the Yeongnam Province, it produced three presidents, Park Chung Hee, Chun Doo Hwan and Roh Tae Woo. As noted

above, the political environment had had a tremendous impact on every sector of Korean society, particularly during the military dictatorship from 1961 to 1992. Thus, Yeongnam and Honam experienced massive disparities. The aftermath of the Gwangju Uprising in 1980 split the already partitioned nation in half, triggering “[I]nter-regional hostility and subsequently imbuing the psyche of Cholla citizens who felt that they had suffered from unfair treatment.”³¹ Although political situations have shifted since this historical tragedy and there have been various endeavours to resolve the trauma, this regional conflict still remains in contemporary Korean society. It is most evident, for example, when it comes to election behaviour. The outcome of most presidential and parliamentary elections still tends to be determined by inter-regional partitioning of the popular vote. The overwhelming majority of voters support candidates and political parties related to their particular region of origin. As a result, some fundamental issues of social and economic policy-making have been trivialised.³²

Despite the administrative reforms in 1994 which attempted to distribute power more equally between the provinces and local communities, the residual effects of the historical favouring and political clout of Pusan were hidden factors which helped the relatively smooth launch of the international cultural event there.³³ Culture alone was clearly not enough as the case of Jeonju city shows. Located in

the Honam, Jeonju had a historical reputation as a home of traditional art and culture. But the city did not factor in any serious discussions about the establishment of an international film festival. This was because it lacked infrastructure, capital, public attention and political clout.³⁴

A Transitional Vacuum Period: A Post-industrialization Symptom and PIFF

While understanding the historical and political backdrop of Pusan in the national context is vital to understanding the inauguration of PIFF, it is also important to remember that PIFF launched and developed between two significantly different periods in the country's history. Kim Soyoung pays attention to this transitional period and attempts to explain the reasons why many film festivals suddenly emerged in Korea from the mid-1990s. As she points out, this was when Korean society was experiencing the politico-economic restructuring process driven by *Segyehwa*. There was also a rupture and aperture as “different interests and ideologies all came into play at the contested intersection of residual authoritarian and emergent democratic modes.”³⁵ In the wake of the formerly powerful labour movement's decline during the 1980s, political and social activities faced a new climate in the 1990s. Furthermore, as she emphasises, young people's desire for cinema had become a much discussed topic. Therefore, film festivals were widely

seen as a key site of new social groups' cultural practice, as political concerns gave way to cinematic ones.³⁶ From this point of view, the late 1990s in Korea can be defined as a contested space and time.

Additionally, alongside the compressed industrialisation and the subsequent drive towards globalisation that occurred during this transition period, there was a pervasive pessimism in Korean society. This psychological and emotional mood was prevalent due to the bureaucratic governance system of the civilian government and the collapse of vital components of infrastructure such as the Seongsu Grand Bridge (1994) and the Samping Department Store (1995) in downtown Seoul. This pessimism became even more pervasive when the subsequent economic crisis followed.³⁷ In his article "Compressed Modernity and its Discontents: South Korean Society in Transition," Chang Kyung-Sup states that in the wake of these collapses, "a grave society-wide pessimism" about renewed long term economic and social development was haunting South Koreans at the time.³⁸ Chang further asserts that Koreans' sense of compressed modernity seemed to be a "sober awakening" to the ramifications of their miracle of achieving over a mere few decades what took Westerners two or three centuries.³⁹ One of the consequences of such a hurried economy-centred approach turns out to be a highly collapse-prone economic, political and social system which was established only at severe costs

and risks. As he describes:

The accident scenes described by witnesses reminded South Koreans of those *Die Hard*-type Hollywood movies. Additional shocking calamities, such as severe underground gas explosions, huge oil spills from stranded super tanks and train derailings, all on unprecedentedly large scales and within a short period, aggravated South Koreans' fear that their lives are under constant threat of fatal accidents of one kind or another.⁴⁰

Moreover, intellectuals and grassroots citizens felt deeply betrayed by civilian governments as they had expected some clear transition from a military dictatorial political system to a civilian democratically-elected one. However, they were let down in their expectations as many undemocratic attitudes and practices plagued former "democracy fighters" once in government.⁴¹ For example, in the cultural arena, due to the legacy of forced state-led modernization, indigenous or traditional culture had been neglected in favour of opening up venues for the importation of Western culture. Importantly, it was before Kim Young-Sam's political bankruptcy and the national financial collapse that South Koreans began to feel the structural pitfalls and dangers of their economically-driven compressed modernity.⁴²

Therefore, it is evident that PIFF developed at a crucial juncture. Its establishment came during a transitional and turbulent period for every sector of Korean society. This was just after an economic crisis, a change of government and a collapse in buildings and self-confidence. Yet, it was also a time when the state-

led drive towards economic globalisation was in full flow and when more autonomy was being handed to local governments under a new policy of self-governance.

During this transitional period, it was far from clear that the establishment of PIFF would be a popular move on a national and local level. Importantly, however, as stated above, the political and social focus moved on to the cultural sector. In addition, local governments were keen to host cultural events as a means of strengthening a sense of local identity. The shift from pessimism about national politics towards optimism within the local community was encouraged by the local media as well as by municipal governments. For example, ahead of the inauguration of PIFF in Pusan, the local press conveyed a powerful sense of optimism and encouraged local communities to pay attention to this new cultural event. As Jancovich claims, “the local press is central to the production of local ‘imagined communities’ as much as the national press is central to the ‘imagined communities’ of the nation.”⁴³ Thus, a turnaround which had been driven by the upsurge of local enthusiasm triggered the inauguration of this cultural event in the community. In other words, PIFF grew out of a desire among the local community for wider recognition of Pusan. It was a branding exercise, promoted by the municipal government, the local media, and of course, the festival organisers.

Part 2

PIFF: Between the Local and the National

As discussed in Part 1, there was a mixture of historical, political and economic situations articulated in a particular Korean context that lay behind the establishment of PIFF. Alongside those broader factors, however, it is necessary to examine in detail the specific processes through which the festival was actually developed. While the establishment of PIFF was largely prompted by the intersection of several political, economic and social conditions, the festival also had to negotiate between the central and the local government. This part of the chapter focuses on the diverse characteristics of the founding committee and argues that a compromise between them was facilitated by a distinctive organising structure that clearly delineated the roles of individual members. To ensure a strong degree of independence from local and state government, committee members gave themselves a strong policymaking role in all decisions regarding the structure of the festival.

As illustrated above, throughout the 1990s, a rapid social transformation was affecting every part of South Korea. Residual authoritarian and emergent democratic interests and ideologies converged in the establishment of film

festivals.⁴⁴ In this context, the organising processes illustrate the complex ways in which groups with local power and decision-making powers negotiate and struggle with one another.

In this shifting period in Korea, reduced financial support from the central government enabled PIFF to be put under less pressure from the Seoul-based political bureaucracy than might previously have been the case. As all festivals face economic pressures, PIFF's survival was dependent on both local and national subsidies. However, as a result of the enactment of the local self-government system, the central government only provided around USD 300,000, less than 20 percent of the annual budget for the first festival.⁴⁵

As discussed, the 1990s saw a shift away from the authoritarian military dictatorship towards a democratic government. Despite the civilian government's ambitious decentralisation policy, local governments and civil society were still extremely weak in comparison to the strong central government, with which local governments continued to exhibit a significant dependency relationship.⁴⁶ Outside of the scant financial support from the central government, the festival faced a range of problems such as administrative management and a lack of media savvy. However, instead of falling apart as a result of meagre funding from the central government, the benefit of this situation was that it enabled a certain autonomy to

be maintained.

On top of relations with the central government, there was a series of issues to resolve in relation to local concerns. For instance, the fact that only a few members of the founding group were originally from Pusan while the majority were from Seoul could have given rise to some resistance from the local community. How were the founders able to negotiate the tensions between local and national interests?

The official launch of the PIFF Committee was announced in February 1996 in Pusan. The organising body was divided into two parts: the Organising Committee and the Executive Committee. Whilst the Executive Committee consisted of film intellectuals, professors and local media executives, the Organising Committee was mainly composed of local government officials, representatives of local business, theatre owners, and hotel owners in Pusan. This division was intended to facilitate arbitration between the various local interests. Whilst the Executive Committee was in charge of envisioning the festival identity, programming and recruiting staff, the Organising Committee was responsible for financial affairs. In this structure, the central decision-making power was in the Executive Committee. The relatively smooth process of negotiation was partly attributable to the well-organised distribution and balance of roles played by the

local and non-local founding members. For example, Kim Dong-Ho, the festival director and member of the Executive Committee, who had specialised in cultural policy for many years in the government in Seoul, played a crucial role in mediating conflict and tension between central and local interests. At the same time, natives from Pusan concentrated on resolving locally-related issues, such as negotiating resistance from local business people and encouraging “local spirit.” This clear role division was maintained throughout the life of the festival and enabled PIFF to prevent any extreme conflict in spite of differences in perception between different parties about the role and aims of the festival. This reciprocal relationship between film industry insiders and local government officials differentiated PIFF from other festivals in Korea as many other festivals, including Puchon and Jeonju, failed to build cooperative relationships with their respective local governments.⁴⁷

However, different components of the power structure perceived PIFF in different ways. One example of this is worth commenting on in more specific detail in order to expose the complicated relationships the festival developed with many of those in power. It is a little known fact that the city government had initially planned PIFF as a temporary event. Inspired by the huge success of the 1988 Olympic Games in Seoul, the *Segyehwa* drive and the inauguration of the local government, the Pusan city government sought to host international events. After a

successful bid to host the 2002 Asian Games in May 1995 as the first international sporting event held in the city, a newly formed Pusan city government wished to generate a new, non-industrial image for the city, and sought to realise this aim in part through organising an event to precede the Games. Significantly, the Pusan government's desire to promote a new East Asian identity for Pusan was reflected in the festival committee's Northeast Asia-focused programming. However, while the founding PIFF members had been preparing for the event since mid-1995 and waiting for a firm confirmation from the local government regarding it as an annual event since that time, the local government did not give a definite answer until the end of that year. Before the official announcement on February 13, 1996, one major local newspaper reported, "Pusan city has suddenly abandoned its long neglect of PIFF and decided to support it, so it can open the event this year to promote the 2002 Asian Games."⁴⁸ It is therefore not surprising to learn that the first PIFF was accompanied by an event called "Asian Week," which acted as a promotional event for the Asian Games and the successful *Segyehwa* process in Pusan. These two twinned events opened and closed on the same day.⁴⁹ Originally, PIFF was supposed to be fundamentally restructured (or even terminated) after the Asian Games in 2002 by the local government.⁵⁰ While this initial plan was dropped soon after the huge success of the first PIFF, the fact this plan existed in the first place

clearly demonstrates that the local government perceived this cultural event as supporting the sports event rather than standing alone as an important cultural practice. In fact, this kind of thinking, motivated by the economically oriented *Segyehwa*, was pervasive in local governments in South Korea at the time. In short, this case highlights how heterogeneous forces surrounding one cultural organisation worked in different directions.

Key Founding Members

Film intellectuals and industry insiders involved in the festival organisation constituted one of the newly emerging social groups which flourished in Korean society in the 1990s. According to Kim Soyoung, South Korean film festivals can be classified into three categories: those derived from a coalition of the state, local government, corporations and intellectuals equipped with film expertise; those which are primarily corporate-sponsored; and those which are organised by new and more established activist groups.⁵¹ According to this view, PIFF fits the first category as it is closely related to the state and the local government, unlike those in the second and third category.⁵² She further observes that the politics of the status quo influenced the whole process of festival organisation in Korea in the late 1990s. Among many other different groups, there were “collectives and identities engaged

in film festival politics, some are not only recognised but also heavily supported by the authorities whereas others are refused recognition or they themselves resist recognition by the authorities.”⁵³ As Kim suggests:

[F]inding themselves in the ever shifting space between the residual authoritarian government of military dictatorship and hegemonic quasi-democratic government, the non-majority groups tend to employ the discourse of radical differences less than the idea of universal humanism. The appeal to human rights reverberates through the array of feminist and gay/lesbian movements.⁵⁴

Examined within this framework, PIFF belongs to a privileged group who were recognised and supported by the authorities in contrast to the Queer Film and Video Festival or the Human Rights Film Festival which have both been severely interrupted and censored by the central government. Kim focuses on the “non-majority groups” establishment of cultural events in the 1990s in Korea. In a similar fashion, special attention is paid in this work to how other “non-majority groups,” in her term, strived to negotiate and engage with the authorities to create a film festival under the shifting, transitional circumstances in the same period.

Amongst the founding members of PIFF were young filmmakers and film critics.⁵⁵ These were largely divided into two groups depending on their links to the local community. Most of the local intellectuals were engaged with local film

communities via film education activities such as those at Gyeongsung University.

Their enthusiasm for cinema was evident as far back as the 1980s when the same generation organised a small film society named Cineclub showing classic Hollywood and European art films.

Regarding the cinematic legacy of Pusan, in September 1950, during the Korean War, the Korean Film Critics Association was established in Pusan, the first such body established in Korea. While its establishment in Pusan was due to the city's temporary status as the capital, the formation of the Association encouraged local film intellectuals to establish their own film society named "the Pusan Film Critics Association" as well as the "Buil Film Award" in 1958.⁵⁶ Although local film production in Pusan deteriorated over the following three decades, local film intellectuals sought to draw on and promote Pusan's legacy in film culture through this tradition so as to support and justify the establishment of PIFF.

In a similar vein, the organising process was marked by the involvement of a wide range of organisations. While most of the founders hailed from Pusan's film community, the Executive Committee quickly expanded to include a broad range of social groups, including an opposition party and non-party politicians, various religious groups, and women's organisations in Pusan. This network also grew to include foreign film festival consultants such as Tony Rayns, Simon Field, Paul Yi

and Wong Ainling.⁵⁷ As noted, the Executive Committee, rather than the central or the local government, assumed a leading role in organising and developing the festival. The committee used this wide network to enlist the efforts of two key figures: festival director Kim Dong-Ho and deputy director Park Kwang-su, the quintessential Korean New Wave director.

Park Kwang-su, who played a central role in the PIFF founding group, is significant in Korean film history. When Roh Tae-Woo enacted a new constitution which allowed for a gradual easing of censorship laws in 1988, the first film to take advantage of this was *Chilsu and Mansu* (1988) by first-time director Park Kwang-su. This film marked the rebirth of political expression in Korean films. Park showed a consistent interest in social reality, going on to direct acclaimed films such as *Black Republic* (1990), *To the Starry Island* (1993), *A Single Spark* (1995) and *Uprising* (1999).

Furthermore, Park was the first film director and producer to receive funding from the West. From the 1980s, the arrival of new directorial talent brought about a revival in the South Korean film industry; every sector of the film industry was dramatically transformed. Multiplex theatres were built and the old distribution monopolies broken down. Filmmakers at all levels, from young independents working on 16 mm to well-known names like Park Kwang-su, sought and found

new sources of finance. Park directed and produced *To the Starry Island* in 1993, the first Korean film to benefit from co-financing from the West, in association with Samsung Nices in Korea and Channel 4 in Britain. At the time of production, he founded and ran his own independent production company in order to open up new funding options for his films outside the mainstream *Chungmuro* industry.⁵⁸ Park thus adopted an intriguing pioneering position within the Korean film industry.⁵⁹

As well as bringing a symbolic association with the image of the New Wave in the Korean film industry to his relationship with PIFF, it is important to note that Park had a firm connection with Pusan. Though born in Sokcho, in the Gangwon Province, he lived mostly in Pusan until he joined the film group *Yallasung* in Seoul in his twenties. This link bolstered his effectiveness as an advocate for the establishment of a film festival in Pusan, as did his personal ties to global film critics through his experience at various Western film festivals as a film director. Park Kwang-su's self-positioning sheds light on PIFF's identity and boundaries. Most importantly, it provided legitimacy in the organisation of this event in Pusan as a successor to the 1980s political movement. In other words, his presence and active engagement with the festival enabled the Executive Committee to position this cultural event as "an important extension of Korea's cultural movement." It also meant a symbolic break away from "authoritarianism and the first dynamic step

towards a more open society.”⁶⁰

While Park Kwang-su played a pivotal role in bringing together local and global resources to assist the establishment of the festival, Kim Dong-Ho, the festival director, had a more pragmatic role as he was responsible for eliciting corporate funding and mediating tensions with the central government. As he was a former Vice Minister of Culture and Tourism, and specialised in cultural policy with long administrative experience in this field since 1961 (including his position as chairman of the Korea Public Performance Ethics Committee [1988 - 1992]), he made the most of a broad and diverse personal network. As discussed earlier, political networks in Korea are often largely economic in character. The first PIFF was financed largely through a 300 million won donation from the Daewoo Group, a top ranking *jaebol* (chaebol) in the region.⁶¹ While Kim played a decisive role in making this happen by using his networks, the availability of such funding was also largely attributed to the rapid transformation of the Korean film industry at the time.

As illustrated earlier, just prior to the establishment of PIFF a shift in production capital had occurred in the film industry. The traditional chain of distribution rooted in *Chungmuro* capital prevailing during the 1980s shifted as key *jaebol* groups such as Samsung and Daewoo began to invest in film production from the mid-1990s on. The inflow of new capital and film industry marketing

strategies rapidly restructured the pattern of film production. In addition, the government's globalisation drive, *Segyehwa*, had affected the film business by offering tax incentives, making it a highly profitable investment option. These conditions encouraged corporations to fund cultural institutions, a situation of which PIFF took full advantage. Kim Dong-Ho personally played a distinctive role which contributed to the relatively smooth development of relationships with both the central government and the conglomerate Daewoo Group. Because of this, although he was not a native of Pusan, he successfully positioned himself in PIFF and developed a positive appeal to the local community.⁶² Overall, these particular characteristics of the founding members played a crucial role in generating a balance between the local and the central governments which was necessary for the successful establishment of the festival.

Local Economy and PIFF

No matter how carefully the structure of the organising committee was set up, local commercial interests were an unavoidable issue for PIFF. As discussed earlier, the local economy of cities is closely related to the rise of international film festivals as such globally-scaled cultural events can attract revenue to the local industry.⁶³

Festivals in cities can stimulate low-season tourism which helps to justify the local

subsidy on which most festivals depend. In this sense, culture has become more and more significant to the meaning and function of cities as they are converted from places of production to places of consumption and as they are forced to compete for finance capital in an increasingly competitive global economy.⁶⁴ PIFF's establishment in Pusan and the city's specific urban economy reflect the changing function of culture, which became an increasingly important commodity for entrepreneurs. For example, a local newspaper editorial emphasised that "through this festival, the city of Pusan can attract tourists each year and ultimately enhance its reputation as a cultural centre" by concentrating on the merits of PIFF to attract more attention to the local community.⁶⁵ This rhetoric underlines the fact that, initially, economic motives trumped cinematic ones in the establishment of the film festival as it was seen primarily as a tourism-related enterprise to boost the local economy.

Although Pusan was primarily regarded as an industrial port city, it also maintained its reputation as a southern tourist centre. It has been estimated that during the summer season over eight million people visit the local beaches, so it has become one of the most popular vacation places in Korea and Pusan had already developed a huge tourist entertainment industry. However, since the 1990s, the local infrastructure began to change. In particular, cinema chains run by local syndicates

began to be transformed in the wake of the multiplex construction boom in Seoul. Consumer spending patterns in Pusan also changed dramatically: the Gwangbok-dong and Nampo-dong area in the city centre, for example, became one of the south's most prosperous zones in the 1990s. Both areas played important roles in the festival, either hosting screenings or parties.

Just before PIFF was launched in 1996, local authorities and the Executive Committee sought to persuade local businesspeople and other interest groups, mainly in the tourism and entertainment sectors, to contribute financially to its founding. However, local businesses were sceptical about the immediate outcomes of PIFF and therefore some failed to follow through on their promises. For example, one of the major local hotel chains promised to be the festival's anchoring sponsor but reneged on its commitment at the last minute.⁶⁶ Moreover, when the festival and the city government planned to build a prestigious space devoted solely to PIFF, intending to symbolise Pusan as a "film festival city," local business people who ran stalls in the open-air markets objected fiercely and protested against the redevelopment of the Market Square.⁶⁷ Traditionally, the Market Square, surrounded by four cinema venues and open-air stalls, symbolised the city centre. In order to construct a new PIFF cinema square, existing open-air markets would have been forced to move.⁶⁸ In the first year of the festival a compromise was reached: a

temporary PIFF Square was constructed, and businesspeople agreed to relocate the market during the festival period. This changed in subsequent years as a permanent structure was completed.

In addition, individual venues to screen films constitute a crucial part of the infrastructure for film festivals. In this respect, the participating festival cinemas in Pusan were clustered in the centre of the city, creating a focal point which resulted in ideal opportunities for socialising among the festival guests and audiences. This spatial configuration, with four cinemas placed around a central square, worked well during the festival even though in 1996 there were not modern multiplexes. However, initially local cinema syndicates in Pusan did not welcome PIFF. To screen festival films PIFF needed access to their venues, yet owners could see no reason to make them available as they were making good money screening Hollywood blockbusters. Pusan city council and the PIFF committee had to persuade them to rent out their venues during *Chuseok*, the Korean Thanksgiving festival, the most lucrative time of the entire year. Through the influential mediation of the Pusan city council, PIFF was able to use these venues to screen festival films by paying expensive rental fees.

As it became clear that the first PIFF could attract enormous attention from local and global audiences and media, public opinion rallied behind the

festival and local enterprises quickly fell in line with the shift in attitude. Thus, the initial situation was reversed in a few years. In the wake of the success of PIFF and the rapid redevelopment plan in place for Pusan, from the year 2000, many new multiplexes were built in the suburban areas of Pusan, for example in Hauendae. These cinemas aggressively promoted themselves to attract young consumers, offering their venues to PIFF on favourable terms.

These tussles lay bare how PIFF was perceived by the local community in its initial stages. While culture was generally considered a profitable product to rejuvenate the local economy, business people, who had never experienced a global cultural event in their own city, were reluctant to support the demands of the festival. Overall, these processes reveal the conflicts, resistances and compromises among the newly inaugurated local government, the commercial power structure and the founding members of the festival committee.

Regulations and PIFF

As emphasised earlier, censorship was one crucial factor in the transformation of the Korean film industry. Specifically, the pre-release review system had long been a serious obstacle to the development of Korean cinema. However, ironically, it affected PIFF's success in a different way. According to the law, PIFF was not

allowed to screen films without advance permission from the government. Amongst the regulations that impacted the festival in this way was the Enforcement Ordinance of the Film Promotion Act. In effect since 1996 this Act stipulated that “unless an international film festival has more than three participating countries and more than three years of history, all invited entries shall be subject to review by the Korea Public Performance Ethics Committee.”⁶⁹ While the founding members of PIFF strove to construct an image for the festival that was free from the reach of authoritarianism, they had to avoid any extreme confrontation with the central government to inaugurate the festival on schedule. Being aware of the difficulty in dealing with this political issue, PIFF coped with the situation at several different levels.

As this was the first time an international film festival had been held in Korea, there were concerns about the ability of the Ethics Committee members to review more than one hundred films in a limited time. In an attempt to resolve this issue, festival director Kim Dong-Ho, who had once headed the Ethics Committee, mobilised his personal network: he met the review board members in order to “appeal for leniency.”⁷⁰ In addition, around this time there had been serious legal discussions about the validity of the Act as it was contradictory to the spirit of the dominant *Segyehwa* campaign.⁷¹ Thanks to these efforts and circumstances, from

the first year the PIFF committee enjoyed a dispensation allowing it to show all films uncut.⁷² Thus, PIFF was able to exist as a censorship-free zone, and the majority of films, which would have been prevented if there was a pre-release review, were shown uncut at PIFF. While this fact was significant in the history of Korean films alone, at the same time it also helped attract a huge audience to PIFF.

Furthermore, the screening of particular films, such as Japanese films, aroused much interest because these had not previously been available to the Korean public. Japanese cultural products - including films, songs, and TV programmes - had been prohibited following the founding of the Republic of Korea in 1948.⁷³ The first PIFF in 1996 featured fifteen Japanese films, including the animation feature *Ghost in the Shell* (1995) by Oshii Mamoru and *Sleeping Man* (1996) by Oguri Kohei, the first such public screenings in Korean film history. Viewers in their teens, twenties and thirties, too young to remember the occupation and apparently attracted by Japanese pop culture, responded with particular enthusiasm.⁷⁴ Furthermore, mainland Chinese films, such as *Behind the Forbidden City* (also known as *East Palace, West Palace*) by Zhang Yuan, banned by the Chinese government for their homosexual and/or political content, were given their world premieres at PIFF. These films soon aroused controversy and attracted attention from the press and foreign film critics as well as local audiences; ticket

sales hit the roof.⁷⁵

However, PIFF still had to grapple with the thorny issue of North Korean cinema. It is worth noting that, since its inception, PIFF had consistently attempted to screen films from North Korea. Despite difficulties due to the National Security Law,⁷⁶ PIFF aggressively tried to announce that the festival would show North Korean films to the public in Pusan. Under the particular political conditions of Korea as a divided nation, such rhetoric tended to attract huge media and public attention to the festival, whether the films were ever actually screened or not. Given that the Human Rights Film Festival was severely censored by the central government around the same period, PIFF's deliberate manipulation of the political situation is noteworthy. To put it simply, as well as taking advantage of loosened government regulations during a transitional political period, the festival also actively manipulated those negative national conditions to garner attention for itself at local, national and global levels.⁷⁷

Conclusion

As the above discussion has demonstrated, the complicated process through which PIFF was established reflects the multilayered aspects of Korean society and the Korean film industry in the 1990s. I have highlighted a number of inter-related

factors which influenced the inauguration of PIFF, casting light on how this process reflects the specificities of Korean society and relates to the Korean film industry.

The successful establishment of PIFF was certainly the result of negotiation among a number of different interests, heterogeneous forces and conflicts. Globally, East Asian cinema - including Korean cinema - was emerging in Western international film festivals at this time. Concurrently in the Asian region, the HKIFF, which had long been a key showcase of Asian cinema for the West, was gradually becoming less important as a platform for Asian cinema. PIFF took the opportunity created by this short-lived vacuum period, during which the HKIFF was in decline due to the city's handover to China in the late 1990s, to claim for itself the status of being the new hub for Asian cinema.⁷⁸

Alongside these changes created by external conditions, the South Korean nation state was being re-shaped by the traumas of colonisation and a rapidly compressed industrialization process. In Part 1, this chapter sketched out the history of the Korean film industry and the city of Pusan to show the national political, economic and social context which influenced the decision-making of PIFF. Along with the inauguration of the local government and the establishment of a national decentralisation policy, the Korean globalisation drive known as *Segyehwa* directly precipitated the launch of PIFF. PIFF also benefited from inter-provincial disparity

in Korea and a vacuum in the political climate as regime change saw a shift between two very different systems at the national level.

Part 2 focused on how PIFF was established and demonstrated how the founding group and the structure of the organising committee helped to reconcile tensions between different interests. In looking at local negotiation processes in particular, the festival's crucial role as a tool for the rejuvenation of the local economy was shown through the examples of the local cinema syndicate and the redevelopment of the city centre. Lastly, the chapter demonstrated that PIFF deliberately attempted to manipulate significant political issues enmeshed within the Korean film industry for the promotion of the festival itself. PIFF benefited from those difficult issues such as censorship and the prohibition of Japanese culture by evoking a controversy and thereby attracting media and public attention. In arguing that these key factors and circumstances were particularly unique to Korea, I have indicated that the development and aims of PIFF should be understood within the context of the political, economic and social transformation of Korea in the 1990s.

As this chapter investigated the political economy of PIFF by focusing on its inauguration period, the next chapter will discuss subsequent changes and the evolution of its status and identity in relation to the local and the global film

industry. It will examine local, regional and global marketing strategies as the festival attempted to position itself as a cinematic hub in East Asia.

Notes

¹ This figure includes overseas guests. In the same year, the Tokyo International Film Festival (TIFF) attracted around 116,000 people. John Krich, "Asia's Upstart Film Festival," *Asian Wall Street Journal*, April 20, 2000, 6.

² In this thesis, the "region" usually means an integrated area beyond the nation-state, such as East Asia, Western Europe. However, in discussing Korean regionalism in the later section, it indicates the sub-national such as *Jeolla* (Honam), the southwestern province or *Gyeongsang* (Yeongnam), the southeastern province in South Korea.

³ For a comparison of PIFF with other film festivals in Asia around the late 1990s, see Appendix 1. For the figures related to the development of PIFF between 1996 and 2005, see Appendix 3. The rating of A-category for film festivals is determined by The International Federation of Film Producers Associations (FIAPF). According to the FIAPF, besides Tokyo, there are twelve A-category festivals including Cannes, Berlin, Venice, San Sebastian, Moscow, Karlovy Vary, Cairo, Mar del Plata (Argentina) and Shanghai, Locarno and Montreal.

⁴ Bill Nichols, "Discovering Form, Inferring Meaning: New Cinemas and the Film Festival Circuit," *Film Quarterly* 47. 3, Spring (1994): 68.

⁵ Soyoung Kim, "'Cine-mania or Cinephilia': Film Festivals and the Identity Question," *UTS Review (Cultural Studies Review)* vol.4, no. 2. (1998): 182. In the late 1990s, a number of local film festivals were organised: PIFF, the Seoul Human Rights Watch Film Festival and the Indi-forum in 1996, the Puchon Fantastic Film Festival (PiFan), the Seoul Women's Film Festival and the Seoul Queer Film Festival in 1997.

⁶ The term *Segyehwa* was explained in chapter 1. Soyoung Kim, "Cine-mania or Cinephilia: Film Festivals and the Identity Question," 1998: 185; Jeeyoung Shin, "Globalisation and New Korean Cinema," in *New Korean Cinema*, eds. Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005), 52-56.

⁷ Soyoung Kim, 1998: 183. Kim emphasises the differences in every sector of Korean society between the two periods since the-mid 1990s. For example, it includes a shift of regime and a financial crisis.

⁸ Julian Stringer, "Global Cities and the International Film Festival Economy," in *Cinema and the City*, eds. Mark Shiel and Tony Fitzmaurice (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 134.

⁹ Stringer, 2001, 143. The term, "global city" here follows the work of Saskia Sassen who has illustrated how global cities such as London, New York and Tokyo have become an important node point in the global economic system according to a hierarchy of importance to the operation of the global system of finance and trade. This argument is also closely linked to Manuel Castells' work that points out the flows of transnational capital and information in a highly technological society into a global space as stated in the second section of the next chapter. In this context, Pusan is positioned as a global city in the global economy which "expands and incorporates additional cities into the various networks." That is, as Stringer considers cities as a nodal point of the film festival economy beyond the nation-state, this thesis illustrates how Pusan (not South Korea) interacts with the forces of cultural economy of globalisation and forges its network between other film festivals and related cultural industries at the local, regional and global levels through PIFF and the PPP. Saskia Sassen, *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001), 2nd ed., Preface xix, 3-15, 90-126.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 142.

¹¹ Yeongnam and Honam are different terms to indicate two regions in Korea in a more general sense than *Jeolla* and *Gyeongsang*.

¹² Kim Young Sam (1993-1998); Kim Dae Jung (1998-2003).

¹³ Rob Wilson, "Melodrama of Korean National Identity: From *Mandala* to *Black Republic*," in *Melodrama and Asian Cinema*, ed. Wimal Dissanayake (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1994), 90-104.

¹⁴ The Japanese government required all foreign and domestic features to be submitted to a government censorship board for approval, and police were present at cinemas for all screenings. From 1930, censorship became much stricter, so that melodramas, costume dramas, and pro-Japanese films were the only genres approved by the government. Finally, in 1942, Korean-language films were banned outright. Young-Il Lee, *The History of Korean Cinema: Main Current of Korean Cinema*, trans. Richard Lynn Greever (Seoul: Motion Picture Promotion Corporation, 1988), 75-82.

¹⁵ The key points of the law were that each production company must produce a minimum of fifteen

films per year; all production companies were required to be licensed, dependent on fulfilment of strict conditions; and each licensed film company was given a special quota for the import of foreign films.

¹⁶ Myung-goo Kang, "Decentralisation and the Restructuring of Regionalism in Korea: Conditions and Possibilities," *Korean Journal* Summer (2003): 81-108.

¹⁷ *Minjung* literally means "mass of people" but in the Korean context its connotation is "oppressed, exploited people." *Minjung* includes working class as well as the rural poor. In the wake of this movement, college filmmakers such as *Yallasung* and Seoul Cine Group produced several films with antigovernment themes, shown at university lecture theatres and factories. Eung-Jun Min, "Political and Socio-cultural Implications of Hollywood Hegemony in the Korean Film Industry: Resistance, Assimilation, and Articulation," in *The Globalization of Corporate Media History*, eds. Lee Artz and Yahya R. Kamalipour (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003), 245-264.

¹⁸ Soon after Park Chung Hee's death, General Chun Doo Hwan took control of the government in a silent coup. Students at Jeonnam National University, Gwangju, demanded the release of Kim Dae Jung, the opposition leader who had been imprisoned for political activities and the removal of Chun. Shocked by the brutality of the suppression ordered by Chun, ordinary citizens joined the demonstration. Gwangju citizens controlled the city for five days before Chun deployed Special Forces to the city on May 27, 1980. Thousands of people were indiscriminately slaughtered. Because this crime was committed with the United States' connivance, the Gwangju Uprising did not receive as much attention from the global media as did China's Tiananmen Square. As clarified in the Introduction, unlike Pusan, Gwangju is used here, not Kwangju, the old name of the city according to the Revised Romanisation System.

¹⁹ Isolde Standish, "Korean Cinema and the New Realism: Text and Context," in *Colonialism and Nationalism in Asian Cinema*, ed. Wimal Dissanayake (Bloomington: Indiana University Press: 1994), 65-89; Tony Rayns, *Seoul Stirring, 5 Korean Directors A Festival of Korean Cinema*, (London: ICA, 1994), 4-5; Hyo-in Yi and Chong-ha Lee eds., *Korean New Wave: Retrospectives from 1980 to 1995* (Pusan: First PIFF, 1996), 32-38.

²⁰ The oppressed left-wing political Kim Dae Jung (who is from Honam) became symbolically associated with Honam Province after the uprising as a great number of the people killed during the massacre were originally from there.

²¹ In addition, domestic film production was separated from foreign film importation and a license system was changed to a registration system. However, the law included a "screen code" designed to protect domestic films. The number of days which Korean films must be shown at cinemas was set at 146.

²² Standish, 1994, 65.

²³ Mark Jancovich and Lucy Faire with Sarah Stubbings, *The Place of the Audience: Cultural Geographies of Film Consumption* (London: British Film Institute, 2003), 16-17.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 18

²⁵ This began with pirates periodically ravaging coastal villages; the *Imjin* Wars at the end of the 16th century involved a brutal invasion. In 1592, the Japanese warlord Hideyoshi dispatched 150,000 troops in an ambitious assault on the Chinese Empire. When Korea refused to grant the Japanese free movement across its frontiers, they proceeded to fight their way through. After six years of war, they finally retreated, failing to conquer China, but devastating Korea.

²⁶ The Russians demanded coal mining rights, trade, and diplomatic relations, but were turned down in 1866. In the same year, nine French Catholic priests and thousands of Korean Christian converts were executed. The French Asiatic Squadron with seven warships was sent to seize Ganghwa Island. In 1871, the American minister to China accompanied five warships to Korea to try to open trade links. After a clash, the Americans occupied Ganghwa but withdrew following resistance. In 1875, the Japanese determined to force the Koreans to abandon their policy of seclusion.

²⁷ Kang, 2003:102

²⁸ In 1991, the KMPPC organised the first public seminar forum on establishing an international film festival, with Jeju in mind as hosting city (at that time, the director of the KOFIC was Kim Dong-Ho, the current director of PIFF). In 1995, Seoul Metropolitan city tried to organise a Seoul international film festival but it failed at the final stage. Moon-Sup Lee, "PIFF," *Busan Ilbo*, August 13, 1996, 5.

²⁹ *Jiyeok gamjeong* means 'regional sentiment'. Wang-Bae Kim, "Regionalism: Its Origins and Substance with Competition and Exclusion," *Korean Journal* Summer (2003). [online] Available at www.ekoreanjournal.net (accessed March 3, 2007).

³⁰ Kang, 2003: 81. See his article for the current argument about the relationship between Korean

regionalism and decentralisation.

³¹ Kyung-Hyun Kim, *The Remasculinization of Korean Cinema* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004), 18.

³² Kyung-Sup Chang, "Compressed Modernity and its Discontents: South Korean Society in Transition," *Economy and Society* vol. 28, no. 1. February (1999): 36.

³³ Pusan's self-supporting finance was 84.8 percent compared with 63.5 percent on average for other cities in 1995. Ministry of Government Administration and Home Affairs of the Republic of Korea. Available at <http://www.mogaha.go.kr/gpms/index.jsp> (accessed April 16, 2007).

³⁴ The Jeonju International Film Festival was launched in 2000 four years after PIFF with a focus on alternative, digital cinema. In Gwangju, soon after the local self-government system was launched in 1994, the first Gwangju Biennale was held in 1995, the first international art event in East Asia with the slogan of "Go beyond borders." However, this case needs to be discussed in different dimensions. The organising committee set up its identity based on the spirit of the Gwangju Uprising in 1980. Strongly evoking the political backdrop in Gwangju as the local identity, the committee announced that "This historical background plays a crucial role to the identity of the Biennale, and is sometimes directly paid tribute to in the program, i.e. in special exhibitions." Gwangju Biennale. Available at <http://universes-in-universe.de/car/gwangju/english.htm> (accessed April 17, 2007). The first Gwangju International Film Festival was established in 2001.

³⁵ Soyoung Kim, 1998: 176.

³⁶ *Ibid.*: 178.

³⁷ The first PIFF was held on September 13, 1996 and the financial crisis hit East Asia, including South Korea, in 1997. However, this thesis largely considers the symptoms of the financial crisis in Korea which had already appeared in the mid-1990s.

³⁸ Chang, 1999: 31.

³⁹ *Ibid.*: 31.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*: 47.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*: 35.

⁴² Chang, 1999: 47.

⁴³ Jancovich, 2003, 25

⁴⁴ Soyoung Kim, 1998: 176.

⁴⁵ After its initial success, however, the central government began to contribute about one third of PIFF's annual budget, making up for the decrease in corporate donations, which had slipped 40 percent due to the IMF crisis. See Krich, *Asian Wall Street Journal*, April 20, 2000, 6.

⁴⁶ Young-Ho Im, "The Media, Civil Society, and New Social Movements in Korea 1985-93" in *Trajectories: Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, ed. Chen Kuan-Hsing (London: Routledge, 1998), 330-345.

⁴⁷ Recently, Puchon (Buchon) city removed festival director Kim Hongjun, one of Korea's most renowned film directors, due to a conflict between Kim and the mayor of Puchon. Jeonju city also dismissed the founding intellectuals after conflicts developed and restructured the committee just before the second edition in 2001.

⁴⁸ Jin-Woo Lee "PIFF opens in September," *Kukje Shinmun*, February 2, 1996, 21.

⁴⁹ However, the Asian Week event did not receive much attention due to the spotlight on PIFF. Ji-Tae Jang, "Asian Week and PIFF open in the same day," *Busan Ilbo*, August 28, 1996, 29.

⁵⁰ Most national newspapers reported this as well as local newspapers. They include: Myung-hwan Kim, "PIFF Opens," *Chosun Ilbo*, May 20, 1996, 19; "PIFF Count Down," *JoongAng Ilbo*, June, 6, 1996, 21.

⁵¹ Kim, 1998:175.

⁵² The third category includes the Human Rights Film Festival, the Labour Film Festival, and the Queer Film and Video Festivals in Korea.

⁵³ Kim, 1998:176.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*:182.

⁵⁵ In 1983, Gyeongseong University in Pusan established a Film Department, the first specialised film course in Pusan. Most teaching staff came from Seoul and were actively involved in PIFF's establishment in the 1990s. All three main programmers at PIFF were involved in local film education.

⁵⁶ The Buil Film Award had a strong reputation in Korean film history but was discontinued as the local film industry in Pusan declined. Since PIFF was based in Pusan, the committee tried to revive this traditional local film award and absorb it into PIFF's own programme. These attempts failed, however, partly because the name 'Buil' literally meant the event was fully sponsored by a private

local newspaper, *Busan Ilbo*. Pusan Jikhalsi Sa Pyeonchan Wiwonhyoe, *History of Pusan City: Pusan-si Sa*, vol.4 (Pusan: Pusan Jikhalsi, 1991), 514-516.

⁵⁷ Tony Rayns was involved in the Vancouver and the Hong Kong Film Festivals as a festival advisor. As a specialist on East Asian cinema and a foreign festival consultant, Rayns played a key role in the establishment of PIFF. Paul Yi worked at the San Francisco Film Festival, while Wong Ainling had been previously involved in the Hong Kong Film Festival. Their experience and networks enormously contributed to the initial organising stage in many ways.

⁵⁸ *Chungmuro* is the name of a district in Seoul synonymous with Korea's film industry because of the high concentration of film production companies there.

⁵⁹ After the successful launch of PIFF, Park subsequently started another important side-bar event, the Pusan Promotion Plan (PPP), a project film market in 1997. Then, he moved on to the Asian Film Market (AFM) in 2005, a full-scale international film market in Pusan.

⁶⁰ Hyuk-sang Lee, ed., *10 Years' PIFF History* (Pusan: Tenth Pusan International Film Festival, 2005), 137. Following Park's leadership, PIFF was structured into two parts: programming and administration. Lee Yong-kwan, a Seoul-based film professor became Korean cinema programmer and Jay Jeon, world cinema programmer. Two natives from Pusan were also appointed: Kim Ji-seok handled Asian cinema and Oh Seuk-keun was appointed general manager.

⁶¹ *Jaebol* (Chaebol) in Korean means 'giant conglomerates usually owned by family groups'. 300 million KRW is approximately 320,000 USD.

⁶² It was apparent that Kim was well aware that he is not from Pusan when he often mentioned that he was honoured to be appointed director of PIFF even if he was not a native. In addition, there was a news report that he was self-consciously not present at some sensitive meetings in the initial stage before PIFF was firmly announced as he did not want to give rise to unnecessary tension among the local communities. Eun-Young Kim, "PIFF Opens," *Busan Ilbo*, February 15, 1996, 1; Eun-Young Kim, "From Preparation to Opening," *Busan Ilbo*, September 13, 1996, 18.

⁶³ Stringer, 2001, 134.

⁶⁴ Jancovich, 2003, 21.

⁶⁵ Sang-kon Shim, "Editorial: Film Festival in Pusan," *Kookje Shinmun*, February 6, 2006, 6.

⁶⁶ In 1995, *the Paradise Hotel* in Pusan was supposed to be the main sponsor of the first PIFF by providing funding of 500 million won but withdrew it in the same year. Left in the lurch at the last minute, PIFF asked the Pusan government for financial support. Finally, the local government decided to commit 300 million won from its budget to the festival. Lee, ed., *10 Years' PIFF History*, 2005, 132-133.

⁶⁷ Jin-kyung Kim and Jung-ho Lee, "PIFF Square," *Busan Ilbo*, September 21, 1996, 31.

⁶⁸ During the first PIFF period, the removal was temporary and then open-air markets returned soon after the PIFF. However, after the huge success of the festival, public opinion to reconstruct the market square permanently and to remove the old shabby stalls poured in. Thus, the local council had to hold a public hearing several times to discuss this issue. Jin-kyung Kim and Jung-ho Lee, "PIFF Square," 31.

⁶⁹ Lee, 2005, 142.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 141.

⁷¹ For instance, on October 4 1996, the Constitutional Court overturned pre-screening censorship in favour of a ratings system. Michael Baker, "Having It Both Ways: Korea Promotes and Censors Films" *Christian Science Monitor*, October 22, 1996. n.p.

⁷² PIFF pursued this policy with no official permission from the state. However, because this was the first international film festival in South Korea, the central government was relatively generous and flexible about screenings.

⁷³ This ban was relaxed in the interests of bilateral relations between Japan and Korea, especially in the wake of President Kim Dae Jung's visit to Tokyo in 1998. Jonathan Watts, "Korea to lift ban on Japan," *Hollywood Reporter*, October 6-12, 1998. n.p.

⁷⁴ Andrew Hindes, "First Korean pic fest an artistic, popular success," *Variety*, September 23-29 1996, 29.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ The National Security Law was promulgated in 1948 to restrict anti-state acts that endangered national security and to protect the nation's safety and its people's life and freedom. Since the Anti-Communism Law was merged into the National Security Law during the 1980s, this law is acknowledged by many South Koreans as a symbol of the anti-communism of South Korea's First Republic and its dictatorial period of 1964-1987; yet this law still exists.

⁷⁷ In 2001, PIFF finally organised a retrospective of the work of Shin Sang-Ok, who had been kidnapped and taken to North Korea where he was held captive until his escape in 1986. Banned from public screening by the South Korean government, these titles were exclusively presented to festival guests at PIFF. This topic will be argued in chapter 5 in detail.

⁷⁸ Dina Iordanova, "Showdown of the festivals: Clashing Entrepreneurship and Post-communist Management of Culture," *Film International* vol.4. issue 23, October (2006): 36; Personal interview with Derek Elley in London (March 14, 2007).

Chapter 3

Making a Hub of Asian Cinema: A Regionalisation Strategy

The previous chapter looked at the political and economic factors behind the establishment of the Pusan International Film Festival in 1996 and examined how they were related to the transformation of the Korean film industry. This chapter focuses on the following decade and explores how PIFF differentiated its identity and status from its counterparts in East Asia, such as film festivals in Tokyo and Hong Kong. By making “Asian identity” a key concept to promote the festival, PIFF fashioned itself as a regional “hub” that appealed to both global and local film markets. This approach was tied into a range of other developments, including an urban regeneration project aimed at transforming the industrial port of Pusan into a cultural centre. It was also incorporated into a global networking strategy that exploited the changes and differences in local and regional attitudes towards the global film market. PIFF forged substantial ties between Asia and Europe in two major ways: by appealing to anti-Hollywood sentiment and a feeling of pan-Asianism towards Asia, and by utilising a strong market-oriented approach towards Europe.

By focusing on two interlinked themes - urban regeneration and networks –

this chapter aims to demonstrate how and why PIFF has conceptualised a regional identity and how this strategy has interacted with local and global forces. The key objective of this chapter is to show the way in which film festivals in East Asia are shifting from focusing on the national to the regional as they increasingly aim to influence the global market. Overall, the chapter will suggest how film festivals have begun to negotiate and renew their roles and identities between the national, the regional, and the global.

Regionalism/Regionalisation in Asia¹

As argued in earlier chapters, the number of film festivals has increased rapidly since the 1990s and become a global phenomenon. Their recent proliferation in East Asia, for example in Pusan and Singapore, deserves particular attention because these examples offer different contexts from existing film festivals, such as Cannes and Berlin in the West, to understand the role of such festivals within the ongoing globalisation of the region. In addition, as many commentators assert, film festivals have been substantially transformed in recent years: the structure of the festival world has changed over the past two decades within a highly competitive global cultural economy. For instance, festivals compete with each other for the limited number of films produced in the annual festival calendar.² Furthermore, festivals'

function in relation to the global film industry has become more influential and expansive at the levels of exhibition, distribution, and even production. In this regard, it is useful to analyse the ways in which festivals specifically market themselves since this may help to explain the new role and influence of festivals in the global film economy. Nevertheless, existing scholarship pays little attention to this subject. The research which has been done on film festivals has not looked at non-western film festivals in any detail or at the way their strategies have been shaped by unique regional approaches. This section interrogates the development of the idea of the region in East Asia and analyses how this process of conceptualisation is related to PIFF's efforts to build a regional hub to promote the festival.

Early debates about regionalism in East Asia and in general outside Asia have tended to focus on a defensive function of regionalism.³ Initially emerging as a bulwark against western encroachment, the concept of Asia as a collective identity has been developed and transformed responding to specific Asian problems and historical experiences - colonialism, nation building and the regional impact of the Cold War. However, the idea of Asia has gained wider currency in terms of global economic issues. Alongside the issue of security, past regional movements tended to focus on economic integration through such bodies as the Association of Southeast

Asian Nations (ASEAN).⁴ Nevertheless, there has rarely been a cultural focus on developing the idea of Asia.

It is noticeable that the concept of Asia, as a constructed idea, has often been arbitrarily manipulated in the region in the name of East Asia including China, Korea and Japan - sometimes referred to as Northeast Asia - and Southeast Asia countries such as Malaysia, Indonesia and Thailand.⁵ Furthermore, Turkey and Iran are also sometimes included in the category of Asia.⁶ As such, the term tends to be widely used and often overlaps or is integrated in “one Asia” to match other corresponding concepts such as Europe or North America. In this respect, the concept of Asia is a contested and contingent term. As Shaun Breslin et al. describe:

The development of the idea of ‘East Asia’, as opposed to the idea of ‘Southeast Asia’ writ small or the ‘Asia Pacific’ writ large is a reasonably long-standing process in which insiders and outsiders are identified. The attempt to assert a particular conception of ‘Asia’ is again evident in the recent debates about monetary regional co-operation where the in-group consists of the ASEAN states, plus China, South Korea and Japan. This ‘Asia’ also corresponds to the Asian side of the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) process. In effect, it represents a widening of the membership of the East Asia Economic Caucus that emerged in spite of stiff resistance from the US, within APEC in the 1990s.⁷

In particular, the economic crisis that hit East Asia in 1997 had various impacts on Asian regionalist impulses. It enhanced understanding of the region’s vulnerability to external forces and led to a belief that existing regional cooperation arrangements were unable to make an effective contribution to solving the

problem.⁸

It must be noted that the prominent appearance of regional integration since the 1990s is closely linked with globalisation. Many scholars agree that recent regionalism and regionalisation phenomena were driven by globalisation and the contemporary regionalism should be redefined as “new regionalism.”⁹ By actively bringing the concepts of the national and the global into the analysis of regionalism, this perspective differentiates itself from earlier works that saw regionalism as a defensive mechanism to reduce dependence on the international economy. Björn Hettne and Fredrik Söderbaum describe this renewed trend of regionalism as “a complex process changing simultaneously and / or involving state as well as non-state actors, and occurring as a result of global, regional, national and local level forces.”¹⁰ As they state:

The ‘new regionalism’ is a truly worldwide phenomenon that is taking place in more areas of the world than ever before. Today’s regionalism is extroverted rather than introverted, which reflects the deeper interdependence of today’s global political economy and the intriguing relationship between globalisation and regionalisation.¹¹

New regionalism is simultaneously influenced by the national, the regional and global factors which often challenge the existing notion of the nation-state but

sometimes reinforce it. In this sense, it can be perceived as a way of “securing greater competitive access to global markets as opposed to securing regional autarchy.”¹² New regionalism is not limited by territorial proximity which reflects a marked departure from the earlier regional debates. In this respect, while regionalism has been driven by globalisation as one of the key external forces that crosses the border of the nation-state, it is also “a response to and a dynamic behind globalisation.”¹³ Hence, it is argued that today’s regionalism is more multifaceted and multidimensional than in the past. For instance, in the case of the Asian Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), the regional project was designed to facilitate wider global processes and could be read as a means of preventing the emergence of a specific East Asian regionalism.¹⁴ As Breslin et al state, “Indeed, the major spur to APEC in the early 1990s was the desire by its ‘Caucasian’ members to use it as a stick with which to beat the EU into finalizing the Uruguay Round.”¹⁵ As a new concept, this regionalism reflects a new trend in relation to the regional move in East Asia that is more active and dynamic but also more contingent and contradictory than previous concepts of regionalism.

Within this context, PIFF’s recent drive to be a representative of East Asia shows how festivals tend to change their approaches to the global market. As shown in the debate on new regionalism, it is global forces that have both promoted the

regional identity and caused tensions between the regional and the national identity. Globalisation in this particular sense seems to influence the trend of regionalisation that is interrelated to the recent growth in cultural exchange at the regional level. For example, while local initiatives have resulted in the rapid growth of the Korean film industry, this in turn has led to the production of regional cultural developments such as *Hanryu* (the Korean Wave).¹⁶ Jeeyoung Shin asserts the close link between regionalisation and globalisation in her discussion of *Hanryu* in East Asia. Pointing out several factors which contributed to the regional success of Korean popular media including films, Shin states, “While many Asian nation-states are still wary of western cultural imperialism, a growing proportion of regional audiences is inclined towards Korean films that reflect cultural values closer to its own.”¹⁷ She further suggests that the vitality of regional media shown in the presence of the geo-cultural market demonstrates the coexistence of regionalisation and globalisation in the world media cultural economy.¹⁸

PIFF’s regionalisation strategy requires recognition at multiple levels. First, while earlier regionalisation projects in Asia were based on a general sense of economic motivation to integrate the region, PIFF’s regionalisation is an attempt to connect the concept of Asia with culture - more specifically, with Asian cinema as an industry that can produce a huge profit. Second, the self-assertion of being a hub

in the region was prompted by both the recent rapid growth of cultural industries and the economic-oriented globalisation, as discussed in the previous chapter. Third, the festival combines a regional identity with the civic identity of Pusan and simultaneously attempts to integrate the festival image into the region of (East) Asia. Fourth, PIFF's regionalisation tends to show its ambivalent and contradictory character in approaching both the global and the local. The concept of Asia that PIFF has struggled to establish was materialised through placing a priority on Asian films in programming and launching a pre-market named the Pusan Promotion Plan (PPP) as a key instrument in making a festival brand image. However, this drive simultaneously faced a challenge in responding to the demand of the local film industry that had been growing and changing, which will be discussed in the following chapter. In this sense, the politics of PIFF seem to stand on an intersection between the national and the regional.

Overall, rather than building a regional arrangement to enhance independence from the global economy, PIFF has perceived regionalism as a measure to ensure continued participation in it. The festival's approach recognises the multi-dimensional process of globalisation while at the same time it reinforces ties with the local economy. Ultimately, this chapter attempts to interrogate how PIFF's regionalisation drive interacts with other approaches at the local and the national

level on two fronts: urban regeneration and global networks.

Becoming a Global City of Cinema

This section examines how the subnational unit has attempted to obtain a wider initiative so as to be a centre of supranational context - a regional hub - through the examination of the relations between the urban regeneration of Pusan and PIFF's regionalisation strategy. As argued in the previous chapter, film festivals today tend to interact with other political, social and economic factors so as to build up a sense of distinctive festival identity and to survive both local shifts and the increasingly competitive global economy. In this context, as Julian Stringer notes, the development of global cities has been bound up with the prominence of international film festivals since the 1990s. Stringer suggests that many festivals actually now market and project a city's own festival image within the global space economy especially in relation to other cities and other festivals.¹⁹ Hence, global-scaled festivals self-consciously tend to expand their events to compete with rival festivals, actively benchmarking existing big festivals, often claiming to be a regional hub and operating according to dual goals: to be globally accessible and locally distinctive within the global space economy.²⁰ As Stringer states:

In order to compete within the terms of this global space economy, such events must operate in two directions at once. As local differences are being erased through globalisation, festivals need to be similar to one another, but as novelty is also at a premium, the local and particular also becomes very valuable. Film festivals market both conceptual similarity and cultural difference.²¹

The more festivals desire to be fixed in a global festival map, the more they need to differentiate themselves from others by reconstructing the host city into a more attractive place. In this regard, PIFF's regionalisation strategy is aligned with the local development project so as to compete for global financing. In order to make its regional identity a marketable trademark, the regenerating urbanity of Pusan was significant. Urban planning, including building up an efficient and comprehensive infrastructure, aimed to suit the image that PIFF wished to construct. The links the festival forges "between local councils, businesses, governments, and communities, as well as some discussion of how all of these relate to global networks of power and influence" also require consideration.²² Hence, the processes of urban regeneration depend to a large extent upon multiple levels of networks.

With regard to PIFF's choice of a regional identification, there are two ways to explain why PIFF has focused on Asian identity from the start. First, as mentioned in the previous chapter, PIFF was initially invented as one of the special

events of the Asian Week which the city of Pusan organised to participate in the 2002 Asian Games in the city. Therefore, the PIFF committee had to enhance the spirit of Asian community in line with the main goal that Pusan city had already established.

Second, as a newcomer, competing against world-renowned and well-established film festivals, PIFF had to find a niche and differentiate itself from them. As the PIFF committee stated, “it would have been impossible for an unfamiliar country like Korea and an even more unfamiliar city like Busan [*sic*] to invite the ‘world premiere’ that other more famous international festivals had their eyes on.”²³ Moreover, the PIFF committee was aware of the potential for a niche market in Asian films, which had been apparent in the warm reception given to Iranian productions at western festivals such as Cannes, Venice and Berlin.²⁴ Although Hong Kong had established an official platform for Asian cinema over the past two decades, it had been deteriorating since the mid - 1990s. PIFF hoped to take its position. The widespread use of rhetoric elevating “Asianness” to promote the festival was evident in a number of cases. The most distinctive examples were the focus on Asian cinema in the main programmes and the project market known as the Pusan Promotion Plan. In addition, the establishment of new awards such as Asian Filmmaker of the Year reinforced the message of Asian identity.²⁵

The shaping of urban spaces by cinema as a cultural, material and social practice is one of the distinctive features of globalisation. As Mark Shiel notes, cinema as an industry provides cities with a subnational driving force in developing civic identities and a renewed function to cope effectively with the changing global economy. As Shiel outlines:

Industrially, cinema has long played an important role in the cultural economies of cities all over the world in the production, distribution and exhibition of motion pictures, and in the cultural geographies of certain cities particularly marked by cinema (from Los Angeles to Paris to Bombay) whose built environment and civic identity are both significantly constituted by film industry and films.²⁶

This description corroborates the view held by large numbers of commentators today, for example, Saskia Sassen, that the city - more so than the nation-state - is the fundamental unit of the new global system which has emerged and of which the mobility of capital and information is the most distinctive feature.

Despite its image as an industrial port city, Pusan managed to host the first international film festival in Korea. However, as the second largest city, and a gateway to the outside world with a growing geopolitical importance, the success of the first cultural event in Pusan influenced a new civic identity and implanted self-confidence. The festival's success encouraged promoters such as sponsors, the local

government, and other related tourist industry groups to make it a regular event.

Despite the negative civic image and the lack of cinematic heritage in Pusan, PIFF's success stimulated local attempts to develop a valuable cultural and economic activity.

In terms of urban development, PIFF seems to share a similar experience with many European film festivals such as those in Berlin and Rotterdam. Both European cities were bombed during World War II, while Pusan suffered extensive damage in the Korean War. Moreover, the three cities carried out prestigious cultural projects to enhance their credentials as future economic and cultural capitals of Europe and East Asia. Like many cities that have endeavoured to become global economic hubs, this urban trio strove to revive the local economy through cultural events. In this respect, Rotterdam has a few extra points of comparison with Pusan.

First, the urban regeneration in Rotterdam was driven by the city council's initiative for the invention of a "new Rotterdam," while in Pusan the success of the festival preceded the development of Pusan, and subsequently, the festival's initiative was combined with support from the local government.²⁷ As demonstrated in chapter 2, the local government was initially doubtful about the feasibility of PIFF and was not actively engaged with its establishment. Yet PIFF's

success stimulated local government plans for urban regeneration.

Second, although both cities are non-capital port cities, their specific approaches for urban regeneration were different. In Rotterdam, art and design was adopted by the city council to change the urban city image. Pusan, relatively lacking cultural heritage, had to create its legacy of culture - cinema - to support its city image. In other words, PIFF has adopted the concept of industrial hub of film industries in East Asia. This impulse was rapidly propelled by the establishment of the project market PPP. The PPP has certainly provided PIFF with a major justification to grasp the new role of the film festival in the process of urban regeneration in Pusan.

Also, there were a variety of factors that prompted PIFF's successful establishment; one crucial circumstance was the newly inaugurated local government in Pusan. Responding to the shift in the political environment in Korea and the demand from the local community, PIFF's establishment is understood as a local initiative rather than being nationally orchestrated. In this respect, PIFF's initiatives to link its festival identity and brand image with a strong Asian identity is closely incorporated with the desire of the local community of Pusan which also tried to gain a distinctive civic image to remain competitive in the global economy. Both the city and the festival had to position themselves beyond the divided nation-

state and insert themselves into a global arena.

Importantly, local economic development strategies in any individual city must increase revenue stability and decrease vulnerability to external forces. They must also provide good jobs for local citizens, and increase the overall satisfaction of city residents.²⁸ For instance, there was intense debate about the economic benefits to be had from hosting an international film festival. These included the rapid increase in tour packages connecting PIFF with the tourist industry in Pusan; including transportation, accommodation, and tickets to films during the festival. Typical advertising lines included “Movie lovers get a chance to tour Pusan and attend the film festival,”²⁹ and “Five-star hotels in Pusan are fully booked due to the special procurements of PIFF.”³⁰ Kim Joo-young, a journalist for a national mainstream economic newspaper, specifically calculated the economic impact of PIFF on Pusan. She reported, “With a budget of just 25 billion won, PIFF secured revenues of 250 billion and significantly contributed to the local economy of Pusan.”³¹ In short, the local community paid special attention to the extent that this cultural event could contribute to the economic development of Pusan.

PIFF’s continued success and growth have accelerated the transformation of Pusan from a manufacturing port city to the culturally driven modern city. Multiplexes, an aquarium and mega-sized shopping malls were constructed in the

suburban area of Pusan including Haeundae where PIFF's headquarters are located. The cityscape has been changed and this has begun to impact on the festival image and vice versa. Indeed, PIFF has proved that the cultural industry could revitalise the local economy. The role of culture in urban regeneration in Pusan seems to be dominated by a combination of economic and marketing considerations in this regard. The success of PIFF has enhanced the entrepreneurial function of culture within the local economy. In the national context, it has also prompted the proliferation of local film festivals in Puchon, Jeonju and Seoul.

As well as boosting the local film industry, PIFF redefined the identity of Pusan as a cinematic city. After PIFF and the PPP, Cinematheque Busan, the Busan Film Commission,³² the Busan Cinema Studio at the Yachting Centre Haeundae and the Asia Film Industry Centre were subsequently built, as well as the Asian Film Commissions Network (AFCNet).³³ Most importantly, it was decided by the government that the Korean Film Council (KOFIC) will relocate its base from Seoul to Pusan by 2008 according to the state's decentralisation policy.³⁴

This chapter argues that the key to success was the consistent focus on Asian cinema and a clear corporate identity consisting of a combination of films and industry. However, it was not until the first Pusan Promotion Plan proved to be successful that PIFF started to have full self-confidence and a decisive initiative in

its Asian-oriented direction. While PIFF tended to carefully stress the locality of Pusan at the time of establishing the first event, as the PPP had been launched in 1998, the festival began to be more aggressive in evoking its Asian identity.

In order to differentiate itself from the Hong Kong and the Tokyo Film Festivals, PIFF created new channels of finance and co-production for Asian films to access the global distribution circuit right after launching the festival. Propelled by the prominent development of regional film industries, the PPP has carved out a major network within Asia's rapidly rebounding film (co) production sector. In the wake of PPP's success, the Hong Kong and the Tokyo Film Festivals competitively established their own programmes: the Hong Kong-Asia Film Financing Forum (HAF) and the Tokyo Film Creators' Forum.

Overall, PIFF has attempted to develop links between the urban image of Pusan and its festival identity as a hub of Asian cinema. To achieve this aim, the festival and the local community have established an efficient infrastructure to become an industrial base of Asian cinema. Furthermore, PIFF has strategically established a pre-market PPP to attract transnational capital to invest in Asian cinema and to share information for participating in the production, distribution and exhibition in the early stage of production. This effort reflects the pervasive trend of globalisation, as Manuel Castells has described: the flow of transnational capital, or

the flow of information in a highly technological society into a global space, namely global cities.³⁵ In this sense, PIFF's urban regeneration project is interlinked with its global networks strategy which was simultaneously carried out. In short, the particular process of regional approach shown at PIFF and Pusan corroborates the argument that globalisation is a complex, dynamic coexistence of overlapping and contradictory modes at local, national and regional levels.

Festival Economy in the Festival Calendar

The previous section has attempted to show that PIFF has built up a regional identity as a hub of Asian cinema through the urban regeneration project of Pusan while responding to the needs of the local industry and local development. This section looks at other strategic actions that PIFF has utilised: deciding the festival season and building up global networks which are interlinked with urban regeneration. Festivals are cultural events where complex economic, cultural, social and political threads come together for a limited time. Various factors influence attendance at festivals and the reputation of each festival. These include the quality of the programme (the line-up of "names"), accessibility (accommodation, transportation, ease of purchasing tickets) and the ease of movement through a festival and its various events, as well as additional attractions in the surrounding

city. Among them, as many commentators point out, as much as festivals create a powerful sense of place, the temporal aspect of film festivals is significant to survive in the context of the existence of many rival film festivals.

Clearly, there has been inequality between established film festivals and new comers, constructed in the structure of the international film festival circuit. For example, it is widely believed that the respected, oldest western film festivals such as those in Venice, Berlin and Cannes have long dominated the annual festival calendar. Hence, scheduling is a key factor since it determines the activities of distinct cities in relation to one another. In addition, it is notable that within the mutual relationships forged with the local tourism and leisure industries, there exist particular high-peak festival seasons – especially between September and November, when film festivals such as those in Venice, Locarno, Pusan, Tokyo and Toronto take place. Within this competitive global map, conflict, negotiation and cooperation are all evident.

Furthermore, as more film festivals compete to be prestigious showcases, as mentioned earlier, the film festival economy has changed. Since the 1990s, many international film festivals have begun trying to insert themselves into this fixed calendar creating new opportunities. To avoid clashing and overlapping with other festivals, cooperation becomes as important as competition. To find a place in a

calendar dominated by established western film festivals, it is necessary to negotiate and link with rival cities and inter-regional counterparts at a variety of levels.

As PIFF has to rent venues for the festival period, it is usually scheduled to open three weeks after the Korean Thanksgiving holidays (which change every year according to the lunar calendar). In PIFF's case, the annual event begins between late September and early October although the range of dates may shift slightly.³⁶ For instance, the sixth PIFF opened one month later than the previous year. This was because PIFF aimed to find a niche market between the Hong Kong Film Festival in April and major western festivals. Obviously, this seems to be the outcome of the consideration of the major route of the festival circuit to avoid competition with Cannes in May, Venice in September, and Berlin in February. Since PIFF has focused on Asian films, it has become important for PIFF to obtain high-impact new titles produced in Asia for a quality line-up.

However, the Venice Film Festival in September – one month earlier than PIFF - might be a threat to PIFF's selection because high-quality Asian films made during the year may be chosen for Venice rather than Pusan in the same autumn period. To avoid this overlapping, PIFF has been set up as a non-competitive festival, discussed further in the following chapter. To better understand the political process in which festivals negotiate and compete with one another, it is worth

noting that this temporal aspect of film festivals is closely related to the premiere system.

Within the premiere system, more attractive world premieres provide a clear reason for the media to go to the event and consequently increase the presence of film distributors and sales-agents. The premiere at festivals often accrues the value of the film, in the name of “international premiere,” “world premiere” or even “national premiere.” Pointing out the significance of the temporal aspect of film festivals and its relation to the premiere system, Janet Harbord further emphasises that the notion of the premiere forges a hierarchical relationship among different festivals. As Harbord states:

Films screened in or out of competition at other international festivals will automatically be excluded from selection. Such a stipulation automatically places the festivals in competition with each other at sites of cultural significance, and confirms their status in the register of importance [...] but in addition to intra-festival premieres, the notion of the premiere constructs a hierarchy of viewing through a temporal axis, securing the originality of the moment of festival viewing as a first.³⁷

In this context, in order for a film to be nominated in the official competition of major film festivals, such as those in Cannes or Venice, the commitment to a sole film festival is necessary.

On top of this, the rules of competition limit the film’s ability to move or flow

around many film festivals at the same time. It is worth briefly mentioning the regulations of the International Federation of Film Producers Associations (FIAPF) here.³⁸ According to the rules of the FIAPF, once festivals are classified as competitive, they are not supposed to accept or exhibit films which have previously been in competition at other festivals. For example, films screened at Cannes are automatically excluded from selection for Venice. Such a stipulation helps determine the hierarchical positions between festivals as Harbord notes above.³⁹ Put simply, FIAPF has played a role in distributing territories to film festivals around the world.⁴⁰

In this climate, it is very difficult for PIFF, as a newcomer in a non-western nation, to obtain new Asian titles. To overcome this disadvantage, PIFF has pursued a special tie with the International Film Festival Rotterdam (IFFR). Both festivals cooperate in programming Asian films through various channels, even by sharing the pre-production stage of Asian films such as the Hubert Bals Fund (HBF) in the PPP.⁴¹ In other words, the IFFR, held at the beginning of the following year of PIFF's October, subsequently took the initiative to show the most recent Asian films prior to Berlin and Cannes. Since the IFFR has aimed to discover and introduce some alternative and experimental films and to differently focus on Asian films from its two counterparts, it does not necessarily block Asian cinema's subsequent

route to Berlin in February and Cannes in May in the same year. By avoiding competition with other well-established film festivals, PIFF actively cooperated with the European film festival, the IFFR. This mutual relationship enabled PIFF to obtain new titles from Asia and a firm position in the festival calendar as a platform for Asian cinema.

Overall, PIFF's strategy to differentiate (and conceptualise) itself through the process of negotiating the festival period and the non-competitive system indicates the complicated cultural politics operating on the festival circuit. By building a vital cooperative relation with other European festivals, PIFF has tried to be the leading platform for Asian films. As shown, interdependency and inequality in the film festival economy necessitate a link to other film festivals. For this reason, PIFF has strengthened ties with the outside world: the rest of Asia and Europe.

Global Networks

This section focuses on PIFF's initiatives to enhance a network with other film festivals. It aims to demonstrate PIFF's different approach to Asia and Europe: while PIFF has appealed to pan-Asianism and anti-Hollywood sentiments to generate regional solidarity in Asia, it has utilised a strong market-oriented approach towards Europe.

PIFF's effort to build global networks is observed at several different levels. It focused on the strong regional tie with Asia by joining up specialist networks such as the Network for the Promotion of Asian Cinema (NETPAC).⁴² At the time of its establishment, PIFF tended to focus on Northeast Asian cinemas including those of Japan, China, Taiwan and Hong Kong. After its successful launch, however, in order to meet the key concept of the Asian hub, the festival had to include other parts of Asia such as India, the Philippines, Malaysia and Indonesia, as well as Iran. To this end, PIFF actively participated in NETPAC, which was initially based in the Philippines and India, and it became a significant member. In November 2002, the NETPAC general conference was held in Pusan during the seventh PIFF. Members agreed to relocate its headquarters from Manila to Pusan for the following five years.⁴³

Moreover, in rebuilding and creating the networks, PIFF seems to have become imitative of the networking style of politico-economic relationships practised within the boundaries of many Asian states in the past such as with ASEAN. For instance, as the ASEAN's primary aim is "to accelerate economic growth, social progress and cultural development in the region," the Asian Film Commission Network (AFCNet - a group of organisations in Asia that provides shooting support services) received its official launch at the ninth PIFF.⁴⁴ The

network's major goals are to collaborate in marketing the Asian region as an attractive shooting location and to encourage the professional development of its members through educational activities.

It is worth pointing out that PIFF has appealed to pan-Asianism and anti-Hollywood sentiments to generate a regional solidarity. As mentioned in the previous chapter, key members of the PIFF committee such as Park Kwang-su and Lee Young-kwan were associated with the National Cinema Movement (*Minjok Younghwa Woondong*) which attempted to “construct the possibility of meaningful political and social change.”⁴⁵ The executive members tried to establish PIFF “without turning the festival into an exhibition fair or showcase for predominantly Hollywood films” and regarded this Asian film festival as “an important extension of Korea’s cultural movement.”⁴⁶ Therefore, even before its inauguration, PIFF invoked a sense of anti-Hollywoodism to protect the local film industry from Hollywood dominance. At an international seminar for the successful launch of PIFF on 5 June 1996, festival consultants and participants pointed out that the South Korean film industry had been dominated by Hollywood commercial films and that PIFF needed to show a new spectrum of world cinema by focusing on Asian cinema.⁴⁷ *Variety* reported in 1997 that “Strategies for combating Hollywood’s grip on foreign audiences dominated the discussion at the second Pusan Int’l. Film

Festival, which ran Oct.10-18 in South Korea's second largest city."⁴⁸ PIFF's anti-Hollywood sentiments were most visible at its active participation in the Screen Quota movement, a strong defence campaign against the US pressure for abolition of this system which required Korean theatres to screen local films for between 106 and 146 days a year.⁴⁹

However, at a regional level, PIFF's anti-Hollywood attitude was incorporated with pan-Asianism to protect the Asian film industry from Hollywood. During the first PPP in 1998, PIFF and the PPP announced the first co-production project, "Y2K," embracing Japan, Taiwan and Hong Kong. At the official press conference, renowned Hong Kong director Stanley Kwan stated that "We looked at the increasing dominance of Hollywood and decided we had to change, to do something different. [...] We hope this sets new standards and provides a model for the future."⁵⁰ In addition, the festival kept generating this discourse to invigorate the Asian film industry network by arranging a conference on "The Impact of the WTO on the Asian Film Industry" during the 2002 PPP.⁵¹

The other strand of PIFF's global networks is its market-oriented approach to Europe. PIFF used a market-oriented approach to build a network with Europe as South Korea attracted huge amounts of capital from the West when it gained the status of "tiger economy" in the late 1980s. In particular, PPP's solidarity with

CineMart at the IFFR and the close tie to the European Film Promotion (EFP) are clear examples of this approach. As PIFF became popular in East Asia as a platform for Asian cinema, the EFP, the Hamburg-based umbrella organisation of all European national promotion and export organisations, wanted to promote European cinema in Asia through PIFF. Since the 1990s, the EFP has been looking for a base from which to promote European films on and to the Asian market. Following the decline of the Hong Kong and Tokyo Festivals, PIFF emerged as a representative market. European cinema's eastward thrust thus encountered Pusan's ambitions to become a nodal point within the Asian market. In the process, PIFF's European bias also helped.⁵² As a result, every year PIFF has invited rising European stars to introduce the films produced in Europe, helping to distribute them to the local cinema chain and Asian film distributors.

This market-driven networking style was most obvious with the establishment of the PPP. Spurred on by its initial success, the PPP carved out a major network within Asia's rapidly growing film production sector. It is worth noting that PPP's initial success was enormously attributed to the partnership with CineMart, the IFFR's co-financing and co-production market. For instance, every year the Asian projects at CineMart were considered by the PPP and, in turn, PPP projects were considered by CineMart, providing a strong collaboration for

supporting new Asian films. Furthermore, PIFF and KOFIC launched the Asian Film Industry Network (AFIN), closely modelled on the EFP, and kicked off the expanded launch of a film market – the Asian Film Market (AFM) - in 2006.

In the meantime, PIFF also had to cope with a changing local situation so as to build up a firm tie with the local and the national context. As argued in the previous chapter, there were a number of distinctive political, economic and social factors that influenced the establishment of PIFF in the mid to late 1990s. After the successful launch in 1996, PIFF was still caught in the rupture of the rapidly changing political circumstances as discussed in chapter 2. Furthermore, the financial crisis that hit Asia in 1997 affected every sector of Korea. For example, Peter J. Katzenstein outlines the situation in which Korea was placed in:

In 1997 Korea was also undergoing far-reaching institutional and policy changes in a volatile geo-strategic situation on the Korean Peninsula. The crisis exploded into the open in the final weeks before the presidential election of December 1997. Rival candidates disavowed the IMF package, which had been put together in record time in November 1997. This further undermined the confidence of international financial markets in Seoul's political capacity for reform.⁵³

Katzenstein outlines the IMF's impact on South Korea by emphasising the political situation. Indeed, this situation influenced PIFF. Film festivals are closely aligned with political, economic and social circumstances in local, national and global

contexts and they are not able to be completely free from these complicated interlinked situations. For example, as PIFF became popular after the first event in 1996, Korean presidential candidates paid attention to this globally successful cultural event by appearing at the event to draw more media attention, thus helping in the process the popularity of the respective leader. On the opening night of the second event in 1997, and without prior notice, opposition leader Kim Dae Jung turned up although he had not received an official introduction from the organisers. The same thing happened in the case of Lee Hwe-chang, the candidate for the ruling party, who arrived a few days later.

As such examples suggest, it is apparent that PIFF has tried to avoid taking a clear political position amid the political changes in Korea. Although Pusan has long been a base of right-wing politics, as mentioned in chapter 2, PIFF has decided to be neutral so as to adjust to the rapidly changing political, economic and social environment at the local, the national and the global level. To support this decision, the focus on Asian identity has helped the festival committee avoid involvement in complex domestic politics by offering a plausible alternative pretext. As a result, while PIFF received enormous media coverage as a popular cultural event for which even presidential candidates lined up to participate, PIFF's efforts and rhetoric to evoke a strong regional identity beyond the nation-state provided good reason to

transcend the difficult political situation within South Korea.

Overall, PIFF forged substantial ties between Asia and Europe in different ways by appealing to an anti-Hollywood sentiment and a feeling of Asianism, and by emphasising the mutual interests in the region. PIFF's widescale adoption of this strategy indicates that PIFF is a conscious and reflexive player aware of changing cultural and political circumstances. It has adapted to the growing commercialism of the film industry, analysed its economic implications and adapted its capacity to cope with changes in the regional and global context.

Two distinctive features of PIFF's regionalisation approach merit special attention: the festival's unique ability to position itself in the region by a specific regionalisation strategy, and its close link with the local film industry, to be discussed in detail in the next chapter. These two aspects are, in turn, intertwined with each other. For instance, global networks and the city regeneration project were carried out at the same time. Scheduling the festival season had to be negotiated with the tourist industry in the local economy of Pusan and within the festival circuit at the global level. The PPP's transnational cooperation and its outcomes for investment, production, and distribution are interrelated to the transformation of the South Korean film industry in terms of shifts in funding sources and the rapid development of the infrastructure for film production.

Transformations in Film Culture

As argued earlier, as a way of taking a firm position in the global festival network, PIFF built up a global network and attracted major western film institutions by demonstrating its market value. This chapter has also tried to demonstrate the coexistence of two different pillars in its politics - one for the local film industry and the other for the regional industry. However, as PIFF expanded, it had to embrace greater professionalism to strengthen its regional identity. Whilst such an evolution has followed the desire for market access, it has been invariably challenged and threatened by the demands of the local industry. PIFF has had to risk its prosperity at the cost of local community ties.

While PIFF has built up its distinctive festival image as a regional hub of Asian cinema in conjunction with urban regeneration and networks projects, it has simultaneously tried to increase its number of films and events. For example, in the first event 163 films from thirty-three countries were shown. By the tenth event in 2006, this figure increased to 307 films from seventy-three countries. As Stringer points out, there is clearly a tendency that many film festivals strive to achieve: to establish a brand image for the festival as a global event “regardless of their actual size and the catchment area they draw participants and audiences from.”⁵⁴ This

tendency can be acknowledged as one of the crucial components of PIFF's strategy to differentiate it from other rival festivals in the same region. PIFF has thus primarily focused on size. Expansion is a necessity if the individual festival is not to be left behind by its rivals.⁵⁵ Importantly, the expansionism of PIFF has been utilised in conjunction with a regionalisation drive in a wide range of strategic actions including programming and establishing a film market.

Film festivals work hard to present a prestigious image in the globally competitive context by providing impressive figures. Especially, attendance figures are an important measure of success as they constitute a crucial factor in applying for funding from the government and private sponsors. Focusing on the changing relationship between international film festivals and cinephilia culture as exemplified by the IFFR, Marijke de Valck attempts to reveal the fabrication involved in the official audience figure published by many festivals. As the second largest audience film festival, the IFFR announced an audience of 355,000 during 2004; these figures seemingly supported the distinctive position of the festival. However, as she argues, "the number is a lie" since this figure includes the number of potential admissions through tickets sold at the festival box office as well as actual visitors.⁵⁶ As de Valck notes:

This data is used to support the impression of the IFFR as an important national and international event when it applies for funding on which the festival organisation is dependent. However, because all film festivals use similar methods to calculate attendance, the lie rules and so these figures retain their usefulness for comparing festivals.⁵⁷

de Valck also emphasises that the conditions of exhibition at film festivals can determine the accessibility of the audience. For instance, while Cannes has become a film festival for professionals, not allowing the general public to attend screenings without proper accreditation, Rotterdam has earned its reputation as the second largest audience film festival by providing easy access for the non-professional cinephile. However, as de Valck also points out, this relationship between the IFFR and its festival audience began to change as the IFFR moved its venue to a multiplex. As the scale and size of the IFFR became bigger, the film culture around the festival also changed. While the impressive attendance figures gave the festival a good reputation, they brought frustration to audiences in terms of access to tickets.⁵⁸ Now as soon as the festival opens online ticket sales, most screenings are already sold out.

Exactly the same situation has emerged at PIFF. Since PIFF strategically expanded its size to be a platform for Asian cinema to enter the global film market, the formerly audience-friendly film festival has become a professional marketplace for foreign financiers and investors. While PIFF increased the number of screenings

for industry professionals by establishing the Industry Screening in 2000 (at the fifth event), it became harder for the general audience to get tickets. The rapid change in the screening environment propelled the shift in relationship between audiences and the festival. Although de Valck discusses the case of Rotterdam, her explanation can be exactly applied to PIFF.

The popularity of the IFFR has enabled the festival organisation to rent the Pathe multiplex in downtown Rotterdam for the festival's duration since 1997. The move has the metaphorical value of capturing some of the essential issues at stake in the transformations of the festival. The multiplex specifically links the film festival to the mass audience it attracts and, at the same time, points to the unavoidable professionalisation that has occurred both in response to the increased global competitive context, as well as the growth and success of the festival itself. The festival schedule resembles the logistics of the multiplex as a commercial enterprise: films are constantly beginning and festival visitors may come to the multiplex without a clear goal of what they are going to see as last-minute decisions are facilitated by the concentration of cinema screens in one mega-theater.⁵⁹

In 2002, PIFF relocated from Nampo-dong, the city centre of Pusan, to Haeundae, a new built suburban area of Pusan which is an hour's travel from the centre. This shift impacted the festival's identity and image as well as film culture in the local community at multiple levels. In terms of the number of venues, for example, eleven screens of the Mega-Box Cineplex in Haeundae were added to the list of PIFF venues, along with the existing screening venues in Nampo-dong. The

public and even film professionals began to complain about the difficulty of getting tickets. On the contrary, as the PPP moved to Haeundae in 2002, it grew in scale and this area became rather industry-related.

In short, PIFF's rhetoric and practice of size and expansionism has impacted its festival brand-image, making it a more market-oriented global event. At the same time, this tendency has caused conflict and tension with the local community that began to have difficulties in getting tickets, for instance. In this respect, the transformation of PIFF can be understood as a response both to the infrastructural changes in film culture driven by globalisation and to a variety of needs from local, regional and global levels within the increasingly competitive global economy.

Between Regionalisation and Nationalism

As discussed, the debates on regionalism in relation to Asia tend to focus on particular economic, political and security issues. Cultural aspects of regionalism in Asia have been relatively neglected in academic discourses. The fact that differences exist among East Asian nations in social, political, economic and cultural backgrounds, especially in language, ethnicity and religion, is often overlooked. In this respect, the term "Asia" is used ambiguously both as a geographical location and a symbolic destination. Various approaches to the re-

labelling of “Asia” are being carried out at a moment when, in the world at large, national borders are collapsing and increasingly giving way to transnational cultural flows.

In his recent book *Recentering Globalization*, Koichi Iwabuchi discusses Japanese cultural power in the Asia region and the Japanese discursive construction of Asia in relation to the rest of the Asian nations and the West.⁶⁰ In suggesting there are difficulties in seeing Asia as a singular cultural geography, Iwabuchi asserts that the legacy of the “Asia is one” ideology was also pervasive in the Japanese media in the 1990s. He further states that “Asia is reimagined as a cultural space in which Japan is located in the implicit centre, playing the part of the conductor of Asian pop-musical cross-fertilization.”⁶¹ It should be noted that PIFF’s regional approach can be compared with the Japanese nationalistic assertion in the 1990s that Iwabuchi examines. As Japan reimagined Asia by means of its economic power and popular culture, such as animation and TV drama which hit the rest of Asia including Taiwan, Hong Kong and China in the early 1990s, as Iwabuchi points out; PIFF similarly reimagines Asia by mediation of another cultural product - film and its industry. Despite this similarity, there are two distinctive differences between the case of Japan and Pusan (Korea). First, PIFF’s regionalisation presents its most dynamic link to globalisation as its initiatives are

driven by the local/global interaction – “the city” - rather than the by aspiration of the nation-state. Second, this approach has been propelled by the industry-oriented impulse which covers the full process of film production, exhibition and distribution. In contrast, Japanese cultural power was driven by consumption of its cultural products in East Asia, as Iwabuchi argues.

Despite these different contexts, it can be argued that PIFF’s regional approach is similar to that described by Iwabuchi. PIFF’s regionalisation strategy through the redevelopment of Pusan shows a different process and context from other major western festivals after the post-war period since the leading actor was the local initiative existing beyond nationally orchestrated propaganda. However, PIFF’s regionalisation strategy also seems to involve latent issues of nationalism. As Stringer points out, the historical backdrop of all major festivals suggests that film festivals may reinforce the continuation of the nation-state system.⁶² This observation indicates the contradictory position where PIFF stands. In other words, whilst Pusan and PIFF both have long desired to position themselves beyond the nation-state of South Korea, and then establish a regional identity to cross the national boundary, they have also deliberately attempted to boost the national film industry. For example, PIFF has given a privileged position to national films in key programming sections and created an exclusive smaller section for national projects

in the PPP (which the following chapters will consider in detail).

Furthermore, the global networks that PIFF has attempted to build may appear likely to degenerate into another form of nationalism or intra-Asian imperialism, reflecting ideas prevalent in Asia. As argued by Arif Dirlik, the economic success of East Asian nations is related to the growth of regional consciousness. Dirlik argues that this kind of regionalism is often accompanied by nationalism and he suggests that “claims to regional culture (be it Asia or East Asia) often serve national yearnings, where supposed national characteristics are projected upon entire regions and continents.”⁶³ Indeed, since the 1990s it has been widely argued that throughout Inter-Asia, a peculiar sense of “triumphalism” has been directed against the West “despite the ‘internal antagonisms’: the twenty-first century is ‘ours’; ‘we’ are finally centred.”⁶⁴

On its tenth anniversary, PIFF succinctly outlined and attempted to justify its ambivalent position between Korean and Asian cinema:

PIFF continued to listen to Asia’s voices and in turn provided the backdrop for Asian films to listen to one another. For the past ten years, PIFF has promoted Korean films across the world and elevated the international status of the harbour city of Busan. [*sic*] These achievements weren’t made by the festival alone. Of course, PIFF was an Asian film festival, and its mainstay was the dynamic films and filmmakers of Asia. This is how the festival has unwavered for ten years, and this is why PIFF is as young and exuberant today as ever.⁶⁵

The above speech suggests how PIFF sees itself: a crossover between Asian and Korean films. This observation also provides the key to understanding contradictions, tensions and ambivalences in positioning the festival in local, national and global contexts.

Conclusion

The present chapter has attempted to understand how and why PIFF has conceptualised a regional identity and utilised regionalisation as a key tool in promoting the festival. PIFF's regionalisation strategy incorporates the branding of the festival image and the redefining of this festival identity in conjunction with urban regeneration and global networks. By mapping out the intersections where PIFF is located between the local and the regional in the global economy, the chapter has tried to illustrate that the regional approach is often at odds with other strategies at local and national levels. While PIFF has striven to promote the locality by boosting the local film industry with various programmes, it has also attempted to position itself within a wider context - as a hub of Asian cinema.

Whereas the first part of the chapter has focused on spatial developments, the second part has tried to elucidate the significance of the temporal aspect of film festivals through PIFF's non-competitive policy and through the particular

circumstances that determine the festival schedule. PIFF navigated the regional and global landscape with aplomb, building networks and helping renew the city of Pusan. Moreover, the chapter has also pointed out some problematic aspects of this expansionism and regionalisation drive in relation to the changing film culture and recent discourses in East Asia which are wary of intra-Asian imperialism. Indeed, PIFF's focus on regionalisation shows that there is a significant change in the way festivals are now entering the global market. At the same time, it also shows that today's regionalisation interacts aggressively and multi-dimensionally with local and global forces. In this context, PIFF is of particular importance since its distinctive approach to cultural politics in East Asia demonstrates the ways in which festivals have begun to negotiate and renew their roles and identities within the national, regional and global economies.

NOTES

¹ For a conceptual clarification of the terms in this thesis, “regionalism” refers to the general phenomenon, which is often associated with an ideology and programme; “regionalisation” denotes the empirical process which leads to “patterns of cooperation, integration, complementarity and convergence within a particular cross-national geographical space.” Björn Hettne and Fredrik Söderbaum, “Theorising the Rise of Regionness,” in *New Regionalisms in the Global Political Economy*, eds. Shaun Breslin, Christopher W. Hughes, Nicola Philips and Ben Rosamond (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), 34.

² The term “festival calendar” is often used by film trade magazines such as *Variety* and *Screen International*. The meaning is attributed to the fact that many film festivals are usually annual events held for a limited time. The term also implies a similar term “festival circuit” which characterises close links and interdependency among festivals. For further discussion regarding this term, see Julian Stringer, “Global Cities and the International Film Festival Economy,” in *Cinema and the City*, eds. Mark Shiel and Tony Fitzmaurice (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 134-144.

³ Shaun Breslin, Richard Higgott and Ben Rosamond, “Regions in Comparative Perspective” in *New Regionalisms in the Global Political Economy*, eds. Shaun Breslin, Christopher W. Hughes, Nicola Philips and Ben Rosamond (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), 2-3; Amitav Acharya, “Regionalism and the Emerging World Order: Sovereignty, Autonomy, Identity” in *Ibid.*, 21.

⁴ The ASEAN was established on 8 August 1967 in Bangkok by the five original member countries: Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand. Afterwards, Brunei Darussalam, Laos PDR, Myanmar and Cambodia joined them. Its main goal is to accelerate economic growth, social progress and cultural development in the region. Available at <http://www.aseansec.org/64.htm> (accessed March 29, 2007).

⁵ The discussion of what counts as Asia here - for example, the whole South Asian sub-continent - is beyond the scope and purposes of this thesis. For further arguments on this subject, see *New Regionalisms in the Global Political Economy*, eds. Shaun Breslin, Christopher W. Hughes, Nicola Philips and Ben Rosamond (London and New York: Routledge, 2002).

⁶ For further discussions on Turkish cinema in the category of Asian Cinema, see Dimitris Eleftheriotis “Turkish National Cinema,” in *Asian Cinemas: A Reader and Guide*, eds. Dimitris Eleftheriotis and Gary Needham (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006), 220-228.

⁷ Breslin, Higgott and Rosamond, 2002, 5.

⁸ Stuart Harris, “Asian Multilateral Institutions and their Response to the Asian Economic Crisis: The Regional and Global Implications” in *New Regionalisms in the Global Political Economy*, eds. Breslin et al, 2002, 119.

⁹ Breslin, Higgott and Rosamond, 2002, 4 ; Hettne and Söderbaum, 2002, 33.

¹⁰ Hettne and Söderbaum, 2002, 33.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² Breslin, Higgott and Rosamond, 2002, 7.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 8.

¹⁴ APEC comprises twenty-one members including Australia, New Zealand, Brunei Darussalam, Canada and United States. APEC indicates their members as economies since the APEC cooperative process is predominantly concerned with trade and economic issues.

http://www.apecsec.org.sg/apec/member_economies.html (accessed May 4, 2006).

¹⁵ Breslin, Higgott and Rosamond, 2002, 8.

¹⁶ The term indicates the sudden influx in and continuing since the late 1990s of Korean popular culture ranging from television dramas to popular music and films throughout East Asia including Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore, Vietnam, Japan as well as mainland China. In discussing *Hanryu*, it is generally agreed that Korean film boom in Asia was followed by the popularity of TV drama and music as the last runner of this phenomenon.

¹⁷ Jeeyoung Shin, “Globalisation and New Korean Cinema,” in *New Korean Cinema*, eds. Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005), 59. Shin outlines four factors: media technology, increased market deregulation, Hong Kong film industry’s relatively weak performance in the region and cultural proximity.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 59.

¹⁹ Julian Stringer, 2001, 140.

²⁰ Stringer, 2001, 138-139; Thomas Elsaesser, *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005), 86-93.

- ²¹ Stringer, 2001, 139.
- ²² *Ibid.*, 141.
- ²³ Hyuk-sang Lee, ed. *10 Years' PIFF History* (Pusan: Tenth PIFF, 2005), 133.
- ²⁴ Iranian cinema is categorised as Asian cinema in PIFF's programmes. Iran, officially the Islamic Republic of Iran, is a Southwest Asian country located in geographic territories of the Middle East and Southern Asia. Dong-Ho Kim, "Foreword," *The First Pusan International Film Festival*, Programme Booklet (Pusan: First PIFF, 1996), 10.
- ²⁵ This award was established in 2003. Given to the individual or organisation who contributed significantly to the advancement of the film industry and cultural exchanges in Asia, the first recipient of this award was director Mohsen Makhmalbaf.
- ²⁶ Mark Shiel, "Cinema and the City in History and Theory," in *Cinema and the City*, eds. Mark Shiel and Tony Fitzmaurice (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 1-2.
- ²⁷ Maarten A. Hajer, "Rotterdam: Redesigning the Public Domain" in *Cultural Policy and Urban Regeneration: The West European Experience*, eds. Franco Bianchini and Michael Parkinson (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1993), 62.
- ²⁸ Paul Swann, "From Workshop to Backlot: The Greater Philadelphia Film Office," in *Cinema and the City*, eds. Mark Shiel and Tony Fitzmaurice (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 88.
- ²⁹ "Movie lovers get a chance to tour Pusan and attend the film festival," *Korea Herald*, September 11, 1998, 10.
- ³⁰ Sang-keun Cha, "Five-star hotels in Pusan are fully booked" *Busanmaeil Shinmun*, September 23, 1998, 18.
- ³¹ Joo-young Kim, "Festivals' Impact on Local Economy," *Maeil Kyungje Shinmun*, December 23, 1999, n.p. 25 billion won is around USD 2.6 million. Since then, every year the statistic figure of PIFF's impact has been announced. In 2004, the economic impact of PIFF was reported as approximately 5.2 million won, for example. Chang-bae Kim, "PIFF's Economic Impact is 5.2 million Won," *Hankook Ilbo*, October 7, 2004. [online] Available at <http://news.hankooki.com/lpage/society/200410/h2004100721170043400.htm>. (accessed June 4, 2007).
- ³² The head of BFC has been appointed as director Park Kwang-su.
- ³³ AFCNet is a network of Asian film commissions and organisations whose aim is to provide a convenient filming environment in the region. This network was established in Pusan in 2003. The board members include Japan, China, Malaysia, Indonesia and Russia as well as Korea. Available at <http://www.afcnet.org/> (accessed August 12, 2007).
- ³⁴ Personal interview with Kim Hye-Joon, General Secretary of KOFIC in Seoul (October 8, 2005); Byung-won Jang, "Can Busan be a Cinema City?" *Film 2.0*, November 28, 2005. [online] Available at www.film2.co.kr. (accessed May 18, 2005).
- ³⁵ Manuel Castells, "The Reconstruction of Social Meaning in the Space of Flows," in *The Informational City: Information Technology, Economic Restructuring and the Urban Regional Process* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989), 348-53.
- ³⁶ Due to the absence of an exclusive festival venue, PIFF has to rent cinema venues in Pusan. Local cinemas in Pusan show the blockbuster movies during high peak *Chusuk*- Korean Thanksgiving Day season generally for four-weeks at least. This means that every year PIFF can start the event only after this traditional holiday. Since 2003, with the support from the Pusan council, an exclusive venue for PIFF has been constructed in the suburban area of Haeundae which should be completed by 2007.
- ³⁷ Janet Harbord, *Film Culture* (London: Sage, 2002), 68.
- ³⁸ According to the International Federation of Film Producers Associations (FIAPF), there are four categories of festivals: Competitive feature film festivals, Competitive specialised feature film festivals, Non-competitive feature film festivals, and Documentary and Short.
- ³⁹ FIAPF operates this kind of hierarchical relationships among international film festivals around the world. For example, according to FIAPF, the A-category festivals include Cannes, Berlin, Venice, San Sebastian, Moscow, Montreal, Tokyo, Cairo, Mar del Plata (Argentina), Shanghai, and Karlovy Vary, Locarno. For further reading of the rules of FIAPF, see the official website <http://www.fiapf.org>.
- ⁴⁰ Dina Iordanova, "Showdown of the Festivals: Clashing Entrepreneurship and Post-communist Management of Culture." *Film International*. vol. 4, no. 23 (2006): 28. In this article, Iordanova argues about Karlovy Vary's case and its relation to the rules of competition operated by FIAPF. For example, FIAPF's rules include that no more than one festival per country can have an A-category

status and no more than two A-festivals can exist per region.

⁴¹ CineMart ran the Hubert Bals Fund Award (a cash prize of Euro 10,000) during the PPP event to discover a new talented Asian director as a sponsorship programme. It largely shows how two project markets in different regions cooperate for their mutual interests.

⁴² NETPAC is an international, non-profit foundation, which was registered in Manila in December 1994. With representatives throughout Asia and the world, NETPAC is a pan-Asian film cultural organisation involving critics, filmmakers, festival organisers, curators, distributors, exhibitors and film educators. The genesis of NETPAC lies in the first conference in New Delhi in 1990, "Promoting Asian Cinema," organised by *Cinemaya*, the Asian Film Quarterly, in collaboration with UNESCO, to address a felt need to promote Asian films within Asia and around the world. To facilitate interaction and exchange regionally and globally, it was decided at this conference to set up a network of Asian Film centres in the countries of Asia, with associate members internationally.

⁴³ Available at <http://net-pac.net/> (accessed September 20, 2006).

⁴⁴ "Objectives of the ASEAN." Available at <http://www.aseansec.org/64.htm>. (accessed July 10, 2007).

⁴⁵ Hollywood dominance of the local film market in the 1980s had spurred local intellectuals and workers to create resistant film discourses. "National cinema resists Hollywood dominance in the international market and the government's monopoly and control over film distribution." Eung-Jun Min, "Political and Sociocultural Implications of Hollywood Hegemony in the Korean Film Industry: Resistance, Assimilation, and Articulation" in *The Globalisation of Corporate Media Hegemony*, eds. Lee Artz and Yahya R. Kamalipour (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003), 253-254.

⁴⁶ Hyuk-sang Lee, ed. *10 Years' PIFF History*, 2005, 137.

⁴⁷ Seung-Hyun Cho, "PIFF Seminar" *Kukjeshinmun*, June 7, 1996, 15.

⁴⁸ Maureen Sullivan, "Pusan Focuses on Holding Back H'wood Onslaught" *Variety*, 10-26 October, 1997, n.p.

⁴⁹ The Screen Quota system is a kind of trade barrier to protect local films. The strictly enforced system, introduced in 1966, requires Korean cinemas to screen local films for between 106 and 146 days each year. It is widely presumed that the Screen Quota system has helped local films to secure screen space and to survive in the highly competitive global film industry. However, this system has been challenged by Hollywood and put under pressure by the dramatic growth of the local film industry since the late 1990s. As a result, controversy has emerged with some advocating a reduction of the quota or the abrogation of the entire system. Korean filmmakers have vigorously fought to protect the system through continuous protest against its abolition. Recently, however, as a result of the Free Trade Agreement between Korea and the United States on April 2, 2007, the Screen Quota has been reduced from 146 to 73 days.

⁵⁰ Quoted in Jonathan Watts, "Korea to lift ban on Japan," *Hollywood Reporter*, October 6, 1998, 143.

⁵¹ WTO is an acronym of World Trade Organisation. Together with this conference several programmes, such as The Future of the Asian Film Industry Network (AFIN), were organised in relation to the WTO issue during the 2002 PPP.

⁵² PIFF has closer ties with Western Europe than with North America, especially with France, which shares its strong anti-Hollywood stance. In fact, the majority of Korean art house films have been officially released in France since the late 1990s. Furthermore, *Cahiers du Cinema*, one of the most prestigious film journals in France, set up an annual screening event in Paris devoted solely to Korean cinema (personal interview with Charles Tesson, previous editor-in-chief of *Cahiers du Cinema* in Paris, June 10, 2003). The line-up has included *Choonhyang* and *Chiwaseon* by Im Kwon-taek, and the majority of Hong Sang-soo's films. Considering that Korean films enjoyed relatively few opportunities to be screened at European venues at the time, such cases appear to reflect PIFF's efforts to forge links with Europe.

⁵³ Peter J. Katzenstein, "Regionalism and Asia" in *New Regionalisms in the Global Political Economy*, eds. Brelin et al, 2002, 115.

⁵⁴ Stringer, 2001, 139. In this article, Stringer observes two crucial components: "a sense of stability" and "expansionism."

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 139.

⁵⁶ Marijke de Valck, "Drowning in Popcorn at the International Film Festival Rotterdam?: The Festival as a Multiplex of Cinephilia" in *Cinephilia: Movies, Love, and Memory*, eds. Marijke de Valck and Malte Hagener (Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam Press, 2005), 97-98. She cites this

phrase by drawing on IFFR's Cinemart director, Ido Abram's words.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 98.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 98.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 105.

⁶⁰ Koichi Iwabuchi, *Recentering Globalization: Popular Culture and Japanese Transnationalism*, (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2002), 6-11.

⁶¹ Ibid., 169-170.

⁶² Stringer, 2001, 140.

⁶³ Arif Dirlik, "Culture Against History? The Politics of East Asian Identity," *Development and Society*, vol. 28, no.2, December (1999): 188.

⁶⁴ Kuan-Hsing Chen, ed. *Trajectories: Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), 2.

⁶⁵ Hyuk-sang Lee, 2005, 277.

Chapter 4

Negotiating a Place Between Korean Cinema and Asian Cinema: Programming Politics

This chapter seeks to reveal some of the institutional dynamics of film festivals by focusing on the programming sections of the Pusan International Film Festival between the years 1996 and 2005. The chapter specifically aims to illustrate how the programming of national/regional sections is closely tied to the political, economic, and social interests of the institution. While PIFF has served as a showcase for Asian films by evoking a strong Asian identity to differentiate it from other counterparts in Asia, the festival has equally striven to promote the national film industry by acting as a gateway to the global market for those Korean films placed into prime sections. By examining the tensions between the “national” and the “regional” in PIFF’s programming, this chapter explores how the festival is attempting to stake out its own unique position within an ever-changing global landscape.

The international recognition of Korean cinema has mainly been achieved through an increased presence on the festival circuit in the West and a concurrent growth in the national film industry since the 1990s. In conjunction with this global visibility of Korean cinema, PIFF has established a firm

position in East Asia in a relatively short period (i.e. since its inception in 1996) to serve as a showcase for Asian cinema. Recent scholarship on Korean cinema tends to agree on the key role that PIFF has played in promoting Korean cinema and its globalisation.¹ Consequently, the evolution of PIFF is very much interrelated with the boom in the Korean film industry and its increasing visibility worldwide. However, despite the importance of the close links between PIFF and the Korean film industry, existing scholarship in this area largely elides any sustained empirical research on the relationship itself. That is, it has largely been taken for granted that PIFF's success is a result of the success of Korean cinema or, conversely, that Korean cinema's global success is a result of significant support from PIFF. Nevertheless, in spite of the keen connection between the two, neither assumption can fully explain the distinctive relations between Korean cinema and PIFF without further empirically verifiable research.

As Julian Stringer observes, just because a festival is internationally established and successful, it does not necessarily imply that the national film industry will follow suit.² In this regard, European film festivals and PIFF differ significantly in their relations with their respective local film industries. For example, Derek Elley, senior critic of *Variety*, states that PIFF was

“exceptionally lucky” as Korean cinema has been growing remarkably since the 1990s compared to its counterparts in other nations. Elley further claims that although the International Film Festival Rotterdam (IFFR) tried to promote Dutch cinema on the international film market through its own festival site, it failed to reverse the decline in the Dutch film industry.³

In this context, the particular relationship between PIFF and Korean cinema requires serious consideration and raises important questions. How do PIFF and the Korean film industry interrelate? If PIFF has played a role in promoting Korean cinema, how specifically and to what extent has the festival functioned in this respect over the decade? How did it correspond to individual Korean filmmakers’ self-positioning strategies aimed at breaking into the global film market? And finally, how does it relate to the Asian identity that PIFF has established as its festival identity?

To answer these questions, a close examination of the key sections of PIFF will act as a useful baseline to understand the complex negotiations of the contemporary Korean film industry within a local/global context. First, the chapter looks at Korean films in two key sections: the Opening Section and the Korean Panorama.⁴ Between 1996 and 2005, three Korean films were shown in the Opening section: *Peppermint Candy* (2000), *The Last Witness* (2001),

and *The Coast Guard* (2002). *Peppermint Candy* is of particular interest for this chapter as the film offers a discursive site to demonstrate the substantial transformation of the Korean film industry. This shall be followed with a consideration of the Korean Panorama, examining how PIFF reacts to developments within the local film industry. Lastly, pan-Asian programmes such as New Currents and A Window of Asian Cinema will be interrogated to discuss the ways in which PIFF has utilised a regionalisation strategy to respond to changing industrial circumstances.

Opening the Festival with a Korean Film

Despite the significance of the roles that festivals have played in global film culture, there has been little research on programming itself. In her recent essay, “Film Festivals, Programming, and the Building of a National Cinema,” Liz Czach specifically discusses how the festival programming process at the Toronto Film Festival is related to the Canadian film industry and Canadian cinema. Developing the concept of “critical capital” from Pierre Bourdieu’s “cultural capital,” Czach argues that a film’s critical capital is accrued and often determined through the film’s placement within the festival structure as well as from being screened at prestigious film festivals such as Cannes.⁵ As

she asserts, a focus on national spotlight programmes is common in every individual film festival because it promotes the national film culture to the global film market. Furthermore, the slot where a film is placed often determines its hierarchical position and indicates the way in which each film may be circulated and interpreted in the global market.

In light of this consideration, opening films are significant since they are the first encounter with festival audiences, especially with film professionals and journalists. Opening films can attract more attention to the festival in terms of promoting the festival to the media and general audience, and through establishing its own festival image.⁶ Therefore, the Opening section often becomes the most prominent slot especially in non-competitive film festivals. Whilst it is the closing night with the winning results that generally gains the most attention in competitive festivals, the opening night in non-competitive festivals attracts a concentrated media spotlight with particular attention from the foreign critics and the public. At the same time, and exactly for the same reason, the reverse is also true. If the opening film fails to gain critical, public and industrial attention at the festival site, it may severely damage the reputation of the festival. Due to this risk, the decision-making process about the key sections necessitates great consideration. Under these conditions,

placing a new local title into the opening slot reflects a strong nationalistic concern to place a special emphasis on the local film industry, and it contains a number of political dimensions and consequences.⁷

PIFF's overall programme consists of nine sections: Opening/Closing, A Window on Asian Cinema, New Currents, Korean Panorama, World Cinema, Wide Angle, Special Programme in Focus, Korean Retrospective, and Open Cinema.⁸ As shown in the chart below, films in the opening section largely compromise some combination of Asian directors and films. It is noticeable, however, that the first opening film was *Secrets and Lies* (1996), as this British film does not reflect the festival's identity as "the platform of Asian cinema." Park Kwang-Su, deeply engaged in the selection process as deputy festival director when launching the first event, said the programmers were desperately looking for a "big, quality film" that could represent the event in that year.⁹ Since the first PIFF was launched in haste as discussed in chapter 2, the emphasis was on a safe choice rather than on taking a risk with a less acclaimed film. For example, *Secrets and Lies* had just won the Palme d'Or in competition at Cannes a few months earlier and had already gained a Korean distributor.¹⁰ However, apart from this case, the section has tended to show new titles of prominent Asian directors such as Wayne Wang, Mohsen

Mkhmalbaf and Hou Hsiao- hsien.

Table 1: Opening Films at PIFF 1996-2005

	Year	Title	Director	Country
1	1996	<i>Secrets and Lies</i>	Mike Leigh	U.K.
2	1997	<i>Chinese Box</i>	Wayne Wang	France/UK/USA
3	1998	<i>The Silence</i>	Mohsen Mkhmalbaf	Iran/France
4	1999	<i>Peppermint Candy</i>	Lee Chang-dong	South Korea
5	2000	<i>The Wrestler</i>	Buddadeb Dasgupta	India
6	2001	<i>The Last Witness</i>	Bae Chang-Ho	South Korea
7	2002	<i>The Coast Guard</i>	Kim Ki-duk	South Korea
8	2003	<i>Doppelganger</i>	Kurosawa Kiyoshi	Japan
9	2004	<i>2046</i>	Wong Kar Wei	Hong Kong China
10	2005	<i>Three Times</i>	Hou Hsiao- hsien	Taiwan

Source: PIFF programme booklets from 1996 to 2005

As we can see, it was not until the fourth year of PIFF that the festival committee chose to open the event with a Korean film. *Peppermint Candy*, Lee

Chang-dong's second feature film, engages with issues of trauma and recovery from the Korean historical experience, such as the Kwangju Uprising, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) crisis and the military dictatorship since the 1980s. On opening the fourth PIFF with this film, the programming committee ambitiously asserted:

This year's festival celebrates Asian cinema with the Korean entry of *Peppermint Candy* as its curtain raiser. Lee Chang-dong, whose acclaimed *Green Fish* (1996) exposed the essence of Korean society, captures the process of recovering lost time with a new cinematic form.[...] Simply put, this film is a personal history of Young-ho. Through his character, however, we experience twenty years of Korean history. The changes in Young-Ho echo the turmoil in our society.¹¹

Drawing most plaudits from foreign guests and local audiences, this film was highly acclaimed during the festival. At a press conference after the world-premiere screening, director Lee said, "I am honoured that this film was selected as the opening film. Without PIFF, it would be impossible to screen Korean films including my film to many film professionals from the entire world."¹² Spurred on by the success at PIFF, it won multiple awards at the Karlovy Vary International Film Festival including the Don Quixote Award, the Special Prize of the Jury, the Network for the Promotion of Asian Cinema (NETPAC) Award as well as the Grand Bell Award for best film of 2000 in Korea. In addition, the film was invited to the Cannes Film Festival's Directors'

Fortnight. On top of the critical applause, the film was successful at the national box-office.¹³ After being shown at PIFF and accompanied by significant support from the media, it was released to the general audience on January 1, 2000.

Alongside this critical success at several international film festivals,¹⁴ the local media paid enormous attention to *Peppermint Candy* as the film suddenly became a phenomenon in Korean society and altered the broader cinema-going culture. The film's realistic approach to a series of traumatic events in the 1980s began to attract a large number of viewers who were between thirty and fifty years old. As the main audience of Korean films has been generally considered to be females in their twenties, the film was celebrated for attracting attention from middle-aged viewers who rarely attended the cinema. Titled "Peppermint Syndrome Changed Cinema Culture," one major newspaper article reported that "this film was highly spotlighted as it hugely contributed to digging up a niche market in the Korean film industry."¹⁵

Among those audiences who had experienced the same historical circumstances depicted in the film, famous opinion leaders within the cultural arena such as Park Wan-seo (the renowned novelist) and Hwang Ji-woo (the poet) both appraised this film in newspapers. For instance, Park Wan-seo

acclaimed that “I found a deep consolation when I saw this film. Ah, a film can be made in this way! This film is truly a good example of Realism cinema.”¹⁶ In addition, as a consequence of this phenomenon, a fan community called “People who Love *Peppermint Candy*” was established.¹⁷ Although this was part of a media-orchestrated public-relations campaign, the group continues to be popular with its annual New Year Special Screening of the film attracting large audiences.

The success of *Peppermint Candy* was a turning point in PIFF’s programming and subsequent direction.¹⁸ Indeed, it gave PIFF (and the wider Korean film industry) some confidence that Korean films are able to appeal globally. Two years later, PIFF selected another Korean film, *The Last Witness*, for the Opening section in 2001. Director Bae Chang-ho was one of the most prominent directors of the 1980s. After his directorial debut, *Slum People* (1982), he shot a number of box office hits including *Flower on the Equator* (1983), *Whale Hunting* (1984), and *Deep Blue Night* (1985). Based on a true story and a legendary Korean novel, *The Last Witness* is a film about people who suffered during the Korean War and the ideological conflicts between democracy and communism during the fifty years that followed.

A similarity between the two films is worth noting. Although *Peppermint*

Candy uses a unique reversed narrative time scheme, both films engage with the history of South Korea in the latter decades of the twentieth century. This common element was confirmed as a trend when *The Coast Guard* was chosen the following year. *The Coast Guard* is a story about a soldier in an observation point whose greatest goal in life is to arrest North Korean spies attempting to infiltrate the coastal area. He mistakenly shoots a young villager who is having sexual intercourse with a village girl. The girl goes insane and becomes the observation point sex toy, while the guilt-ridden coast guard also suffers from mental problems. Hur Moon-yung, the programmer of the Korean section introduced this film as “a shocking report on the oppressiveness that permeates Korean society.”¹⁹

These three films commonly demonstrate how national narratives are constructed cinematically and how individual identity is brutalised by institutional repression.²⁰ In *Peppermint Candy*, lead character Young-ho’s innocence is destroyed by police and military brutality during the 1980s and 1990s, while Private Kang in *The Coast Guard* becomes crazy as a result of the hair-trigger atmosphere of guarding the volatile North-South Korean border. The tragedy in *The Last Witness* comes from the political situation in the divided nation and the prisoners of the Korean War. In this respect, despite the

specific textual differences among the three films, they all display an exploration of national history that is pertinent to an understanding of the way in which PIFF presents and promotes national films to the global market.

Alongside the thematic similarity in their engagement with Korea's national history as a divided nation, it is interesting that there was an attempt towards blockbuster filmmaking in both *The Last Witness* and *The Coast Guard*. It could be argued that by mixing national history with popular genres, these two films shown at the opening section reflect the same trend prevalent in contemporary Korean films since the late 1990s, as exemplified by *Shiri* (Kang Je-kyu, 1999) and *Joint Security Area* (Park Chan-wook, 2000). As Chris Berry points out, whilst utilising recognisable Western aesthetics such as the blockbuster model to appeal to global audiences, recent Korean films since the late 1990s have drawn on an interest in local political issues. As he argues:

[B]oth of the most successful Korean blockbusters to date (*Shiri* and *Joint Security Area*) provide a space for examining and exorcizing the anxieties associated with the division of the Korean peninsula.²¹

For veteran director Bae, once one of the leading directors of the 1980s, *The Last Witness* was his ambitious comeback to commercial filmmaking by casting top stars Ahn Sung-ki, Lee Jung-jae and Lee Mi-youn. In a rare instance of local government funding, the film received financing from Koje

city in Korea and Miyazaki prefecture in Japan, which amounted to around twenty percent of the film's total budget.²² Yet this film attracted praise neither at the opening screening nor on subsequent general release in Korea. Indeed, there was a significant amount of negative media coverage regarding the choice of *The Last Witness* as opening film.

Film critic Yang Yoon-mo complained to a major local newspaper:

Firstly, PIFF made a critical mistake in selecting *The Last Witness* as an opening film, since the film was full of cliché. The film discouraged local audiences from being enthusiastic about the festival and Korean films alike. The festival committee, in particular, must not tie the current human relationship to the Korean film industry or certain reputation of a filmmaker.²³

And, journalist Park Eun-ju was equally critical:

It is doubtful that such a high-budgeted blockbuster like *The Last Witness*, whose production cost amounted to a staggering 4 billion Korean won, could incorporate the festival's spirit about Asian cinema. The committee needs to be aware that it is not obligated to screen a Korean film as the opening selection of the festival.²⁴

The quotations above indicate that a discrepancy exists between how PIFF prioritises a local title by placing it into a particular section and how it is then received at both global and local levels.²⁵ Despite PIFF's endeavour to highlight Korean films in the Opening section, the choices were not always

successful in satisfying the demand of the local film industry and audiences.

In *The Coast Guard*, director Kim Ki-duk also attempted a blockbuster that was very different from his previous films by casting a big star, Jang Dong-kun, and invoking a strong political message but, ultimately, proved that “his films are hardly commercial blockbusters in Korea despite the considerable weight of the opening slot at Pusan.”²⁶ Several extremely provocative scenes including brutal rapes and a miscarriage seemed to be unbearable to the audience.²⁷ In fact, those scenes have always been typical characteristics of Director Kim. For instance, British film critic Tony Rayns describes his films as “sexual terrorism.”²⁸ Ironically, however, and partly due to this aspect, his films were praised and awarded at major Western film festivals such as Venice and Berlin whereas they were turned away by the local audience.²⁹ Furthermore, in contrast to this critical praise from the West, it is noticeable that PIFF never paid critical attention to Kim’s films until he started to gain an international reputation. In this context, PIFF’s choice of this film as an opening title gave rise to controversy as it symbolised a sort of official ratification of his films which had been “ostracized” by the local film industry.³⁰

Such a contrast in the reception of Kim Ki-duk’s films illustrates how

taste regimes operate in the process of festival programming: some films are included and others excluded according to the particular “taste” of the film festival. Indeed, festival programming and the notion of taste are closely related. Despite his rather journalistic approach, Kenneth Turan usefully describes the nature of the selection process at festivals:

If there is one thing that is generally agreed about the official competition, it's that the selection process is baffling at best [...] The uncomfortable truth is that for a film festival that is the cynosure of all eyes, Cannes' taste, at least as far as the competition goes, is surprisingly narrow.³¹

The festival programming process of decision-making can never be neutral. It depends highly on the current political, economic, and social interests of the institution. However, programming national sections tends to be treated as an exceptional occasion as it is bound up with a different agenda, what Czach describes as a “national interest.” She explains that “Personal taste and value judgements might be downplayed more often in national spotlight programmes than in other programming decisions as these decisions are in the national interest - so to speak.”³² If this is true, then how can one clearly explain the choice of Kim Ki-duk's film as operating within this taste regime? A possible answer may become clear when Kim Ki-duk is compared with Lee

Chang-dong. The two directors show different pathways to reach global access, particularly in relation to PIFF's programming. Whilst all of Lee's films to date - *Green Fish*, *Peppermint Candy* and *Oasis* - were shown at the prestigious programming sections, none of Kim Ki-duk's nine films from 1997 to 2002 were ever invited to more important programming sections. For example, in the same programme catalogue in 1997, Lee's first feature film *Green Fish* was shown at New Currents and accompanied with critical praise such as "characters share similarities that represent the distortions of Korean society,"³³ whereas Kim's debut film *Crocodile* was allocated to Korean Panorama and described as "*Crocodile* is reminiscent of a painting, yet that doesn't compensate for the lack of good storytelling."³⁴

Considering this situation, it is apparent that the world-premiere screening of *The Coast Guard* at the Opening section was an exceptional occasion. Furthermore, this decision seems to have been prompted more by the global recognition of the director rather than by PIFF's self-motivated determination. In short, this process illustrates the complex negotiations of the festival's taste regimes, particularly around notions of "national agendas," and the complex, uneven and political process of programming. Furthermore, the discussion above reveals, the dilemma, which PIFF faces when programming

local films and the conflicting relationship with the local film industry. While the festival committee has tended to rely on established or globally recognised directors for the opening section, the Korean film industry has begun to evolve and grow rapidly both in terms of industry infrastructure and creativity.³⁵ For example, in 2001 when *The Last Witness* was shown at PIFF, Korean audiences experienced huge box office hits such as *Friend* (2001), *My Sassy Girl* (2001), *Kick the Moon* (2001) and *My Wife is a Gangster!* (2001). As Hyangjin Lee explains, a new trend which illustrates a kind of hybridism of commercialism and artistic experimentalism emerged in Korean cinema. She remarks:

The hybridism of commercialism and artistic experimentalism is a significant factor in contemporary Korean cinema as it has successfully created its new identity politics in Asia. The creative adaptation of Hollywood dramatic conventions flavoured by the locality is essential to capture the audience.³⁶

In other words, as Berry points out, it is not only the type of film that has been driving Korean cinema's international success that is different from the "new waves" of art cinema that made Taiwanese and mainland Chinese films well-known overseas in the mid to late 1980s.³⁷ Moreover, as we saw with *The Last Witness* and *The Coast Guard*, the fact that a film is chosen and shown as an opening film does not necessarily imply that commercial gain or enhanced

reputation will follow. As Czach admits, although the programming process can be a crucial way to understand the important relation between film festivals and the formation of a national cinema, programming itself is only one of the multiple factors implicated in these processes and its operation is often uneven at many levels.³⁸

As illustrated above, an examination of Korean films at PIFF enables us to consider the particular conditions, considerations and criteria around decision-making processes. It also provides one of the indicators that may reflect the way in which PIFF attempted to promote Korean cinema to the global film market. However, to fully account for the key factors surrounding PIFF and the Korean film industry, it is important to trace the transformation of the contemporary Korean film industry since the 1990s. To demonstrate this, the example of *Peppermint Candy* will be considered again. This film can provide a contested discursive site to observe the transformation of the Korean film industry during this crucial period. Apart from consideration on a textual level, it also invites a number of wider questions; for instance, why was this film chosen from among the many new local titles, such as *Lies* (Jang Sun-woo, 1999), *Chunhyang* (Im Kwon-taek, 2000), *Barking Dogs Never Bite* (Bong Joon-ho, 2000), *The Isle* (Kim Ki-duk, 2000), *The Virgin Stripped Bare by her*

Bachelors (Hong Sang-soo, 2000), and *Die Bad* (Ryoo Seong-wan, 2000), and why in this particular year, between 1999 and 2000?

To address these questions, it is necessary to pay attention to the period from the late 1990s to the early 2000s. For the Korean film industry, 1999 was the year when the first Korean blockbuster, *Shiri*, was released.³⁹ The commercial success of *Shiri* and the subsequent large amounts of capital available for filmmaking quickly transformed the structure of the local film market. The emergence of PIFF became an important part of the local film industry as the latter was looking for a route to the global film market. As it marks the beginning of a crucial period for the Korean film industry that substantially transformed the industry, the positioning of *Peppermint Candy* within this situation is significant.⁴⁰

Firstly, the film was financed by UniKorea, a new investment firm founded in 1999.⁴¹ The importance of UniKorea lies in its founding members and target films for financing since it was created by actors and filmmakers in order to support diverse films outside the mainstream.⁴² *Peppermint Candy* was the first film that UniKorea financed.⁴³ As this shows, the founding of UniKorea indicates a space for niche products such as *Peppermint Candy* to exist in, alongside the resurgent blockbuster and other popular genres in the

Korean industry. The legacy of UniKorea becomes most obvious in the presence of its cofounder, actor Moon Sung-keun.⁴⁴ Moon starred in various works of New Korean Cinema, such as *Black Republic* (1992) and *A Single Spark* (1995), and also served as Vice Chairman of the newly launched Korean Film Council (KOFIC) in 1999.⁴⁵ Alongside the transformation in structures of capital in the film industry, there has been considerable struggle between the so-called old and new generations in the local film industry in terms of governmental film policies. When the former Korean Motion Picture Promotion Corporation (KMPPC) was replaced with a body named KOFIC, the new leadership presided by members including Moon Sung-keun was challenged by older film professionals such as the former KMPPC president Yoon Il-bong and Kim Ji-mi, head of the Korean Motion Picture Artists Association. Although Moon had to resign due to resistance from the old generation, KOFIC had successfully taken the initiative and played a key role in establishing a new governmental cultural policy during this period.⁴⁶ The unique position of UniKorea and the dramatic transformation in terms of cultural policy at governmental level at that time are intertwined with the position of *Peppermint Candy* in the local film industry.

Meanwhile, crucially, it is also helpful to look at the position and status

of director Lee Chang-dong in the local film industry. Following the previous screening of *Green Fish* shown in the New Currents section and subsequently *Peppermint Candy* in the Opening section, Lee Chang-dong finished his third film *Oasis* (2002) with the financial support of the Pusan Promotion Plan (PPP), a project market or a forum through which selected filmmakers pitch new projects to potential producers.⁴⁷ This film was subsequently nominated for a Golden Lion at the Venice Film Festival and received the Special Director's Award in 2002. In this way, by exhibiting films in the New Currents (*Green Fish*, 1996) and Opening sections (*Peppermint Candy*, 1999), and utilising the PPP fund (*Oasis*, 2002), Lee has been closely involved with PIFF and used this to establish himself within the Korean film industry. The fact that Lee worked as Minister for Culture and Tourism between 2003 and 2004 further indicates the exalted position which he has gained in Korean society. As we can see, this case illustrates the ways in which the festival engages with particular filmmakers, offering a perfect marriage of interests between filmmakers and institutions.

Another significant point is that *Peppermint Candy* is the first co-produced film between Japan and Korea to be followed by a theatrical release in both countries. Considering that there were still some restrictions in cultural

exchanges and collaborations at that time, a new finance initiative from NHK (Nihon hōsō kyōkai, Japanese National Broadcasting Corporation) determined the film's distinctive position in the local industry. Despite their geographical contiguity, it is true that before the 1990s there was little cultural exchange among East Asian countries due to the colonial history, especially with Japan. For example, Japanese cultural products, including films, songs, and television programmes, were prohibited following the founding of the Republic of Korea in 1948, as illustrated in chapter 2. The position and success of *Peppermint Candy* should be considered within this political and historical context since there has been growing attention from the public on this sensitive issue.

Hollywood Reporter stressed this fact by reporting that:

Confirming its groundbreaking role in Asian cinema, the Pusan International Film Festival will open on Oct. 14 with the first Japanese-Korean co-production to be released in South Korea, organizers said Thursday. *Peppermint Candy*, directed by Korea's Lee Chang-dong and financed by Japan NHK, will premiere at the huge 5,000-seat outdoor theatre as the first of more than 200 films to be shown at the 10-day festival. It will be the first co-production to be screened in South Korea since the country's President Kim Dae-Jung announced a gradual lifting of the ban on Japanese cultural products last year, according to NHK.⁴⁸

In addition, at the Opening ceremony of 1999, a special message on the

importance of “cultural exchange” between Japan and Korea from President Kim was delivered on the big screen. After PIFF, *Peppermint Candy* was also screened in the opening section at the third NHK Asian Film Festival in December 1999 in Japan amidst a huge media spotlight. All these rhetorical and political circumstances around this film precisely mirror the transformation in the local film industry and show how these factors were activated and contributed to PIFF’s aim to promote Korean films and highlight the event.

The final point regarding PIFF and *Peppermint Candy* concerns the Screen Quota, a system which required Korean theatres to screen domestic films for between 106 and 146 days a year, claiming that, without it, Hollywood products would completely dominate the local market. When the United States demanded the removal of this system, it provoked an enormous defensive campaign from Korean filmmakers. Following the huge dramatic demonstration in Seoul, the fourth PIFF in 1999 provided a climatic moment for this nationalistic campaign by spotlighting the screening of *Shoot the Sun*, directed by Cho Jae-hong, a documentary film dealing with this very issue. By occupying PIFF square in Nampo-dong street in Pusan during the festival, local filmmakers fervently supported the quota system. Indeed, newly emerging members of the local film industry, such as Lee Chang-dong, Myung Kae-nam

and Moon Sung-keun, who were also key producers of the film, were always at the head of the parade. As the nature of a Screen Quota arguably indicates a strong nationalistic agenda, this was, ironically enough, the same place where Japanese films, that could now be shown, were enthusiastically received by the young audience. Consequently, the space where PIFF is located reveals a complex and contradictory interplay between the local and the global. Indeed, the screening of *Peppermint Candy* at PIFF in 1999 should be read within these new complexities caused by such transformations in Korean society.

Putting Korean Panorama into a Global/Local Context

Whilst Korean films screened at the Opening section over the past decade have mirrored some of the ways in which institutional dynamics interact with the local film industry, the Korean Panorama is the key to understanding how individual filmmakers have responded to these institutional dynamics. The emergence of PIFF in the late 1990s has become an important part of local cinema. For instance, there has been recognition that films shown and spotlighted at PIFF frequently achieve global distribution. However, as will be argued, this position has gradually shifted since many new local titles have begun to find a direct route to the global market without the mediation of local

institutions such as PIFF or KOFIC.

Within the overall festival programme structure, apart from the Opening/Closing sections, locally or regionally defined programmes generally receive less media attention and are even perceived as “ghettos.”⁴⁹ Furthermore, although a film may benefit from the critical, public and industrial attention that the festival brings to a national section, this success at the festival site does not necessarily lead to a consequent success at the local box office. For example, Czach succinctly analyses the way in which Canadian films at the Toronto International Film Festival are enthusiastically received and sold during the festival by creating “otherness” while they do not attract local audiences throughout the rest of the year.⁵⁰ In contrast, however, the Korean Panorama at PIFF has been widely spotlighted by both foreign guests and local audiences since its inception. The Korean Panorama aims to showcase the latest spectrum of Korean films by featuring approximately twelve to fifteen films each year. As a number of international film festivals have similarly utilised their own national cinema sections to achieve overseas visibility, PIFF has attempted to manipulate this section so as to “break through” to the global film market. It is worth looking at the initial goal of PIFF. At the first event, Kim Dong-Ho announced the central goal of the

festival:

Finally, the first and foremost objective of PIFF is to present and promote Korean cinema. For the most part, exposure of Korean cinema has been limited to single film screenings at individual festivals or week-long retrospectives at various cinemathèques around the world. From now on, however, we will showcase the strength and complexity of Korean films through our own self-determined and uncompromised film festival. This, I believe, is also the most effective way of advancing Korean films distribution into foreign markets.⁵¹

Such phrases as “exposure of Korean cinema” and “through our own self-determined and uncompromised film festival” suggest the ways in which PIFF perceived the status and the problem of Korean cinema at the time of launching PIFF. Kim Dong-Ho’s words further emphasised that the “Korean Panorama reflects the most definite aim of PIFF, featuring outstanding Korean films made in the past year with the utmost artistic, commercial and critical merit.”⁵²

Unlike New Currents, which strictly limits its selections to only art-house cinema from Asia, the Korean Panorama operates with a broader remit to showcase a range of local productions.⁵³ Thus, this section served to introduce a variety of Korean films to programmers and distributors from the Western film festivals. As a growing number of Korean films at PIFF participated in these major Western film festivals, the Panorama section became something of

a gateway to the West. The powerful position of this section can be attributed to the relatively strong possibility for global distribution. Consequently, it has led the local film industry to believe that PIFF can guarantee the exhibition and distribution of their products. Furthermore, it has become increasingly competitive to be selected as the opening/closing Korean films because many more local titles are being produced. In this context, the Korean Panorama has often been the only available section for the Korean film industry to exhibit films to the global market before theatrical release.

As many new titles have begun to be premiered at other prestigious international film festivals such as Cannes, Venice and Berlin, however, PIFF has started to lose its special position as a showcase for Korean movies, and since 2003 it has failed to stage the world premiere of any major local titles. At this point, it may prove useful to consider some examples. The majority of the films selected in the Panorama in 1999 had already been shown abroad before Pusan. In September of that year, *Lies* (Jang Sun-woo) had been in competition at the Venice Film Festival. In July, E Jae-yong's *An Affair* had won the main prize at the Fukuoka Asian Film Festival, while Song Il-gon's *The Picnic* had won the top prize at the 1999 Melbourne Film Festival. Also, Park Kwang-su's *The Uprising (Les Insurges)* had been screened in competition at Locarno. As

British film journalist Stephen Cremin notes, overseas guests no longer seem to visit Pusan to watch – let alone discover – Korean cinema. Indeed, in May 2006, in addition to the world premiere of Bong Joon-ho's *The Host*, Cannes attendees could catch over twenty different Korean films in the market.⁵⁴

Meanwhile, there has been much criticism of the Korean Panorama focused on the small number of titles and the lack of diversity in the section. For instance, in 1999 the Korean Panorama featured eleven local films made over the previous year. Derek Elley commented that this section failed to encompass “the full breadth” of current Korean production.⁵⁵ Tony Rayns also complained that, “there are many people who mainly come here to see Korean films, so they want to have a good panorama. Panorama should mean panorama, it should mean wider view.”⁵⁶

As seen in the examples cited above, the Korean Panorama was unable to offer the first showing of Korean films since several filmmakers constantly sought to establish an international reputation for their artistic achievements though securing a premiere abroad. Another clear example is the case of Park Chan-wook whose films have recently gained a strong reputation in the global film market. Although almost all films from *The Trio* (1997) to *Sympathy for Mr. Vengeance* (2002), and from *Old Boy* (2004) to the recent *Sympathy for*

Lady Vengeance (2005) were shown at the Korean Panorama, not one of Park's films was ever world premiered in Pusan. As this example illustrates, individual filmmakers and distribution companies have begun to present many local titles directly to the global market, more specifically to the competition sections of global festivals such as Cannes, Berlin and Venice, without the institutional support of PIFF. Being aware of this difficulty in premiering Korean films in the Panorama section, the festival has begun to find a way to adapt to a more competitive film festival environment by strengthening its Asian identity and remapping Asian films through its programming strategies.

Building Up an Asian Identity Through Asian Programmes

The world of film festivals is always in “a state of flux,”⁵⁷ some older festivals vanish while new ones flourish.⁵⁸ The Hong Kong International Film Festival (HKIFF), once one of the top festivals in East Asia, has been upstaged by its young and dynamic counterpart, Pusan, since the late 1990s. More recently, the position of the Tokyo International Film Festival has been threatened by its domestic counterpart in Tokyo, FILMex, initiated in 2000. Considering these circumstances, PIFF's self-generating, self-reflexive manifestation of regional identification to differentiate it from competing festivals is notable. As argued

in the preceding chapters, PIFF's strategy to survive the highly competitive global film industry is not only to link its festival identity to its city identity but also to develop this identity so as to integrate the region of (East) Asia through industrial links. Furthermore, this emphasis on regional identity reflects a wider shift throughout the region. PIFF's reclaiming of Asian identity and Pan-Asianism could be said to reflect an attempt to build up the idea of region as a unified entity as a strategy to compensate for the lack of internationally renowned directors in Korea, unlike Japan which has Ozu Yasujiro and Kitano Takeshi, or China which has Zhang Yimou. Thus, the concept has evolved from the vulnerable "in-betweenness" and "indistinguishableness" of Korea as a cultural entity.

From this context, it is notable that while PIFF has responded to local imperatives through local programmes, it has always equally stressed its position as an East Asian hub. In order to be a platform for Asian cinema, PIFF has established two key Asian sections: New Currents and A Window of Asian Cinema. Featuring between ten and twelve films, New Currents aims to discover talented Asian directors and to present a cash award of USD 30,000. A Window of Asian Cinema, covering between thirty and forty films, serves as a showcase for brand new and representative films by talented Asian filmmakers

with “their diverse points of view and style.”⁵⁹ Although both sections focus on Asian films, each has a slightly different goal. Whereas New Currents, the only featured competition at PIFF, includes an award by utilising an ambivalent tactic of non-competition and competition system, as shall be discussed later, A Window of Asian Cinema aims to be a portal of East Asian cinema by extensively selecting Asian films ranging from Northeast to South Asia.

As the programme catalogue states:

PIFF includes the New Currents Award to promote and encourage emerging film talents from Asia by selecting the best new film by an Asian director. First or second time directors of a feature film are eligible. An international jury, made up of eminent film professionals, judges films for the competition with the award guaranteeing a USD 30,000 cash prize to a winning director.⁶⁰

Considering that PIFF has been classified as non-competitive according to the International Federation of Film Producers Associations (FIAPF),⁶¹ the dual operation of competition and non-competition draws attention. As argued in the previous chapter, under the regulation of FIAPF, once festivals are classified as competitive, they are not supposed to accept or exhibit films which have previously been in competition at other festivals. Due to this regulation, and in order to avoid disadvantages in supplying and screening

films within this system, some smaller, or newly opened international festivals tend to operate with less strict selection criteria in order to be categorised as non-competitive festivals such as the IFFR and Edinburgh Film Festival. In the same vein, as a recently launched festival in a non-Western region, PIFF had to self-consciously position itself as non-competitive to survive in the competitive global festival world which consists of uneven power and hierarchical relationships.

In fact, PIFF's dual approach to this particular section seems to closely model the Asian programmes of the IFFR and Vancouver Film Festival. The IFFR is classified as non-competitive but includes the VPRO Tiger Awards, a competition for first or second features as a platform for discovering new talent.⁶² At each festival, an international jury grants three VPRO Tiger Awards consisting of Euro 10,000 each as well as guaranteed television airing in the Netherlands. Interestingly, the majority of the recent winners have been from East Asia including China, Japan and South Korea. For example, winning films include *Postman* (He Jianjun, 1995) *Suzhou River* (Lou Ye, 2002) and *Walking on the Wild Side* (Han Jie, 2006) from mainland China; *Like Grains of Sand* (Hasiguchi Ryosuke, 1996) from Japan; *Last Holiday* (Amir Karakulov, 1997) from Kazakhstan; *The Day a Pig Fell into the Well* (Hong Sang-Soo, 2000)

from South Korea; and *The Missing* (Lee Kang-sheng, 2004) from Taiwan.

Another similar case is the Dragons and Tigers: the Cinemas of East Asia section at the Vancouver International Film Festival. As the largest annual exhibition of East Asian films outside Asia, the festival has, since 1988, offered the Dragon and Tigers Award for Young Cinema to “the most creative and innovative feature by a new director from the Asia-Pacific region.”⁶³ In terms of scale, this section covers the largest selection of East Asian films of all the western film festivals.⁶⁴

As Thomas Elsaesser observes, while the IFFR has pursued a platform of Asian cinema *outside* Asia and has played a role in “building bridges between Asian cinema and European audiences” as a specialty for two decades,⁶⁵ PIFF’s goal has been to be act as a platform for Asian cinema *within* Asia. That is to say, instead of dispatching films and people to achieve recognition from the West, PIFF has set up its own festival platform to attract western film professionals with a “self-determined point of view” toward its own cultural products.⁶⁶ Although the HKIFF had played a key role in introducing Asian films inside Asia for about two decades, this role has been severely weakened since the late 1990s.⁶⁷

Given these examples, PIFF has striven to establish its image as non-

competitive so as to remain competitive in the festival world. At the same time, however, the festival has also deliberately extended its desire to create and brand its own new product, “made in Pusan,” by dually operating a competition system in the New Currents section.⁶⁸ Equally, the festival has also highlighted its wide scope, in A Window of Asian Cinema, as a showcase of Asian films ranging from Northeast Asia to the rest of Asia. When PIFF was launched, it differentiated itself from its counterparts in Japan and Hong Kong by focusing on Northeast Asian cinema. As PIFF organisers announced in 1996:

PIFF emphasizes films from Asia, especially Northeast Asia. In recent years, films from China, Taiwan and Hong Kong have been acclaimed at international film festivals. Likewise, filmmakers from Southeast Asia and Middle East countries such as Iran, India, and Vietnam are also enjoying world-wide attention, proving that films out of Asia have improved with each passing year. PIFF strives to further this exciting movement and to discover and support promising filmmakers and their stunning cultural productions.⁶⁹

Yet this boundary has changed and rapidly expanded. Since 1997, the festival has started systematically to showcase Asian films by selecting Asian cinemas in the section “Special Programme in Focus.” For instance, in 1997, PIFF showed twenty-two films from Korea, Japan, mainland China, Indonesia and India at the Special Programme in Focus called “Early Asian Cinema:

Close Encounters with Asia's Past.” In 1999, thirteen films entitled, “Celebrating 20th Century Asian Cinema: 20th Century Asian Masterpieces” were introduced. In addition, in 2000 the festival ambitiously established a special series of screenings of Central Asian cinema, “Cinema over the Tien Shan Mountain: Special on Central Asian Cinema,” which covered the little-seen cinemas of Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and Kyrgyzstan. In the same year, PIFF also focused on Iranian cinema in its Special Programme in Focus “Salaam Cinema!, Films of the Makhmalbaf Family.” In such instances, and as the cinema of Central Asia had generally been elided since the collapse of the Soviet Union,⁷⁰ PIFF attempted to cover this territory by actively including films from Central Asia and integrating them within an Asian-themed special section.

This expansionist tendency in programming can be understood, as Stringer notes, as one of the crucial components of the survival strategies used to differentiate a festival from other rivals in the same region.⁷¹ Consequently, the expansionism of PIFF, as a regionalisation strategy, utilises a wide range of tactics centred on programming. For instance, the tenth PIFF can be considered a significant moment in terms of its overall structure, identity, and position within a local, regional and global context.⁷² This event was accompanied by a

promotional crusade involving a massive 31 screens, 307 films including 122 Asian films from 73 countries, the launch of the Asian Film Academy and the announcement of the launch of the new Asian Film Market in 2006.⁷³ By aggressively programming Asian films in the name of “Remapping Asian *Auteur* Cinema: Asian Pantheon,” the festival has claimed its position as a critical hub in Asia, upstaging the existing Hong Kong and Tokyo festivals to become the portal for a first contact with “the other new Asian cinemas.”⁷⁴

By contrast, the HKIFF recently attempted to redefine its festival identity in a different way. Celebrating its twenty-fifth anniversary in 2001, the festival organised a special programme integrating ethnic Chinese cinemas including those from mainland China, Taiwan and Hong Kong.⁷⁵ In its subsequent year, the HKIFF deleted the key section named “Asian Vision” which showcased between fourteen and sixteen contemporary Asian films. Instead, films produced in the Asia region were now allocated to the Global Vision section as well as a new section named “Age of Independence: New Asian Film and Video,” an Asian digital competition. These examples indicate a struggle over the festival’s status and identity through self-consciously differentiating itself from its counterparts in the same region.

This regionalisation strategy in programming Asian sections is closely

aligned with local (and regional) film industries, such as in the interplay between PIFF and the Korean film industry. On the industrial side, PIFF's regionalisation approach was achieved by the PPP, a project market, which is one of the most distinctive marketing strategies allowing the festival to survive the dramatic transformations of the local/global film market. Since its establishment in 1998, the PPP has positioned itself as a gateway to Asian film projects by demonstrating that a number of previous projects have been completed, prizes awarded at other prestigious festivals, and distributed to the global audience. This will be discussed further in chapter 6.

In summary, to actively respond to the transformation of the local film industry and to survive the competitive environment of the global film market, PIFF negotiated its own position between the local and the regional film industry and attempted to reconstruct Asian identity through its particular programming strategies.

Conclusion

The recent momentum towards establishing PIFF as representative of East Asia reflects a change in the festival's relationship with the global film market. This emphasis on regional identity also reveals a wider shift throughout the region.

Furthermore, the recent trend for co-productions on a transnational level in the region has challenged the idea of narrowly defined national values in East Asia. This chapter has tried to suggest how PIFF has negotiated its own position within these changing global/local dynamics by examining the festival's ambivalent and complex programming politics.

By placing Korean films such as *Peppermint Candy* (2000), *The Last Witness* (2001), and *The Coast Guard* (2002) in the Opening section, PIFF attempted to utilise programming as a way of promoting national films to the global market. Among the three films, the chapter focused on *Peppermint Candy* as this film usefully demonstrates some of the substantial transformations in the Korean film industry. The Korean Panorama section has also reflected these changes, as many of the films exhibited in this section had been previously premiered at Western film festivals. Alongside the programming politics in national sections, Asian focused programmes, such as "New Currents" and "A Window of Asian Cinema," have reflected the way in which PIFF has utilised a regionalisation strategy to respond to these changing industrial circumstances through programming. To negotiate the new complexities emerging in the local film industry, PIFF has reconstructed and reinforced a pan-Asian identity as a way to appeal to the regional and the

global film industry.

However, the ambivalences of the politics of simultaneous regional/national identity precipitated by globalisation are intrinsically intertwined. These are frequently at odds with changing political, historical and economic contexts such as the Screen Quota movement and the lifting of the ban on Japanese cultural products. From this perspective, new complexities have spawned a drive for the festival to establish a new approach by expanding its strong sense of regionalisation in tandem with a transnational and globalisation framework. Furthermore, PIFF's transformation in cultural politics seems to prompt shifts in East Asia, such as in the case of the Hong Kong and Tokyo Film Festivals' attempts to reconstruct their status and identities. Indeed, the cultural politics of cultural industries in East Asia seem to moving from the national to the regional in order to participate more fully in globalisation. Overall, PIFF's programming politics over a decade demonstrate how the festival has attempted to negotiate a place between the national and the regional within rapidly changing national, regional and global circumstances.

Notes

- ¹ Jeeyoung Shin, "Globalisation and New Korean Cinema," in *New Korean Cinema* eds. Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005), 54-55; Darcy Parquet, "The Korean Film Industry: 1992 to the Present" in *Ibid.*, 49.
- ² Julian Stringer, "Global Cities and the International Film Festival Economy," in *Cinema and the City* eds. Mark Shiel and Tony Fitzmaurice (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 139.
- ³ Personal interview with Derek Elley in Karlovy Vary, Czech Republic (July 23, 2003).
- ⁴ The whole programme and the entry criteria explained in Appendix 2.
- ⁵ Liz Czach, "Film Festivals, Programming, and the Building of a National Cinema," *The Moving Image* 4.1 (2004), 82. [online] Available at: http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/the_moving_image/v004/4.1czach.html. (accessed September 19, 2006).
- ⁶ Czach, 82.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, 85.
- ⁸ Since the first event, however, these categories have slightly changed, adding two sections - Open Cinema in 1997 at the second event, and the Critic's Choice in 2002 at the seventh event.
- ⁹ Personal interview with Park Kwang-su in Seoul, Korea (January 6, 2006).
- ¹⁰ Unlike PIFF, other festivals in East Asia have tended to select an international - most often, a Hollywood - title that has already gained a distribution deal. This is because a festival screening prior to the film's theatrical release could actually add box office value to the film. For example, the Tokyo International Film Festival in 2000 presented *The 6th Day* (Roger Spottiswoode, 2000) at the opening section and *Charlie's Angels* (Mc G, 2000) as the closing film.
- ¹¹ Yong-kwan Lee, "Opening Film," *The Fourth Pusan International Film Festival*, Programme Booklet (Pusan: Fourth PIFF, 1999), 21.
- ¹² Dong-jin Lee, "To Get the Innocent Dream Back, 'About-turn'," *Chosun Ilbo*, October 15, 1999, 35.
- ¹³ The film attracted over 300,000 admissions in Seoul alone. This figure means that this film received relatively handsome box office returns especially in Seoul, considering that the average box office of Korean blockbusters was over one million in the whole country including Seoul at that time. Available at www.kofic.or.kr/statistics. (accessed June 18, 2007).
- ¹⁴ It should be noted that one of the key members of the programming committee at PIFF played an influential role in this film's smooth entry to some of the European film festivals such as Cannes and the Karlovy Vary Film Festival. Jay Jeon, programmer of the World Cinema section was associate producer of this film.
- ¹⁵ Kyung-moon Jung, "Peppermint Syndrome Changed Cinema Culture," *Hankook Ilbo* [online] 11 February 2000. Available at <http://www.hankooki.com/> (accessed February 20, 2007).
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁷ The official website of this film is <http://www.peppermintcandy.co.kr/>
- ¹⁸ Personal interview with Lee Yong-kwan in Seoul, Korea (January 4, 2007).
- ¹⁹ Moon-yung Hur, "Opening Film" *The Seventh Pusan International Film Festival Catalogue*, Programme Booklet (Pusan: the Seventh PIFF, 2002), n.p.
- ²⁰ David Martin-Jones, *Deleuze, Cinema and National Identity* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006), 205-221.
- ²¹ Chris Berry, "'What's big about the big film?: De-Westernizing' the Blockbuster in Korea and China," in *Movie Blockbusters*, ed. Julian Stringer (London: Routledge, 2003), 226.
- ²² Hye-jin Jung, "The Last Witness' Fail to Deliver" *Korea Times*, 17 November 2001, 16.
- ²³ Yoon-mo Yang, "This Year's Programming," *Busan Ilbo*, 17 November 2001, 26.
- ²⁴ Eun-ju Park, "The Last Witness," *Hankook Ilbo*, 13 November 2001, 36.
- ²⁵ Julian Stringer, "Putting Korean Cinema in its Place: Genre Classifications and the Contexts of Reception" in *New Korean Cinema*, eds. Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer (Edinburgh:

Edinburgh University Press, 2005), 99-101.

²⁶ Frank Segers, "Hae-an-seon", *Moving Pictures*, November issue, 2002, n.p.

²⁷ Soo-kyung Kim, "Hae-an-seon", *Dong-A Ilbo* [online] 21 November 2002. Available at http://www.donga.com/fbin/output?code=Q__&n=200211210301. (accessed March 8, 2007).

²⁸ Tony Rayns, "Sexual Terrorism: The Strange Case of Kim Ki-duk" *Film Comment* November-December (2004): 51. In this article, Rayns particularly uses this expression to describe the striking scene of fishhooks in the woman's vagina and down the protagonist's throat in Kim's *The Isle* (1999).

²⁹ In Venice, *The Isle* (1999) and *Unknown Address* (2001) were nominated in the competition and *3-Iron* (2004) received the Best Director Award while *Bad Guy* (2002) was shown in the competition and *Samaritan Girl* (2003) received the Best Director Award at the Berlin Film Festival.

³⁰ Rayns, 2004: 50.

³¹ Kenneth Turan, *Sundance to Sarajevo: Film Festivals and the World They Made* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 27.

³² Czach, 84.

³³ Yong-kwan Lee, "Programme Note" *The First Pusan International Film Festival*, Programme Booklet (Pusan: the First PIFF, 1999), 42.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 54.

³⁵ Darcy Paquet, "The Korean Film Industry: 1992 to the Present" in Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer (eds.) *New Korean Cinema* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005), 44-46.

³⁶ Hyangiin Lee, "South Korea: Film on the Global Stage" in *Contemporary Asian Cinema*, ed. Anne Ciecko (New York: Berg, 2006), 184.

³⁷ Chris Berry, "Full Service Cinema: The South Korean Cinema Success Story (So Far)," in *Text and Context of Korean Cinema: Crossing Borders*, ed. Young-Key Kim Renaud et. al., Sigur Center Asia Paper no.17 (2003), 7-16. Available at www.gwu.edu/~eall/special/berry-hms02.html. Accessed on 20 June 2003.

³⁸ Czach, 85.

³⁹ *Shiri* was released in February 1999 to the public and the new director's cut was screened at the Open Cinema section in the same year at the fourth PIFF.

⁴⁰ Paquet, 46.

⁴¹ Although his theoretical approach is different from mine, David Martin-Jones also points out the importance of UniKorea (see note 20) in his analysis of *Peppermint Candy*. See Martin-Jones, 205-221.

⁴² "Mainstream" here indicates films intentionally targeted to be box-office hits such as *The Ginkgo Bed* (Kang Je-kyu, 1996), *The Letter* (Lee Jung-gook, 1997), *A Promise* (Kim Yoo-jin, 1998) and *Shiri* (Kang Je-kyu, 1999). From the late 1990s, Korean cinema entered a boom period with the unprecedented box-office success of many of its films. The key factors explaining this rapid growth are new sources of film finance, increased standards of film production, and governmental film policy prompted by Korean globalisation. See Paquet, 2005, 32-50.

⁴³ UniKorea Culture & Art Investment Co. Ltd., an investment firm made up of actors and filmmakers, was launched in January 1999 with an initial operating budget of 3 billion KRW (USD 2.5 million). The owner of the company is Yeom Tae-soon who runs an enterprise named Aizim, a fashion brand for young consumers. Its key members are Lee Chang-dong, Moon Sung-keun, and Myung Kae-nam. UniKorea and Aizim were one of the key sponsors of the 1999 PIFF.

⁴⁴ Martin-Jones, 208.

⁴⁵ The Korean Film Council was established on 28 May 1999 through the restructuring of the Korean Motion Picture Promotion Corporation (KMPPC) by the new regime of President Kim Dae Jung (1998-2003). The KMPPC was founded on April 3 1973 under the military regime. President Park Chung Hee's government (1961-1979) enforced a strict political and ideological agenda that stifled the film industry. For example, the KMPPC enacted the Motion Picture Law and frequently revised it to keep the film industry under tight control.

-
- ⁴⁶ Following the revision of the Film Promotion Law in 1999, the reform of film policy by KOFIC changed the structure of the industry. For example, claiming “cultural diversity,” KOFIC has supported art-house cinema as well as commercial cinema and tried to restructure the distribution system.
- ⁴⁷ *Oasis* was one of the Korean projects of PPP in 2001 with *Bow* (Kim Ki-duk, 2005), receiving Mybi Award (cash prize 10,000,000 KRW).
- ⁴⁸ Jonathan Watts, “Japan-Korea Team at Pusan” *Hollywood Reporter*, September 17-19, 1999, 16.
- ⁴⁹ Czach, 82.
- ⁵⁰ Czach, 78.
- ⁵¹ Dong- Ho Kim, “Foreword,” *The First Pusan International Film Festival*, Programme Booklet (Pusan: the First PIFF, 1996), 10.
- ⁵² Ibid.
- ⁵³ For the entry criteria of this section, see Appendix 3.
- ⁵⁴ Stephen Cremin “Pucheon Set to Fill Regional Niche,” *Hankyureh* 21, August 2, 2006. [online] Available at http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_entertainment/146041.html. (accessed October 8, 2006).
- ⁵⁵ Derek Elley, “Pusan Pumps Korean Pic Profile,” *Variety*, 1-7 November 1999, 19. However, responding to those criticisms, in 2004 PIFF established an extra section named “Industry Screening” for the guests who attend the PPP to show more Korean films.
- ⁵⁶ Su-yun Kim, “British Film Critics Pleased with Improved Facilities at PIFF,” *Korea Times*, October 22, 1999. 12.
- ⁵⁷ Cremin, 2006, Ibid.
- ⁵⁸ An example would be the Karlovy Vary Film Festival in the Czech Republic, one of the most important international venues within the Eastern bloc, which was put at risk by an attempt to replace it with a new festival in Prague between 1995 and 1996. Dina Iordanova, *Cinema of the Other Europe: The Industry and Artistry of East Central European Film* (London and New York: Wallflower Press, 2003), 30.
- ⁵⁹ The official website of PIFF. http://www.piff.org/english/html/info_02.asp. (accessed July 27, 2005).
- ⁶⁰ Ibid.
- ⁶¹ The preceding chapter briefly discussed about the roles and influences of the International Federation of Film Producers Associations (FIAPF) to explain the rules of competition and the premiere system.
- ⁶² For IFFR’s Asian-focused programmes, see Chapter 6: A Global Film Producer: Pusan Promotion Plan.
- ⁶³ The official website of Vancouver Film Festival. Available at <http://www.viff.org/viff05/index05.html>. (accessed June 20, 2006).
- ⁶⁴ For example, in 2004, 95 films were in the programme. The winners of this section included Kore-eda Hirokazu (*Maborosi*, Japan, 1995), Hong Sang-soo (*The Day the Pig Fell Into the Well*, Korea, 1996), Zhang Ming (*Rainclouds over Wushan*, China, 1996), Lee Chang-dong (*Green Fish*, Korea, 1997), Jia Zhangke (*Xiao Wu*, China, 1998), and Liu Jiayin (*Ox Hide*, China, 2005). Available at <http://www.viff.org/viff05/index05.html>. (accessed June 22, 2006).
- ⁶⁵ Thomas Elsaesser, *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005), 85.
- ⁶⁶ Dong- Ho Kim, 1996, 10.
- ⁶⁷ According to Derek Elley, specialist in the Asian film industry, there was a kind of “vacuum.” period after Hong Kong and before the Pusan around the mid-1990s and PIFF aggressively took over at this moment (Personal interview in London, October 6, 2006). For a more detailed and in-depth discussion of the relationship between the Hong Kong Film Festival and PIFF, see Chapter 7: Remapping Asian Cinema: The Tenth Anniversary in 2005.
- ⁶⁸ For an in-depth analysis of “branding” and “made in Pusan,” see Chapter 6.
- ⁶⁹ Dong- Ho Kim, 1996, 10.

⁷⁰ Iordanova, 2003, 14.

⁷¹ Stringer, 2001, 138. Stringer observes two crucial components: “a sense of stability” and “expansionism.”

⁷² A close examination of varying degrees of expansionism in relation to a regional approach is discussed in chapter 7 through the specific case of the tenth anniversary of PIFF in 2005.

⁷³ At the previous event (2004) there had been 17 screens, 266 films from 63 countries.

⁷⁴ Elsaesser, 2005, 85.

⁷⁵ *A Century of Chinese Cinema: Look Back in Glory: The Twenty-fifth Hong Kong International Film Festival* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong Critics Society, 2001).

Chapter 5

Re-imagining the Past: Programming Retrospectives

“In the past 10 years, Korean cinema has spread rapidly in France, where it is much loved by local audiences. Considering the fact that Korean cinema history boasts no great master such as Kurosawa Akira in Japan, isn't this global spotlight amazing?”

“Have you ever wondered why classic Korean films have long been unknown in Europe? The absence of information about old Korean films may be attributed to Korea's history. I don't think the quality of Korean cinema at that period was inferior to other countries in East Asia. When Kurosawa made films in Japan, there were quite a few film *auteurs* in Korea whose work was just as excellent. Yu Hyun-Mok, who made *An Aimless Bullet* (1961), is representative of those masters.”

“When one French audience asked a question to Bong Joon-ho in a Q&A session after the screening of *The Host* (2006) in France, director Bong jumped up from his chair to answer.”¹

Following the discussion of contemporary Korean cinema and PIFF in the preceding chapter, this chapter explores the relationship between *older* Korean films and PIFF. The chapter specifically looks at a series of retrospectives organised by PIFF between the years 1996 and 2005.² By recirculating classic Korean films in this particular section, PIFF has sought to redefine the concept of Korean cinema and play a key role in sanctioning old films made in Korea as a legitimate agent of memory within South Korea. At the same time, PIFF has highlighted old Asian films in these retrospectives in an attempt to justify the festival's identity as a platform for Asian cinema. The present chapter aims to demonstrate how PIFF strategically exploited this section to promote the festival and highlights the

mediation and negotiation that appeared in the process of remapping old Korean and Asian cinema.

It is an often overlooked fact that film festivals have provided a significant location for screening “old” films. Research on the global phenomenon of international film festivals have continued to select many innovative, “cutting-edge” contemporary films for world premieres in order to attract more global attention and to secure a high profile within an increasingly competitive film festival economy. Dudley Andrew calculates that approximately 3,000 films are produced annually around the world and make up a “sea of films” at festivals in every corner of the globe.³ A series of processes for identifying and categorising these thousands of films has been developed for differentiating amongst them. Among these new films, some are identified as “New Wave,” breaking through existing trends in cinema, and then categorised by a group of film professionals - for example, programmers of film festivals and film critics - while others disappear from public view.⁴

Furthermore, this obsession with “newness” at festivals has enabled festivals to become a key location for the selling and buying of projects and ideas at the pre-production stage: these are films which are not yet produced but will be completed in the future. More and more film festivals have created their own project film markets alongside the main event. For example, the Pusan Promotion Plan (PPP) at

PIFF and CineMart at the International Film Festival Rotterdam (IFFR) have played a key role in producing “new” films and branding them as their own distinctive products, a phenomenon which will be discussed in detail in the following chapter.

Conversely, Julian Stringer claims that festivals today play a crucial role in the re-circulation of old films.⁵ As Stringer states:

As with the process of labelling that happens at museums and art galleries, any movie shown at a film festival needs to be positioned for public display, and this is achieved through acts of classification and identification. At its moment of reception by a festival audience, a title will be made sense of, in part, through the weight of the interpretative frames provided at and around such events.⁶

By analysing the relationship between Hollywood “classics” and the London Film Festival between the years 1981-2001, Stringer attempts to reveal the role that festivals play in the re-circulation of old films. Focusing on the materialisation of film memory through a particular logic of re-release sequencing of classic Hollywood title at film festivals, he points out a hidden logic in the commercial agenda around festival viewing.⁷ In other words, he explores a series of specific memory narratives that the London Film Festival drew on to collect, categorise and present old films, such as technological developments and “firsts,” special modes of public presentation, traditional conceptions of authorship and opportunities for recommodification.⁸ Importantly, Stringer suggests that the growth of the

international film festival circuit makes it possible to open up “a more decentred and de-territorialised view of Hollywood’s reception history.” That is, the same “old” films may be viewed differently in different contexts and with different preservationist concerns.⁹

From this perspective, exhibiting old films at PIFF can provide an opportunity to understand one such different context and raises several important questions - Are the retrospectives at Pusan different from ones in the West? If so, how have different institutional interests become intertwined within this particular section over the past decade? And how does the decision to screen old Korean and Asian films at PIFF support the formation of the festival’s identity and its strategy to enter the global market? To address these questions, this chapter considers how such strategic activities around retrospectives are closely related to the particular political, social and cultural circumstances of South Korean cinema.

Exhibiting old films produced in host countries is one of the most important programming features of film festivals around the globe. Despite considerable national variation, retrospective sections serve to justify and legitimate the current status of each national cinema, often coalescing with the festivals’ interest in promoting their own events. In this respect, by connecting the past to the present through its Korean retrospective programme, PIFF has attempted to both establish

and maintain a sense of “continuity” in Korean cinema as well as to solidify the position of the festival in the local and the global market. Similarly, as one of PIFF’s key aims and sources of identity is to be a hub of Asian cinema in both a critical and an industrial sense, the festival also highlights old Asian films through retrospective programmes alongside its contemporary Asian programming.

Taking this into account, this chapter considers one pan-Asian and three key Korean retrospective programmes from the years 1996 to 2005: Korean New Wave (the first PIFF, 1996); Kim Ki-young, *Cinema of Diabolical Desire and Death* (the second PIFF, 1997); Shin Sang-Ok, *Prince of Korean Cinema, Leading the Desire of the Masses* (the sixth PIFF, 2001); and *Rediscovering Asian Cinema Network: The Decades of Co-production between Korea and Hong Kong* (the ninth PIFF, 2004).

These programmes have been chosen for two reasons. First, the programmes clearly illustrate significant processes of negotiation and mediation in refiguring the past of Korean and Asian cinema and in constructing PIFF’s festival identity. Second, they were the most controversial and widely discussed programmes over the decade. They can therefore provide an opportunity to grasp the multifaceted roles and complex motivations involved in marketing retrospectives to the local and global markets. In short, they can help us to understand the ways in which these old

films were received within the political, social and cultural context of South Korea.

Retrospectives at PIFF, as a key means of constructing the festival identity, will be examined at two levels. On the one hand, the chapter discusses how this section played a crucial role in connecting Korean cinema's past with its present. Korean retrospectives established "continuity" in Korean cinema history and legitimised old Korean films at the festival site. This becomes most apparent when looking at the establishment of the first retrospective, "Korean New Wave," in 1996. Significantly, such an effort to continue the legacy of South Korean cinema was inter-linked with the desire of the Korean film industry to "breakthrough" into the global film market. Furthermore, this interdependency between PIFF and the Korean film industry can also be observed in the case of retrospective focusing on the works of Kim Ki-young and Shin Sang-Ok.

On the other hand, the strategic exhibition of old Asian films in this section is one way in which PIFF has tried to build up the festival's brand image as an official platform for Asian cinema. Although this effort operates within various programmes to re-map Asian cinema's history over the decade, "Rediscovering Asian Cinema Network: The Decades of Co-production between Korea and Hong Kong" at the ninth PIFF in 2004 provides the most interesting case. This particular retrospective clearly pinpoints the very moment at which a critical review of the past was linked

with the ongoing transformation of the Asian film industry.

Before examining these programmes in more detail, it is worth noting that there are significant differences between the re-circulation of old Korean films at PIFF and how classic Hollywood film is viewed in the West (both in Europe and North America).

Firstly, the way in which Korean cinema is remembered should be understood within its particular historical context. Unlike old Hollywood films, which tend to be extolled as an “emblem of the good old days” and as helping viewers remember a “glorious” or “better past,” the past in Korean cinema has often been depicted as traumatic and painful due to colonization, the Korean War and the subsequent dictatorship and compressed modernization processes.¹⁰ Cinematic imagery of the nation in Korean cinema therefore tends to be interpreted pessimistically as a response to the historically, politically and socially traumatic consequences of modernization put in place by the authoritarian government. In this sense, the ways in which Korean cinema are remembered should be understood within its particular historical contexts. For example, one western journalist described Korean cinema after the first PIFF in the *Village Voice* as follows:

All these films, however, do retain the sad ending; in a nation that has been colonized for centuries, suffering is a necessary element of its drama. The New Wavers do it with style, though, making the art film’s art film. For a country historically known as the ‘Hermit Kingdom,’ the

emergence of these New Wavers signals a move toward worldwide recognition. There is, no doubt, more to come.¹¹

The nation's cinema is here interpreted pessimistically as a response to the historically, politically and socially traumatic consequences of modernisation. In this sense, the ways in which Korean cinema is remembered should be understood within particular historical contexts.

Secondly, it should not be forgotten that there are relatively fewer old films left in Korea since the majority of films made during the colonial period and before the 1960s were physically destroyed during the Korean War. It is therefore difficult to find materials and resources for public exhibition. The vast majority of Korea's early film footage was destroyed in the 1950s during the Korean War, and not a single feature film produced before 1945 survives in complete form today. For these reasons, when PIFF launched in the mid-1990s, academic research on Korean films made before the 1950s had yet to be systematically undertaken.

Due to these historical and material conditions, archival activities to preserve historical materials have been less developed in Korea than in the West. As retrospective programmes are usually conducted in cooperation with major film archives across the country, the programme's relation to one archival institution in particular - the Korean Film Archive (KOFA), the national archival body - requires attention. Although many previous Korean retrospectives had been made possible

through the cooperation and support of KOFA, due to the short history of archival activities and the particular historical situation of Korea, PIFF did not historically have a great range of old films to choose from, especially in its early stages. Therefore, decisions concerning which retrospectives to show depended heavily upon the condition and availability of films. For example, before the first event was launched in 1996, PIFF made a special effort to look for a way to find a lost film entitled *Arirang* (Na Woon-kyu, 1926), which was made during the colonial period, to highlight the launch of the inaugural event. However, even though the festival committee desperately tried to contact the Japanese owner of a rare print, negotiations failed and in the end PIFF could not display this historically crucial film.¹² Films made during the colonial period were not restored and made available to the public until very recently. A systematic and strategic cooperative effort with the archive for the preservation of films made during the colonial period was finally realised at the eleventh PIFF in 2006, when PIFF was able to organise a retrospective of colonial films entitled “The Time of Change and Choice: Discovery of Films from the Japanese Colonial Period.”

Furthermore, the lack of market value placed on old films in Korea is the most influential factor in understanding differences in the context of the recirculation of old Korean films. Before the first PIFF, no Korean film institution

could claim sustained success in exhibiting films as objects of lasting cultural, aesthetic, or historical value. For instance, the Korean Film Archive was only founded in 1974 and did not receive government funding for the preservation of moving image materials until 1994.¹³

To compare this situation with circumstances in the West, in the 1930s film libraries in Berlin, London, and Paris had already started to function as powerful articulations of nation, film, and educated citizenship.¹⁴ Additionally, when the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) in New York launched its screening of Hollywood classics at the Film Library in 1935, Korea was still suffering from colonial suppression by Japan. These examples suggest that different national contexts should be considered when understanding the ways in which national film culture is formed in relation to the perception of the value of heritage.

For this reason, the systematic reissue of films in ancillary venues in Korea is not as fully developed as that of Hollywood classics both in Korea and internationally. The DVD/VHS market in Korea has been particularly unstable since the late 1990s due to the increasingly frequent occurrences of illegal downloading prevalent in East Asia.¹⁵ Unlike the diffuse presence of Hollywood commemorative activities, the revival of old films in retrospectives at PIFF is not therefore aligned with the commercial power of the DVD market.

Lastly, the critical status of films exhibited at PIFF is totally different from that of old Hollywood films screened at film festivals in the West. While Hollywood classics exhibited at film festivals in the West are “all safe, stellar attractions from the global film canon which have in effect already been voted as worthy of preservation by international film culture,” old Korean films shown at PIFF tend to be films that have been largely ignored both in the West and in Korea.¹⁶ The meaning and aim of recirculation should thus be discussed in a different way. PIFF cultivated the re-evaluating of old Korean films so as to challenge the previous perception of these films which were less frequently viewed and were previously considered to be less important than contemporary movies.

It is widely believed that Korean films made before the 1990s have been largely unknown in the West. This ignorance can be attributed to the fact that South Korean cinema has only very recently and rapidly emerged onto the global stage.¹⁷ As discussed in the previous chapter, since the West’s recent encounter with Korean cinema has been heavily dependent upon its appearance at film festivals in the West, global recognition of Korean cinema as a national cinema has focused primarily on contemporary Korean films. This is partly due to the absence of a distinctive brand image associated with Korean cinema. Old Korean films have therefore been less acknowledged than old Japanese and Chinese films on the global art-house circuit.

For instance, in Britain particular films made by contemporary filmmakers largely construct the available image of Korean cinema. For example, an article in the *Guardian* attempted to identify the particular timing of Korean cinema's emergence on to the world stage. Whilst Japanese cinema was described as being associated with the Japanese "golden era of Kurosawa and Ozu in the 1950s," the article placed the golden age of Korean cinema in the "present" (early 2000s) rather than the "past."¹⁸ In this special section on World Cinema, Hannah McGill, director of the Edinburgh International Film Festival, wrote "[e]nter South Korea, with daring, convention-busting auteurs such as Park Chan-wook and Kim Ki-duk."¹⁹ As McGill adds:

South Korea: 2002-2005. Far East cinema got a new injection of venom from a batch of hyper-violent, hyper-stylish films, among which Park Chan-wook's *Old Boy* (2003) has arguably had the most significant impact. Balance is provided by more serene offerings from art film director Kim Ki-duk and Im Kwon-taek. Key film: *Old Boy* (Park Chan-wook, 2003).²⁰

From this, it is possible to conclude that although global (in particular western) audiences were intermittently exposed to several old Korean films through festival exhibition before the 1990s, these films failed to create an international currency constituting a distinctive image of South Korean cinema in the West.

It is important to examine the relationship between old Korean films and

PIFF in this context. Although there have recently been significant improvements in the understanding of old Korean films in academia, there has been to date no sustained empirical research on how old Korean films *per se* have been displayed and relabelled by international film festivals. This includes how they have been presented at PIFF, the leading film festival associated with Korean film culture itself. Nancy Abelmann and Kathleen MacHugh have recently discussed old South Korean films - specifically South Korean Golden Age Melodrama - and their work contributes to the research on old Korean films by providing a rare opportunity to enhance understanding of them. However, their studies were largely conducted on a textual level, and institutional perspectives toward old Korean films have not been seriously considered.

This chapter focuses upon the context and backdrops of particular PIFF retrospectives rather than undertaking a full textual analysis of each programme. It considers the role that retrospectives at PIFF play in the strategic re-imagining of the past. It examines how PIFF's strategic arrangements reveal an institutional endeavour to restore continuity between older films and contemporary cinema in an effort to renew confidence in the past of Korean and Asian cinema as well as contemporary movies.

Re-defining Korean cinema in “our own” critical perspective:

Korean New Wave Retrospective from 1980 to 1995²¹

“Korea’s New Wave: Retrospectives from 1980 to 1995” was organised in 1996 as the first retrospective in PIFF’s history. It is worth paying particular attention to the fact that PIFF decided to show relatively recent rather than older films in its first retrospective programme. This retrospective programme highlighted seventeen Korean films from the fifteen years prior to 1996 including *Sopyonje* (Im Kwon-taek, 1993), *Mandala* (Im, 1981), *Why has BOHDI-Dalma Left for the East?* (Bae Yong-kyun 1988), *Black Republic* (Park Kwang-su, 1990) and *301, 301* (Park Chul-Soo, 1995). As we shall see, this event is significant because it shows how PIFF perceived its role as a key mediator between the global and the local in the promotion of Korean cinema at this time.

It is significant that the time around the mid-1990s when the first PIFF launched was just prior to when Korean cinema was on the verge of “breaking through” into the global market.²² In this respect, PIFF’s choice of “Korean New Wave” as the first Korean retrospective suggests that the festival self-consciously sought to position these recent Korean films within a legacy of Korean cinematic history in order to forge a sense of “continuity” between the past and the present. PIFF attempted to identify Korean films produced during this period as a starting point to display old films in subsequent events. That is to say, by exhibiting recent

Korean films which were relatively well known and already circulating to the Western film festivals, PIFF was attempting to reconfigure the legacy of Korean cinema as a legitimate agent to sanction national products.²³

In examining the backdrop to the establishment of this first retrospective, it is helpful to look at the particular historical situation of South Korea in the mid-1990s. When PIFF organised this first retrospective, no material infrastructure had been successfully built to secure lasting studios attention to films. Furthermore, as mentioned above, the unavailability of old films affected PIFF's initial decision to screen more recent films rather than older Korean films.

Just as new exhibitions at museums are often influenced by research taking place in academic circles, the retrospective programme at festivals often relies on the work of scholars who are specialists in related fields.²⁴ In this sense, it is noticeable that the choice of these films at the first PIFF was influenced by work going on *outside* Korea. A number of diverse retrospectives focusing upon Korean cinema had been organised in the West earlier than the first PIFF, such as Im Kwon-taek's retrospective in 1990 at the Munich Film Festival and at the Centre du Pompidou in 1993. Moreover, a retrospective with the exact same title was held at the Institute of Contemporary Arts, London, in 1994. South Korean cinema was poised to appear on the global stage just at that time and the retrospective at PIFF

was precipitated by the rise of attention paid to Korean cinema in the West. For this reason, the majority of films included in the New Wave retrospective at PIFF had been previously exhibited at other film festivals outside of Korea. A report in a local Pusan newspaper reinforced this perspective. The first retrospective was introduced to the local audience with the words: “this year’s retrospective is a collection of Korean films from the 1980s and 1990s which proudly demonstrate the power of Korean cinema in international film festivals.”²⁵

Regarding the labelling of these films with the categorisation “New Wave,” it should be mentioned that PIFF tried to redefine this term through its first retrospective. As a term, “Korean New Wave,” had already been circulating in the West to describe a distinctive trend in Korean cinema before this retrospective at PIFF. In introducing Korean films to the U.K. audience, for example, Tony Rayns, for instance, paralleled the Korean New Wave with other new wave trends such as the French, German, Japanese and Chinese new cinemas.²⁶ As Dudley Andrew describes it, the term “new wave” is arbitrary. Andrew suggests that “[c]ritics and festival programmers continue to invoke the term because the original New Wave inundated world cinema so decisively in the ’60s that a total renewal of the art seemed imminent.” He further states:

As European art cinema was moribund, desperate festivals began

looking elsewhere for signs of life. And life was found in what I call the Second Set of New Waves. By the early '80s, as if sucked into a vacuum, came films from places never before thought of as cinematically interesting or viable: Mainland China, Senegal, Mali, Ireland, Taiwan, and Iran. This second set of waves is distinct from those of the 1960s not only in their provenance but in the way they functioned in a greatly changed international system.²⁷

In fact, many scholars attempted to periodically identify a new movement in Korean cinema around the course of the early - to mid- 1980s and across the 1990s.²⁸ However, as Julian Stringer admits, defining a particular group of directors and films in this era of Korean cinema can be problematic. While differentiating “New Korean Cinema” from “Korean New Wave” both in terms of period and focus, Stringer points out difficulties in the placement of boundaries since Korean cinema is still in the process of formation as a new national cinema.²⁹ Considering this situation, it is noteworthy that PIFF attempted to redefine the Korean New Wave according to its own criteria - from 1980 to 1995, just *before* the first PIFF. For both PIFF and Korean cinema, it was imperative to build up a certain distinctive image as a national cinema to support the entering of the global market. In this sense, reinventing the term “New Wave” and re-identifying this trend at the first retrospective helped construct clear identities for both Korean cinema and PIFF, in order to securely position themselves in the global film market.

In this process of renegotiation and reconfiguration, however, there was a sense of hesitation when PIFF used the term. In an official publication, local critic

Yi Hyo-In attempted to clarify the definition of the term:

It may not be completely justifiable to label the group of directors that joined the Korean film scene in the mid 1980s the 'new wave,' as the term usually indicates filmmakers with a subversive ideology contrary to the existing film values. And in any event, to warrant the appellation they should at least share common characteristics that can tie them into a single category. Of course, another convenient way to organize the 'new wave' would be to look for common elements related to specific film ideologies and methodologies, or a tendency to lead film movements. One cannot say for certain that the new directors who started their career in Korea in the mid '80s share such qualities. In a broad sense, however, it is a fact that such directors do keep a distance from the conventional filmic practices in terms of ideology and techniques that had been prevalent to that point in time, and they were seen as actually implementing their own beliefs regarding film. Therefore, they will be termed the Korean New Wave in this sense.³⁰

To justify connecting the films made in the 1980s to ones made in previous years,

Yi also carefully states that "[t]he mainstream movies in the 1980s inherited the conventions of Korean films of the 1960s and 70s."³¹ As the term "New Wave" was not created by PIFF or the Korean film industry, there was a necessary self-consciousness surrounding attempts to reclaim the meaning of the term in this form of self-definition. This self-consciousness reflects the fact that there was a series of struggles to determine and invent its own identity in order to retain continuity both with Korean cinema and PIFF itself. As festival director Kim Dong-Ho asserts:

The reason that we are holding a Korean Retrospective section in the first PIFF is to convey a clear image to the audience from Korea and abroad who are interested in understanding the Korean cinema. We do not expect to accomplish everything through this initial attempt, yet we expect that we will open a new venue for international cultural exchanges and discussions, which should include not only appraisals but also sharp criticism of Korean cinema.³²

In this regard, the exhibition of Korean New Wave cinema at the first PIFF was crucial to PIFF and the Korean film industry because it addressed the rupture and discontinuity in the legacy of Korean film history and began to constitute a clear identity for Korean cinema and PIFF for the future.

It is notable that responses to this first event show clear discrepancies between global and local audiences. Although foreign viewers at the first PIFF paid special attention to the Korean cinema sections including the retrospective, this section largely failed to evoke interest from the local audience.³³ For instance, statistics published in a local Pusan newspaper show the lowest attendance among local viewers in the retrospective section that year, demonstrating how local media and audiences perceived the lowly importance of this section. The World Cinema section was the most popular programme, quickly selling out and recording 26.5 percent of tickets sold in advance. However, the Korean New Wave retrospective only had 2.4 percent of seats sold in advance and no film in this programme ever sold out during the festival.³⁴ An editorial article in one of the mainstream national newspapers pointed out the unwelcoming reception experienced by this event by noting that “[a]lthough the Korean Panorama and New Wave retrospective contributed to promoting Korean cinema to overseas audiences at PIFF, these

sections seriously asked us to reflect on the current problems in Korean cinema.”³⁵

Furthermore, PIFF opened an exhibition at the Yachting Centre in Haeundae, entitled as “From Na Woon-kyu to Namyangju Seoul Studio,” as a side event to promote the retrospective. This exhibition displayed historical materials related to old Korean films which had seldom before been displayed to the public. It was also organised to celebrate KOFIC’s studio in Namyangju which was due to be constructed soon after PIFF ended that same year. Despite PIFF’s endeavour to highlight the value of its cinematic heritage through this event, however, the side bar event completely failed to attract attention from the local audience.³⁶ This suggests that there was a discrepancy between the public audience and PIFF in terms of perceptions about the value of old cultural products, although PIFF attempted to bridge this gap. However, overall the first retrospective allowed PIFF to begin to constitute a legacy for Korean cinema and it played an important role in revealing the different perspectives on Korean cinema present at this time.

Kim Ki-young: Rediscovering a Director from the Past

Kim Ki-young’s retrospective, entitled “Kim Ki-young, Cinema of Diabolical Desire and Death,” was the first retrospective on an individual Korean director to be held at PIFF. With the cooperation of the Korean Film Archive, new prints were

made for this programme. For PIFF, this retrospective at eight films from *The House Maid* (1960) to *Carnivore* (1989) was a challenge since films made by Kim Ki-young had never before been the subject of critical study nor been systematically exhibited to the public in Korea.³⁷ Due to the particularly “excessive” nature of his films, director Kim was considered a maverick figure and his films were classified as cult movies in Korean cinematic history.³⁸ For these reasons, PIFF was not sure whether this retrospective could appeal to local or global audiences and doubts continued “as late as two months before the festival.”³⁹

This can help explain why the results of this programme were often described using terms such as “discovered,” “unexpected,” “sudden success” or “surprising appeal.”⁴⁰ Although he made thirty-one films over three decades, including his debut *The Box of Death* (1955), Kim’s work had previously received scant attention from critics at home and abroad. Kim Ki-young, who had previously not been seen as an important filmmaker in Korean film history, subsequently became the first director to receive international recognition through an exhibition at PIFF. In particular, western viewers enthusiastically responded to his work by highlighting his films when covering PIFF. As *Moving Pictures* commented with the title “A Star is born - aged 78”:

The new discovery at this year’s 2nd Pusan International Film Festival

was not to be found in the New Currents section, a competitive event for new Asian directors. Instead, it was the name of 78-year-old director Kim Ki-Young [...] Critics from around the world delighted in films like *Killer Butterfly* and *Insect Woman*, movies which quickly established Kim as a fully-fledged auteur in the Russ Meyer/Roger Corman scheme of things.⁴¹

Another critic from the US also described Kim's work as a "never-too-late rediscovery" and enthused that "his films may well be poised to enter the ranks of the world's most sought-after cult flicks."⁴² After this exhibition, festival programmers and critics subsequently invited his films to numerous international film festivals such as the 1998 Berlin Film Festival in the following year. Through PIFF, Kim had clearly been "discovered by the international film world."⁴³

Significantly, the success of this section reveals PIFF's insufficient awareness of the unconscious assumptions that lay behind its own exhibition decisions. As stated earlier, for PIFF – or more specifically for programmer Lee Yong-kwan who chose Kim Ki-young for the second retrospective - this enthusiastic response from western viewers was surprising since the organisers somehow underestimated the value of Kim's films.

Despite such doubts about Kim's films, there were two factors that may have propelled the decision to hold this retrospective. First, as Kim Soyoung argues, an increasingly cinephile culture in Korea in the 1990s encouraged this retrospective

programme devoted to Kim Ki-young.⁴⁴ In addition, just one year before (in 1996), the twentieth Hong Kong International Film Festival had organised a Korean retrospective entitled “The Rediscovering Korean Classics' Retrospective.” This special programme brought in twelve South Korean films made between the 1960s and the 1980s. Amongst them Kim Ki-young’s *The Housemaid* received special attention from western participants due to its unique style.⁴⁵

However, this successful event reveals several problems in shaping discourses at the festival site. Kim Soyoung points out the absence of diverse perspectives and local voices in constructing discourses on Korean films. According to her, despite overseas guests’ enthusiastic reaction to contemporary Korean cinema, little opportunity to examine it across discursive positions between local critics and foreign participants was provided during and after the festival. Overseas viewers such as festival programmers and critics who had been invited by the festival therefore shared major comments and criticism about Korean cinema shown in Pusan mainly amongst themselves.⁴⁶ This apparent inability to include local Korean voices in the discussion created an imbalance in constructing discourses about the current status of Korean cinema as the particular discussion about Kim Ki-young’s films was shaped mainly by western participants and failed to connect up with the local reception and interpretation of these same films.

As a clear example of this, whilst the majority of the western press praised Kim Ki-young, the local media did not pay much attention to this retrospective section and the majority of the press did not even realise the success of the retrospective programme during PIFF.⁴⁷ National and local newspapers went so far as to criticise the apparent failure of the retrospective programme for the poor attendance at its screenings. Even after they recognised the positive response from western journalists, they still did not know how to understand it. This confusion in interpreting the western reception of Kim Ki-young, who had long been neglected by local audiences, is most apparent in one article written by a well-known local critic. In a major newspaper, Lee Dong-jin, lamented how “the popularity of Kim’s films to the western film professionals conversely reflects that we don’t have any representative Korean *auteur* available at the moment to show to the global film market.”⁴⁸ The confusion and lack of consensus in looking at Kim’s films demonstrates that both PIFF and the Korean film industry were struggling to find (or invent) a way to accommodate the perspectives about Korean cinema then constituted by the West.

At the time of the retrospective, Korean cinema had, to repeat, not yet established an image for itself on the international art-house circuit. Although numerous Korean films had been screened at international festivals, few or none

were to generate much of an impact until the late 1990s. The “blank” image of Korean cinema was considered one of the main obstacles preventing it from achieving international success. Few spectators differentiated Korean films from those of Japan or Mainland China. In this respect, as Chris Berry suggests, Korean cinema had to establish its own distinctive image as a national cinema which could thus be easily distinguished from other East Asian countries on the “globalized art-house circuit.”⁴⁹ It is thus essential for a film or group of films to establish a distinctive and appealing image as a new product, defined in national and *auteur* terms.⁵⁰ Berry further explains the reason for many Korean realist films failure to receive global attention, pointing out the necessity for a distinctive product image. He compares Kim’s films to other Korean realist films and emphasises the distinctiveness of Kim Ki-young’s films by stating that:

Although many Korean realist films might be considered very fine, they do not have this type of distinctiveness among realist films [...] In some ways, it is reminiscent of other recent Asian films that have revisited the traumas of the fifties.⁵¹

In this respect, Kim’s films seemed to get around this obstacle as their “analytic excess” set them apart from the mainstream.⁵² This also explains why subsequent PIFF retrospectives did not receive as much critical attention as Kim’s. When Yu Hyun-Mok’s retrospective, “The Pathfinder of Korean Realism Yu Hyun-Mok”

followed Kim's, there was considerable expectation of success since Yu holds a firm position in Korean cinematic history and his films realistically depict the traumas of the Korean War. However, this programme failed to receive much attention both from the local and the global audience.

In other words, although Korean filmmakers had previously targeted the film festival circuit, before the emergence of PIFF and its strategically orchestrated exhibition of old films, few international film festivals paid attention to old Korean films. For example, few critics showed interest in Kim Ki-young's *Fire Woman* (1982) when it was screened at the Pesaro Film Festival in 1983, clearly showing that the conditions of exhibition are crucial to a film's life - or afterlife.⁵³ The presence of Kim Ki-young at PIFF enabled the rest of the world to reconsider the legacy of Korean cinema. For example, David E. James told a national newspaper when he visited Pusan in 1997, "I always thought that Korean cinema began from Im Kwon-taek until I knew Kim Ki-young. I didn't know there was another master before Im. It's Kim Ki-young."⁵⁴

The success of the first solo retrospective, focusing on Kim Ki-young, gave PIFF confidence to approach the global film market with old Korean films as well as contemporary ones.⁵⁵ Since then, PIFF has tried to sustain the "heat" that Kim's retrospective generated and has striven to develop further discourse around his films.

When Director Kim suddenly died the following year, PIFF presented the world premiere of his posthumously discovered film *A Moment to Die For* (1988) as a tribute to him. Furthermore, PIFF re-exhibited Kim's films at Busan Cinemathque and tried to generate critical attention from the local film community.⁵⁶ It is worth pointing out that a large-scale retrospective featuring eighteen of Kim's films was recently held in December 2006 at the Cinémathèque Française in Paris to celebrate 100 years of diplomatic relationships with Korea. Indeed, PIFF's continuing efforts to rediscover old Korean masters has been prompted by the huge success of Kim Ki-young's Retrospective.

Shin Sang-Ok: The Politics of Memory and the Articulation of History

PIFF featured the films of Shin Sang-Ok in a solo retrospective at the sixth festival in 2001. This retrospective is distinctive as it demonstrates how PIFF promoted this particular exhibition by emphasising political issues. Benefiting from a promotional campaign focusing on Shin's career in North Korea, the retrospective obtained huge media attention from the local and global media. Moreover, it illustrates a rare case of the recirculation of old Korean films in other local film festivals and the process of shaping different discourses. Finally, this retrospective was the first PIFF retrospective programme sponsored by a private corporation. This introduces the

possibility that although Korean retrospective programmes are less popular than others featuring contemporary movies, they can still attract commercial interests and link up with commercial agendas. It also shows that there has been a shift in perceptions about old films as cinematic heritage in Korea.

After his debut feature in 1952, Shin directed over seventy films until he died in 2006. The cinematic world of Shin Sang-Ok illustrates diverse aspects of Korean cinema: he founded his own film studio, *Shin Film* (with 200 full-time workers in the mid 1960s, a recording room, its own generator, and even an engineering department to maintain machinery to make films); he was the producer of about 300 films, and the director of two movies per year on average during the 1960s and the 1970s.⁵⁷

He was often called a “legend” who led the boom of the 1960s Golden Age. However, what made him more famous in the West was his political involvement with North Korea. In 1978, Shin was kidnapped and taken to North Korea, where he was held captive until his escape in 1986. Since his dramatic escape, which was an unprecedented event, it has been impossible to consider Shin Sang-Ok without reference to North Korea. For example, John Gorenfeld wrote an article on him in the *Guardian* entitled “Producer From Hell” and begins his detailed account mainly by focusing on his relationship with Kim Jong-il. As Gorenfeld states:

The North Korean dictator Kim Jong-il has a passion for cinema. But he could never find a director to realise his vision. So he kidnapped one from the South, jailed him and fed him grass, then forced him to shoot a socialist Godzilla. Now, for the first time, Shin Sang-ok tells the full story of his bizarre dealings with - and eventual flight from - the world's most dangerous dictator.⁵⁸

Shin's image as it is tied to this particular story has been increasingly reinforced since his death in 2006. Much of the western press as well as the local press repeated this story in obituaries and articles which appeared after his death highlighting his personal history with North Korea. In these writings about Shin it is often difficult to determine whether it is a story about Shin or Kim Jong-il in North Korea.⁵⁹ In other words, both local and global audiences paid more attention to Shin's filmmaking career in North Korea and his subsequent experience of escape rather than his films. In this context, the image of Shin Sang-Ok has played an intriguing position within the Korean film industry. Director Shin and his work remained undiscovered and rather ambiguous until the retrospective was held at PIFF in 2001. This may be attributed to the fact that he was never completely able to separate his film career from politics especially in relation to North Korea. Although the local film industry and public were aware of his contribution to the Korean film industry, Shin's films were not actively talked about since his name was always associated with the North Korean issue which was prohibited from

public dialogue in South Korea.

In fact, even before 1978 when he was kidnapped and taken to North Korea, Shin was regarded by the Korean public more as a political figure than a filmmaker. In the 1960s he maintained good relations with the government and benefited from them, but by the mid 1970s he suffered from financial problems resulting from the regime's strict regulations. After his escape from North Korea in 1986, he produced *Three Ninjas* (1995) and its sequels in Hollywood. When he returned to Korea, Shin made *Mayumi* (1990) and *Vanished* (1994). During this period, Shin Sang-Ok had become a political figure in both Koreas.

Considering this situation, the PIFF retrospective was significant because it was the first exhibition to cover the whole period of his filmmaking by screening ten films, from *A Flower in Hell* (1958) to *Vanished* (1994), including two films, *Runaway* (1984) and *Salt* (1985), which were made in North Korea. PIFF insisted on screening and putting the two films in the official catalogue although the organising committee was aware of the risk.⁶⁰ Consequently, this decision caused a public outcry. Just one day before the scheduled screening of *Runaway*, the public prosecutor of Seoul halted the showing by invoking the National Security Law, which bans any action that could benefit the North. Banned from public screening by the government, this film was exclusively presented only to festival guests

including festival professionals from the western film festivals such as Berlin and Cannes.⁶¹

Furthermore, it is worth noting that the films in this retrospective were selected after consultation with director Shin and other western festival consultants. Programmer Han Sang-Jun notes that “We would like to express our deepest gratitude to ex-programmer Lee Yong-Kwan and Mr. Pierre Rissient from France for all the help they have provided.”⁶² This suggests that PIFF carefully orchestrated the selection process by including the views of a Western consultant - specifically one involved with the Cannes Film Festival – in an attempt to appeal to global participants more than local audiences. After this retrospective, Shin was subsequently invited to participate in the special programmes section at Cannes in 2003 with his film *The Evergreen Tree* (*Sangnoksu*, 1961).

Because one of his films produced in North Korea had been banned, the major western media dealt with such a restriction as a hot issue which no doubt met PIFF’s goal to attract attention from the global media. *Variety*’s report is typical:

Drawing more attention was the fest’s other sidebar, a long-delayed retrospective of the legendary Shin Sang-Ok (aka Simon Sheen), the only Korean director to have made movies in both South and North Korea. Now a sprightly 75, and still talking about further projects, Shin remains a political hot potato in the divided country - one North Korean movie in the retro “Runaway” was withdrawn at the last moment - but the sensuality and invention of some of his pics from the ’50s and ’60s

delighted foreign attendees.⁶³

Whilst the western media mainly highlighted the fact that his films were banned by the government because they had been made in North Korea, local papers blamed PIFF's relaxed attitude toward the screening. On the one hand, the local press harshly reprimanded PIFF for ignorance about this serious political issue, although it was clearly expected that the government would take strong action before the screening. On the other hand, PIFF was also criticised for "easily" cancelling the screening due to governmental pressure.⁶⁴ It is unclear whether PIFF responded to these pressures by negotiating with the government authorities at the last moment. However, although PIFF had apparently previously negotiated an alliance with the state authority, it is true that PIFF's success in this section hugely benefited from political elements of exhibition which were carefully orchestrated by the festival.

The lesson it is possible to take away from an examination of this situation is that Shin's political engagements and subsequent narrowly defined image have long acted as deterrents to the development of a fuller understanding of his work.⁶⁵ In this way, his case echoes that of Zhang Yimou. Yingjin Zhang suggests that apart from the international applause for Zhang's films, his reputation in the western world can be attributed largely to the fact that most of his films were banned by the

Chinese government.⁶⁶ Though political issues are not the sole reason for Shin's global appeal, they can help market his films at global festivals.

Furthermore, and importantly, this retrospective was the first to attract a corporate sponsor in *Hermes Korea*. Local newspapers highlighted Shin's retrospective during the festival due to the marketing activities of this famous international cosmetics corporation. For example, large pictures covering a special event organised by *Hermes Korea* and a complimentary "Director's Chair" specially manufactured in France were spotlighted in major newspapers and broadcast news. A party dedicated to Shin and his actress wife, Choi Eun-hee, was also widely advertised through national newspapers.⁶⁷ Such media exposure was not accorded to previous retrospectives. Rather, glamorous parties or sidebar events were devoted to particular programmes, such as Korean Panorama or to the Opening night film which provided promotional opportunities for private companies. Naturally, following information about the event in the press, a short introduction to *Hermes* was added: "Hermes Korea has been supporting various arts and cultural events in the form of *Mecenat* (business art association) activities in Korea and operates an arts award program worth 20 million won every year."⁶⁸ Moreover, this company announced that it had agreed to sponsor the retrospective for the following five years up to 2005. Thus, although the Korean retrospective programme was less

popular than other sections which feature contemporary movies, it demonstrated that it could attract commercial interests and link up with commercial agendas. It also suggests that there was a shift in perceptions about the role of old films as cinematic heritage in Korea. In short, Shin's retrospective provided both PIFF and the Korean film industry with an effective starting point from which an awareness of the economic value of old national films at the festival could become visible in new ways.

Lastly, this retrospective presents a rare case of the recirculation of Korean classic films at the local level. Following the first retrospective at PIFF in 2001, another film festival in Korea organised a retrospective programme devoted to Shin. The tenth Puchon Fantastic Film Festival (PiFan) organised a Shin retrospective entitled "Fantastic Shin Sang-Ok: A Legend in Korean Film in the '60s and '70s" five years after the first event in Pusan. Although it was organised mainly because Shin had died in that year, this event, comprising six films, demonstrates a different point of view on Shin's work and position in Korean film history:

Although he made big hits in the '60s, starting with *A Romance Papa*, Shin's debut film, the quality of his work over-all was uneven. This was because of his complicated desire to be an outstanding movie technician and producer as well as a director. Unlike other rival directors such as Kim Ki-Young, Kim Soo-Yong, Lee Man-Hee and Yu Hyun-Mok, he made it clear that commercial success is as important as critics' success. [...] Although there are some exceptions, including movies made during his stay in North Korea, through his movies we can see a complicated Korean film history which cannot be defined in

one frame. He did not pursue a revolutionary style but he nonetheless created innovations in realms such as shooting, editing, use of colours, music, studio set, and many others.⁶⁹

In this second festival retrospective which placed an emphasis on his innovative technical contribution to the Korean film industry, Shin was regarded as “an outstanding movie technician and producer” rather than a director.⁷⁰ Whilst the programmers at the sixth PIFF produced a nebulous definition of Shin’s position - questioning whether he was an *auteur* or a commercial master, the tenth PiFan clearly illustrated his industrial engagement with Korean cinema:

Like Howard Hawks in Hollywood, director Shin had a huge influence in Korean film history. His filmography included various genres such as *Guest and Mother*, a prototype of melodrama; *The Red Muffler*, a popular war action movie; *A Romantic Papa*, a home sitcom; *Prince Yeonsan*, a historical drama; *The Sino-Japanese War and Queen Min the Heroine* and *Female Bandits*, action films; and *Evergreen Tree* and *Rice*, campaign moves. He also tried hard to modernise Korean film techniques but establishing economies of scale in the industry was not easy.⁷¹

Shin has a remarkable record: he was the first filmmaker to make a colour cinemascope film, *Sung Choon-Hyang* (1961), using a 13mm telephoto lens and a 250mm zoom lens for *Rice* (1963). Furthermore, he was the first Korean director to attempt synchronised sound in *King’s Father* during the 1960s. In short, he was a pioneer of new film technology as well as industrial and artistic development in Korean cinema of that era.⁷² In this way, Shin and his films were redefined and

refigured through the particular recirculation process organised by film festivals.

The discrepancy in how his work was presented and discussed between these two festivals points out some significant procedures in the refiguring of the past of Korean cinema. It also demonstrates how different institutional interests impacted the particular institutional activity of displaying old national films.

Overall, these three PIFF Korean retrospectives played a key role in allowing the festival to sanction the legitimacy of old Korean films, creating and establishing a sense of continuity within Korean cinema history. While the first retrospective on Korea's New Wave in 1996 provided a useful starting point to establish the legacy of Korean cinema, the retrospective on Kim Ki-young in 1997 contributed to increasing the self-confidence of the Korean film industry and PIFF in approaching the global film market. Furthermore, by initiating a retrospective on Shin Sang-Ok and highlighting the controversial issue of North Korea in its attendant promotional campaign, PIFF attempted to maximise local and global media attention. In short, the development and presentation of Korean retrospectives at PIFF illustrates the close links between the interests of the Korean film industry and PIFF whose mutual aim is to break through into the global market. Overall, an examination of these three programmes over the past decade provides an opportunity to grapple with the multifaceted and complex roles played by retrospective exhibitions at film

festivals.

Remembering the Regional Cinematic Past: Asian Retrospectives at PIFF

While PIFF has presented a number of old Korean films in retrospectives over the decade of its existence in order to establish a sense of continuity with the legacy of Korean cinema, the festival has equally attempted to highlight old films produced in the Asian region more generally. This corresponds with the aim of the festival to promote itself as a platform for Asian cinema. It will be argued in the remainder of this chapter that Asian retrospectives at PIFF illustrate a growing self-awareness of the importance of the preservation of a regional cinematic heritage to justify and enhance a sense of Asian identity. PIFF's efforts to achieve this aim are examined along two lines of inquiry. First, rather than devoting itself to one national filmmaker, PIFF established a transnational framework to examine the past of Asian cinema. Second, PIFF's focus on old Asian films served the festival's regional drive to reinforce industrial networks in Asia, such as the Asian Film Commissions Network (AFCNet) and the Asian Film Industry Network (AFIN), as discussed in chapter 3. For example, the festival's drive to support archival networks in Asia is in tune with its industry-oriented approach in the region. In addition, it is possible to discern the festival's desire to present a pan-Asian perspective and contribute to the

development of an integrated approach to Asian cinema in the programming decisions related to PIFF's retrospective sections. By strategically displaying old Asian films from a diverse array of countries, PIFF has pursued the construction of a reputation as the gateway to the Asian film industry in the global market.

From the early stages of the festival, PIFF included films from Hong Kong, Taiwan, the People's Republic of China and other parts of Asia in its retrospectives. For instance, alongside the Korean Retrospective of Kim Ki-young, PIFF organised a special exhibition of two Asian retrospectives: "Hong Kong Cinema" and "Early Asian Cinema" in 1997. Whereas the special retrospective on Hong Kong Cinema was organised in commemoration of Hong Kong's handover to the PRC, "Early Asian Cinema" aimed to review, in a more general fashion, early films from the region including those from the PRC, India, Indonesia, Japan and Korea. In addition, this programme was accompanied by a seminar, "The Beginnings and Development of Early Asian Film," to shape discourses around the heritage of Asian cinema. It is important that PIFF acknowledged the display of old Asian films as a crucial means of promoting the festival's pan-Asian identity as well as that of contemporary Asian cinema from the start. PIFF self-consciously outlines the aim of this section in its 1997 programme brochure:

The focus and mainstay of the Pusan International Film Festival are the regional cinemas of Asia. In this year's Retrospective section, we offer three special programs salient to the world of Asian cinema. This year PIFF is proud to present a very strong retrospective, with the discovery of rare films and the programming of significant works. Reaching back into Asian history is a crucial step in looking forward to Asian futures as this area becomes more of a regional community in today's age of transnational flows.⁷³

Since being a platform for Asian cinema formed an important plank of PIFF's self-defined festival identity, it was necessary for the festival to showcase the diverse spectrum of Asian cinema. In this sense, there were a number of special retrospectives focusing on Asian cinema, including independent films produced in Asia, and one particular period of one national cinema. For example, the subsequent year, two special programmes were introduced: "Another Korean Cinema: Works by Overseas Koreans" and "The Double Wall: Becoming a Woman Director in Asia."

In 1999, PIFF attempted to refigure classic Asian cinema by displaying thirteen films under the title, "Celebrating 20th Century Asian Cinema: 20th Century Masterpieces" to "coalesce and point towards a bright new future."⁷⁴ In 2002, "The 20th Anniversary of New Taiwanese Cinema 'From New Wave to Independent': Taiwanese Cinema 1982-2002" and "Seen from the Perspective of Nagisa Oshima" were presented alongside the Korean retrospective of Kim Soo-

yong. However, PIFF's efforts to connect with the past of Asian cinema reached its peak during the tenth event in 2005. That year produced the festival's most ambitious, in terms of scale and diversity, and highly promoted Asian retrospectives as "Remapping of Asian Auteur Cinema 1" and "10th 'PIFF's Asian Pantheon" were held to celebrate the festival's tenth anniversary. For this second programme, the festival aggressively selected and screened an extensive selection of thirty films from seventeen Asian countries in an attempt to claim its place as a critical hub in Asia. It is significant that PIFF's strong focus on Asian cinema was maximised both by displaying old films from Asia and by launching the massive Asian network on an industry-wide level. For its anniversary, PIFF established the Asian Film Industry Film Network with the Korean Film Council and announced the inauguration of the Asian Film Market to advocate the concept of the pan-Asian film network. In short, a critical remapping of Asian cinema in these retrospectives was closely aligned with PIFF's drive to consolidate important industrial networks.

On the one hand, while PIFF's diverse Asian retrospective programmes served the reconceptualisation of a distinct festival identity, PIFF actively participated in archival activities at the regional level in conjunction with the national film archive, KOFA. Sharing mutual interests in restoring and preserving moving image materials as a form of cultural heritage, both these institutions were

fully aware of the importance of “(re)discovering” old Korean and Asian films. It is apparent how PIFF considered the preservation project at the regional as well as national level when the International Federation of Film Archives (FIAF)’s annual conference was held in Seoul for the first time in 2002.⁷⁵ Kim Dong-Ho, PIFF’s director presented his remarks on the current perception of the past of Asian cinema and of the role of PIFF to the event. As Kim states:

I believe the main cause for Asian films remaining relatively unknown, lies upon the lack of active cultural exchange for film culture between East and West, as well between the Asian countries. [...] Fortunately, thanks to various international film festivals taking place in Asia in recent year, active film exchanges between the Asian countries are taking place, along with increased numbers in co-productions between them. Pusan International Film Festival has been contributing greatly in shedding the lights on Asian cinema that was relatively unknown previously and introducing it to the Western society.⁷⁶

Thus, to enhance cultural exchange in the region Kim emphasises the significance of a “collaboration” between rather than individual effort within each country. He further suggests that the most efficient plan to achieve this was to establish a system of close collaboration among each nation’s film archives and cinematheques. Kim further states:

Unfortunately, Asian countries went through numerous wars and lost so many precious Audio-visual materials in the process, even losing the desire to preserve what is left. Because of this, it is quite difficult to

discuss the history of cinema in Asian countries. It is very fortunate to see that, in recent times, many countries have acknowledged the importance of the film archive and its role, after experiencing such heavy losses of many valuable audio-visual treasures.⁷⁷

As Korea has a relatively short archival history compared with others in the region, such as the Hong Kong Film Archive and the Singapore-based Asian Film Archive, PIFF and KOFA self-consciously joined regional archival organisations such as the Association of Asian Film Archives (AAFA) as well as FIAF. This active engagement shows how film festivals are cooperating with relevant film institutions to strengthen regional identity within the cultural heritage industry.

On the other hand, the presentation of Asian retrospectives at PIFF over the past decade illustrates how the role and function of retrospectives can be expanded and systematically organised within the institutions' interests alongside shifts in the regional industry. The recent Asian retrospective programme is distinctive in that it clearly demonstrates the potential to expand the boundaries of this section, thus differentiating it from other programmes. The ninth retrospective in 2004 is a good example of this. The title of this retrospective is "Rediscovering Asian Cinema Network: The Decades of Co-production between Korea and Hong Kong," and it features nine films co-produced between Korea and Hong Kong. As PIFF asserts:

Entering into the new millennium, the flourishing Korean cinema now expands its range to the rest of Asia. Having shared its markets and

resources, the Asian film industry enters into the age of full-scale co-production, and Korean cinema is expected to play a central role in this movement more than ever. However, Korean cinema has always tried to make Korean-Asian co-production alliances, ever since the early 20th century, under Japanese rule, and later in the 1950s [...] Throughout the co-production years with Shaw Brothers in its 1960s golden years, and then with Golden Harvest in the 1970s, the Korean film industry could exert its distinctive voice by encountering “Chinese martial art films” (*Muhyupyounghwa*) and “Fist Fight Films” (*Kwongkyukyounghwa*).⁷⁸

Despite these manifestations of an existing legacy of co-productions in Asia, it has often been pointed out that a lack of experience and understanding of co-production among East Asian countries could be an obstacle to future transnational co-productions. As programmer Huh Moon-yung notes:

Most people think that Asian countries, especially Northeast Asian countries, have only recently started co-producing films. But in fact, Korea, Hong Kong and Japan have experimented with co-production since the mid '50s, driven by one need or another. *The Last Woman of Shang* (1963) is one accomplishment borne of such efforts. Looking back on Korea-Hong Kong co-productions now is an attempt to both recognize the significance of the achievements of Asian film collaboration, and provide meaningful guidelines for the current revival of co-production and the Asian Cinema Network that has captured the attention of Korean filmmakers today.⁷⁹

This consciousness is further strengthened by the recent increase in the number of co-production bodies across East Asia such as the Pusan Promotion Plan and the Asian Film Industry Network. Within this context, this particular retrospective reflects PIFF’s efforts to surmount a vulnerability— a perceived lack of co-production experience - by rediscovering the hidden, unknown history of co-production in East Asia. In this sense, this retrospective served a diverse set of

interests contained within the current film industry and played a key role in justifying the festival's pan-Asian identity.

Furthermore, the recent Asian retrospective programmes at PIFF demonstrate that there has been significant progress in expanding the range of films in this particular section and in increasing awareness of the importance of the preservation of old films within the public and academic arenas. However, and significantly, it should be mentioned that this progress could not have been made without significant and increasing financial support directed towards the Asian retrospective section from PIFF's resources. Although the budget for this section has typically been far smaller than for other programmes, the budget allocated for the display of old Asian films, in particular, rapidly increased over the past decade. To be more specific, no separate budget allocation for Asian retrospectives existed before the sixth festival in 2001. However, from the seventh PIFF in 2002, the festival began to earmark 9,000,000 KRW (approximately 9,800 USD) for Asian retrospectives separate from Korean films. The budgetary allocation for Asian retrospectives then gradually increased to 15,000,000 KRW (approx. 16,300 USD) for the ninth festival in 2004.⁸⁰ This demonstrates that PIFF has sought to reinforce its focus on old regional films as there was a need to enhance the festival's competitiveness with provision of more diversified cultural products by showing older films as well as

contemporary movies.

Conclusion

This chapter has looked at retrospectives over the decade of PIFF's existence and tried to demonstrate how displaying old films at the festival provides a potentially contested place for reconstructing cinema's past in the Asia region. On the one hand, by re-circulating old Korean films, PIFF sought to re-examine the legacy of Korean cinema and so establish for itself a role as a legitimizing agent for Korean cinema. Similarly, PIFF attempted to reconfigure the history of old Asian films to justify the festival's identity as a platform for Asian cinema. The present chapter has elucidated how PIFF strategically utilised this section to promote the festival and reveals the mediation processes and negotiation strategies throughout this process.

While the first retrospective, "Korean New Wave," shows how PIFF tried to re-identify Korean Cinema to continue a historical legacy, the Kim Ki-young event illustrates how PIFF perceived its own old national films as a form of cultural heritage and how different discourses were shaped between the local and the global through the exhibition of his films at PIFF. Furthermore, a retrospective on Shin Sang-Ok demonstrates how the festival deliberately orchestrated this special exhibition to maximise the marketing potential of the retrospective section by

highlighting Shin's role in the on-going political conflict with North Korea. In short, the re-exhibition of old Korean films at PIFF provides an opportunity to grasp the complex roles of retrospectives at film festivals and understand its interlinks with the promotion of the contemporary national film industry.

As PIFF has aimed to construct for itself a new position in East Asia as an official showcase for Asian cinema, the festival has gradually begun to pay more attention to displaying old films from a broader cross-section of East Asian countries. Co-productions between Korea and Hong Kong, spotlighted at the ninth event, suggest how PIFF has sought to create a strong link between the screening of old regional films in the retrospective section and a recent development in the regional film industry – transnational film production. In this respect, retrospectives at PIFF reflect a complex transformation of festival's approach to the global market: the focus of the festival has begun to move away from the national and towards the regional as shown in the preceding chapter.

It is still too early to accurately or systematically measure the impact of the recirculation of old films in retrospectives at PIFF. Nevertheless, as observed above, the retrospectives of the past decade have enhanced the credibility and reputation of both PIFF and Korean cinema both locally and in a global context. These retrospectives also prove that there is still much room for PIFF to explore the "past"

in Korean and Asian cinema, and that doing so may improve PIFF's overall appeal to the global market as a showcase for both old and contemporary cinema in the region.

Notes

¹ Young-shin Park, "Why Bong Joon-ho Jumped up From the Chair to Say Something", *Ohmynews* [online newspaper] November, 18, 2006. [online] Available at http://www.ohmynews.com/articleview/article_view.asp?at_code=374048 (accessed November 28, 2006). This article reported on the second Korean cinema and music festival in Strasbourg (2eme festival de cinéma et musique coréenne) in France held from 7-12 November, 2006. This festival screened contemporary Korean films including Bong Joon-ho's *The Host* (2006) as the opening film. It also organised a retrospective of Yu Hyun-Mok's films: *An Aimless Bullet* (1961), *Daughters of the Pharmacist Kim* (1963) and *Rainy Days* (1979).

² The full titles of the Korean Retrospective section are as follows: Korea's New Wave (1996); Kim Ki-young, Cinema of Diabolical Desire and Death (1997); Beautiful Cinematographer Yoo Young-kil (1998); The Pathfinder of Korean Realism Yu Hyun-Mok (1999); Everlasting Scent of the Classic: Choon-Hyang Jeon (2000); Shin Sang-Ok, Prince of Korean Cinema, Leading the Desire of the Masses (2001); Kim Soo-yong, An Aesthete Bridging Tradition and Modernism (2002); Chung Chang-wha, the Man of Action (2003); Rediscovering Asian Cinema Network: The Decades of Co-production between Korea and Hong Kong (2004); Lee Man-hee, the Poet of Night (2005). Korean and Asian retrospectives were included together in the "Special Programme in Focus" section until the seventh PIFF (2002) but since 2003, PIFF has split Korean retrospectives from this section and created an independent section entitled "Korean Cinema Retrospective."

³ Dudley Andrew, "Waves of New Waves and the International Film Festival," *Asia/Cinema/Network: Industry, Technology and Film Culture*, Tenth PIFF Symposium Booklet (Pusan: Tenth PIFF, 2005), 255-265.

⁴ Julian Stringer, "Raiding the Archive: Film Festivals and the Revival of Classic Hollywood," in *Memory and Popular Film*, ed. Paul Grainge (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), 81-96.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 82.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 83.

⁷ See Stringer, 2003, 81-96.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 85.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 95.

¹⁰ Barbara Klinger, *Beyond the Multiplex: Cinema, New Technologies, and the Home* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 102; Roberta Pearson, "A White Man's Country: Yale's Chronicles of America" in *Memory and Popular Film*, ed., Paul Grainge (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), 25.

¹¹ Edmund Lee, "Pusan Power," *Village Voice*, October 29, 1996, n.p.

¹² According to a local newspaper interview with Kim Dong-Ho, the festival director, PIFF desperately looked for this film since this film had never been shown to the public. Kim said that the festival committee failed to negotiate with the Japanese owner of this film, called "Abe," as this person placed some difficult conditions on lending it to PIFF. However, Kim asserted in this interview that PIFF would not give up efforts to screen this historic film in the future. Eun-young Kim, "Interview with Kim Dong-Ho," *Busan Ilbo*, August 16, 1996, 6.

¹³ The official website of The Korean Film Archive is available at <http://www.koreafilm.org/kofa/history.asp> (accessed December 2, 2006).

¹⁴ Haidee Wasson, *Museum Movies: The Museum of Modern Art and the Birth of Art Cinema* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 6.

¹⁵ For a discussion of some of the specific cases of ancillary markets in East Asia, see Darcy Paquet's festival report "PPP Seminar: Advanced Widow Marketing" held at the tenth PIFF in 2006. [online] Available at <http://www.koreanfilm.org/piff05.html>. (accessed November 29, 2006).

¹⁶ Stringer, 2003, 85.

¹⁷ *South Korean Golden Age Melodrama: Gender, Genre, and National Cinema*, eds., Kathleen McHugh and Nancy Ablemann, (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2005), 3.

¹⁸ Hannah McGill and Andrew Pulver, "World Cinema Special - Is Nigeria the new Japan?" *Guardian*, March 30, 2007, 9.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 9.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 10.

²¹ Dong-Ho Kim, "Foreword," *The First Pusan International Film Festival*, Programme Booklet (Pusan: First PIFF, 1996), 10.

- ²² Julian Stinger, "Introduction" in *New Korean Cinema*, eds., Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer, (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005), 2.
- ²³ Song-hyun Cho, "Special Programmes and Korean Retrospective," September 13, 1996, *Kookje Shinmun*, 13.
- ²⁴ Steven D. Lavine and Ivan Karp, "Introduction: Museums and Multiculturalism," in *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, eds., Ivan Karp and Steven D. Lavine (Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991), 2.
- ²⁵ Song-hyun Cho, 1996, 13.
- ²⁶ Tony Rayns, "Korea's New Wave," *Sight and Sound*, vol.4. no. 11(1994): 21-25.
- ²⁷ Andrew, 2005, 256.
- ²⁸ Tony Rayns, 1996: 22-25; Rayns, *Seoul Stirring: 5 Korean Directors*, London: Institute of Contemporary Arts; Stringer, 2005, 6; Isolde Standish, "Korean Cinema and the New Realism: Text and Context" in *Colonialism and Nationalism in Asian Cinema*, ed., Wimal Dissanayake (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996), 65-89.
- ²⁹ Stinger, 2005, 6. In the Introductory chapter of this book, Stringer defines "New Korean Cinema" by period: the post-authoritarian, post-political period of the post-1990s and post *Sopyonje* era; he also emphasises specific elements which define the commercial film industry in defining New Korean Cinema.
- ³⁰ Hyo-In Yi, "A Turning Point: The New Wave (1988-1991)" in *Korea's New Wave*, eds., Hyo-In Yi and Jung-Ha Lee (Pusan: First PIFF, 1996), 35.
- ³¹ Hyo-In Yi, "The New Beginning of Korean Cinema" in *Ibid.*, 9.
- ³² Dong-Ho Kim, 1996, 10.
- ³³ Edmund Lee, 1996, n.p.; Aruna Vasudev, "Pusan's Enthralling Show", *The Pioneer*, October 3, 1996, 11; Andrew Hindes, "First Korean Pic Fest an Artistic, Popular Success" *Variety*, September 23-29, 1996, 27.
- ³⁴ Sang-do Jung and Jin-woo Lee, "World Cinema is the Most Popular Section at PIFF," *Kookje Shinmun* September 21, 1996, 13.
- ³⁵ Editorial "What PIFF Left Behind," *JoongAngilbo*, September 23, 1996, 6. This article emphasises the importance of cinema as an industry which can provide enormous profits to the national economy by citing the huge box-office of *Jurassic Park* (Steven Spielberg, 1993).
- ³⁶ "Exhibition of Historical Material of Korean Cinema is Empty and Quiet," *Kookje Shinmun*, September 21, 1996, 13.
- ³⁷ Young-kwan Lee, *The First Pusan International Film Festival*. Programme Booklet (Pusan: First PIFF, 1996), 118.
- ³⁸ Young-kwan Lee, 1996, 118; Chris Berry, "Introducing 'Mr. Monster': Kim Ki-young and the Critical Economy of the Globalized Art-House Cinema," in *Post-colonial Classics of Korean Cinema*, ed. Choong-moo Choi (Irvine : Korean Film Festival Committee of University of California, 1998), 39-47; Soyoung Kim, "Modernity in Suspense: Translation of Fetishism," in *The First Jeonju International Film Festival Symposium*, ed. Soyoung Kim (Jeonju: JIFF, 2000), 83-90.
- ³⁹ Berry, 1998, 41.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 39-41.
- ⁴¹ Richard James Havis, "A Star is born - aged 78" *Moving Pictures MIFED 1997 Special*, November 1997, n.p.
- ⁴² Chuck Stephens, "Pusan the Envelope: Film -festival Fever Seize South Korea's 'Hermit Kingdom'", *LA Weekly*, November 7-13, 1997, n.p.
- ⁴³ Berry, 1998, 39; James Havis, 1997; Stephens, 1997.
- ⁴⁴ Soyoung Kim, "Cine-mania or Cinephilia: Film Festivals and the Identity Question," in *UTS Review* (Cultural Studies Review), vol. 4, no. 2 (1998): 183. Before the retrospective in 1997, it was widely known that the distinctiveness of Kim Ki-young's films was appreciated by local critics and journalists and his films were circulated by on VHS tapes. Thomas Jong-suk Nam, former Festival Coordinator at PIFF 1997-2004, Personal Electronic Mail Communication (August 10, 2007).
- ⁴⁵ Toh Hai Leong, "Postwar Korean Cinema: Fractured Memories and Identity," *Kinema* (Fall 1996) [online]. Available at <http://www.arts.uwaterloo.ca/FINE/juhde/kfall96.htm>. and www.kinema.uwaterloo.ca/gvtt-962.htm (accessed June 10, 2006).
- ⁴⁶ "Festival for the Public', Korean Cinema Spotlighted: Interview with Soyoung Kim," September 23, 1996, *Kookje Shinmun*, 21. At the first PIFF, a number of international guests were invited including Laurence Kardish, senior curator of MoMA; Erica Gregor and Dorothee Wenner from the Berlin Film Festival; Adriano Apra, the festival director of Pesaro Film Festival; Simon Field, the

director of Rotterdam Film Festival; Alain Jalladeau from the Nante Film Festival, and representatives from the Pompidou Centre and the Cannes Film Festival. Eunha Oh and Hong-joo Sohn, "Pleased to see Korean Film Festival," *Hankyorye Shinmun*, September 29, 1997, 15-17.

⁴⁷ For example, *Korea Herald*, a major English language newspaper reported: "However, Korean films were on the whole, neglected by fans and foreign distributors. With a few exceptions like "Motel Cactus" and "Green Fish," local productions weren't well received for their conventional subjects and lack of quality." "Pusan Film Fest: Huge Success with Foreign, Local Movie Fans," *Korea Herald*, October 20, 1997, 11.

⁴⁸ Dong-jin Lee, "Toward the New Centre in Asia," *Chosun Ilbo*, November 10, 1997, 14.

⁴⁹ Berry, 1998, 46.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 44.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 45.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 44-46.

⁵³ Richard Allen, "Pesaro 1: Festival Review," *Framework*, issue 22/23, (Autumn, 1983): 74.

⁵⁴ Cheong-sook An, "Shedding a Light on Asian cinema: Closing the Second PIFF," *Hankyureh Shinmun*, Oct 18, 1997, 16.

⁵⁵ Personal interview with Lee Yong-kwan in Seoul, Korea (January 4, 2007).

⁵⁶ A retrospective on Kim Ki-young was held at the Busan Cinematheque on 20 February - 4 March 2007.

⁵⁷ Sang-Jun Han, "The Cinematic World of Shin Sang-Ok" in *Shin Sang-Ok: Prince of Korean Cinema, Leading the Desire of the Masses*, eds. Sang-Jung Han and Jeong-hwa Yang (the Sixth PIFF), 6; Young-Jin Kim, "Fantastic Shin Sang-Ok: A Legend in Korean Film in the '60s and '70s" in *The Tenth Puchon International Fantastic Film Festival Programme Booklet* (Puchon: Tenth PiFan, 2006), 148.

⁵⁸ Gorenfeld John, "Producer From Hell", *Guardian* (April 4, 2003). [online] Available at <http://film.guardian.co.uk/print/0,,4640432-3181,00.html>. (accessed December 1, 2006).

⁵⁹ For instance, an article on his death also began clearly by indicating the existence of Kim Jong-il by exemplifying his notorious terrorist image presented in *Team America: World Police* (Trey Parker, 2004), the recent Hollywood animation film, taking up a large part of the story. "Obituary: Shin Sang-Ok, film director and abductee, died on April 11th, aged 79", *The Economist* (27 April 2006). [online] Available at http://www.economist.com/people/displayStory.cfm?story_id=6849979. (accessed December 2, 2006).

⁶⁰ Jung-in Sohn, "Art or Law?" *Kukje Shinmun*, November 15, 2001, 3.

⁶¹ For example, programmers from Berlin and the artistic director Thierry Fremaux and the newly appointed Critics' Week head Claire Clouzot from the Cannes festival were present.

⁶² Sang-Jun Han, "Korean Cinema Retrospective," *The Sixth PIFF*, Programme Booklet (Pusan: Sixth PIFF, 2001), 226.

⁶³ Derek Elley, "Korean Pix Primp at Pusan Fest," *Variety* (November 20, 2001). [online] Available at: <http://www.variety.com/toc-archive>. (accessed August 11, 2006). It was believed that the retrospective of Shin was delayed at PIFF. According to Han Sang-Jun, Shin's retrospective was supposed to run in the previous year but PIFF committee changed the initial plan and announced *Choon Hyang* instead of Shin. Interview with Han Sang-Jun (Seoul, January 2007).

⁶⁴ Jung-In Sohn, "Runaway Was Banned," *Kukje Shinmun*, November 15, 2001, 1.

⁶⁵ For instance, his case echoes that of Zhang Yimou. Apart from the international applause for his films, his reputation in the western world can be attributed largely to the fact that most of his films were banned by the Chinese government as Yingjin Zhang suggests. Though political issues are not the sole reason for Shin's global access, they can help market his films at global festivals.

⁶⁶ Yingjin Zhang, *Screening China* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002), 31-39.

⁶⁷ *Korea Herald*, reported that "'Hermes Night for Korean Filmmakers' will take place at the Paradise Hotel at 10 p.m., said officials of the sponsor firm, Hermes Korea." Yong-shik Choe, "Director to be Honoured at PIFF," *Korea Herald*, November 15, 2001, 16.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.* 20 million KRW is approximately 21,000 USD.

⁶⁹ Young-Jin Kim, "Fantastic Shin Sang-Ok: A Legend in Korean Film in the '60' and the '70" in *The Tenth Puchon International Fantastic Film Festival*, Programme Booklet (Puchon: Tenth PiFan, 2006), 148.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.* However, it should be mentioned that Han Sang-Jun was deeply engaged with this second retrospective programme at the PiFan although Kim Young-Jin coordinated it. Han was in charge of Shin's first retrospective as programmer of Korean cinema at PIFF in 2001. After programmer Han

quit PIFF in 2002, he took over the new position as senior programmer at PiFan in 2006 and became festival director since 2007.

⁷¹ Young-Jin Kim, 2006, 148.

⁷² Sang-Jun Han, "The Cinematic World of Shin Sang-Ok" in *Shin Sang-Ok: Prince of Korean Cinema, Leading the Desire of the Masses*, The Sixth PIFF (Pusan, Sixth PIFF, 2001), 7.

⁷³ Dong-Ho Kim, "Preface," in *The Second PIFF*, Programme Booklet (Pusan: Second PIFF, 1997), 119.

⁷⁴ Ji-Seok Kim, "Celebrating 20th Century Asian Cinema: 20th Century Masterpieces" *The Fourth PIFF*, Programme Catalogue (Pusan: Fourth PIFF, 1999), 198.

⁷⁵ The FIAF, founded in 1938 in Paris, France, is an international body consisting of organizations and institutions that preserve and manage moving image materials from all over the world as cultural heritage as well as historical material. Members cover more than 140 institutions from over 77 countries.

[online] Available at: <http://www.fiafnet.org/uk/> (accessed June 28, 2007).

⁷⁶ Dong-Ho Kim, "The Past, the Present and the Future of Asian Cinema", in *FIAF 58th Congress Symposium in Seoul: Asian Cinema - Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow*, ed. KOFA (Seoul: Korean Film Archive, 2002), 158.

⁷⁷ Dong-Ho Kim, 2002, 156-160.

⁷⁸ Young-jung Cho, "Programme Note of Korean Cinema Retrospective" in *The Ninth Pusan International Film Festival*, Programme Booklet (Pusan: Ninth PIFF, 2004), 112.

⁷⁹ Moon-yung Huh, "For Greater and Deeper Dialogue - Reflections on the Cultural Significance of Co-production," in *Rediscovering Asian Cinema Network: The Decades of Co-Production Between Korean and Hong Kong*, eds. Lee Yong-kwan, Huh Moon-yung and Cho Young-jung and Park Dosin, The Ninth PIFF (Pusan: Ninth PIFF, 2004), 9.

⁸⁰ "Budget for Special Program and Retrospective (2000-2007)" Unpublished Material. Ji-seok Kim, Asian Programmer of PIFF, Personal Electronic Mail Communication (June 28, 2007).

Chapter 6

A Global Film Producer: The Pusan Promotion Plan

The preceding two chapters have looked at PIFF's key programme sections to reveal how the festival has negotiated its position within the changing global/local festival landscape. While PIFF has served as a showcase for Asian films by evoking a strong regional identity, the festival has equally striven to promote the national film industry by placing Korean films into prime high-profile sections which act as a gateway into the global film market.

This chapter aims to show how PIFF's regionalisation strategy has been furthered by the Pusan Promotion Plan, a market in which new Asian feature film projects can seek co-financing and co-production partners from all over the world.¹ By looking at the PPP, this chapter aims to demonstrate that festivals have become a key location to sell and buy projects and ideas in the pre-production stage. The key argument of this chapter is that film festivals are beginning to play a new role in the global film industry, that of being a new kind of *producer*, by actively engaging with the production process as well as exhibition and distribution. Through the effective operation of the PPP, PIFF has expanded the boundaries of its festival functions and intensified the hype surrounding this event. By doing so it has also

made a name for itself as “a prime regional mover.”²

As argued in earlier chapters, for the past few decades international film festivals have played a key role in introducing world cinema to the West. Among the film industries’ three conventional modes – production, exhibition and distribution - film festivals have established themselves as important centres of exhibition and distribution. As Julian Stringer states, it is festival exhibition that determines the distribution of certain films in particular cultural arenas. As such, festivals have enabled western scholars to encounter non-western films.³

Yet, despite the close link between festivals and the film industry, there has been little academic discussion of festivals’ new role in film production. Festivals’ involvement in film production is increasingly visible as the global film market becomes more competitive. The new relationship between film festivals and industry is best explained by Yingjin Zhang. Although Zhang focuses on big-budget Chinese films of the late 1990s, his research encompasses the whole process of production, exhibition and distribution. A study of all of these elements is necessary to understand the content and impact of any given film. As Zhang asserts:

[A]part from some basic facts and film texts themselves, very few research publications to date can tell us what went on behind the scenes in the processes of planning, financing, scripting, shooting, editing, marketing, distributing and receiving big-budget films such as *Red Cherry* (Hong Yingtao, 1995) and *The Emperor’s Shadow* (Qinsong, 1996).⁴

Considering that transnational co-financing and co-production have become dominant trends in the global market, the modes of production, exhibition and distribution are increasingly interlinked and simultaneously determined by a variety of structural and situational factors.⁵ In this regard, the production-oriented role of festivals in the global film market has been overly downplayed and should be redefined as one of the crucial functions of film festivals. In this context, a critical focus on a project market in Asia, such as the PPP, can provide a useful base from which to understand the ways in which festivals are involved in the planning, financing and production of films in the region. The PPP serves an exemplary example of how festivals position themselves within the global film economy.⁶

Focusing on the years 1998 to 2005, this chapter will first explore how and why PIFF established the PPP by investigating the background, aims and achievements of this project market. Second, the chapter will discuss how the PPP has tried to brand its products in the name of Asian cinema and has forged a link between exhibition at PIFF and projects at the PPP. Third, it will show that the PPP has achieved its industrial objectives by building networks with other film institutions at the local, regional and global level. Finally, the chapter will consider the necessary compromises made between the PPP's regional approach and its goal

of promoting local products in South Korea.

Overall, by examining tensions between national and regional forces through the PPP, the chapter will seek to reveal how the festival deliberately played up to and manipulated western expectations as a means of reaching the global market. It also attempts to show that the PPP's development and success were linked with strong commercial imperatives prevalent in the national and the regional film industries as a result of globalisation.

The Pusan Promotion Plan (PPP)

The PPP is a co-financing and co-production market for Asian films established in 1998 as a side event of the third PIFF. Each year the festival showcases a select number of Asian film projects in the development or production stages, giving out cash awards and providing an opportunity for filmmakers to meet prospective financiers. More specifically, as it is a project market, the PPP candidates are film projects that are in the pre-production stage, including scriptwriting, casting, and budgeting. By arranging one-to-one meetings between investors and filmmakers, the key aim of the PPP is to provide Asian filmmakers with an opportunity to get funds in order to complete their films, and in return, to encourage the investors to acquire rights for distribution as one of the important conditions of the contract. The

PPP selection committee, consisting of the festival programmers and specialists in the local film industry, selects projects which are submitted from the Asia region.

Over three days during the festival, the PPP guests and a limited number of festival guests participate in panels and roundtable discussions and pitch presentation events.

This project market ultimately aims to encourage and educate buyers and investors to support and finance new film projects from Asia.

The PPP runs a number of awards that offer production financing to Asian filmmakers. Every year for eight years the number of awarding bodies has increased. The main awards are the Busan Award (Pusan city, USD 20,000), the Hubert Bals Fund (HBF) Award, the CineMart Award [International Film Festival Rotterdam (IFFR), USD 10,000],⁷ the Kodak Award (Eastman Kodak, negative film worth USD 20,000), the Busan Film Commission (BFC) Award (USD 10,000) and the New Directors in Focus (NDIF) Awards (various funding bodies, KRW 10 million).⁸ As shall be discussed, the biggest indication of the PPP's effectiveness is the success of the market's past selections.⁹ By completing each project, the PPP has become more closely involved in all three stages of film-making – pre-production, production and post-production – in the global market.¹⁰

It is important to consider how and why PIFF established the PPP from the earliest stages of the festival. In 1997, PIFF staged a forum to lay the foundations

for the launch of the project market the following year. PIFF gathered the key producers, distributors, sales agents and investors of Asian films in the international market and tried to find new models of co-financing and co-production for Asian films. The following comment from festival director Kim Dong-Ho is helpful in understanding how the festival self-consciously perceived its role in the global film market when launching the PPP:

The critical element in filmmaking is often not the script, the producer, nor the actor: it is *money*. To further the goal of supporting Asian cinema, the festival will launch in 1998 the Pusan Promotion Plan (PPP), a co-financing and co-production market for Asian films. PPP will invite Asian producers and directors with projects at the development, pre-production or production stage to meet invited financiers, distributors, television buyers, sales agents and other funding sources. PPP is unique in being the only pre-market in Asia for Asian films. The potential influence and impact of PPP on Asian cinema is thus rather high, especially when considering the emerging strength of the festival itself (Italics added).¹¹

This demonstrates PIFF's pro-market stance when establishing its own market within the festival. It also indicates how PIFF focused on boosting the Asian film industry. For example, although the forum in 1997 was divided into three areas (Asia, North America and Europe), the focus was on the Asian films in overseas markets, funding issues, joint investments and co-productions. In the Asia section, participants discussed several issues specific to Asia such as "How have Asian films

fared in their own backyard?” and “Who is emerging as key players in Asia-wide distribution?” The Europe section dealt with questions such as “What influence do festivals have in presenting Asian films to the wider European public?” and “In which European countries have Asian films been most successful and why?” By contrast, in the North America session, the main topic was why it is difficult to sell Asian films in North America.¹²

In recent years, Asian films have been enthusiastically received by international audiences. Indeed, this has become something of a global phenomenon. However, this warm reception depends heavily on the availability of films, especially those with English subtitles. In this respect, it becomes apparent that film festivals have played a key role in circulating Asian cinema to the West. For example, as Stringer notes, contemporary Korean cinema is most obviously associated with two specific forms of contemporary film consumption: high-profile international film festivals and home consumption on commercial video, VCD and DVD.¹³ In this way, many Asian films have been discovered by westerners through the festival circuit. Consequently, films produced in certain regions of the world are often under-acknowledged until they have been recognised by western film festivals. As Stringer states, “scholars tend to approach them through the nostalgic invocation of those moments when non-western industries were “discovered”- that is

“discovered” by westerners - at international competitions.”¹⁴ Being aware of the limited funding opportunities in the global film market, PIFF has actively worked with the Asian film industry to create new channels of financing and co-production. Rather than relying on being discovered by the West in western film festivals, PIFF has attempted to create indigenous regional products and to brand films produced, discovered or financed in Pusan through the PPP.

As explained in chapter 2, in the late 1990s, many East Asian film industries, including Korea, were facing hard times in the wake of the IMF crisis. Film production had fallen sharply in most countries in this region. Moreover, the structures for transregional cooperation which the PPP attempted to consolidate were less familiar than the ones in Europe. Despite these obstacles, the PPP has achieved considerable success. The first event attracted record attendance and much positive feedback from delegates.¹⁵ Seventeen Asian projects, including five from Korea, won USD 10,000-prizes, awarded by the HBF and the Korean investment company Ilshin. Ishi Sogo won the PPP Award for his science-fiction Samurai story, *Gojo-Reisenki*, and Chinese filmmaker Jia Zhangke took the HBF Award for *Platform*. The success of the PPP that year was, as *The Hollywood Reporter* stated, a case of “triumph amid adversity.”¹⁶

Throughout its eight-year history until 2005, the PPP positioned itself as the

gateway for Asian film projects by proving it could recognise and promote success.

Many projects submitted during the early years went on to become award-winning films that reached a global audience. As evidence of its effectiveness, the organisers released data relating to the number of completed projects. For example, the following films were among the completed projects funded by the PPP: *Platform* (Jia Zhangke, 1998), *Beijing Bicycle* (Wang Xiaoshuai, 2001), *The Circle* (Jafar Panahi, 2000), *Address Unknown* (Kim Ki-duk, 2001), *The Bow* (Kim Ki-duk, 2005), *Oasis* (Lee Chang-dong, 2002), and *Woman Is the Future of Man* (Hong Sang-soo, 2004).

However, why did PIFF have to organise a pre-market rather than a market to buy and sell completed films, such as the Cannes Film Market and the American Film Market (AFM) or the International Multimedia and Film Market in Milan (MIFED)? Furthermore, why did PIFF devote itself to a more production-oriented strategy rather than other types of investment or distribution arrangements?

There are several factors which determined PIFF's choice of a project market. First of all, PIFF was aware that the recent international spotlight on Asian cinema could not guarantee the long-term stability of supply and demand in the global market. In spite of the growing interest in Asian cinema and the prolific film production in the region at the time, there was a sense in the Korean film industry

that Asian cinema had been restricted by limited releases as well as other unexpected factors in the global film market.¹⁷ For this reason, the creation of a new brand – through incubating, developing and marketing products - was a significant step into the global distribution system. Moreover, as other major film festivals in the West had already established their own film markets, PIFF had to find a niche to avoid competition and differentiate itself from others in the global film industry. Lastly, it was CineMart, a project market of the IFFR, that specifically influenced the establishment of the PPP. In launching the PPP, PIFF closely examined and modelled it after CineMart, an established project market in Europe, and has continued building a partnership with it over the past decade.

PIFF's choice of a project market mirrors a trend for festivals to be more involved with their local and regional film industries. Recently, more international film festivals have become aware of the significance of the project market and begun to establish their own. For example, during the 2004 Berlin Film Festival, a co-production market was launched in tandem with the festival. Although there was an European Film Market (EFM) which dealt with completed films during the festival, the need for a project market and co-production prompted the Berlin Film Festival to launch this project market separately.¹⁸ Additionally, the Locarno International Film Festival began to widen the scope of its "Industry Office" by

focusing on the functions of a project market such as co-financing and co-production. Despite the existence of film markets within renowned festivals, the growing visibility of project markets indicates their increasing importance in the global film industry. Indeed, it is a response to the shared needs of film industries and festivals, both of which are looking for more opportunities in a competitive global market.

Asian Identity Meets Asian Products

Since its inception in 1996, PIFF has stressed its Asian identity as a vehicle to reach beyond national boundaries to the global market. This strategic regional approach has been aligned with the festival's link to the regional film industry in the fields of production, exhibition and distribution. PIFF forged strong links with the PPP by consolidating the relationship between projects completed through the PPP and programming at PIFF, as shall be discussed.

PIFF specifically engaged with film projects that had not been completed by arranging financing or financiers and attempting to brand these products as "PIFF films." The festival has tried to implant some material signs of a film's construction on the film in order to maintain a legitimate identities as "made in Pusan," insisting that this product was chosen and created by Pusan. To achieve this aim, the festival

has utilised the PPP as a means of identifying those titles that belong to Pusan. This is linked with PIFF's efforts to integrate its image as a hub of Asian cinema with attempts to establish a reputation as a market-oriented festival.

In this context, it is significant that many of the PPP projects have been specifically linked with PIFF's main programme. For instance, the choice of *Chinese Box* (Wayne Wang, 1997) as the opening film at the second PIFF was made in consideration of the key agenda of the PPP: co-finance and co-production of Asian films. *Chinese Box* was a suitable model for the PPP as it had been co-financed with capital from France, Japan, the UK, the USA, and Hong Kong through CineMart. To learn about the specific process of co-production, the PPP established a roundtable by inviting director Wayne Wang and the key producer and distributor.¹⁹

Furthermore, the PPP has enabled the PIFF programming committee to have access to much greater variety and availability of films in selecting and exhibiting Asian films in the various festival sections that focus on Asian cinema. As the PPP was able to prove it can provide funding opportunities for Asian projects and help to complete films, increasingly large numbers of Asian directors began to attend PIFF and the PPP. Since the second PPP, the organisers have been able to boast that many projects taken on previously through the PPP were completed, invited to renowned

film festivals elsewhere and also shown at PIFF itself. For example, at the fourth

PPP, they announced:

As of September 2001, already 19 projects have been completed of the 55 projects (56 films) introduced at PPP in the last three years. These films have been awarded, completed or were invited to many historic and prestigious film festivals including the Cannes, Berlin, Venice and Rotterdam Film Festivals. Of these completed films, 5 will be screened at this year's 6th Pusan International Film Festival (PIFF).²⁰

The films which were selected and completed through the PPP in previous years were screened at PIFF in 2001. These films include *The Monkey* (Aktan Abdykalykov, Kyrgyzstan), *Address Unknown* (Kim Ki-duk, Korea), *The Road* (Darejan Omirbaev, Kazakhstan), *All About Lily Chou-Chou* (Iwai Shunji, Japan) and *Weekend Plot* (Zhang Ming, People's Republic of China). In this way, the PPP provided PIFF with potential opportunities to obtain more prospective products at the festival programmes. This vital link between exhibition at PIFF and projects at the PPP demonstrates a collusion of the conventional modes of production, exhibition and distribution.

However, while PIFF pursued the creation of its own brand through the PPP, the results did not always match its aim, suggesting a complex and negotiated relationship between Asian filmmakers and PIFF. The relationship between the

festival and filmmakers through the PPP cannot be simply defined as an exchange and a barter system. Rather, the relation between the awarding bodies and winning filmmakers points to a complex and negotiated process through which specific films tie in with particular film festivals and funding bodies. In particular, in its early stages – that is, before the PPP established a reputation – the PPP’s role was to provide a meeting place rather than to directly offer funding to projects.²¹ Although PIFF desired to hold the world-premieres of the completed Asian films which had been funded, supported and spotlighted by the PPP itself, directors of those films often chose other influential film festivals that offered more opportunities to get into the global film market instead.²² Apparently, PIFF expected a world premiere screening of those films if the 2001 PPP Report, an official publication, is anything to go by. This report was released to guests prior to the opening of the festival. It proudly announced, “*Weekend Plot*, which won the HBF Award at the previous year’s PPP, was co-produced by Les Films De L’Observatoire and this film will be making its world premiere at this year’s PIFF.”²³ Notwithstanding PIFF’s expectations, however, *Weekend Plot* was screened at the Toronto International Film Festival in September 2001 at the last minute, and was shown again at PIFF two months later, when it could be billed only as the Korean premiere. Considering that Zhang Ming’s *In Expectation* (1996) was the winner of the New Currents at the first

PIFF, if his new film *Weekend Plot* which had been funded at the PPP, had been world premiered at PIFF, it would have provided PIFF with a successful example of its achievement by combining the PPP (a funded project) with PIFF (a world-premiere screening).

In view of this situation, and in order to activate and maximise the impact of the PPP from its initial stages, PIFF had to create its own so-called Asian star who was “discovered” or “made” in Pusan from the first event. Jia Zhangke from the PRC was the most likely candidate with films in the most high-profile sections of the festival, New Currents and the PPP. Jia received the New Currents Award, in the competition section, for his film *Xiao Wu* (1997) at the festival and was financed by the HBF Award for his project *Platform* at the PPP. The PIFF committee declared the birth of an Asian star as follows:

A new master in Asian cinema was discovered during the 3rd PIFF. Chinese filmmaker Jia Zhangke, who presented a superb self-examination on the lives of Chinese youths in *Xiao Wu*, stormed the festival by receiving the New Currents Award and the Hubert Bals Award for his new project presented at PPP, *Platform*, and thus arose an up and coming talent in Asian Cinema.²⁴

Some international media reports concurred with PIFF’s focus on this director.

The Hollywood Reporter comments:

The brightest star to emerge was Chinese director Jia Zhangke, who won

PIFF's main prize – the New Currents Award – for his film *Xiao Wu*, a tale of a pickpocket in provincial China. The award, which is given to the best new film by an Asian director, guarantees distribution in South Korea or USD 10,000. It was Jia's second success of the week. Earlier, he was given the USD 10,000 Hubert Bals award for *Platform*, which was deemed one of the most promising of the 17 scripts presented at the promotion project. The New Currents jury hailed Jia as 'an auteur in the making.' One of them, Gohei Oguri from Japan, said Jia's success at Pusan marks the birth of a rare filmmaking talent which appears only once every few years.²⁵

Jia received huge amounts of media attention during the third PIFF and the first PPP in 1998 and became a regular guest at Pusan thereafter. Although *Xiao Wu* had already been shown and had received the NETPAC Award at the Berlin Film Festival in February (prior to PIFF), the festival insisted that Jia was discovered by PIFF and never mentioned his previous award at Berlin when releasing press material during the festival. Spurred by the media and financial support, his new project *Platform* was subsequently completed in 2000 through co-financing from Hong Kong, France and Japan. This film was nominated at the competition section, world-premiered and won the NETPAC Award at the Venice Film Festival in 2000. In addition, it won multiple awards such as the best film at the Buenos Aires International Festival of Independent Cinema, and the Don Quixote Award at the Fribourg International Film Festival in 2001.

By helping film projects receive production financing, PIFF sought to consolidate the exhibition role of the festival with the production role of the PPP. If

film projects funded through the PPP are completed and exhibited at PIFF, the festival is able to secure some world premieres of Asian films in return for its initial investment in sponsoring and organising the PPP. However, the response of Asian filmmakers who benefited from the PPP was different from what PIFF had hoped for. It is significant that *Platform* was world premiered at the Venice Film Festival and also shown at the Toronto Film Festival in September of that year. After being shown at two major western film festivals, it was screened at A Window on Asian Cinema, a non-competition section of PIFF, in October. Although this film was significantly supported by PIFF and IFFR, Jia Zhangke chose to be world-premiered in Venice, at a more influential film festival than Pusan or Rotterdam.

There are a number of similar cases. In the year 2000, examples of such films include Jafar Pahani's *The Circle* (Iran), which won the Golden Lion, the top competition prize at the Venice Film Festival; and Fruit Chan's *Little Cheung* (Hong Kong), which won a Silver Leopard at the Locarno International Film Festival in 2000. Korean projects are no exception: *Address Unknown* (Kim Ki-duk, 2001) was selected as the official project by the second PPP, funded by the Korean Film Council and screened in Venice after being nominated for the Golden Lion and invited to Toronto before PIFF in 2001. Hong Sang-soo's project *Woman is the Future of Man* received the Busan Award, a top award funded through the PPP, in

2002 but this film went to the competition section of the Cannes Film Festival before PIFF.

These Asian filmmakers' choice of major western film festivals rather than Pusan to premiere their films at reveals there to be complicated hierarchical relationships both among global film festivals and between festivals and filmmakers. An unequivocal barter arrangement between the PPP and the filmmakers who have benefited from participation at the market is not always guaranteed to occur as part of this relationship. This also reveals how Asian film directors cope with the complex relationship between the different interests of international film festivals and their own desires to get easier access to the global market.

Global Networks and the PPP

Globally-scaled film festivals are emerging as a new type of producer through their powerful involvement with the creative production process via project markets such as the PPP and CineMart. Project markets are connected in "complex webs of alliance, partnership and joint venture," competing and cooperating with each other.²⁶ PIFF and the PPP have developed a particular relationship with the IFFR and CineMart. This relationship is important as it allows us to understand a set of significant characteristics of film markets and film festivals. It illustrates how this

kind of alliance is created among different film festivals and how this relationship affects all the parties involved. Furthermore, it specifically shows how cultural intermediaries act through both markets and festivals.

CineMart has been the prime partner of the PPP since its inception in 1998. Every year the Asian projects presented at CineMart are considered for the PPP official project selection and, in turn, the PPP projects are considered by CineMart, providing a strong collaboration in supporting new Asian films. In addition, CineMart sponsored the HBF Award in the amount of USD 10,000 every year between 1998 and 2003.

Initially, when CineMart was launched in 1983, it was a regular film market. However, the IFFR shifted it to a pre-market for film projects which were looking for additional financing. By differentiating itself from major film festivals such as Cannes, Venice and Berlin, the IFFR has positioned itself as one of the distinctive international film festivals in Europe specialising in the presentation of innovative and independent films. In the same vein, the IFFR established CineMart and enhanced its function of arranging co-financing and co-production to differentiate it from the other film markets of major festivals in Europe. Across its twenty-three-year history, approximately 315 films have been realised at CineMart. The organisers boast that around twenty former CineMart titles were premiered at

leading global festivals, including Cannes, Venice, Locarno, Toronto and Berlin, as well as its home festival in Rotterdam. Indeed, the establishment of CineMart as a pre-market to support talented young filmmakers has been successful and has successfully matched the aim and identity of the festival as it pursued the selection of worldwide independent, innovative and experimental cinema and visual arts.²⁷

The prime benefit to the PPP of modelling itself on CineMart, was the know-how of running a project market. From the formula of introducing projects to potential co-producers, sales agents, TV buyers, distributors and financiers, to the setting up of one-to-one meetings, all the important knowledge was shared with the PPP's organisers, who did not have any experience in this field. In the meantime, as a new international body in a non-western region, there was a need for the PPP to gain international authority by associating itself with a more renowned counterpart.

In turn, CineMart, geographically located outside of Asia, received materials and resources of Asian filmmakers from the PPP. The IFFR had been paying special attention to East Asian cinema for the previous decade. As discussed in chapter 4, many of the winners of the VPRO Tiger Awards have been from East Asia including the PRC, Japan, and South Korea. In the same vein, the HBF Award at CineMart also played a key role in discovering and supporting many Asian projects. The project line-ups of CineMart over the decade in question demonstrated Rotterdam's

ambition to discover East Asian films.²⁸ Simon Field, who worked as festival director for eight years (1997-2004) also contributed to the festival's focus on Asian films.²⁹ These facts illustrate that Rotterdam had self-consciously pursued a platform of East Asian cinema *outside* Asia. In this context, CineMart's support of the PPP and its special partnership with the PPP could be understood as a strategic decision to make the most of both markets.

The intimate collaboration between these two project markets becomes most explicitly articulated in the case of *The Beijing Bicycle* (Wang Xiaoshuai, 2001). This project was selected at the script stage as one of the official projects at the second PPP in 1999. After a two-year search for funding at the post-production stage, this project turned again to CineMart, which came up with the money. After completion, this film won multiple awards including the Silver Bear at the Berlin Film Festival. Both project markets in Europe and Asia supported this project from its initial stage to completion. In this way, the case of Wang's film and its dual engagement of the two funding bodies can be seen as a typical example that illustrates the way both institutions cooperated in order to brand their product and link with the creators' need to complete their cultural product. It also illuminates how film festivals deal with intensified competition to control risk and manage creativity in the process of decision-making, whom to support, or whom to give up.

In these kinds of decision-making processes at CineMart and the PPP, the role of the cultural intermediaries who engage with and impact on the selection process becomes more visible. The issue of evaluating and ratifying arises here. As Howard Becker notes, “[w]ho can confer on something the status of candidates for appreciation, and thus ratify it as art?”³⁰ As demonstrated in chapter 4, the decision-making process can never be neutral. It depends highly on the current political, economic, and social interests of the institution. Therefore, some people occupy institutional positions which allow them to decide what will be acceptable and what excluded. This group of professionals can be called either “creative managers” or “cultural intermediaries” and they play a significant role as mediators between the interests of filmmakers and those of film institutions.³¹ As Julian Stringer argues, “within an overall context of professional standardisation of norms, product differentiation is thus one means by which institutional intermediaries articulate and understand their specialized roles.”³² For example, in film institutions such as PIFF and the IFFR, Kim Ji-seok, who acts as Asian programmer at PIFF and Simon Field, the previous festival director at the IFFR, take on roles as shapers of a particular trend in Asian cinema each year.

Significantly, the role of intermediaries also ranges across the globe, such as between Rotterdam in Western Europe and Pusan in East Asia. Considering the fact

that CineMart is a model for the PPP and that it offered its own funding programme HBF to the PPP from the PPP's beginning - as the project of Wang Xiaoshuai demonstrates - the decision-making at both markets can be understood to be based on shared information and opinions that are interdependent of each other's interests. As a particular network has been shaping film festivals according to their mutual interests, these powerful intermediaries influence trends in filmmaking and distribution. Crucially, their role is more significant to the pre-market than to other established film markets, such as the Cannes Film Market. By involving a vital pre-production stage including scriptwriting, casting, and budgeting, the interests of institutions including profits, revenues and reputation can be estimated and maximised in advance of the exhibition and distribution stages. Hence, like the international consultants at festivals, the presence of intermediaries in project markets becomes influential because they affect how projects interact with other cultural and non-cultural institutions to build global film culture.³³

In addition to its close partnership with CineMart, PIFF has attracted interest from other major western film institutions, such as the European Film Promotion (EFP), another European partner, by demonstrating its market value through the results of the PPP projects. As briefly mentioned in chapter 3, the EFP is the umbrella organisation for all European national promotion and export organisations.

With twenty-seven national export and promotion organisations from twenty-eight countries, the EFP included PIFF as an important Asian partner among partner-festivals and markets such as the Berlin International Film Festival, the Buenos Aires Festival of Independent Cinema, Cannes, Karlovy Vary, and the Toronto International Film Festival, and the American Film Market. Winning out over the Hong Kong and Tokyo film festivals, PIFF was chosen as a key partner festival in Asia. The following description clearly shows the high estimation that EFP had of the PPP:

European and Asian films take centre stage – European films win over the Korean public during the festival. Directors and actors from Europe introduce their new films at one of the most important Asian film festivals. The event proved to be one of the most energetic film festivals in Asia. With the launch of the new Asian Film Market in 2006, Pusan takes on a new and expanded role in the region – and for the industry in general. The festival is also a partner for the Film Sales Support.³⁴

This alliance shows that European cinema's eastward thrust to promote European films in the Asian market encountered Pusan's ambitions to become a nodal point within the Asian market. The successful partnership with CineMart and the EFP accelerated alliance-building with other institutions. For example, from the fourth PPP in 2001, the Swedish Göteborg International Film Festival has joined the PPP awards by organising the Göteborg International Film Festival Fund Award.³⁵

While PIFF's Asian identity was associated with the PPP's strategy of branding Asian projects, the PPP built up global networks to develop mutual relationships among different institutions, such as CineMart. Through this network, a group of agents played a role in the project decision-making process as cultural intermediaries. However, although the PPP is modelled on CineMart, it is noticeable that the PPP sought to utilise a multi-faceted approach to the local, regional and global markets. It differed from CineMart's relatively inactive relation with the Dutch and European film industry by employing diverse network strategies that relied more substantially on its market value and active industrial engagement. As argued in earlier chapters, the establishment of PIFF and the PPP was accompanied by the burgeoning of the Asian film industry. For instance, the success of most PPP projects was helped by increased global interest in Asian films, and the growth and development of Korean film boosted the PPP's prospects of becoming the Asian film market hub. Hence, in terms of its deep engagement with the film industry, the PPP has received more attention than PIFF during the festival period.³⁶ In this respect, as discussed in previous chapters, the development and growth of the PPP were related to a broader transformation within the film industry in East Asia. This, in turn, was linked to growing commercial imperatives in international film culture.

Spurred by its early success, the PPP has carved out a major network within

Asia's rapidly growing film production sector. Different networks show the direct or indirect economic impact of the PPP and PIFF. Two of the most pertinent are to do with regional development and local government support for the film industry. As demonstrated, PIFF has continued to actively engage with film industries in Asia by establishing diverse programmes. Clearly, this attempt to establish a reputation as the gateway to the Asian film industry was accompanied by a particular approach to networking, centred on establishing its position as an East Asian hub. As argued in chapter 3, the PPP is the most obvious model for PIFF to draw on to bolster the Asian regional film network. It aims to attract global capital to the Asian film market and thus facilitate co-financing and co-production of Asian films, as well as generating solidarity among Asian countries. The festival's location in East Asia and the fact that most participants hail from the Asia-Pacific region have been crucial in achieving this. Chapter 3 demonstrated how PIFF adopted an anti-Hollywood stance in establishing networks, as was the case with "Y2K," the first co-production project at the PPP. It also explained how PIFF embraced this discourse to invigorate the Asian film industry network.

Significantly, since PIFF has persevered in its efforts to be the hub of the film industry in Asia, it has affected neighbouring film industries. The Tokyo International Film Festival established the Tokyo Film Creators' Forum in 1999 (a

year after the first PPP) which included a project market to enable young filmmakers to get funding for their new works. The Hong Kong Asia Film Financing Forum (HAF), which is a project market alongside the Hong Kong International Film Festival, was organised in 2000.³⁷ In this way, the PPP has played a triggering role in East Asia since its inception by attracting a number of international financiers energised by the boom of the local film industry. The presence of rivals in the same region has brought both competitive tensions and collaborative alliances. For instance, when the HAF was not able to host its event due to a SARS virus prevalent in South East Asian countries in 2003, five projects that had been initially submitted to the HAF were co-presented at the PPP that year.

Overall, PIFF has built up extensive global and regional networks through its industrial drive embodied by the PPP. PIFF's growth in this ten year period has been accompanied by a particular regional approach in order to cooperate and compete with its regional counterparts through the PPP. This strong drive has affected trends in film festivals and film industries in East Asia which will be further discussed in the following chapter. However, PIFF's case is notable for the way that it has expanded its territory not only in terms of scale but also its exploitation of the possibilities of new functions for the film festival. In addition, PIFF differed from other festivals in that it used its project market as a means of linking to the local

film industry.

Local Networks

While PIFF forged a relationship with its regional Asian counterparts, its regionalisation strategy also had to navigate the anxieties and concerns of the local industry. As argued in chapter 2, PIFF was founded partly because of the desire of the Pusan government and representatives of the local business community to gain recognition for the city and rejuvenate the local economy. The local community was interested in the economic benefits to be had from hosting an international film festival. As PIFF proved the film industry could revitalise the local economy, it provided a strong incentive for the authorities and business community in Pusan to better support the local film industry, as examined in chapter 3. Therefore, a number of film-related institutions were built in Pusan including Cinematheque Busan, the Busan Film Commission and the Busan Cinema Studio in the Hauendae area where PIFF's headquarters are located. Furthermore, the Asia Film Industry Centre was subsequently constructed as well as the Asian Film Commissions Network (AFCNet).³⁸

In order to understand PIFF's relationship with the local film industry, it is helpful to examine the case of the Busan Film Commission (BFC). The BFC was

founded in 1999 with the support of the Pusan City government. The main purpose of the institution is to provide one-stop support to filmmaking, from pre-production to production to post-production, and to establish the location support system. The city also has plans to construct a base for post-production in the city so as to become a centre for the Asian film industry. The following clearly presents their ambitions:

The Busan Film Commission is building the infrastructure for a new film industry. This includes provision of local human, technological and financial capital to attract national and international films to Busan. Subsequently, it is emerging as a new hub of the Asian film industry, the ‘Cine-Port Busan’, by maximising its endogenous economic and cultural assets.³⁹

In conjunction with the growing scale of the PPP, the BFC forged synergies with the former. In 2003, the BFC and the PPP co-organised the Busan International Film Commission and Industry Showcase (BIFCOM) to highlight the concept of a “one-stop-service” wherein everything needed from the start to the finish of the filmmaking process - including sales, purchasing, location research, equipment purchasing and rental and post-production works - can be sourced at one point.

Apart from the rhetoric of the organisation, it should be noted that the founding members of the BFC overlap with those of PIFF and the PPP. The most

distinctive figure is Park Kwang-su, who played a central role in the PIFF founding group. He was appointed as the BFC's first commission director in 1999 when he left PIFF after having launched the first PPP in 1998. Park established the PPP from scratch and led the PIFF committee to develop the festival's business-oriented position within the global film industry. After the successful establishment of the PPP, he was subsequently engaged with launching the BFC as a base of post-production associated with the city of Pusan. The presence and the role of Park Kwang-su are crucial as they demonstrate the significance of human agency in establishing relationships between the film industry and film festivals. As Stringer asserts:

The rise of film festivals positively demands expansion in the number of arts administrators required to staff them [...] All of these skill-specific roles constitute part of the network of cooperating specialised intermediaries who need to pick up appropriate knowledge concerning the correct way to do things.⁴⁰

As the principal figure in many of these undertakings, Park contributed to the establishment of PIFF, the PPP and the BFC.⁴¹ This suggests the key role played by particular cultural intermediaries in building networks and mediating relationships amongst the diverse interests of different local cultural institutions.

Furthermore, the strong industrial drive in Pusan, propelled as it was by the success of PIFF and the PPP, impacted on national goals and imperatives. The

Korean Film Council (KOFIC), one of the most important governmental cultural institutions, decided to move its head office from Seoul to Pusan by 2008. KOFIC, initially the Korean Motion Picture Promotion Corporation (KMPPC), was founded in 1999 as a body supported by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. Like the UK Film Council, the aim of KOFIC is to improve the quality of Korean films and to promote the Korean film industry. Especially since the late 1990s, KOFIC has focused on the international promotion aspect of its mandate to cope with the demands of the global film industry.⁴² To promote Korean films at international film festivals, KOFIC co-established an Asian Film Industry Centre (AFIC) within PIFF. As the top film policy decision-making institution at the governmental level, the link between PIFF and KOFIC is distinctive.⁴³ Although this decision was made with other cities in order to decentralise policymaking from the capital, the shift from Seoul to Pusan (not to other cities) was clearly affected by the presence of PIFF, the PPP and the BFC. Overall, the PPP's impact on and links with the global economy are related to its dual engagement with the local and regional film industries and are interdependent on this link. In short, PIFF's ambition to link its local film industry to the global network by attracting co-production and co-financing has been realised by the PPP.

Korean Films and the PPP

The establishment and success of the PPP precisely demonstrates the way PIFF has set up its brand image as a strongly market-oriented festival. However, it is important to remember that until PPP's launch at the third edition of the festival in 1998, PIFF had been unable to consolidate this identity even though the festival had consistently emphasized its focus on Asian cinema. Furthermore, in the early stages of the PPP, the local film industry did not pay much attention to this event and few local film production or distribution companies participated in the PPP. This fact suggests that at the time of the launch, the local film industry was not as fully aware of the possible significance of the co-financing and co-production options on offer as was PIFF. For instance, despite the success of the forum in 1997, the PIFF committee clearly states, in its own historical documents, that "although many Korean producers were absent, the systematic discussions led by a diverse group of experts became the foundation for the following year's PPP."⁴⁴

As many commentators point out, global consumerism has been intensifying, with brand names vying for recognition and attraction. In this respect, the global presence of South Korean cinema is a very recent phenomenon considering Korea has remained a "blank and unimagined space" for the West for a long time.⁴⁵ Furthermore, the recent international reception of Korean cinema illustrates that

“branding” or establishing a “trademark” is a complex process intertwined with the global distribution system at various levels.

This becomes apparent when observing the recent release of Korean films in the UK. From art to horror to gangster, a range of Korean films has been screened at local cinemas in the UK since 2000, including *Old Boy* (Park Chan-wook, 2003), *A Tale of Two Sisters* (Kim Ji-woon, 2003), *3-Iron* (Kim Ki-duk, 2004), *Sympathy for Lady Vengeance* (Park Chan-wook, 2005) and *A Bittersweet Life* (Kim Ji-woon, 2005). This list shows what kind of Korean films British viewers have favoured. Significantly, the majority of these titles have been released on DVD by the company Metro Tartan, one of the major distribution companies in the UK. This company has released a series of films from East Asia, titled “Asia Extreme,” most of which are categorised as popular commercial films in East Asia, including Korea, Japan, and Thailand. As discussed earlier in this chapter, the exhibition and distribution of Asian cinema (including Korean cinema) in the global market has been dependent on and limited by various factors. In this sense, distribution of films on DVD as an important ancillary window has played a key role in circulating Asian cinema to Britain. However, the method used to categorise and promote Korean cinema is determined and enhanced by the particular distribution channel since the label “extreme cinema” refers to a particular genre: horror films.

Considering the fact that the Korean film industry has a relatively short history of branding or promoting indigenous cultural products to the global film market, the PPP becomes significant as it aims to engage with the branding and promotion of Korean cinema through programmes and events. In this respect, the PPP can be the local film industry's best bet for global/local survival, especially in relation to global distribution systems.

In relation to the PPP's link with the local film industry, the fourth PPP in 2001 marks a turning point. That year saw: the launch of an official programme for Korean projects, "New Directors in Focus (NDIF)" and the "Industry Centre"; the number of awards increased from seven to eleven; and four new awards were provided by the local industry to support the local projects participating in the NDIF.⁴⁶

It is notable that the PPP has primarily depended on the marketing value and the possibility of commercial success of each project. If not for the concrete results accomplished during the PPP, it would have never got off the ground. Especially as the PPP was a newcomer in this field, the PIFF committee had to choose projects by those directors who had achieved recognition abroad through participation in other film festivals. This reduced the risk of failure and made it possible for a PPP project to receive international recognition during the incubation period. Moreover, since

PIFF tried to position itself beyond the Korean nation-state and self-consciously discover Asian films, this tendency was obvious in selecting PPP projects. To justify its Asian focus, especially during the PPP's early stages, the needs of local production had to take a back seat, or at least appear to. Accordingly, the projects that received the most attention from within the festival during the first and second PPP were mainly by non-Korean filmmakers such as Jia Zhangke from the PRC, Fruit Chan from Hong Kong and Jafar Panahi from Iran.

However, since Korean projects also began to attract international attention during the PPP, and the local film industry became aware of the significance of co-financing/co-production through the PPP, more local projects have benefited from the market's programmes. For instance, at the third PPP in 2000, the Korean project *The Trigger* (Park Kwang-su) won both the Kodak Award and the Korean Film-Making Assistant Project (KF-MAP).⁴⁷ Another local project *The Knife* (Song Il-gon) also received USD 10,000 cash for the Hanul Award that same year.⁴⁸ In 2003, the PPP selection committee decided to support Korean director Hong Sang-soo's *Woman Is the Future of Man*. This project was promptly funded by MK2, a French sales company, which meant automatic distribution in the European film market.

The establishment of the NDIF to support local projects at the fourth PPP was precipitated by the arrival of new sources of sponsorship in the PPP and the success

of local projects. This new side programme within the main selection programme was aimed only at local projects. In fact, while the PPP concentrates on relatively well-known Korean and Asian filmmakers for the completion of each project in order to reduce risks, this side programme is open to prospective Korean directors working on their first feature films. This programme to discover talented local directors demonstrates how PIFF has tried to link its industrial functions to the growth of the local film industry. This also shows the way in which the local film industry has responded to the transformation of the local and global markets, including the western reception of Korean cinema and a rapid shift in trends in film consumption in Korea. The rhetoric used to introduce the new programme demonstrates:

As the success of PPP has improved, so has the quality of the projects that were submitted. The selection process was near impossible, but finally 19 projects were chosen from around 200 entrants. 2001 PPP will be featuring outstanding projects from China, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, the Philippines, Taiwan, Tajikistan, Thailand and of course, Korea. An equally difficult selection process was required for New Directors in Focus (NDIF). Making its debut this year, a total of 8 projects were chosen to highlight the rising directors of Korea. All of this is designed to meet our goal of providing a convenient meeting place to allow cooperative ties and deals to be made.⁴⁹

Korean directors of all NDIF projects appeal to producers, distributors and

investors in person through pitch presentations during the PPP. Thanks to the enthusiastic response of the local film industry, this section was successful. Several projects were completed and subsequently distributed. For example, the horror film *Into the Mirror* (Kim Seong-ho, 2003) was presented at the first NDIF and after impressing investors at Cinema Service, director Kim Seong-ho was given the opportunity to make the film. Significantly, although this film was not successful at the box office in Korea, it was distributed to the DVD market in the UK and the USA by Metro Tartan.⁵⁰ This is another interesting example of the link between local projects at the PPP and the particularities of the western reception of contemporary Korean films. As Korean projects selected by the PPP targeted global audiences rather than merely the local audience, those projects selected tended to embrace some of the existing perspectives on Korean films within the global film market. For example, there had been a warm reception to the particular genre of horror films via previous DVD releases by Tartan.

Several other projects from the first and second NDIF were completed and are nearing production. This programme became increasingly popular by 2003, when sixty young filmmakers applied to the NDIF with their ideas and plot synopses. At the 2004 NDIF, Kim Young-nam's *Don't Look Back* was co-financed by Japan's NHK and completed in 2006. This film received multiple awards at film festivals including Locarno and Taipei. The increasing number of sponsors and special attention to this programme for local talent also reflects the rapid transformation of the Korean film industry. As new technologies in the local multi-

media industry rapidly developed, the scope of exhibition windows has changed and expanded. New modes of domestic consumption of films have emerged such as mobiles and Digital Multimedia Broadcasting (DMB), which increasingly need more visual entertainment content.⁵¹

In the meantime, as the PPP pursued its aim of playing a leading role in Asia, the festival added the Industry Centre within the PPP to expand its function within the regional film market. Apart from acting as a project market, the Industry Centre, as a small film market, hosts sales agents from Korea and Asia and distribution companies from outside Asia. Although PIFF operated the PPP as a project market for multiple reasons, as pointed out earlier, the establishment of the Industry Centre indicates PIFF's desire to upgrade its function and expand its project market to a full-scale film market covering the Asian region. This was achieved with the official launch of the Asian Film Market in 2006.

Overall, since the first event in 1998 the PPP has highlighted Asian projects in order to secure its position as a leading project market in the region. However, after its early success it began to support local film projects. On the one hand, a series of processes - incubating and branding the indigenous products - shows an attempt to satisfy the demands of the local film industry. On the other hand, this process is closely linked with a response from both PIFF and the Korean film

industry to accommodate western views on Korean cinema. Furthermore, the PPP's focus on local projects is associated with transformations in the Korean film industry, such as the rapid development of new technologies in the field of multimedia. The PPP has become an important part of the local film industry because its aims have corresponded with the needs of Korean filmmakers and distributors to reach out to the global market.

Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated how and why PIFF established the PPP. It has set out to identify how PIFF's regionalisation strategy was achieved in part through the success of the PPP. By charting distinctive features of this project market, the chapter has illustrated how the PPP forged a close relationship with the production arm of the film industry. The PPP has tried to brand its own products and build networks at the local, regional and global levels. In seeking a nodal point between festival exhibition and production at the project market, PIFF and the PPP forged synergies wherein projects become completed products within the particular networks formed with other institutions and cultural intermediaries. Furthermore, the chapter has looked at the NDIF, which supports local projects, and demonstrated that PIFF equally strove to promote the local film industry as well as the regional

Asian film industry. Overall, by actively involving itself in film production, the PPP has provided PIFF with a major justification to grasp a new role for the film festival as a global film producer.

Notes

- ¹ Hereafter abbreviated to PPP. As explained in the Introduction, although Pusan became Busan in 2000 following the revision of the Romanisation system, the festival committee has decided to retain Pusan and thus the acronym is PPP rather than BPP. However, Busan is used in other relevant organisations that changed their names following the revision, such as Busan Award, Busan Film Commission (BFC) and Busan Cinematheque.
- ² Derek Elley, "Savvy moves boost Pusan fest fortunes," *Variety*, October 8, 2006, October 8, 2006, A1/ A4.
- ³ Julian Stringer, "Global Cities and the International Film Festival Economy," in *Cinema and the City*, eds. Mark Shiel and Tony Fitzmaurice (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 135.
- ⁴ Yingjin Zhang, *Screening China: Critical Interventions, Cinematic Reconfigurations, and the Transnational Imaginary in Contemporary Chinese Cinema* (Michigan, Ann Arbor: Centre for Chinese Studies in University of Michigan, 2002), 40.
- ⁵ Jorge A. Schitman, *Film Industries in Latin America: Dependency and Development* (Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publication, 1984), 1.
- ⁶ Stringer, 2001, 142.
- ⁷ The IFFR launched the Hubert Bals Fund (HBF) within the CineMart in 1988, to support the completion of talented projects from developing countries. The HBF is also organised in partnership with CineLink, a co-production market of the Sarajevo Film Festival. This fund was awarded at the PPP between 1998 and 2003 and has since been transferred to the Hong Kong - Asia Film Financing Forum (HAF) in the HKIFF. The principal financier of the fund is the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- ⁸ Sponsors have varied and every year since its launch in 1998 new awards have been established. Apart from the main awards, there were other funding awards such as the UniKorea Award (1998, KRW 10,000,000), the Inshin Award (1998-2001, USD 10,000), and the Hanul Award (2000-2001, USD 10,000), which were sponsored by the local film industry.
- ⁹ For a detailed list of projects presented to the PPP between 1998 and 2005, see the PPP project history at the official website, http://ppp.asianfilmmarket.org/eng/03database/list_2006_project.asp. For the PPP projects completed upto the year 2005, the 8th PPP, see Appendix 5 in this thesis.
- ¹⁰ Within the film production process, there typically are the pre-production, production, and the post-production stages. The pre-production stage is concerned with the development and revision of the script. Budgeting and financing decisions are made in this period. The production stage is when the actual filming takes place. This is the phase of principal photography with the director of the film overseeing the operations. During the post-production stage, film editing and the addition of visual effects are completed. Also, sound editing, musical scoring, and sound effects are completed during this stage.
- ¹¹ Dong-Ho Kim, *The Second PIFF*, Programme Booklet (Pusan, Second PIFF, 1997), 137.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, 139.
- ¹³ Julian Stringer, "Putting Korean Cinema in its Place: Genre Classifications and the Contexts of Reception," in *New Korean Cinema*, eds. Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005), 105.
- ¹⁴ Stringer, 2001, 136.
- ¹⁵ According to PIFF's official record, 659 professionals from twenty-five countries were invited to PIFF and the PPP in 1998. PIFF proudly reported the outstanding number of international participants. In that year, international guests numbered 419 while Korean guests were 240. [online] Available at www.piff.org. (accessed April 18, 2006).
- ¹⁶ Jonathan Watts, "Pusan Festival Perseveres," *The Hollywood Reporter*, October 2-4, 1998. n.p.
- ¹⁷ Derek Elley commented "there's still a perceptible feeling both at PIFF headquarters and in the South Korean industry as a whole that the good times could end tomorrow." Elley, "10th PIFF," *Cine 21*. October 27, 2005. [online] Available at http://www.cine21.com/Article/article_view.php?mm=001001002&article_id=34493. (accessed August 25, 2007).
- ¹⁸ The EFM is a film market affiliated with the Berlin Film Festival.
- ¹⁹ As well as director Wayne Wang, Daniel Marquet (Le Studio Canal Plus, France), and Yoshizaki Michiyo (NDF International, UK) also attended the roundtable to discuss the co-production process in 1997.
- ²⁰ Dong-Ho Kim, *PPP Project: Fourth PPP* (Pusan: Sixth PIFF, 2001), 10.

-
- ²¹ For example, the Busan Award, the most prestigious fund, was given from 1999 onwards.
- ²² It should be noted that it was not always film directors who made this decision. Producers or distributors, for instance, closely (often financially) involved with the film also did. However, this chapter largely considers film directors as key decision-makers.
- ²³ Dong-Ho Kim, 2001, 10.
- ²⁴ Hyuk-Sang Lee, "The Third PIFF," *10 Years' PIFF Moments*, Photo Collection of PIFF, (Pusan: Tenth PIFF, 2005), n.p.
- ²⁵ Watts, "Pusan Festival Perseveres," *Hollywood Reporter*, October 2-4, 1998, n.p.
- ²⁶ David Hesmondhalgh, *The Cultural Industries* (London: Sage, 2002), 2.
- ²⁷ Available at http://www.filmfestivalrotterdam.com/eng/about/profile_iffr.aspx. (accessed May 9, 2006).
- ²⁸ For the full list of projects selected by CineMart, see the official website of CineMart. Available at http://professionals.filmfestivalrotterdam.com/eng/cinemine/cinemart_awards.aspx. (accessed July 20, 2007).
- ²⁹ Jan Brussels "Asian films getting popular in Europe," *Kyodo News International*, January 29, 2004. [online] Available at <http://findarticles.com/p/articles>. (accessed August 24, 2007).
- ³⁰ Howard Becker, *Art Worlds* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), 150.
- ³¹ Hesmondhalgh, 2002, 53.
- ³² Julian Stringer, *Regarding Film Festivals*, Ph.D. Thesis (Ann Arbor: UMI Dissertation Services, 2003), 20.
- ³³ Stringer, 2001, 138.
- ³⁴ The official website of the EFP. Available at: http://www.efp-online.com/cms/overview/overview_p_festivals_markets.html. (accessed July 20, 2007).
- ³⁵ To be used for project development, this fund supports a total sum of 150,000 Swedish Krona (SEK) for travel and accommodation costs of eight to ten directors and/or producers of selected projects. This fund also provides a SEK 25,000 cash award to the best pitched project.
- ³⁶ Derek Elley, "Pusan Mart Hits Bull's Eye," *Variety*, Oct 5-11 1998, 21-22.
- ³⁷ HAF is co-organised by the Hong Kong Trade Development Council, Hong Kong, Kowloon and New Territories Motion Picture Industry Association Ltd. The past HAF took place in 2000, 2005 and 2006.
- ³⁸ The AFCNet was explained in chapter 3.
- ³⁹ The official BFC website. Available at http://www.bfc.or.kr/eng/01_about/overview.php. (accessed June 29, 2006).
- ⁴⁰ Stringer, 2003, 44.
- ⁴¹ In addition, Park led the launch of the Asian Film Market in 2006.
- ⁴² On May 28 1999, the KMPPC was renamed the Korean Film Commission and changed its organisational structure in conjunction with the launch of Kim Dae Jung's government.
- ⁴³ As a non-governmental cultural organisation, PIFF has played a leading role in the promotion of Korean films by establishing international networks before KOFIC started its full-scale international marketing business in 1999. Since then, the two organisations work in close collaboration promoting Korean films to the global market.
- ⁴⁴ Hyuk-sang Lee, ed. *10 Years' PIFF History* (Pusan: Tenth PIFF, 2005), 175.
- ⁴⁵ Rob Wilson, "Melodramas of Korean National Identity: From *Mandala* to *Black Republic*," in *Melodrama and Asian Cinema*, ed. Wimal Dissanayake (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 90.
- ⁴⁶ The new awards for the NDIF are Zemiro, Movie Zemiro, Muhan and the BFC Award. *The PPP Project Guide Book* (Pusan: Fourth PPP, 2001), 17. Zemiro is a Korean multimedia entertainment company.
- ⁴⁷ The Kodak Award provides negative film or services from Cinesite valued at USD 20,000. The Korean Film-Making Assistant Project (KF-MAP) was sponsored by Japan's SONY PCL, to support the post-production of the project.
- ⁴⁸ This award was sponsored by the local film company Hanul Cine, providing a USD 10,000 cash prize.
- ⁴⁹ Tae-Sung Jeong, *Introduction of the PPP Project* (Pusan: Fourth PPP, 2001), 6.
- ⁵⁰ The total number of spectators of this film was approximately 240,000. [online] Available at http://www.kofic.or.kr/b_movdata/b_02bstatis.jsp. (accessed July 15, 2007).
- ⁵¹ In recent years, mobile and DMB markets in Korea have become increasingly competitive. The links between these new media and films have become significant. For example, the first Mobile and

DMB Film Festival was held in 2005 within the fifth Seoul Net Film Festival (SeNef), the online international film festival in South Korea. Available at http://senef.net/senef_2006en/dmb/dmb_info.php. (accessed July 22, 2007).

Chapter 7

Re-mapping Asian Cinema: The Tenth Anniversary in 2005

The previous chapters have explored how and why PIFF has utilised a regionalisation strategy as a key instrument to promote the festival locally and globally. Since its inception in 1996, PIFF has actively engaged with the local and regional film industries by establishing distinctive programmes and a project market, the PPP. This regional approach has also been accompanied by a variety of networking activities to strengthen the position of PIFF as a hub of Asian cinema in the global market over the last decade. This final chapter considers the tenth anniversary of PIFF as a significant moment in PIFF's history in terms of its overall structure, identity and position and specifically examines the events and programmes associated with the tenth anniversary festival.

Based on the author's field research at Pusan in October 2005, this chapter will look at this anniversary in a wider context rather than providing a snapshot of any particular event. The key to understanding the goals of this anniversary is its varying degrees of "expansionism." The grand scale and scope focusing on Asian identity were utilised on two fronts. On an industrial side, the festival launched a regional network, the Asian Film Industry Network, and announced the

inauguration of the Asian Film Market, a full-scale film market embracing the existing project market. Additionally, PIFF also sought to gain clear recognition that the festival is not only an industrial but also a “critical” hub of Asian cinema through an extensive list of specifically Asian programmes including Asian Pantheon, Remapping Asian Auteur Cinema 1 and a Special Screening for APEC Films.¹ Most importantly, to create a nodal point between these critical and industrial levels, the festival launched a new sidebar workshop – the Asian Film Academy (AFA), an education programme modelled on the Talent Campus at the Berlin Film Festival and the Sundance Lab. Finally, the tenth festival created diverse public events to highlight the festival’s devotion to local audiences, including a closing party open to the general audience and an increase in the number of festival venues.

This chapter consists of several parts. First, to better understand PIFF’s expansionism, the chapter will look at the recent transformation of the local and global film industry. Second, it will examine the key programmes shown in 2005 including Asian programming and the AFA. The chapter then moves on to examine the particularities of the PPP, the Asian Film Market and the Asian Film Industry Network. Finally, the chapter looks at a range of audience-friendly local events. Above all, the present chapter will focus on Asian Programming and the Asian Film

Academy as these two undertakings most effectively demonstrate the festival's strategic moves towards its anticipated future directions. By specifically investigating these programmes, the chapter aims to provide tentative answers to some of the questions raised by other chapters – for example, why the festival chose expansionism and regionalization as key strategies and how it implemented these choices over the past decade. It will also seek to point out the complexities and contradictions that PIFF has to face within the rapidly changing local and global circumstances that earlier chapters have discussed. PIFF ostensibly expanded its scale to make this anniversary a turning point in the festival's life, acknowledging past, present and future tenses: by collecting Asian classics (past); selecting contemporary Asian films (present); and launching a new education programme AFA (future). PIFF's emerging priorities, in particular at its tenth event, illustrates how the festival has broadened its roles and diversified its functions in order to effectively cope with the transformations of the global/local economy. In this respect, a close examination of these key programmes will provide a new perspective on the ongoing globalisation process in local, regional and global contexts.

“Bigger is Better” to Celebrate a Decade (1996-2005)

To make 2005 a special year, PIFF screened 307 films from seventy-three countries at its tenth event, including sixty-two world premieres, as well as eighty-seven Asian premieres; the largest number of films and the greatest number of countries in the festival’s history.² This dramatic growth may be illustrated by comparing it with the first event in 1996 where 170 films from twenty seven countries were screened. As the result of extensive media coverage following a huge promotional campaign, PIFF achieved remarkable success in its tenth year claiming record attendance figures for both festival guests and audience members. Meanwhile, however, there was significant criticism of its growing scale globally and locally. For example, a renowned local film critic warned PIFF of the dangers of its expansionism. As Cho Hee-moon states:

PIFF seems to be caught in a trap of ‘size’. The main concern of PIFF and the media is ‘big figures’. Both are emphasising how many films and how many participating countries and audiences and how quickly films were sold out like a live broadcast. Therefore, their reaction to the decrease in numbers is over-sensitive as if that directly indicates the decline of the festival. Every year it is believed that the more the festival presents, the smoother things go without problems.... Although PIFF is called the most dynamic and rapidly growing festival in the world, it is difficult to define PIFF as a creative and distinctive festival in terms of its quality. This is because the scale of the festival does not coincide with improvements in the content or quality.³

Variety also described the tenth event as follows: “Scale, scope and celebration, rather than focus and tight selection, appear to be the themes set to dominate the 10th running of the PIFF.”⁴ Moreover, some film professionals in the local film industry were sceptical about the festival’s celebratory attitude, pointing out the mutually beneficial relationship between PIFF and Korean films over the decade. As Kim Hye-joon in of the Korean Film Council (KOFIC) states:

PIFF should remember that its success has hugely benefited from the rise of Korean cinema over the past ten years in many ways. Without strong back-up from Korean films, the current powerful position of the festival would have not been possible. In this respect, rather than to celebrate its tenth anniversary, PIFF should look back at its past in a modest way and seek to establish a new role without delay.⁵

All of this poses a question concerning PIFF’s tendency towards continuous expansion and growth. Despite increasing concern and criticism over its expansionism, why did PIFF so aggressively pursue such large-scale presentations on the special occasion of its tenth anniversary year? What factors affected the scale and scope of the event? To unravel the answers to these questions, it will be argued that rapidly changing festival dynamics in the global market prompted PIFF’s current tendency towards expansionism.

As discussed in earlier chapters, the world-wide increase in the number of international film festivals over the past two decades has changed the structure of “the festival world” within a highly competitive global economy. Festivals

compete with each other for the limited number of films produced in the festival calendar. Even prestigious film festivals such as Cannes, Venice and Berlin are fighting harder to obtain new titles. Within the premiere system, more attractive world premieres provide a clear reason for the media to go to the event and consequently increase the presence of film distributors and sales-agents. In this climate, the smallest changes seem to have the effect of seismic shocks in the global film industry. For example, when the Sundance Film Festival (January) announced that it would establish an international competition section from 2005, several rival festivals held around the same time of year, such as the Rotterdam (January) and the Berlin (February) festivals, were anxious that competition for premieres would become tougher.⁶

Julian Stringer observes the need for two crucial components to survive in this competitive festival world; “a sense of stability” and “expansionism”.⁷ Festivals self-consciously tend to expand their events to compete with rival festivals, actively benchmarking against existing big festivals, and claiming to be a regional cultural hub while operating with dual goals - to be both globally accessible and locally distinctive within the global space economy.⁸ In this sense, any anniversary provides a good reason to raise the festival’s profile. Even the PyongYang International Film Festival in North Korea celebrated its tenth

anniversary in 2006 by inviting a number of international guests in an effort to upgrade its profile.⁹ The range and scope of events associated with the tenth anniversary of PIFF can be understood within this competitive global festival landscape. By selecting an extensive variety of Asian films and establishing a range of side bar events focusing on the Asian film industry, PIFF attempted to reconfirm the festival's identity as an "official" platform for Asian cinema and to differentiate itself from its counterparts in the region, such as the Hong Kong and Tokyo film festivals.

In fact, although this event was the biggest in PIFF's history, the move towards such a grand scale should not be seen as a sudden or unexpected emergence. The festival had gradually expanded by increasing its number of films, audiences and side-bar events since its inauguration in 1996.¹⁰ In particular, to highlight its brand image as a market-oriented festival, PIFF had continued to add new side bar events and networks, including the PPP and Asian Film Commissions Network (AFCNet), and it reinforced the festival's strong industrial links to the local and regional film industries over the years. In this way, PIFF's expansion also reflects a recent trend noticeable at many global film festivals. A substantial transformation in the film festival world in recent years has affected the boundary of the festival's function in relation to the film industry. Recently, festivals have become more

influential and their function has expanded at the levels of exhibition, distribution, and even production of films, as clearly shown in chapter 6. As film festivals have become a marketing location for the global film business, they have had to provide distributors and sales agents with an attractive place to sell and/or buy their products. This explains why PIFF also took the opportunity of its tenth anniversary to announce the launch of a full-scale film market, the Asian Film Market, to start the following year 2006.

Moreover, it is worth noting that celebrating an anniversary can provide a film festival with a pretext to receive extra-funding from the government and to source new streams of corporate sponsorship.¹¹ For example, the expanded programmes and events of 2005 were made possible by an additional funding worth one million USD from the central and local government to help celebrate PIFF's anniversary, boosting the total funds the festival received from governmental sources to five million USD.¹²

The more festivals desire to be fixed in a global festival map, the more they need to stay alert to the rise of new rivals and differentiate themselves from others by reconstructing the host city into a more attractive place and creating “new” themed programmes. In this regard, PIFF's expansionism is notable, as this tendency has always been incorporated into its strong regional approach. The Asian

Film Academy, as shall be discussed below, is a good example of how festivals broaden their roles and boundaries to become leaders in the regional film industry. While PIFF has pioneered a new role for film festivals - a producer in the global film market through PPP- the inauguration of the AFA suggests that the festival has begun to pursue another linkage between “education” and industry in order to establish and strengthen regional networks and help mark out the festival’s future direction.

It should be also noted that PIFF’s ability to manifest its leading cinematic role in the region is also linked to the situation of the local film industry at the time of the tenth anniversary in 2005. There was celebratory mood in the Korean film industry when the tenth anniversary festival was held. In part this was because from 2000 the Korean film industry had experienced a remarkable nineteen percent average annual growth rate in the number of admissions and of local films produced and screened over the intervening years.¹³ For example, at the beginning of 2004, the Korean film industry was buzzing with the surprising success of films like *Old Boy* (Park Chan-wook, 2003), *Untold Scandal* (E Jae-yong, 2003) and *Memories of Murder* (Bong Joon-ho, 2003). In addition, Korean films were leading local box-office figures following the enormous success of two local blockbusters, *Silmido* (Kang Woo-suk, 2003) and *Brotherhood - Taegukgi* (Kang Je-gyu, 2004). These two

titles passed the previously only dreamed of mark of ten million admissions.¹⁴

Furthermore, the exporting of Korean film to other countries expanded rapidly over the few years prior to 2005 - particularly to Japan (exports to Japan grew by 74.1 percent in the first half of 2005 alone) which was prompted by the increased visibility and popularity of “Korean Wave.”¹⁵ Alongside increasing local success, globally, Korean films received considerable attention as many titles had garnered awards at major Western film festivals held earlier in the festival circuit year than is PIFF: Park Chan-wook won an award at Cannes Festival with *Old Boy*, while Kim Ki-duk achieved the rare feat of garnering directing prizes at both Berlin and Venice in 2005 with *Samaritan Girl* and *3-Iron*. This ‘buzz’ reached its peak when PIFF was declared the best film festival in Asia by *Time Magazine* (Asia edition) and Pusan city won its bid to host the APEC Summit.¹⁶

Overall, all these global and local circumstances further propelled PIFF’s self-generated grandiosity and self-aggrandising tendency to play on a grand scale and create many new additions to its tenth anniversary programme. In this regard, the issue of expansionism at the tenth PIFF should be understood within both the specific global and local contexts. While this event reflects a rapid and visible transformation in global film festivals in recent years, it also mirrors complexities in the local film industry.

A Critical Hub of Asian Cinema: Asian Programming and World Premieres

This part of the chapter aims to demonstrate how PIFF sought to redefine the concept of Asian cinema in order to reconstruct its festival's identity by examining Asian Pantheon. To illuminate how the festival tried to justify its goal – as a showcase of Asian cinema - the notion of a “world-premiere” is also discussed, along with some of the problems the festival experienced in selecting contemporary Asian films. Finally, the chapter will reveal the complex and contradictory position of PIFF in the local context by examining the Special Screening for APEC Films.

PIFF's consistent focus on Asian films in its programme structure reached its peak at the tenth event in terms of the quantity of films shown. Apart from the regular Asian programmes, New Currents (nine films) and A Widow of Asian Cinema (thirty-eight), PIFF aggressively added extensive numbers of Asian films in special programmes; Remapping Asian Auteur Cinema 1 (eight films), Asian Pantheon (thirty), Reunion of New Currents (seven), and Special Screening for APEC Films (twenty).

Among these, as one of the special programmes to celebrate the anniversary, the Asian Pantheon presented thirty “Asian classic masterpieces” from seventeen Asian countries. These were films which PIFF aimed to have rediscovered in celebration of its tenth anniversary. This special section shows how PIFF tried to

both position itself as dedicated to Asian cinema and brand Asian cinema in the name of PIFF. Besides films from Taiwan, Japan, China, and Hong Kong, the programme also showcased films from countries whose films are rarely exhibited abroad such as Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Syria, Sri Lanka, and Mongolia.

The list of Screening Films is as follows:

- (1) *The Big Parade*, Chen Kaige, China (1985)
- (2) *The Horse Thief*, Zhuangzhuang Tian, China (1986)
- (3) *Dragon Inn*, King Hu, Hong Kong (1966)
- (4) *Centre Stage*, Stanley Kwan, Hong Kong (1991)
- (5) *The Vagabond*, Raj Kapoor, India (1951)
- (6) *The Big City*, Satyajit Ray, India (1955)
- (7) *A River Named Titash*, Ritwik Ghatak, India (1973)
- (8) *Bombay*, Mani Ratnam, India (1995)
- (9) *The Face of Man*, Teguh Karya, Indonesia (1972)
- (10) *The Cow*, Dariush Mehrjui, Iran (1964)
- (11) *Close up*, Abbas Kiarostami, Iran (1990)
- (12) *A Moment of Innocence*, (1996) Mohsen Makhmalbaf, Iran (1996)¹⁷
- (13) *Late Spring*, Yasujiro Ozu, Japan (1949)
- (14) *You Were Like a Wild Chrysanthemum*, Keisuke Kinoshita, Japan (1955)
- (15) *Deep Desire of Gods*, Shohei Imamura, Japan (1968)
- (16) *Floating Clouds*, Mikio Naruse, Japan (1995)
- (17) *The Last Stop*, Serik Aprimov, Kazakhstan (1989)
- (18) *The Adopted Son*, Aktan Abdykalykov, Kyrgyzstan (1998)
- (19) *Tsogt Taij*, M. Luvsanjamts, Mongolia (1931)
- (20) *Manila: In the Claws of Light*, Lino Brocka, Philippine (1975)
- (21) *Manila by Night*, Ishmael Bernal, Philippine (1980)
- (22) *The Changing Village*, Lester James Peries, Sri Lanka (1965)
- (23) *The Leopard*, Nabil El-Maleh, Syria (1972)
- (24) *The Terroriser*, Edward Yang, Taiwan (1986)
- (25) *Dust in the Wind*, Hou Hsiao-hsien, Taiwan (1986)
- (26) *Rebels Of the Neon God*, Ming-liang Tsai, Taiwan (1992)
- (27) *Kosh ba kosh*, Bakhtyar Khudojnazarov, Tajikistan (1993)
- (28) *Dark Heaven*, Ratana Pestonji, Thailand (1958)

- (29) *Tahir and Zühre*, Nabi Ganiyer, Uzbekistan (1952)
(30) *The Girl on the River*, Dang Nhat Minh, Vietnam (1987)

Embracing an extensive selection of titles, the purpose of this special selection was defined by PIFF as follows:

These masterpieces from 17 Asian nations will represent their countries, broadening the meaning of ‘Asian Cinema.’ From some relatively unknown works by renowned Asian filmmakers like Hou Hsiao-hsien, Mohsen Makhmalbaf, Chen Kaige, Imamura Shohei, and Abbas Kiarostami, the programme also covers names who are recognized primarily domestically within their own countries such as Ishmael Bernal from Philippine, Teguh Karya from Indonesia, Keisuke Kinoshita from Japan, Ratana Pestonji from Thailand, Nabil El-Maleh from Syria, Lester James Peries from Sri Lanka.¹⁸

As briefly discussed in chapter 4 and 5, since 1997, the festival has started to systematically showcase Asian films by selecting Asian cinemas in the section entitled “Special Programme in Focus.” PIFF’s approach to integrating Asian cinema regionally on an industrial level has been synergised by a rapid expansion in how it defines the boundaries of “Asia” both geographically and critically. Following the special programme entitled “Central Asian Cinema” in 2000, which featured films from Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan, PIFF included these countries - all traditionally seen as “minorities” in Asia in terms of film production and Western recognition - in the Asian Pantheon section of its tenth anniversary. While the festival attempted to show lesser-known

titles by regional masters who had already established their reputations, it also tried to rediscover unknown filmmakers in the region thereby seeking to legitimate its position as a platform for Asian cinema.

The extent to which geography influences programming decisions at PIFF is also made obvious by the fact that the festival has deliberately continued to screen North Korean films. After several attempts resulted in failure for political reasons, a retrospective of Shin Sang-Ok's films was finally able to be organised at the sixth event as was discussed in chapter 5. However, as observed in the case of *Runaway* (1984), which had been withdrawn at the last minute, it has proven difficult to screen North Korean films at PIFF. In 2003, at the eighth event, however, PIFF was finally able to show seven North Korean films to the general public.¹⁹ This is in striking contrast to the PyongYang International Film Festival, Pusan's counterpart in North Korea, which had never attempted to show South Korean films until its tenth event in 2006.

In conjunction with the Asian Pantheon, the tenth anniversary festival added another special programme focusing on Asian classics, Remapping Asian Auteur Cinema 1. Whilst this sidebar programme was created to celebrate the anniversary, it was also the first instalment of a series aiming to rediscover important Asian directors who have been neglected in world cinema history. It consisted of eight

films from three directors: Rattana Pestonji (also called R.D. Pestonji) from Thailand; Teguh Karya from Indonesia; and Sohrab Shahid Sales from Iran.²⁰ In this programme, the “rediscovery” of old Asian films was also highlighted in tandem with the Asian Pantheon. This suggests that PIFF had actively started spreading its wings as a “critical learning school” with Remapping Asian Auteur Cinema 1, “a finessing of the Hong Kong Intl. Film Festival's pioneering work during the '80s.”²¹ While PIFF had gradually increased and enhanced its classic Asian sections ever since its establishment, two special programmes - the Asian Pantheon and Remapping Asian Auteur Cinema 1- at the tenth anniversary festival clearly articulated the festival’s most ambitious and bold approach to the region yet in terms of highlighting both the number and the range of its films.

While these programmes indicate the ways in which PIFF attempted to play a leading role in the rediscoveries of classic Asian films, Asian programming in general - including New Currents and A Window of Asian Cinema, the main programmes highlighting contemporary Asian cinema - brought several problems to PIFF, including an “obsession” with premiere titles and the resulting limitations to showcase the whole spectrum of the region’s trends. In order to encapsulate PIFF’s self-defined identity as a platform for Asian film, it would be necessary for the festival to showcase the diverse spectrum of Asian cinema being produced in the

region. However, as regards PIFF's contemporary Asian programming, there has been some criticism of a lack of mainstream films, especially from China and Japan. For example, it has been pointed out by international critics²² that PIFF's Asian programming favours independent low budget Chinese films made by new generation directors, the so-called "Sixth Generation" from mainland China, such as Jia Zhangke, Lou Ye, and Wang Xiaoshuai. Despite this criticism, PIFF has consistently selected a number of independent Chinese films for its main sections, such as A Window of Asian Cinema and New Currents, and even aggressively established a special 2003 programme on independent films from China entitled "Cinema on the Borderline: Chinese Independent Films," showcasing ten films produced over ten years.

Since that time, there has been growing criticism that PIFF's Asian programming does not portray a wide spectrum of contemporary Asian cinema, instead focusing predominantly on films believed to be suited to western tastes. At the time of the tenth event, *Variety* outlined the success of PIFF as involving "a combination of lucky timing, canny programming and quietly aggressive promotion." However, it also sharply points out the limits of the Asian programming at the festival. As Patrick Frater and Derek Elley state:

PIFF officials don't specifically acknowledge their growing role as a fest of record. Still, the bulky Window to Asian Cinema section, which collects films that bowed at other fests throughout the year, certainly takes PIFF in that direction. If an Asian art-house pic doesn't screen at Pusan, it's likely not part of the cream of the year's crop.²³

Moreover, PIFF's favouritism towards independent Asian films was also criticised in relation to the festival circuit. As Derek Elley further points out:

Such a tendency was more criticised than so-called 'banana programming' is likely to arouse suspicion that it aims to establish Pusan as the first step in the festival circuit to the prestigious western festival since these type of films - for instance, low budget, small independent, alienated by the mainstream in China, dealing with drugs, gender and political issues - has long been liked by the western film festivals, especially Rotterdam and Berlin.²⁴

It is important to note that one possible explanation for this tendency may be PIFF's inability to premiere mainstream Chinese films. Established (or even new) Chinese directors have tended to premiere their titles at prestigious western film festivals, and this fact has also been cited as one of the many possible factors in explaining the Hong Kong International Film Festival's decline since the 1990s. In addition to the Chinese case, however, it has also become more difficult for PIFF to stage the world-premieres of major local titles since increasing numbers of Korean directors have favoured showing their films at major festivals in the West. In this regard, PIFF's favouring of Asian independent films is related to the current global

dynamics of film festivals generally – it has simply become more difficult to obtain world-premieres. Consequently, the harder it is to win premieres, the more PIFF has to struggle with finding a “niche” to justify and prove its Asian identity. In short, PIFF’s choice of Asian independent cinema reflects the competitive festival circumstances in regards to obtaining premieres. Like many other international film festivals, PIFF has sought to screen as many world-premieres as possible. In 1999, PIFF enjoyed more world and Asian premieres than any other festival in Asia. For example, whereas the Tokyo International Film Festival staged thirteen world and twenty-four Asian premieres, PIFF screened twenty-six world premieres and eighty-four Asian premieres.²⁵

This obsession with world premieres was most explicitly demonstrated when PIFF screened Hou Hsiao-hsien’s *Three Times* in its Opening section at the tenth anniversary festival. PIFF announced the world-premiere screening of this film with much fanfare and subsequently boasted that it had completely sold out within thirteen minutes and forty seconds of tickets going on sale. However, the version of *Three Times* screened at PIFF was, in fact, a revised version of the film which had previously been shown at the Cannes Film Festival earlier that year (the PIFF version being a mere nine minutes longer than the Cannes’ version). However, the choice of this film to be screened at the tenth anniversary was important to PIFF for

several reasons. Director Hou had historically been close to PIFF, often called a part of the “PIFF Family.”²⁶ Following his win at the previous year’s award for “Asian Filmmaker of the Year,” and the presentation by him of a special lecture under the title Master Class, Hou became dean of PIFF’s new Asian Film Academy workshop. More importantly, *Three Times* originated as a PPP project in 2002. For all of these reasons, it was extremely important for PIFF to show his film as a world-premiere at its tenth anniversary. The festival’s emphasis on “the first” screening of this re-edited version can thus be understood in this context.

A similar case from the previous year of PIFF is also worth noting. The ninth festival screened *2046* (Wong Kar-wai, 2004) in its Opening section. Like *Three Times*, this film had also been shown at Cannes earlier in that year. Very similarly, the PIFF committee emphasised the “world-premiere” status of its screening of *2046* by insisting that the Cannes version was an “unfinished” version and that this “new version” was different from the one shown at Cannes as it had been re-filmed and re-edited. As it was the opening film, director Wong and leading actor Tony Leung were invited and highlighted during the festival’s glamorous opening gala ceremony. However, there was scepticism about this film’s “world-premiere” screening status. For example, one local newspaper criticised PIFF’s choice of *2046* since this film was going to be released across China on September 30, 2004, or

prior to PIFF's opening date.²⁷ Furthermore, after the screening, local newspapers also reported on this issue by citing a western film critic's reaction to it. As Ines

Cho states:

Dutch film critic Peter van Bueren criticised the decision to show the film again in Busan after it had premiered in Cannes in May saying that *2046* didn't need to be reedited and re-shot again, because now the film 'didn't make sense.'²⁸

Both cases above precisely reveal the extent of the festival's obsession with world-premiere screenings highlighting Asian films. They also illustrate that one of the biggest challenges for any new non-Western film festival is to keep its international profile as local (regional in this case) "big" films are increasingly premiered at the major festivals in the West rather than at their own neighbourhood festivals. Similarly, as many commentators have pointed out, PIFF's biggest challenge during the next decade will be to avoid the "twin traps" common to many growing festivals: to sustain its international profile as big name local (and regional) films increasingly premiere their titles at the major Western festivals; and to ride out any future downturn in the Korean film industry initially which helped the festival rise to global prominence.²⁹

As the screening of world premieres has become increasingly significant in

the fight to sustain a festival's distinctive position, in order to obtain premieres festivals have often competed and cooperated at the same time. For instance, the recent launch of the International Film Festival of Rome (the Festa Internazionale di Roma) in October, 2006, with its convenient location and links to business, made organisers at Venice and Pusan very nervous.³⁰ However, this tense situation was resolved through a negotiated compromise between Rome and Pusan: the two festivals, which were held simultaneously that year, decided to share one simultaneous world premiere, *After This Our Exile* (Patrick Tam, 2006, Hong Kong). Another example is the negotiation between the Berlin and Sundance Film Festivals. When Sundance decided to become a competitive festival, tougher competition to obtain world premieres was then expected. However, this issue was settled by a third party, the FIAPF (Federation Internationale des Associations de Producteur de Films). Before the Sundance and Berlin festivals opened, Dieter Kosslick, director of the Berlin Festival, announced:

[T]here will be a new regulation in 2004: US productions competing just prior to the Berlinale in the Sundance Film Festival will also be accepted for submission to the Competition stream of the Berlinale International Film Festival. The FIAPF, which supervises the standards of so-called 'A' film festivals, such as Cannes, Berlin and Venice, has given its approval.³¹

Such negotiated settlements, which have arisen in a number of different circumstances in relation to a number of different problems, therefore illustrates the way in which film festivals have striven to remain competitive in these rapidly changing local/global circumstances.

APEC and PIFF in Local Context

PIFF's tenth anniversary's focus on Asian cinema is also demonstrated by another special programme, the APEC Special Programme.³² When it was announced that the APEC Summit was to be held in Pusan, the tenth PIFF committee prepared a special programme both for APEC and for the tenth anniversary entitled "APEC Special Programme." This programme was a section dedicated to films from APEC member countries. While this reveals PIFF's geopolitical approach to Asian programming, it also highlights the festival's contradictory position in the local and global film industries.

The announcement of the decision that Pusan would host the forthcoming APEC conference was reported upon and highlighted by the local and national media in tandem with PIFF's tenth anniversary due to the timing of this announcement. Hence the promotion of a cultural event (PIFF) became propelled by the meaning and importance of a politico-economic event (APEC). The following

passage illustrates some of the details of the relationship between APEC and PIFF:

The main theme of the 2005 APEC conference that will be held in Busan is 'Toward One Community', and one of three subtitles is 'Building a Bridge over the Gap', and one of five agendas is 'Respecting Various Cultures.' Cinema can be a perfect tool to materialize these themes and agendas. Pusan International Film Festival (PIFF), recognized as the most prestigious film festival in Asia, will take place from October 6th to 14th this year, a month before APEC. During the festival, PIFF is planning to hold cultural events that mirror the themes and agendas, in part by presenting 'APEC Special Screening'. More specifically, by screening films that can build common ground within various cultures among APEC nations and having a place for constructive discussion, this event will create fruitful results that accord with the main goal of APEC itself.³³

This special section covered twenty films from countries including Canada, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Australia/Papua New Guinea, Vietnam/Germany/Australia, Singapore, Japan, Russia, Peru, Taiwan, Malaysia, Korea and the Philippines, USA, Thailand, Mexico, Chile/Argentina/France, New Zealand/UK, and China. To match the aim of the APEC meeting, PIFF included twenty films on the theme of "communication" dealing with reconciliation between races or nations. According to PIFF, this would be a chance to stimulate APEC attendees "in considering more universal values for humanity such as antipoverty, war deterrence, and environment protection by recognizing cultural diversity beyond religion and ideologies."³⁴ PIFF's engagement with this socio-political event clearly suggests how the festival has attempted to upgrade its position and identity at the regional and global level.

However, importantly, PIFF's links with APEC gave rise to controversy in the local film industry as APEC demands to de-regulate and open the film market in Korea so as to "free" trade amongst member economies was contradictory to the perceived interests of the Korean film industry. The Korean Screen Quota system was the most controversial issue at this time and the local film industry fiercely defended this system. Consequently, a group of organisations, including the Coalition for Cultural Diversity in Moving Images,³⁵ held a number of demonstrations against the agenda of the APEC meeting in front of the PIFF venue screening the APEC special programme and organised a separate film screening entitled "No APEC Festival."³⁶

The difficult position PIFF was faced with became more apparent when the Korean film community proclaimed their strong support for the Convention on Cultural Diversity in September, 2005. This treaty was ratified by United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) member nations one month later, in October 2005, and was intended to protect the diverse cultures of nations from the homogenizing effects of globalisation. During the festival, approximately 500 Korean and European film professionals gathered at the Korean Night organised by KOFIC to defend the screen quota system against pressure to

reduce or abolish it. This event also focused on revealing problems with the South Korea -U.S. Bilateral Investment Treaty (a pretext for the pressure on the system). Additionally, on the same night and after the event, *Fatal Attraction Vol. 2004* (Lee Hoon-kyu, 2005) was shown at one of the festival venues. This film is a documentary depicting the process through which the U.S. Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA) attempted to pressure the Korean government to abolish the Screen Quota system. Many in the local film industry, including independent filmmaker Hwang Chul-min, criticized the contradiction whereby PIFF appeared to support APEC by establishing the Special Screening for APEC, yet had historically claimed to the public that it defended the Screen Quota system.³⁷ In fact, PIFF belongs to an organisation, “The Committee of the Korean Film Community Opposing the South Korea-U.S. Bilateral Investment Treaty and a Reduction of the Screen Quota System” set up by a broad range of insiders in Korean film circles.³⁸ This situation reveals the tensions and complexities faced by both PIFF and the Korean film industry. While defending the Screen Quota system so as to receive support from the local film industry, PIFF had to negotiate its position with the central government in order to continue to receive the funding which PIFF is dependent on for running its annual event.

To put it simply, PIFF attempted to highlight its Asian identity by creating

extensive Asian programmes focusing on contemporary and classic films from the region for its tenth anniversary. At the same time, this attempt was sometimes at odds with local interests as illustrated by the controversy surrounding the APEC Screening. Overall, PIFF's Asian programming was explicitly articulated in conjunction with its expansionist strategy and most apparently highlighted at the tenth event.

It is worth comparing the scale and scope of the tenth PIFF with that of the same anniversary of the Hong Kong International Film Festival. When the tenth HKIFF was held in 1986, Hong Kong did not mount a huge event, screening only 120 feature films including twenty-two Asian films.³⁹ Established in 1977, the HKIFF maintained its prominent international profile as a platform for Asian cinema during the 1980s. Several big names were “discovered” there including Chen Kaige. By the time of its tenth anniversary in 1986, the HKIFF was clearly aware of its status and identity as a premier film festival in East Asia. In the foreword to the 1986 programme, Festival Coordinator Albert Lee states:

Over the decade, the festival, apart from presenting recent European and American films, has also put much effort into showcasing Asian and Hong Kong cinema. This has given the HKIFF its uniqueness among film festivals all over the world.⁴⁰

Significantly, PIFF asserts a surprisingly similar rhetoric with its tenth event in 2005, with programme notes including such phrases as “to become a centre of cultural exchange in Asia and to further promote cultures of visual arts worldwide” and “serving Asian cinema as a stepping stone into the world market” with “Pusan, a hub city for the Asian film industry.”⁴¹ This suggests that the use of a regionalisation strategy to promoting an Asian film festival both locally and globally is not unique to PIFF.

Since the late 1980s, the HKIFF had slowly begun to decline as many new Asian titles were premiered instead at major Western film festivals. As Elley notes:

When *Yellow Earth* (Chen Kaige) was screened on the evening of 12 April, 1985 at the Hong Kong International Film Festival, I was in that exclusive screening room for international press. It is true that the Hong Kong Film Festival played a key role in ‘discovering’ Asian films and enjoyed a glorious period but starting in the 1980s it began to decline and lost its power to discover cutting-edge Asian films. There was a kind of ‘vacuum’ period after Hong Kong and before Pusan, around the mid-1990s, and PIFF aggressively began to take over at this moment.⁴²

It is noticeable that fifteen years later, to celebrate its twenty-fifth anniversary in 2001, the HKIFF evaluated its achievements and redefined its festival identity by focusing on integrating three types of ethnic Chinese cinema; that from mainland China, from Taiwan, and from Hong Kong. Specifically, the HKIFF published a special catalogue entitled “A Century of Chinese Cinema: Look Back in Glory,”

which featured twenty-five Chinese classics of the past century.⁴³ Attempting to redefine Chinese cinema, the HKIFF states:

Chinese cinema covers productions originating in Mainland China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan, created by ethnic Chinese on subject matters that are historically and culturally distinctive of the Chinese race; this would seem a more appropriate definition than merely 'Chinese language films'.⁴⁴

Contrasting with PIFF's strong regional focus on Asian cinema as a whole in celebrating its ten year achievement, the HKIFF's emphasis on the notion of Chinese cinema in particular suggests there has been an on-going struggle between the two festivals for pre-eminent regional status and festival identity and this seems to be the latest solution to their complex relationship.

Whilst the twenty-fifth anniversary of the HKIFF presented this event as a special occasion, the atmosphere was not entirely celebratory as there was huge criticism of "political or administrative interference" in the selection process.⁴⁵ For example, writing under the title "Anniversary Blues," journalist Jeremy Hansen reported on the Hong Kong film festival's bureaucracy and political meddling by pointing out "[t]he festival opened April 6 against a backdrop of infighting, protest resignations by key staff members, and previously heard recriminations that Hong Kong's annual cinema celebration is being upstaged by a younger and more

dynamic counterpart in Pusan, South Korea.”⁴⁶ As a result of this situation, after its twenty-fifth event, the HKIFF became more aware of and felt threatened by PIFF’s new success.⁴⁷ Furthermore, as briefly mentioned in chapter 4, the twenty-sixth HKIFF in 2002 deleted the section “Asian vision” which had previously showcased fourteen to sixteen contemporary Asian films. Instead, films produced in the Asian region were now allocated to the “Global Vision” section and separately exhibited under a new section entitled “Age of Independence: New Asian Film and Video, Asian Digital Competition.” This development also illustrates how the HKIFF has consciously tried to differentiate itself from PIFF’s aggressive Asian-focused programming.

In sum, whilst PIFF’s extensive regional approach focusing on Asian programming reveals the festival’s complex relationship with the local film industry, it also shows that this aggressive drive severely affects the identity and position of its regional counterpart in Hong Kong.

Asian Film Academy: Education and Industry

Alongside a wide range of programmes operating at a critical level, the tenth PIFF launched a new training programme, the AFA. Closely modelled on the “Filmmaker’s Lab” at Sundance and “Talent Campus” at Berlin, the AFA is an

education programme aiming to provide film education and production experience and skills.⁴⁸ It aims to help young Asian young directors learn about film production, produce their work and establish networks that can be drawn upon in their future careers. Upon launching the AFA in 2005, festival director Kim Dong-Ho announced:

Successful film festivals have their own strengths but they need to keep trying to come up with new programs to compete with other festivals, not just merely try to maintain the status quo [...] AFA is the result of 10 years of Pusan International Film Festival. PIFF will be reborn as a productive festival through a new program, Asian Film Academy, which will find and support young filmmakers from all over Asia.⁴⁹

Such comments testify to the festival's intention to continue to sustain its firm position in the future, in part through this regional training programme. As mentioned, the AFA adopted specific know-how from two Western counterparts: firstly, the training workshop methods from Talent Campus; and secondly, the production system which supports the works of candidates at the Sundance Lab. However, PIFF has differentiated the AFA from other existing workshops in several important ways. First, while its Western counterparts do not put geographic restrictions on where applicants can come from, the AFA strictly limits applicants to those living in the Asia region, thus manifesting its aim to support specifically the

Asian film industry. Second, PIFF claims that the AFA is not only for experienced filmmakers, but also for Asians who have not had the opportunity to obtain a proper film education and so discover his or her cinematic potential.⁵⁰ Third, the AFA provides all participants with full-expense reimbursement including travel, accommodation as well as any visa fees. This is in consideration of the fact that many Asian participants are still unlikely to be able to afford the initial financial outlay required for participation in the AFA. This is similar to the Cannes Film Festival's *Résidence du Festival*, which provides young international directors working on their first or second fictional feature film project with a place of residence in Paris, a personalised programme accompanying the writing of their scripts, and a collective programme of forums with film industry professionals.⁵¹

Fourth, unlike other festival-associated workshops, the AFA is not considered a one-time event as support continues after the workshop itself has finished. This continuing support aims to help participants persist in filmmaking as well as to establish networks to enable them to do so. PIFF, Dongseo University in Pusan and the Korean Film Council (Korean Academy of Film Arts) are linked through this programme and work together to make this continuous support for future filmmakers possible. In order to allow the existence of this extended training course, extra funding programmes were created.⁵² In terms of funding sources, it is

noticeable that funding for the AFA is provided at the national level, from the Korean government, while other festival-aided workshops in Europe receive funds from regional associations such as the European Union.⁵³ In this regard, the AFA is the first programme targeting the regional film industry in Asia created by an individual film festival and financially supported solely by the host country.

The decision by PIFF to create this training programme apart from the PPP, whose aim is also to incubate potential Asian talent, has often been seen as controversial because it required extra funding and a separate budget and organisational infrastructure. However, as demonstrated in chapter 6, the PPP has tended to select and support projects by those directors who have already achieved recognition abroad at other film festivals. This has been done in order to reduce the risk of failure as it is believed that prior success by a director would make it more likely for a PPP project to receive international recognition during its incubation period. PIFF felt that this limitation in the PPP necessitated the launch of the AFA which, in the name of “education,” can actually discover and incubate young Asian film students or novice filmmakers who have yet to prove themselves but who possess much potential. The most explicit statement of this aim came when PIFF Director Kim Dong-Ho contended, “If PPP has led PIFF by linking film directors to investors over the last decade, AFA will allow PIFF to leap forward into the next

decade.”⁵⁴

At the first AFA in 2005, renowned Asian filmmaker Hou participated as School Dean while two established filmmakers from Asia and another two from Korea played a key role in presenting the course programme.⁵⁵ One hundred and sixty four applicants from Asia applied to this workshop and twenty-eight were selected in 2005. For the short film project, the filmmakers (two directors and two cinematographers) formed two groups with AFA participants and each made fifteen minutes of short film in HD or 35mm.⁵⁶ Their completed projects were filmed and edited in Pusan during the festival and the finished projects were officially screened at a PIFF venue.

Like the PPP, the AFA is understood as resulting from PIFF’s strong drive to boost the film industry in Asia and create its brand name “made in Pusan.” In this sense, PIFF’s expansionism and new additions are utilised through a wide range of strategies; whilst the festival draws on and finesses several ideas originating in the West, it tries to do so in a way that will create successful examples of creative localisation.

Industry and the Regional Network: the PPP, Asian Film Market (AFM) and AFIN (Asian Film Industry Network)

PIFF's consistent industry-oriented approach to the regional film industry was at its height at its tenth anniversary. Following the successful establishment of PPP in 1998, PIFF was able to boast that a number of projects had been completed and showcased in 2005, including the opening film *Three Times*, six films shown in the A Window on Asian Cinema section, four films shown in the New Currents section, and two films in other sections. This testifies to PIFF's ability to provide solid proof that PIFF is functioning as a productive market place and providing leadership to the regional film industry. By selecting the largest number of projects ever that year (thirty-three - ten more than the previous year), the eighth PPP, taking place at the tenth festival also demonstrated the festival's continuing inclination towards growth and expansionism.⁵⁷

Alongside this, the dominant issue in relation to the PPP at the tenth event was the announcement of the inauguration of a full-scale film market, AFM. Plans for the market were announced by city mayor Hur Nam-sik at the end of the festival. It was announced that the proposed market, heavily subsidised by Pusan City, would be part of a plan to turn Pusan into a film and multimedia hub.⁵⁸ For example, PIFF will have a purpose-built theatre complex in 2008 and both KOFIC

and the Korea Media Rating Board have decided to relocate to Pusan. In fact, before this announcement, from the ninth PIFF, the festival established separate “market screenings” for those Asian companies participating in the PPP. Co-organised with the Busan Film Commission, PIFF stated that the AFM would be the biggest and most comprehensive film market in Asia.⁵⁹ Housed at the Busan Exhibition and Convention Centre (BEXCO) and the ten-screen Megabox multiplex in Haeundae, the market would also feature programmes and about 200 market screenings.

After this announcement, popular opinion was divided. On the one hand, the festival committee claimed an urgent necessity for the full-scale market alongside the festival, as the PPP is unable to deal with completed works including those produced under its auspices. Furthermore, being aware of recently increasing rivalries in the region, PIFF had to take a further step towards distinguishing itself from its counterparts. Hence, it was believed that the launch of the market was the only way for the festival to move on to the next stage to survive in the global film economy.⁶⁰

On the other hand, there was some doubt expressed about the necessity and potential for success of this market as it takes place shortly after similar ad hoc markets at the Venice and Toronto film festivals and just weeks before the American Film Market in November. As argued in earlier chapters, timing is significant for

the success of any market as much as for the main festival. For example, since 2004 when the American Film Market rescheduled its annual event from February to November, the Cinema and Television, International Multimedia Market (MIFED) in Italy, which is also held in November, has already declined. In the wake of PIFF's announcement, tension has already been generated with its counterparts in the region: the Hong Kong International Film and Television Market (FILMART), an already established film market in the region; TIFFCOM, another merging market associated with the Tokyo International Film Festival; and smaller markets at the Bangkok and Shanghai film festivals.⁶¹

Alongside the expansion shown by the PPP and AFM, the tenth PIFF also inaugurated the Asian Film Industry Film Network in conjunction with KOFIC. The aim of the Network is to advocate for the concept of a "Pan-Asian" film network, following the previous year's launching of the Asian Film Commissions Network (AFCNet), an umbrella of organisations in Asia that provides production support services. Initially proposed at the seventh PIFF in 2002, AFIN aims to promote Asian film through co-promotion activities at international film festivals and markets; exchanging research and film-related data; and facilitate international co-productions. The network's four founding members include the Korean Film Council, UniJapan, the Vietnam Media Corporation and the Federation of National

Film Association of Thailand. Two additional organisations - China Film Promotion International and the Singapore Film Commission - joined this network as official observers with a view to joining at a later date.

Thus, a trio of industry-oriented undertakings - the PPP, AFM and AFIN - at the tenth anniversary event illustrate how PIFF has forged synergies through linking industrial activities. In particular, the tenth festival attempted to provide evidence of its ability to provide the regional market with varying degrees of industrial support by initiating the full-scale market and regional network. These activities also reveal the extent to which the festival can take an active role in the film industry at local, regional and global levels. While such industry-oriented expansion shows how PIFF has pursued a more self-reliant structure by establishing a large scale industrial base in Pusan, these multiple activities conversely testify to the festival's struggle for its position in the global festival calendar, which in recent years has been unexpectedly changing and become increasingly competitive.

Public Events for Local Audiences

As well as embracing an expansive industry-oriented and critical approach aimed at the regional level, the tenth PIFF also paid special attention to emphasising its dedication to local audiences by organising a series of public events. These included

the opening up of the closing night party to the general public and an increase in the number of screening venues, from seventeen in the previous year to thirty-one, to make this anniversary more service-oriented and easier to access.⁶²

This increase in the number of audience-oriented events suggests that PIFF has attempted to reconstitute local audiences' attention and foster a sense of community to compensate for some of the negative side effects of the previous decade's expansionist projects. It also testifies to the festival's efforts to negotiate its changing role and position in the global and local film markets. In short, all these arrangements aim to facilitate good community feeling by offering opportunities "to partake of exclusive and differentiated pleasures" and to assure the local community an important role in the festival.⁶³

As discussed above, the fast growth and success of PIFF has propelled the "professionalisation" of the festival and enhanced its business-oriented function. As a result, there has been a tendency for the festival to concentrate on building up its international profile rather than devoting itself to the interests of the local community. In other words, PIFF and local audiences had to be ready to welcome outsiders (mostly international professionals) as guests to the festival, rather than expecting merely the presence of locals who belong to the city and the nation. This welcoming atmosphere has been facilitated by the economic benefits of the festival,

including those brought about by tourism. However, it is also true that PIFF's establishment and success relied on the strong local support of Pusan, as explained in chapter 2. In this context, while PIFF has achieved its global goals and established a solid reputation over the years, the local film industry and audiences have tended to be sceptical of the festival's links with them. As film journalist Han Sun-hee comments:

I agree with the fact that PIFF has played an important role in boosting Asian cinema. However, Korean cinema? I know that some local film professionals consider PIFF's role in relation to promoting Korean films abroad to be important, but others don't agree that PIFF directly influenced the growth and development of the domestic film industry itself.⁶⁴

Alongside this scepticism, the larger scale of the festival also began to affect the ability of the local population to participate in the festival as it became harder and harder for the general public to get tickets. As soon as the festival opens online ticket sales each year, most screenings become quickly sold out. As briefly described in chapter 3, PIFF relocated from Nampo-dong, the city centre of Pusan, to Haeundae, a newly built suburban area, in 2002 and increased the number of festival venues alongside the previously existing screening venues in Nampo-dong. Despite this, however, and due to the growing number of films screened every year, the public and even film professionals began to complain about the difficulty of

getting tickets. Therefore, the question of “whose festival is it?” has been raised.⁶⁵

As well as the general audience, international guests also began to complain about the difficulty of obtaining tickets. As *Variety* complained:

As the number of films at PIFF grows ever larger - a giant 170-plus features this year, excluding retros - it's developing a rep as one of the hardest fests at which to actually see them. Even invited guests, shipped in and housed at the fest's expense, face a daily scramble for press and guest tix at booths that open at 8.a.m. but hang up the “sold-out” sign at 8.01.⁶⁶

Moreover, for professionals who attend the festival, PIFF became a more difficult festival to get access to. For instance, like the Cannes Film Festival, PIFF has started to restructure its accreditation system and classify it into more than four categories. Being self-consciously aware of these problems, PIFF made a special effort to resolve them on the occasion of its tenth anniversary. Specifically, to prevent early ticket sell-outs and provide more opportunities to actually see films, the number of screening venues increased. The number of theatres rose to thirty-one, which was fourteen more than at the ninth event, and the number of seats rose to 300,000. By increasing the number of its venues, the festival hoped to make a better viewing environment. In addition, following a pilot midnight screening at the ninth event, PIFF introduced some special midnight screenings for younger audiences at its tenth event.⁶⁷

When it comes to ticket sales, although funds from the central government and Pusan city are the major source of revenue for the annual budget, ticket sales

have also been important to PIFF, making up approximately twenty to thirty percent of its annual budget each year.⁶⁸ Therefore, in addition to invited international guests, local festival audiences who purchase their own tickets are important consumers and sources of revenue for PIFF. Furthermore, apart from actual profits from ticket sales, the high rate of occupancy in seats is significant for PIFF as local support and enthusiasm can help the festival sustain its distinctive position in the global market.

It is apparent that the effects of these audience-friendly events are maximised through various forms of tie-ins. This was most explicitly articulated by the closing night event at the tenth festival. As previously mentioned, unlike in previous years, PIFF opened its tenth closing night gala to the general public. With a special ticket package including entrance to both the Closing Ceremony and closing party, this special event was entitled “Closing Reception with Lotte” and allowed general audience members to gather together with film professionals and special guests of the Closing Ceremony.⁶⁹ Not surprisingly, tickets for the closing-night film, *Wedding Campaign* (Hwang Byung-kuk, 2005) were quickly sold out.

It is noticeable that PIFF’s choice of a world-premiere screening of *Wedding Campaign* helps explain the excitement that arose in conjunction with these public events. This film is the story of two men from the countryside in Korea who go to

Uzbekistan to search for wives. The pair meet a series of different girls - a refugee from North Korea, women from Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan - as they search for the right mate. Festival Director Kim Dong-Ho asserts that the tenth festival chose this film in particular to wrap up the festival, “as part of efforts to make the festival more widely available and enjoyable.”⁷⁰ Programmer Hur Moon-yung also comments, “we looked for something a little more commercial in order to finish with a sensation of festivity.”⁷¹ Obviously, unlike previous closing films, such as *The Scarlet Letter* (Daniel H. Byun, 2004) and *Acacia* (Park Ki-hyung, 2003), which were both critically well-received, this film was described as “a heart-warming melodrama” which could be enjoyed by “audiences of all ages.”⁷² In short, this process reveals how the notion of the “festival audience” can be justifiably incorporated into film programming at a major festival.⁷³

Overall, the rapid growth of the festival and its accompanying response from local audiences, in conjunction with successive transformations in the local and global markets, prompted PIFF to turn more to local audiences in its tenth year. Through multiple appeals to this audience, it is obvious that PIFF attempted to negotiate its role and position to effectively cope with a changing film festival landscape.

Conclusion

This chapter has looked at the tenth PIFF and examined the various expressions of expansionism associated with the event. In doing so it has suggested that the range and scale of the tenth event presents an example of how film festivals can broaden the range of their roles within rapidly changing local/global circumstances. PIFF's case, in particular, illustrates how a festival's expansionism may be linked to a regionalisation strategy.

Specifically, the chapter has focused on Asian programming in order to illustrate PIFF's ambition to be a critical hub as well as an industrial hub of Asian cinema. While the Asian Pantheon and Remapping Asian Auteur Cinema 1 programmes were crucial instruments for reconstructing Asian identity by allowing for the incorporation of a massive selection of Asian classics, the sometimes problematic relationship between the world premiere system and contemporary Asian programming at PIFF demonstrates the way in which the festival attempted to cope with an increasingly competitive global film festival economy.

Most importantly, by launching the Asian Film Academy, PIFF attempted to synergise the existing regional network by linking education and industry in a new way. This decision reflects a larger trend amongst global film festivals which have begun to concentrate on boosting the festival's industrial function by establishing

side bar training programmes to discover and incubate potential young filmmakers.

Moreover, following the success of the PPP, PIFF's strong regionalisation drive was furthered when the AFIN was launched during the tenth festival alongside the announcement of the subsequent year's launch of a full-scale film market – the Asian Film Market. This ambitious approach suggests the way in which PIFF perceived its role and responded to the demands of the local and global film markets.

It is instructive to consider at what has emerged over the first ten years of PIFF's existence. PIFF's first ten years coincided with rapid changes in East Asia in every aspect and all sectors; economically, culturally, and politically. It also coincided with the dramatic growth and transformation of the Korean film industry as a whole. In this regard, the massive scale and scope of the tenth PIFF should be understood as occurring in conjunction with a rapidly changing local and global film industry, rather than being regarded as a single event's celebration of its success. Whilst the celebratory tone of the tenth anniversary was propelled by the growing importance of the Korean film industry in local and global markets, it also revealed some of the contradictions and complexities experienced by PIFF within the local/global context. Specifically, PIFF's special programme in tandem with the APEC conference and the festival's relation to the Screen Quota system provides a clear example of some unresolved political tensions within the

organisation. Furthermore, this chapter has illustrated how PIFF's extensive programme of regional initiatives directly affects the identity and position of other regional film festivals. Finally, the strategic arrangement of diverse audience-friendly public events demonstrates that PIFF is aware of its changing relationship with local audiences and has sought to renew its links with the local film culture. In all of these ways, the priorities and decisions that PIFF has made, such as struggles over the definition of a self-proclaimed "Asian" identity, have to be observed within particular political, economic and historical contexts.

In sum, this chapter has illustrated how the dominant trend of expansionism can cause contradictions and complexities for a major film festival whilst still providing a good opportunity for PIFF to distinguish itself from its counterparts in the Asia region. A close examination of the varying degrees of expansionism and regionalisation evidenced by this specific case study of the tenth PIFF enables us to broaden extant perspectives on the complex phenomenon of international film festivals.

Notes

¹ As explained in chapter 3, APEC (Asian Pacific Economic Cooperation) comprises twenty-one members including Australia, New Zealand, Brunei Darussalam, Canada and the United States. APEC brands their members “economies” since the APEC cooperative process is predominantly concerned with trade and economic issues.

² For an overview of the 2005’s festival, see Appendix 4.

³ Hee-Moon Cho, “Forum: PIFF’s Achievement for Ten Years and Assignment for Future.” *Munhwa Ilbo*, October 15, 2005, 23.

⁴ Patrick Frater, “Pusan Unveils Bumper Crop,” *Variety*, September 9, 2005. [online] Available at <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117928571.html?categoryid=19&cs=1> (accessed September 6, 2005).

⁵ Personal interview with Kim Hye-Joon, General Secretary of KOFIC in Pusan (October 8, 2005).

⁶ Derek Elley, “How Things Have Changed in the World of Film Festivals during the Past 20 Years!” *Cine 21*, no. 525, October 27- November 1, 2005. [online] Available at http://www.cine21.com/Article/article_view.php?mm=001001002&article_id=34493 (accessed September 10, 2007).

⁷ Julian Stringer, “Global Cities and the International Film Festival Economy,” in *Cinema and the City*, eds. Mark Shiel and Tony Fitzmaurice (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 139.

⁸ Stringer, 2001, 139; Thomas Elsaesser, *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005), 86.

⁹ The tenth Pyongyang International Film Festival was held in Pyongyang, the capital city of North Korea between September 13 - 22, 2006. Pyongyang (PIFF), which shares the same acronym as the South Korean Pusan International Film Festival, showcased seventy-two films including forty-two features, documentaries, shorts and animation. It started in 1987 bi-annually since its second edition in 1990. For its tenth anniversary in 2006, the Pyongyang Festival invited international guests including: representatives from the Cannes Festival: Dieter Kosslic, director of the Berlin Film Festival, and journalists from the U.K. However, Americans were still barred from attending and no U.S. films were screened. For further information, see Derek Elley’s report, “In North Korea, Serenity is Surreal”, *Variety* Oct 2-8, 2006, 10 and 16; Elley, “N. Korean Festival Draws Int’l Crowd” *Variety*, September 25- October 1, 2006, 7 and 12.

¹⁰ For an overview of the decade between 1996 and 2005, see Appendix 3.

¹¹ Elley, “How Things Have Changed in the World of Film Festivals during the Past 20 Years!” *Cine 21*, 2005.

¹² PIFF is the first film festival in South Korea able to use the occasion of its tenth anniversary to leverage resources from the central government. Unlike PIFF, PiFan, the second biggest festival in Korea, failed to receive financial support for its tenth anniversary in the following year, 2006. This failure was widely attributed to the festival’s unstable status which was attributed to the collision between the local film community and the festival committee since the mayor of Puchon had dismissed festival director Kim Hong-joon the previous year.

¹³ “A Review of Korean Film Industry During the First Half of 2005,” *Korean Film Observatory*, No.16 Summer (2005), 2-3.

¹⁴ Ibid. In the first half of 2005, the market share of domestic films was 50.4 percent.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ilya Garger, “Best Film Festival” *Time Asia*, November 15, 2004. [online] Available at: <http://www.time.com/time/printout/0,8816,501041122-782192,00.html#> (accessed September 7, 2007).

¹⁷ This film was the opening film at the fourth PIFF.

¹⁸ Press Release of the tenth PIFF, the Tenth PIFF, September 29, 2005. [online] Available at <http://press.piff.org/kor/index.asp> (accessed June 1, 2006).

¹⁹ In 2003, PIFF announced the screening schedule for North Korean films at its press conference and stated, “The selection consisted of a range of seven films made between independence in 1945 and the 1990s, including *Beyond Joy and Sadness*, *Newly-Weds* and *Snow Melts in Spring*. For three days starting the seventh PIFF, October 2003, the North Korean films were shown free of charge at two cinemas.” Hyuk-sang Lee, ed. *10 Years’ PIFF History* (Pusan: Tenth PIFF, 2005), 256-257.

²⁰ The screening list of this section was as follows: *Ballad of the Man* (Teguh Karya, Indonesia,

1972); *Behind the Mosquito Net* (Teguh Karya, 1983), *Black Silk* (R.D. Pestonji, Thailand, 1961); *Country Hotel* (R.D. Pestonji, 1957); *Dark Heaven* (R.D. Pestonji, 1958); *A Simple Event* (Sohrab Shahid Sales, Iran, 1973); *Still Life* (Sohrab Shahid Sales, 1974); *Sugar is Not Sweet* (R.D. Pestonji, 1965). In the following year (2006), fourteen films, made by Iran's Amir Naderi, India's Rajaram Vankudre Shantaram and China's Cui Zi'en were highlighted in the second version. 2007, the third year of this special programme, focused on Iranian director Dariush Mehrjui's films.

²¹ Derek Elley, "Savvy Moves Boost Pusan Fest Fortunes," *Variety Daily*, Oct 14 2006, A1/ A4.

²² In particular, a couple of journalists who wrote for the international trade magazines -*Variety* and *Screen International* - such as Patrick Frater and Derek Elley were critical about the scope of the PIFF's Asian programming.

²³ Patrick Frater and Derek Elley, "Pusan Fest Balloons: Record Films, Attendance Marks 10th Year," *Variety*, October 3-9, 2005, B4.

²⁴ "Banana programming" is a term used to describe Asian programming that deliberately reflects Western taste in festival programming. This is a festival term informally well-known to festival professionals, particularly journalists who write for the industry magazines. The origin of this term can be traced back to the Hong Kong film *Banana Cop* (Po-Chih Leong, 1984). It is the story of a British-born Chinese cop who is sent to Hong Kong but cannot speak or read Chinese at all. In this film, "banana" specifically refers to someone who is yellow on the outside and white on the inside. Interview with Elley in London (October 6, 2006 and September 13, 2007).

²⁵ See Appendix 1. "Film Festivals in Asia."

²⁶ Ji-seok Kim, "PIFF Family," *Cine21*, October 7, 2005. [online] Available at http://piff.cine21.com/2005/article_view.php?article_id=33980&mm=006005001 (accessed September 10, 2007).

²⁷ Eunjung Lee, "Selection of opening film," *Kookje Shinmun*, September 14, 2004, 21.

²⁸ Ines Cho, "Bright Light on for PIFF Opening" October 11, 2004, *JoongAng Daily* [online] Available at <http://joongangdaily.joins.com/article/view.asp?aid=2479244> (accessed September 6, 2007).

²⁹ Elley, "Savvy Moves Boost Pusan Fest Fortunes," A1/ A4.

³⁰ This festival was established as a strong market-based film festival in downtown Rome. The dates it ran in its first year were October 14 - 21, which overlapped with PIFF's festival period in that year.

³¹ Festival director Dieter Kosslick further stated: "For American productions, especially for independent productions, this new procedure offers a unique chance within a very short period to position a new film not only on the market in America, but also worldwide at the Berlinale - and testifies once more to the good relationship between Germans and Americans." Press Release [online]. Berlinale, March 5, 2003. Available at [www. http://www.berlinale.de](http://www.berlinale.de) (accessed September 4, 2007).

³² As described in chapter 3, the concept of Pacific Rim or Asia Pacific is often related to socioeconomic processes and patterns of migration rather than geographic definition.

³³ Press Release of the tenth PIFF [online], the Tenth PIFF, September 29, 2005. Available at <http://press.piff.org/kor/index.asp> (accessed June 1, 2006).

³⁴ "Introduction of the APEC Screening," *Ticket Catalogue*, The Tenth PIFF (Pusan: Tenth PIFF, 2005), 126.

³⁵ For instance, this organisation claimed that "We object to the conspiracy of mercantilists who use the yardstick of neoliberalistic economics in the area of culture, and we do not think the cultural area should be subject to negotiations in a bilateral investment treaty, free trade agreement, and World Trade Organization." [online] Available at http://culturescope.ca/ev_en.php (accessed September 14, 2007).

³⁶ Sooman Jegal, "Dark Clouds over PIFF," *Jeongookmael Shinmun*, October 10, 2005, 8.

³⁷ Joonsang Kang, "Defending Screen Quota but Supporting APEC?" *Prometheus*, October 13, 2005. [online] Available at <http://www.prometheus.co.kr/articles/107/20051013/20051013192600.html> (accessed September 10, 2007).

³⁸ The members include a range of film community organisations and insiders, including: Busan Film Commission, PiFan, Seoul Film Commission, Council of Professors of Motion Picture Departments in Korean Universities, JIFF, Korean Film Directors Association, The Korean History of Motion Pictures Association, The Korean Moviemaker Association, The Association of Korean Movie Producers, Korean Motion Pictures Assistants Association, Korean Film Critics Association,

Korean Motion Pictures Institute, and so on.

³⁹ Elley, "How Things Have Changed in the World of Film Festivals during the Past 20 Years!", 2005.

⁴⁰ Foreword of Festival Coordinator, *The Tenth Hong Kong International Film Festival Programme* (Hong Kong: the Urban Council, 1986), 8.

⁴¹ Dong-Ho Kim, "Foreword," *The Tenth Pusan International Film Festival*, Programme Booklet (Pusan: Tenth Pusan International Film Festival, 2005), 5.

⁴² Personal interview with Derek Elley in London (October 6, 2006).

⁴³ Films include *Spring River Flows East* (1947, Cai Chushen, Zheng Junli) from the PRC, *The Beauty of Beauties* (1965, Li Hanxiang) from Taiwan, *Laugh, Clown, Laugh* (1960, Li Pingqian) from Hong Kong, *A Touch of Zen* (1971, King Hu) from Taiwan, *Boat People* (1982, Ann Hui) from Hong Kong and *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon* (2000, Ang Lee), a co-production of Taiwan/Hong Kong/U.S./PRC.

⁴⁴ *A Century of Chinese Cinema: Look Back in Glory*, The 25th Hong Kong International Film Festival (Hong Kong: Hong Kong Critics Society, 2001), 5.

⁴⁵ Jeremy Hansen, "Anniversary Blues: Bureaucracy and Political Meddling Threaten Hong Kong Film Festival", *Asia Week*, April 13, 2001, Vol.27. No.14. [online] Available at <http://www.pathfinder.com/asiaweek/magazine/life/0,8782,105407,00.html> (accessed August 15, 2007).

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ In addition to this situation, it is widely believed that frequent changes to the nature of its funding body can be understood as another factor in the decline of the HKIFF. It was initially funded by the Urban Council and Leisure and Cultural Services Department from 1977 to 2001, and then by the Hong Kong Arts Development Council from 2001 to 2004. In 2006, after completing its twenty-eighth edition, the HKIFF became officially incorporated as an independent, charitable organisation – the Hong Kong International Film Festival Society Limited.

⁴⁸ Talent Campus is a program wherein about 500 new directors from almost seventy countries are invited to attend seminars and meetings at the festival. Since 2003, this training programme has taken place in tandem with the Berlin Film Festival and attracted many talented young filmmakers from all over the world. In addition, this programme was recently expanded to include Talent Abroad, an identical programme taking place in locations outside of Berlin such as India, South Africa and Argentina.

⁴⁹ Official website of the AFA, Tenth PIFF. Available at <http://afa.piff.org/eng/index.asp> (accessed on September 3, 2007).

⁵⁰ Twenty candidates and eight Teaching Assistants from Asia are selected through both open admissions and a recommendation process.

⁵¹ This Paris-based residency programme is a part of the Cinefondation which was created in 1988 as a Cannes festival selection category for short films. Each year since 2000, twelve participants are selected and invited to live in Paris for four and a half months. The residents all receive: a 800-euro grant per month; free access to a large number of Paris cinemas; French lessons (optional); and the attending opportunity of Cannes festival during their stay.

⁵² As a part of the post-AFA programme, AFA is planning for the selected participants to continue their studies in filmmaking in the long-term through KAFA's KASP(KAFA Asian Scholarship Programme) and Dongseo University's DASP(Dongseo University Asian Scholarship Programme). DAF (Donesgo University Asian Fund) was created in order to form a budget to support continuous production for the selected participant.

⁵³ For instance, as well as Talent Campus at the Berlin Film Festival, there have been several similar workshops including Interactive Film Lab in Utrecht Academy of Arts in Netherlands, which all were supported by the Media Plus (activities of the European Union) programme in European Union.

⁵⁴ Jae-hyuk Yoo, "PIFF Has Surpassed Thirty Years' Tokyo Film Festival in Just Ten Years," *The Korean Economy Daily (Hankook Kyungje Shinmun)*, September 25, 2005, 26.

⁵⁵ The Dean of the second AFA was Korean director Im Kwon-taek, and the third in 2007 is to be Mohsen Makhmalbaf, an Iranian director. Among the many training programmes run by film festivals, only PIFF has this "dean" system. While the Dean, who is usually a renowned Asian filmmaker, plays a key role in promoting the AFA by creating the image of a "real school," PIFF may experience some difficulty in finding suitable Deans in the Asia region in coming years as the

Dean has to be changed every year.

⁵⁶ AFA takes place in two cities in Korea, Pusan and Seoul, over a three-week period - the first half in Seoul and the second half in Pusan. In the first part, participants get to make a short film after practical and individual training on HD and 35mm while various programmes, including Master Workshop, Individual Mentoring, Seminar and Interview and Intensive Lectures, are held in the second part.

⁵⁷ This drive towards growth and change was also obvious when PPP started including non-Asian projects beginning in 2006. In 2006, with the purpose of embracing a wider range of recent trends in the film industry, PPP selected forty projects, including, for the first time, projects with a more commercially oriented nature, moving beyond but not forsaking its traditional preference for low-budget or independent films. This significant change of direction came alongside the launch of the Asian Film Market.

⁵⁸ The AFM benefits from a six-fold budget increase, in comparison to a budget of 500,000 USD for the PPP in 2005.

⁵⁹ The AFM is structured around market booths, with room to accommodate 300 companies from forty countries, the BFM-TV multimedia contents market and exiting events PPP and the BIFCOM locations showcase.

⁶⁰ Jung-in Sohn, "Tokyo, Hong Kong tensed, Pusan is going to be a Mecca of cinema," *Kookje Shinmun* October 12, 2005, 21.

⁶¹ Patrick Frater, "Beyond borders: Pusan pumps market plans", *Variety*, Oct 11, 2006. [online] Available at <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117951695.html?cs=1&s=h&p=0> (accessed July 14, 2007).

⁶² In addition, to strengthen links with the local audience, the festival added an event called "Actors' Choice Troopers (A.C. Troopers)," in which selected audiences are joined by a group of Korean actors to watch films together. The AC Troopers joined the "Directors' Choice Troopers (D.C. Troopers)" which had been established at the ninth festival.

⁶³ Julian Stringer, *Regarding Film Festivals*, PhD Thesis (Ann Arbor: UMI Dissertation Services, 2003), 266.

⁶⁴ Personal interview with Han Sun-hee, *FILM2.0* ex-Online Chief Editor in Pusan (11 Oct, 2005). She was in charge of reporting from PIFF between 1998 and 2005.

⁶⁵ Stringer, 2003, 239.

⁶⁶ Derek Elley, "Fest's Big Ticket Thicket," *Variety Daily*, Oct 19 2006, 6.

⁶⁷ PIFF finally decided to establish another special section entitled "Midnight Passion" in 2006.

⁶⁸ For instance, according to the festival's official records, the fifth PIFF in 2000 gained 648,188,600 KRW (approximately 698,103 USD) from paid admission of 148,733 for the ticket sales (the whole budget is 3.5 million USD) and the sixth in 2001 sold 657,149,000 KRW (707,753 USD) from 143,106 paid admissions (the whole budget is 3.9 million USD) The sold tickets were 604,490,000 KRW (651,039 USD) from 165,102 admission at the eight PIFF in 2003 (the budget 4.6 million USD). PIFF Organising Committee, *A Report on Final Accounts*, unpublished material (Pusan: Fifth PIFF, 2000), 26; (The sixth PIFF, 2001), 28; (The eighth PIFF, 2003), 20.

⁶⁹ Lotte Entertainment has begun to invest in and distribute local films since 2004. With a remarkable multiplex cinema chain running across the nation (more than 206 screens in twenty-six cities), this *jaebol* (chaebol) corporation has aggressively increased its domain in the film business and emerged as one of the forerunners, alongside Showbox and CJ Entertainment/Cinema Service, in the Korean film industry. Furthermore, it is worth noting that the sponsor of this spectacular event at closing night event was Lotte Entertainment, both the distribution company of the closing film and one of the premiere sponsors of the tenth PIFF.

⁷⁰ Yang Sung-jin "Pusan film festival to strengthen leading position in Asia", *Korea Herald* [online], September 8, 2005. Available at: www.koreaherald.co.kr/archives (accessed September 8, 2007).

⁷¹ Lina Yoon, "On Parade at Pusan," *The Wall Street Journal*, [online] Available at www.wsj.com (accessed September 30, 2006).

⁷² Yang Sung-jin, "Quality Asian films await movie buffs" *Korea Herald*, October 1, 2005. [online] Available at <http://www.koreaherald.co.kr/archives> (accessed September 2, 2007).

⁷³ For an extended discussion of the "festival audience," and "festival communities" in a European context, see Julian Stringer's *Regarding Film Festivals*, 239-282; and Marijke de Valck's "Drowning in Popcorn at the International Film Festival Rotterdam?: The Festival as a Multiplex of Cinephilia," in *Cinephilia: Movies. Love and Memory*, eds. Marijke de Valck and Hagener Malte (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005), 97-109.

Conclusion

This thesis has brought discussion of film festivals into an East Asian context by exploring how the Pusan International Film Festival in South Korea has actively positioned itself within the rapidly changing global film economy. By investigating the establishment and development of the festival between 1996 and 2005, the thesis has sought to demonstrate how and why PIFF has used Asian identity as its most visible marketing strategy. It has thus brought to light a series of Asian regional self-definition processes that the festival utilised to differentiate itself from its counterparts, such as the Hong Kong and Tokyo film festivals.

This project has analysed this regional approach which was synergised with the festival's strong industrial drive within regional film industries. It has also considered the complexities brought by the rapid transformation of the South Korean film industry which has sought to reach out to the global film market since the late 1990s. The key objective of this study was to show the ways in which film festivals in East Asia are now moving from a focus on the national to the regional as they aim increasingly to influence the global market. However, this trend does not mean that the notion of the national is not valid in observing the global phenomenon of film festivals. Rather, this research has suggested how film festivals have begun to negotiate their roles and identities between the national, the regional, and the global by examining PIFF's programming politics, its own project market - the PPP

- and the tenth anniversary as a clear landmark of the history of the festival.

The project has presented this discussion in seven chapters. The first chapter, “Contextualising Film Festivals Between the National and the Transnational,” identified and discussed existing debates on film festivals and sought to present the discussion in a non-Western context which has hitherto been little studied in Film Studies. By contextualising film festivals in the East Asian context, the chapter shows the difficulties and significance of researching this topic and the urgent need to look at unexplored dimensions of film festivals in different locations to comprehensively extend the complexities already found in the extant debates on film festivals.

By focusing on its inauguration period in mid-1990s South Korea, chapter 2, “Why Pusan?: The Political Economy of a Film Festival,” investigated the socio-political factors surrounding PIFF’s establishment. This chapter argues that PIFF’s success should be understood as resulting from a negotiation amongst divergent groups of people with very different interests but all of whom operated within the specific social, political and economic circumstances of Korea. It also examined how these political and economic factors relate to the transformation of the Korean film industry.

By extending the discussion surrounding PIFF’s establishment to the following decade, chapter 3, “Making a Hub of Asian Cinema: A Regionalisation Strategy,” further explored subsequent relevant developments and the evolution of

the festival's status and identity in relation to the local and the global film industries. By focusing on the debates on regionalisation, which have been prevalent in East Asia, the chapter considers how and why PIFF attempted to position itself as a cinematic hub in East Asia. This chapter concentrates on two interlinked themes - urban regeneration and networks - to demonstrate why PIFF conceptualised a regional identity and how this strategy interacted with the transformation in the local and global film market.

To further reveal the tensions between the national and the regional which appeared in PIFF's formulation of regionalisation, chapter 4, "Negotiating a Place Between Korean Cinema and Asian Cinema: Programming Politics," examines PIFF's programming politics by focusing on the Opening and Korean Panorama sections. The chapter illustrates how the programming of national and regional sections was closely tied to the political, economic, and social interests of PIFF as an institution. While PIFF has served as a showcase for Asian films and evoked a strong Asian identity, the festival has equally striven to promote the national film industry by acting as a gateway to the global market for those Korean films placed into prime sections.

Following this discussions of contemporary Korean cinema and PIFF, the fifth chapter, "Re-imagining the Past: Programming Retrospectives," examines the relationship between older Korean films and PIFF. This chapter sought to reveal how PIFF strategically exploited this section to promote the festival and shows the

mediation and negotiation that took place in the process of remapping classic Korean and Asian cinema. While the chapter demonstrates that PIFF sought to play a key role in sanctioning old films made in Korea as a legitimate agent, it also argues that the festival highlighted old Asian films in these retrospectives in an attempt to justify the festival's identity as a platform for Asian cinema.

Whilst the preceding two chapters looked at PIFF's key programme sections to reveal how the festival negotiated its position within the changing global/local festival landscape, chapter 6, "A Global Film Producer - The Pusan Promotion Plan," argues that PIFF's regionalisation strategy was further achieved through the Pusan Promotion Plan, a project market in which new Asian feature film projects may seek co-financing and co-production partners. By exploring the PPP and its relation to the national and regional industries, the chapter demonstrates that film festivals today have begun to play a new role in the global film industry as a new kind of "producer" by actively engaging with the production process as well as exhibition and distribution.

The final chapter, "Re-mapping Asian Cinema: The Tenth Anniversary in 2005," considers the tenth anniversary of PIFF as a significant moment in PIFF's history in terms of its overall structure, identity and international position. The chapter proposes that the key to understanding the goals of this anniversary lie in its varying degrees of "expansionism." The grand scale and scope focusing on Asian identity were utilised at both industrial and critical levels. To demonstrate this,

special programmes and various networks designed to strengthen Asian identity and associated with the tenth anniversary festival, such as the Asian Film Industry Network, the Asian Film Market, Asian Pantheon, Remapping Asian Auteur Cinema 1 and a Special Screening for APEC Films, were examined. In particular, the chapter focused on the launch of the Asian Film Academy, a new education programme which aims to create a nodal point between critical and industrial cultures. The chapter also argues that PIFF's strategic arrangement of diverse audience-friendly public events reflects its awareness of its changing relationship with local audiences.

As discussed, this thesis intends to reveal the ambivalence of regional and national politics brought about by globalisation. These two intertwined forces have shown to be frequently at odds with the changing political, historical and economic contexts among local, regional and global forces, as in the case of the Screen Quota movement and the lifting of the ban on Japanese cultural products. Furthermore, PIFF's regionalisation approach to the global film market seems to prompt shifts in East Asia such as the Hong Kong and Tokyo film festivals' attempts to reconstruct their status and identities.

To conclude, this study has explored how PIFF has attempted to stake out its own unique position within an ever-changing global film landscape. It has shown how and why PIFF utilised a regionalisation strategy to promote the festival locally and globally.

The thesis draws three main conclusions. Firstly, existing Western perspectives on film festivals are not sufficient to comprehensively explain either the complexities of non-Western film festivals such as PIFF or the multi-dimensional nature of film festivals whose importance has been rapidly growing in the global economy.

Secondly, this research on PIFF has discovered that film festivals today have escaped the boundaries of their previously understood functions in diverse ways. International film festivals have played a key role in introducing world cinema to the West for the past few decades. Among the global film industry's three conventional modes - production, exhibition and distribution - festivals have, up until now, been known as important centres only of exhibition and distribution. However, one of the most distinctive features of PIFF is its establishment of a project market, the Pusan Promotion Plan. By forging a close relation with the production arm of the film industry, the PPP has tried to brand its own products and hence build networks at the local, regional and global levels. This aspect of the film festival has never before been critically explored. In short, by actively involving itself in film production, the PPP has provided PIFF with a major justification to grasp the new role of the film festival as global media producer.

Thirdly, this study has observed that PIFF's regionalisation strategy as cultural and industrial practice was combined with the festival's rapid expansion. This fact provides a useful basis from which to address the gap in understanding

film festivals in different regions - West and non-West in particular. In other words, PIFF's self-determined conceptualisation and manipulation of a regional identity to approach the global market is unique and not to be found among any prestigious film festivals in the West including Cannes, Venice and Berlin. This study therefore broadens our perspective on the unique specificities of individual film festivals and helps to comprehend the institutional and conceptual complexities of researching film festivals in local, regional and global contexts.

In sum, this thesis places discussion of film festivals into a non-Western perspective by focusing on one individual film festival which has rapidly emerged in the global film market over the last decade as a powerful representative of Asian cinema. Its empirical investigation of one single event, which has to date been little studied before, will hopefully serve to draw further academic attention to this long neglected but important topic and to encourage the study of different film festivals in different regions utilising multi-dimensional perspectives in Film Studies.

Bibliography

- Acharya, Amitav. "Regionalism and the Emerging World Order: Sovereignty, Autonomy, Identity." In *New Regionalisms in the Global Political Economy*, edited by Shaun Brelin, Christopher W. Hughes, Nicola Philips and Ben Rosamond, 20-32. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Allen, Richard. "Pesaro 1: Festival Review." *Framework*. issue 22/23 (Autumn, 1983): 74.
- An, Cheong-Sook. "Shedding a Light on Asian Cinema: Closing the Second PIFF." *Hankyureh Shinmun*, October 18, 1997, 16.
- Andrew, Dudley. "Waves of New Waves and the International Film Festival." In *Asia/Cinema/Network: Industry, Technology, and Film Culture*. The Tenth Pusan International Film Festival Symposium Programme Booklet, 255-265. Pusan: Tenth PIFF, 2005.
- Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.
- Baker, Michael. "Having It Both Ways: Korea Promotes and Censors Films." *Christian Science Monitor*, October 22, 1996, n.p.
- Becker, S. Howard. *Art Worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.
- Berry, Chris. "Introducing 'Mr. Monster': Kim Ki-young and the Critical Economy of the Globalized Art-House Cinema." In *Post-colonial Classics of Korean Cinema*, edited by Chungmoo Choi, 39-47. Irvine: Korean Film Festival Committee at University of California, 1998.
- . "'What's big about the big film?': 'De-Westernizing' the Blockbuster in Korea and China." In *Movie Blockbusters*, edited by Julian Stringer, 217-29. London: Routledge, 2003a.
- . "Full Service Cinema: The South Korean Cinema Success Story (So Far)." In *Text and Context of Korean Cinema: Crossing Borders*, edited by Young

Key Kim and Renaud et al, Sigur Centre Asia Paper, no.17. (2003b): 7-16.
Available at www.gwu.edu/~eall/special/berry-hms02.html (accessed
February 6, 2004).

----. "From National Cinema to Cinema and the National: Chinese-language
Cinema and Hou Hsiao-hsien's 'Taiwan Trilogy'." In *Theorising National
Cinema*, edited by Valentina Vitali and Paul Willemen, 148-157. London:
British Film Institute, 2006.

Bianchini, Franco and Michael Parkinson, eds. *Cultural Policy and Urban
Regeneration*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press,
1993.

Breslin, Shaun, Richard Higgott and Ben Rosamond. "Regions in Comparative
Perspective." In *New Regionalisms in the Global Political Economy*, edited
by Shaun Breslin, Christopher W. Hughes, Nicola Philips and Ben Rosamond,
1-19. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.

Brussels, Jan. "Asian Films Getting Popular in Europe." *Kyodo News International*
January 29, 2004. [online] Available at <http://findarticles.com/p/articles>.
(accessed August 24, 2007).

Castells, Manuel. *The Informational City: Information Technology, Economic
Restructuring and the Urban Regional Process*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1989.

Cha, Sang-Keun. "Five-star Hotels in Pusan Are Fully Booked." *Busanmaeil
Shinmun*, September 23, 1998.

Chang, Kyung-Sup. "Compressed Modernity and its Discontents: South Korean
Society in Transition." *Economy and Society* vol. 28, no. 1. February (1999):
30-55.

Chen, Kuan-Hsing. ed. *Trajectories: Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*. London and New
York: Routledge, 1998.

Cho, Hee-Moon. "Forum: PIFF's Achievement for Ten Years and Assignment for
Future." *Munhwa Ilbo*, October 15, 2005, 23.

- Cho, Ines. "Bright Light on for PIFF Opening." *JoongAng Daily*, October 11, 2004.
[online] Available at
<http://joongangdaily.joins.com/article/view.asp?aid=2479244> (accessed
September 6, 2007).
- Cho Seung-Hyun. "PIFF Seminar." *Kukje Shinmun*, June 7, 1996, 15.
- Cho, Song-Hyun. "Special Programmes and Korean Retrospective." *Kookje
Shinmun*, September 13, 1996, 13.
- Cho, Young-jung. "Programme note of Korean Cinema Retrospective." in *The Ninth
Pusan International Film Festival*, Programme Booklet (Pusan: Ninth PIFF,
2004), 112.
- Choe, Yong-Shik. "Director to be Honoured at PIFF." *Korea Herald*, November 15,
2001, 16.
- Choi, Chungmoo. ed. *Post-Colonial Classics of Korean Cinema*. Irvine: Korean
Film Festival Committee at the University of California, 1998.
- Christie, Ian. "Rendezvous A Bruxelles." *Framework*. issue 14, Spring, 1981: 55.
- Ciecko, Anne. ed. *Contemporary Asian Cinema*. Oxford and New York: Berg. 2006.
- Corless, Kieron and Chris Darke. *Cannes, Inside the World's Premier Film Festival*.
London: Faber and Faber, 2007.
- Cremin, Stephen. "Pucheon Set to Fill Regional Niche." *Hankyureh 21*, August 2,
2006. [online] Available at
http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_entertainment/146041.html.
(accessed October 8, 2006).
- Czach, Liz. "Film Festivals, Programming, and the Building of a National Cinema." *The Moving Image* 4.1 (2004): 76-88. Project Muse through the Electronic
Library. Available at:
http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/the_moving_image/v004/4.1czach.html.
(accessed September 19, 2006).

- De Valck, Marijke. "Drowning in Popcorn at the International Film Festival Rotterdam?: The Festival as a Multiplex of Cinephilia." In *Cinephilia: Movies. Love and Memory*, edited by Marijke de Valck and Malte Hagener. 97-109. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005a.
- . *Film Festivals: History and Theory of a European Phenomenon that Became a Global Network*. Ph.D. Thesis. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam, 2005b.
- Dirlik, Arif. "Culture Against History? The Politics of East Asian Identity." *Development and Society* 28, no.2, (1999): 188.
- Eleftheriotis, Dimitris. "Turkish National Cinema." In *Asian Cinemas: A Reader and Guide*, edited by Dimitris Eleftheriotis and Gary Needham. 220-228. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.
- Elley, Derek. "Pusan Mart Hits Bull's Eye." *Variety*, Oct 5-11, 1998, 21-22.
- . "Pusan Pumps Korean Pic Profile." *Variety*, November 1-7, 1999. 19.
- . "Korean Pix Primp at Pusan Fest." *Variety*, November 20, 2001. [online] Available at: www.variety.com/toc-archive. (accessed August 11, 2006).
- . "Remake Fever Hits Pusan Festival." *Variety*, December 1, 2002. [online] Available at <http://www.variety.com/index.asp?layout=festivals&jump=story&id=1061&articleid>. (accessed November 2, 2007).
- . "Korea, Beware! Ten Myths about the International Film Festival Circuit." *Cine21*, February 6, 2004. [online] Available at www.cine21.com. (accessed October 10, 2006).
- . "10th PIFF." *Cine 21*. October 27, 2005. [online] Available at: http://www.cine21.com/Article/article_view.php?mm=001001002&article_id=34493. (accessed August 25, 2007).
- . "How Things Have Changed in the World of Film Festivals during the Past 20 Years!" *Cine 21*, October 27- November 1, 2005. [online] Available at:

http://www.cine21.com/Article/article_view.php?mm=001001002&article_id=34493 (accessed September 10, 2007).

----. "N. Korean Festival Draws Int'l Crowd." *Variety*, September 25- October 1, 2006, 7 and 12.

----. "In North Korea, Serenity is Surreal." *Variety*, October 2-8, 2006, 10 and 16.

----. "Savvy Moves Boost Pusan Fest Fortunes." *Variety*, October 8, 2006, A1/ A4.

----. "Fest's Big Ticket Thicket." *Variety Daily*, October 19, 2006, 6.

Elsaesser, Thomas. "Images for Sale: The 'New British Cinema.'" In *Fires Were Started: British Cinema and Thatcherism*, edited by Lester Friedman. 52-69. London: UCL Press, 1993.

----. *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005.

"Exhibition of Historical Material of Korean Cinema is Empty and Quiet." *Kookje Shinmun*, September 21, 1996, 13.

"'Festival for the Public,' Korean Cinema Spotlighted: Interview with Kim Soyoung." *Kookje Shinmun*, September 23, 1996, 21.

Frater, Patrick. "Pusan Unveils Bumper Crop." *Variety*, September 9, 2005. [online] Available at:
<http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117928571.html?categoryid=19&cs=1>
(accessed September 6, 2005).

----. "Beyond Borders: Pusan Pumps Market Plans." *Variety*, October 11, 2006. [online] Available at:
<http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117951695.html?cs=1&s=h&p=0>
(accessed July 14, 2007).

Frater, Patrick and Derek Elley. "Pusan Fest Balloons: Record Films, Attendance Marks 10th Year." *Variety*, October 3-9, 2005, B4.

- Garger, Ilya. "Best Film Festival." *Time Asia*, November 15, 2004. [online] Available at: <http://www.time.com/time/printout/0,8816,501041122-782192,00.html#> (accessed September 7, 2007).
- Gorenfeld, John. "Producer From Hell," *Guardian*, April 4, 2003. [online] Available at <http://film.guardian.co.uk/print/0,,4640432-3181,00.html>. (accessed December 1, 2006).
- Hajer, Maarten A. "Rotterdam: Redesigning the Public Domain." In *Cultural Policy and Urban Regeneration: The West European Experience*, edited by Franco Bianchini and Michael Parkinson, 48-72. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1993.
- Han, Sang-Jun and Jeong-hwa Yang. eds. *Shin Sang-Ok: Prince of Korean Cinema, Leading the Desire of the Masses*. Pusan: Sixth PIFF, 2001.
- Hansen, Jeremy. "Anniversary Blues: Bureaucracy and Political Meddling Threaten Hong Kong Film Festival." *Asia Week* 27, no. 14, April 13, 2001. [online] Available at <http://www.pathfinder.com/asiaweek/magazine/life/0,8782,105407,00.html> (accessed August 15, 2007).
- Harbord, Janet. *Film Culture*. London: Sage, 2002.
- Harris, Stuart. "Asian Multilateral Institutions and their Response to the Asian Economic Crisis: The Regional and Global Implications." In *New Regionalisms in the Global Political Economy*, edited by Shaun Brelin, Christopher W. Hughes, Nicola Philips and Ben Rosamond, 119-136. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Havis, Richard James. "A Star Is Born - Aged 78." *Moving Pictures MIFED*, 1997 Special, November, 1997, n.p.
- Hesmondhalgh, David. *The Cultural Industries*. London: Sage, 2002.
- Hettne, Björn, and Fredrik Söderbaum. "Theorising the Rise of Regionness." In *New Regionalisms in the Global Political Economy*, edited by Shaun Brelin,

Christopher W. Hughes, Nicola Philips and Ben Rosamond, 33-47. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.

Hindes, Andrew. "First Korean Pic Fest an Artistic, Popular Success." *Variety*, September 23-29, 1996, 26-29.

The Hong Kong International Film Festival. Programme Booklet:

The 10th Hong Kong International Film Festival. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Urban Council. 1986.

The 20th Anniversary of the Hong Kong International Film Festival: 1977-1996. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Urban Council. 1996.

The 25th Hong Kong International Film Festival. *A Century of Chinese Cinema: Look Back in Glory*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Critics Society, 2001.

Huh Moon-yung. "For Greater and Deeper Dialogue - Reflections on the Cultural Significance of Co-production" In *Rediscovering Asian Cinema Network: The Decades of Co-Production between Korean and Hong Kong*, edited by Lee Yong-kwan, Huh Moon-yung and Cho Young-jung and Park Dosin, 8-13. Pusan: Ninth PIFF, 2004.

Im, Yung-Ho. "The Media, Civil Society, and New Social Movements in Korea, 1985-93." In *Trajectories: Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, edited by Chen Kuan-Hsing, 330-345. London: Routledge, 1998.

"Introduction of the APEC Screening," In *The Tenth Pusan International Film Festival*, Ticket Catalogue, 126-131. Pusan: Tenth PIFF, 2005.

Iordanova, Dina. *Cinema of the Other Europe: The Industry and Artistry of East Central European Film*. London and New York: Wallflower Press, 2003.

----. "Showdown of the Festivals: Clashing Entrepreneurship and Post-communist Management of Culture." *Film International*. vol. 4, no. 23 (2006): 25-37.

Iwabuchi, Koichi. *Recentering Globalization: Popular Culture and Japanese Transnationalism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.

- Jancovich, Mark, Faire, Lucy, and Sarah Stubbings. *The Place of the Audience: Cultural Geographies of Film Consumption*. London: British Film Institute, 2003.
- Jang, Byung-Won. "Can Busan be a Cinema City?" *Film 2.0*, November, 28. 2005. [online] Available at www.film2.co.kr. (accessed on 18 May 2005).
- Jang, Ji-Tae. "Asian Week and PIFF Open in the Same Day." *Busa Ilbo*, August 28, 1996, 29.
- Jegal, Sooman. "Dark Clouds over PIFF." *Jeongookmael Shinmun*, October 10, 2005, 8.
- Jung, Hye-Jin. "The Last Witness' Fail to Deliver." *Korea Times*, November 17, 2001, 16.
- Jung, Kyung-Moon, "Peppermint Syndrome Changed Cinema Culture." *Hankook Ilbo* 11 February 2000. [online] Available at: <http://www.hankooki.com/> (accessed February 20, 2007).
- Jung, Sang-Do and Jin-Woo, Lee. "World Cinema is the Most Popular Section at PIFF." *Kookje Shinmun*, September 21, 1996, 13.
- Kang, Joon-Sang. "Defending Screen Quota but supporting APEC?" *Prometheus*, October 13, 2005. [online] Available at: <http://www.prometheus.co.kr/articles/107/20051013/20051013192600.html> (accessed September 10, 2007).
- Kang, Myung-Goo. "Decentralisation and the Restructuring of Regionalism in Korea: Conditions and Possibilities." *Korean Journal*, Summer (2003): 81-108.
- Karp, Ivan, Kreamer, Christine M., and Steven D. Lavine, eds. *Museums and Communities: The Politics of Public Culture*. Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992.

- Katzenstein, Peter J. "Regionalism and Asia." In *New Regionalisms in the Global Political Economy*, edited by Shaun Brelin et al. 104-118. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Kim, Chang-Bae. "PIFF's Economic Impact is 5.2 Million Won." *Hankook Ilbo*, October 7, 2004. [online] Available at: <http://news.hankooki.com/lpage/society/200410/h2004100721170043400.htm>. (accessed on 4 June 2007).
- Kim, Eun-Young. "PIFF Opens." *Busan Ilbo*, February 15, 1996, 1.
- . "Interview with Kim Dong-Ho." *Busan Ilbo*, August 16, 1996, 6.
- . "From Preparation to Opening." *Busan Ilbo*, September 13, 1996, 18.
- Kim, Ji-Seok. "PIFF Family." *Cine21*, October 7, 2005. [online] Available at: http://piff.cine21.com/2005/article_view.php?article_id=33980&mm=006005001.
- Kim, Jin-Kyung, and Lee, Jung-Ho. "PIFF Square." *Busan Ilbo*, September 21, 1996, 31.
- Kim, Joo-Young. "Festivals' Impact on Local Economy." *Maeil Kyungje Shinmun*, December 23, 1999, n.p.
- Kim, Kyung-Hyun. *The Remasculinization of Korean Cinema*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004.
- Kim, Myung-Hwan. "PIFF Opens." *Chosun Ilbo*, May 20, 1996, 19.
- Kim, Soo-Kyung. "Hae-an-seon." *Dong-A Ilbo*, November 21, 2002. [online] Available at: http://www.donga.com/fbin/output?code=Q__&n=200211210301.(accessed March 8, 2007).
- Kim, Soyong. "Cine-mania or Cinephilia: Film Festivals and the Identity Question." *UTS Review (Cultural Studies Review)*, vol. 4, no. 2 (1998): 174-187.

- . "Modernity in Suspense: Translation of Fetishism." In *The First Jeonju International Film Festival Symposium*, edited by Kim Soyoung, 83-90. Jeonju: JIFF, 2000.
- Kim, Su-Yun. "British Film Critic Pleased with Improved Facilities at PIFF." *Korea Times*, October 22, 1999, 12.
- Kim, Wang-Bae. "Regionalism: Its Origins and Substance with Competition and Exclusion." *Korean Journal* Summer (2003). [online] Available at: www.ekoreanjournal.net. (accessed on 3 March, 2007).
- Kim, Young-Jin. "Fantastic Shin Sang-Ok: A Legend in Korean Film in the '60s and '70s." In *the Tenth Puchon International Fantastic Film Festival Programme Booklet*, 146-149. Puchon: Tenth PiFan, 2006.
- Klinger, Barbara. *Beyond the Multiplex: Cinema, New Technologies, and the Home*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.
- Korean Film Database Book From 2000 To 2006*. Seoul: KOFIC, 2006.
- Krich, John. "Asia's Upstart Film Festival." *Asian Wall Street Journal*, April 20, 2000, 1-6.
- Kwak, Han-Ju. "Discourse on Modernization in 1990s Korean Cinema." In *Cinemas and Popular Media in Transcultural East Asia*, edited by Jenny Kwok Wah Lau, 90-113. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2003.
- Lavine, Steven D. and Ivan Karp, eds. *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*. Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991.
- Lee Dong-jin. "Toward the New Centre in Asia." *Chosun Ilbo*, November 10, 1997, 14.
- . "Sunsuhaettön kkum cha'cha 'twiro tora' [To Get the Innocent Dream Back, 'About-turn']." *Chosun Ilbo*, October 15, 1999, 35.

- Lee, Edmund. "Pusan Power." *Village Voice*, October 29, 1996, n.p.
- Lee, Eunjung. "Selection of Opening Film." *Kookje Shinmun*, September 14, 2004, 21.
- Lee, Hyang-Jin. "South Korea: Film on the Global Stage" In *Contemporary Asian Cinema*, edited by Anne Ciecko, 182-192. Oxford, New York: Berg, 2006.
- Lee, Hyuk-sang. ed. *10th Years' PIFF History*. Pusan: Tenth PIFF, 2005.
- . ed. *10 Years' Moment*. Photo Collection, Pusan: Tenth PIFF, 2005.
- Lee, Jin-Woo. "Pusankukje yŏnghwajŏ kuwŏl kaech'oe [PIFF Opens in September]." *Kookje Shinmun*, February 2, 1996, 21.
- Lee, Moon-Sup. "PIFF." *Busan Ilbo*, August 13, 1996, 5.
- Lee, Yong-Kwan and Sang-yong Lee, eds. *Yu Hyun-Mok: The Pathfinder of Korean Realism*. Pusan: Fourth PIFF. 1999.
- Lee, Yong-Kwan, Hur Moon-yung and Cho Young-jung and Park Do-Sin, eds. *Rediscovering Asian Cinema Network: The Decades of Co-Production Between Korean and Hong Kong*. Pusan: Ninth PIFF, 2004.
- Lee, Yong-Kwan and Sang-yong Lee, eds. *Kim Ki-young: Cinema of Diabolical Desire and Reason*. Pusan: Second PIFF. 1997.
- Lee, Young-Il. *The History of Korean Cinema: Main Current of Korean Cinema*, translated by Richard Lynn Greever, 75-82. Seoul: Motion Picture Promotion Corporation, 1988.
- Leong, Toh Hai. "Postwar Korean Cinema: Fractured Memories and Identity." *Kinema*, Fall (1996). [online] Available at: <http://www.arts.uwaterloo.ca/FINE/juhde/kfall96.htm>. (accessed June 10, 2006).
- Martin-Jones, David. *Deleuze, Cinema and National Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.

McGill, Hannah, and Pulver, Andrew. "World Cinema Special - Is Nigeria the New Japan?" *Guardian*, March 30, 2007, 9- 10.

McHugh, Kathleen and Nancy Abelmann, eds. *South Korean Golden Age Melodrama: Gender, Genre, and National Cinema*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2005.

Min, Eung-Jun. "Political and Sociocultural Implications of Hollywood Hegemony in the Korean Film Industry: Resistance, Assimilation, and Articulation." In *The Globalisation of Corporate Media Hegemony*, edited by Lee Artz and Yahya R. Kamalipour, 245-264. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003.

"Movie Lovers Get a Chance to Tour Pusan and Attend the Film Festival." *Korea Herald*, September 11, 1998, 10.

Nichols, Bill. "Discovering Form, Inferring Meaning: New Cinemas and the Film Festival Circuit." *Film Quarterly* 47, no. 3 (1994): 16-30.

"Obituary: Shin Sang-Ok, Film Director and Abductee, Died on April 11th, Aged 79," *The Economist*, April 27, 2006. [online] Available at: http://www.economist.com/people/displayStory.cfm?story_id=6849979. (accessed December 2, 2006).

Oh, Eun-Ha, and Sohn, Hong-Joo. "Pleased to See Korean Film Festival." *Hankyeorye Shinmun*, September 29, 1997, 15-17.

Oh, Young-Sook. "Imagination of Excess or Heresy" In *Kim Ki-young: Cinema of Diabolical Desire and Death*, edited by Yong-kwan Lee and Sang-yong Lee, 24-31. Pusan: Second Pusan International Film Festival, 1997.

Park, Eun-Ju. "Hüksusŏn: The Last Witness." *Hankook Ilbo*, November 13, 2001, 36.

Park, Young-Shin. "Why Bong Joon-ho Jumped up From the Chair to Say Something." *Ohmynews*, November 18, 2006. [online] Available at: http://www.ohmynews.com/articleview/article_view.asp?at_code=374048

(accessed November 28, 2006).

Paquet, Darcy. "The Korean Film Industry: 1992 to the Present." In *New Korean Cinema*, edited by Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer, 32-50. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005.

----- . "PPP Seminar: Advanced Widow Marketing." Festival Report. [online] Available at: <http://www.koreanfilm.org/piff05.html>. (accessed November 29, 2006).

Pearson, Roberta. "A White man's country: Yale's Chronicles of America." In *Memory and Popular Film*, edited by Paul Grainge, 23-41. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003.

"PIFF Count Down." *JoongAng Ilbo*, June 6, 1996, 21.

The Pusan International Film Festival (PIFF). Programme Booklets:
The First Pusan International Film Festival. Pusan, First PIFF, 1996.
The Second Pusan International Film Festival. 1997.
The Third Pusan International Film Festival. 1998.
The Fourth Pusan International Film Festival. 1999.
The Fifth Pusan International Film Festival. 2000.
The Sixth Pusan International Film Festival. 2001.
The Seventh Pusan International Film Festival. 2002.
The Eight Pusan International Film Festival. 2003.
The Ninth Pusan International Film Festival. 2004.
The Tenth Pusan International Film Festival. 2005.

The Pusan Promotion Plan Project (PPP) Booklets:
The First Pusan Promotion Plan. Pusan, Third PIFF. 1998
The Second Pusan Promotion Plan. Fourth PIFF, 1999
The Third Pusan Promotion Plan. Fifth PIFF, 2000.
The Fourth Pusan Promotion Plan. Sixth PIFF, 2001.
The Fifth Pusan Promotion Plan. Seventh PIFF, 2002.
The Sixth Pusan Promotion Plan. Eighth PIFF, 2003.
The Seventh Pusan Promotion Plan. Ninth PIFF, 2004.
The Eight Pusan Promotion Plan. Tenth PIFF, 2005.

- “Pusan Film Fest: Huge Success With Foreign, Local Movie Fans.” *Korea Herald*, October 20, 1997, 11.
- Pusan Jikhalsi Sa Pyeonchan Wiwonhyoe, *History of Pusan City: Pusan-si Sa*, vol.4. Pusan: Pusan Jikhalsi, 1991.
- Ranvaud, Don. “Italian Festivals.” *Framework*. 21 (1983): 54.
- Rayns, Tony. “Korea's New Wavers.” *Sight and Sound*. 4, no. 11 (1994): 22-5.
- . *Seoul Stirring: 5 Korean Directors*, London: Institute of Contemporary Arts, 1994.
- . “Sexual Terrorism: The Strange Case of Kim Ki-duk.” *Film Comment*. November-December (2004): 50-52.
- A Report on Final Accounts*. Unpublished Material. Pusan: Fifth PIFF, 2000.
- . Sixth PIFF, 2001.
- . Eighth PIFF, 2003.
- “A Review of Korean Film Industry During the First Half of 2005.” *Korean Film Observatory*. 16 (2005): 2-3.
- Sassen, Saskia. *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001, 2nd ed.
- Schitman, Jorge A. *Film Industries in Latin America: Dependency and Development*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publication, 1984.
- Segers, Frank. “Hae-an-seon.” *Moving Pictures*, November issue, 2002, n.p.
- Shiel, Mark and Tony Fitzmaurice, eds. *Cinema and the City*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.
- Shim, Sang-Kon. “Editorial: Film Festival in Pusan.” *Kookje shinmun*, February 6, 1996, 6.

- Shin, Chi-Yun and Julian Stringer, eds. *New Korean Cinema*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005.
- Shin, Jeeyoung. "Globalisation and New Korean Cinema." In *New Korean Cinema*, edited by Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer, 51-62. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005.
- Smith, Dorothy E. "Institutional Ethnography." In *Qualitative Research in Action*, edited by Tim May, 17-52. London: Sage Publication. 2002.
- Sohn, Jung-in. "Art or Law?" *Kukje Shinmun*, November 15, 2001, 3.
- . "Runaway was Banned." *Kukje Shinmun*, November 15, 2001, 1.
- . "Tokyo, Hong Kong Tensed, Pusan Is Going to Be a Mecca of Cinema." *Kookje Shinmun*, October 12, 2005, 21.
- Standish, Isolde. "Korean Cinema and the New Realism: Text and Context." In *Colonialism and Nationalism in Asian Cinema*, edited by Wimal Dissanayake, 65-89. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.
- Stephens, Chuck. "Pusan the Envelope: Film -festival Fever Seize South Korea's 'Hermit Kingdom' ." *LA Weekly*, November 7-13, 1997, n.p.
- Stringer, Julian. "Global Cities and the International Film Festival Economy." In *Cinema and the City*, edited by Mark Shiel and Tony Fitzmaurice, 134-146. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.
- . "Raiding the Archive: Film Festivals and the Revival of Classic Hollywood." In *Memory and Popular Film*, edited by Paul Grainge, 81-96. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003a.
- . *Regarding Film Festivals*. Ph.D. Thesis. Ann Arbor: UMI Dissertation Services. 2003b.
- . "Putting Korean Cinema in its Place: Genre Classifications and the Contexts of Reception." In *New Korean Cinema*, edited by Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer, 95-105, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005.

Sullivan, Maureen. "Pusan Focuses on Holding Back H'wood Onslaught." *Variety* October 10-26, 1997, n.p.

Swann, Paul. "From Workshop to Backlot: The Greater Philadelphia Film Office." In *Cinema and the City*, edited by Mark Shiel and Tony Fitzmaurice, 88-98. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.

Turan, Kenneth. *Sundance to Sarajevo: Film Festivals and the World They Made*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Vasudev, Aruna. "Pusan's Enthralling Show." *The Pioneer*, October 3, 1996, 11.

Wasson, Haidee. *Museum Movies: The Museum of Modern Art and the Birth of Art Cinema*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

Watts, Jonathan. "Korea to Lift Ban on Japan." *Hollywood Reporter*, October 6-12, 1998, n.p.

----- "Pusan Festival Perseveres." *The Hollywood Reporter*, October 2-4, 1998. n.p.

----- "Japan-Korea Team at Pusan." *Hollywood Reporter*, September 17-19, 1999, 16.

"What PIFF Left Behind." *JoongAngilbo*, September 23, 1996, 6.

Willemen, Paul. "Pesaro Film Festival." *Framework*. no. 14 (1981): 96-98.

----- "Rotterdam." *Framework*. no. 20 (1983): 41-44.

Wilson, Rob. "Melodrama of Korean National Identity: From *Mandala* to *Black Republic*." In *Melodrama and Asian Cinema*, edited by Wimal Dissanayake, 90-104. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Woods, Peter. "Collaborating in historical ethnography: researching critical events in education", *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 7, 4,(1994): 309-321

- Yang, Sung-Jin. "Pusan Film Festival to Strengthen Leading Position in Asia." *Korea Herald*, September 8, 2005. [online] Available at: www.koreaherald.co.kr/archives (accessed September 8, 2007)
- . "Quality Asian Films Await Movie Buffs" *Korea Herald*. October 1, 2005. [online] Available at <http://www.koreaherald.co.kr/archives> (accessed September 2, 2007).
- Yang, Yoon-Mo. "Olhae pŭrokŭraeming [This Year's Programming]." *Busan ilbo*, November 17, 2001, 26.
- Yi, Hyo-In, and Chong-Ha Lee, eds. *Korean New Wave: Retrospectives From 1980 to 1995*. Pusan: First PIFF, 1996.
- Yoo, Jae-hyuk. "PIFF Has Surpassed Thirty Years' Tokyo Film Festival in Just Ten Years." *The Korean Economy Daily (Hankook Kyungje Shinmun)*, September 25, 2005, 26.
- Yoon, Ja-Kyung. "PIFF, Looking for Sponsors." *Mael Kyungje Shinmun*, November 6, 2001, n.p.
- Yoon, Lina. "On Parade at Pusan." *The Wall Street Journal* [online] Available at: www.wsj.com. (accessed September 30, 2006).
- Yoshimoto, Mitsuhiro. "National/International/Transnational: The Concept of Trans-Asian Cinema and Cultural Politics of Film Criticism." In *The First Jeonju International Film Festival Symposium*, edited by Soyoung Kim, 61-69. Jeonju: JIFF, 2000.
- Zhang, Yingjin. *Screening China: Critical Interventions, Cinematic Reconfigurations, and the Transnational Imaginary in Contemporary Chinese Cinema*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002.

Websites

AFCNet. www.afcnet.org

APEC. www.apecsec.org
ASEAN. www.aseansec.org
Berlin Film Festival. www.berlinale.de
Busan Film Commission. www.bfc.or.kr
Cine 21. www.cine21.com
CineMart. <http://professionals.filmfestivalrotterdam.com/eng/cinemine/profile.aspx>
EFP. www.efp-online.com
FIAF. www.fiafnet.org
Gwangju Biennale. <http://universes-in-universe.de/car/gwangju/english.htm>
Gwangju International Film Festival. www.giff.or.kr
International Film Festival Rotterdam. www.filmfestivalrotterdam.com
Jeonju International Film Festival. www.jiff.or.kr
Korean Film Archive. www.koreanfilm.or.kr
Korean Film Council. www.kofic.or.kr
Korean Film Database. www.koreafilm.or.kr
NETPAC. <http://net-pac.net/>
Pusan International Film Festival. www.piff.org
Puchon Fantastic Film Festival. www.pifan.or.kr
Pusan International Film Festival. www.piff.org
Seoul Net Film Festival. <http://senef.net/senef>
The House of Kim Ki-young. www.knua.ac.kr/cinema
Vancouver Film Festival. www.viff.org

Personal Interviews

Elley, Derek (Senior International Film Critic of *Variety*, London)

----. London, January 10, 2003.

----. Karlovy Vary, Czech Republic, July 10 and 23, 2003.

----. London October 6, 2006

----. London, March 14, 2007

----. London, September 13, 2007.

Han, Sang-Jun (ex-Korean Programmer of PIFF and current Festival Director of PiFan), in Seoul, January 8, 2007

Han, Sun-hee (ex-Online Chief Editor of FILM2.0, Pusan), in Pusan, October 11, 2005.

Kim, Hye-Joon.(General Secretary of the KOFIC), in Seoul, October 8, 2005.
----. Pusan, October 10, 2005.

Lee, Yong-Kwan (PIFF Co-director, ex- Korean Programmer), in Seoul, South
Korea, January 4, 2007.

Park, Kwang-Su (Film Director/Director of BFC), in Seoul, January 6, 2006.

Tesson, Charles (former editor-in-chief of *Cahiers du Cinema*), in Paris, June 10
2003.

Email Communications

“Budget for Special Program and Retrospective (2000-2007).” Unpublished
Material. Kim Ji-Seok (Asian Programmer of PIFF). Personal Electronic
Mail Communication, June 28, 2007.

Thomas Jong-Suk Nam (Former Festival Coordinator at PIFF 1997-2004). Personal
Electronic Mail Communication, August 10, 2007.

Appendix 1. Film Festivals in East Asia

City (dates)	Founded	Number of Films	Total Attendance	World Premiere	Asian Premiere
Singapore (April, 2 weeks)	1988	190	65,000	1	3
Hong Kong (April, 2 weeks)	1977	250	103,000	8	0
Manila (July, 1 week)	1999	80	15,000	0	7
Fukuoka (July, 9 days)	1991	53	15,700	3	6
Bangkok (September, 10 days)	1998	52	22,000	3	9
Yamagata (October, 1 week)	1989	67	20,000	24	27
Pusan (October, 10 days)	1996	171	180,900	26	84
Tokyo (November, 9 days)	1988	146	116,400	13	24

* Figures for the year 1999. *Source: Asian Wall Street Journal, April 20, 2000.*

Appendix 2. PIFF Over a Decade

	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	6 th	7 th	8 th	9 th	10 th
Audience	184,071	170,206	192,547	180,912	181,708	143,103	167,349	165,102	166,164	192,970
Film	17	17	21	21	21	20	23	24	26	31
Country	31	33	41	53	55	60	55	61	63	73

Source : The Official Website http://www.piff.org/english/html/info_02.asp (accessed 15 May, 2006)

Appendix 3. Main Programme Sections of PIFF

Sections		Contents
1	A Window of Asian Cinema	A showcase of brand new and/or representative films by the talented Asian filmmakers with their diverse point of views and style
2	New Currents	The only international competition section featuring the first or the second feature films by the future leading directors of Asian cinema
3	Korean Panorama	A presentation of latest outstanding Korean films that will help grasping the current trends in Korean cinema
4	Korean Cinema Retrospective	Re-shedding on the history of Korean cinema by spotlighting the films by a certain notable director or a significant subject matter.
5	World Cinema	A presentation of new works by world's renowned filmmakers along with the year's best films that will help in understanding of the recent trend in world cinema
6	Wide Angle	A section dedicated in showing the outstanding short films, animation, documentary and experimental films presenting different and distinct vision via broader cinematic viewpoints
7	Open Cinema	A collection of new films, combining both art and mass popularity, along with internationally acclaimed works, are shown at the unique outdoor screening venue
8	Critic's Choice	Screening of films chosen by four renowned critics in an attempt to discover new film artists and engage in sincere aesthetic discourse with new cinema generation
9	Special Programme	A retrospective and/or a special showcase of films by a certain notable director or a genre

Source : The Official Website http://www.piff.org/english/html/info_02.asp (accessed February 10, 2006)

The order of the section's title in this table follows its original form.

Appendix 4. An Overview of the Tenth PIFF (October 6-14, 2005)

■ Opening Film : <i>Three Times</i> (Hou Hsiao-hsien)	
■ Closing Film : <i>Wedding Campaign</i> (Hwang Byung-kuk)	
■ Invited guests: 6,088 from 55 countries (excluding PPP & Press)	
■ New Currents Award : <i>Grain in Ear</i> (Zhang Lu, China) ■ Korean Cinema Award : Dieter Kosslic (director of the Berlin Festival) and Thierry Fremaux (Artistic Director of the Cannes Festival) ■ Asian Filmmaker of the Year: NHK (Japan Broadcast) Korean Cinema Retrospective; Lee Man-hee, the Poet of the Night	
■ Special Programmes	Re-mapping Asian Auteur Cinema 1; APEC Special Programme; Reunion of New Currents; Spotlight on British Cinema; Critics Choice; Industry Screenings; PIFF's Asian Pantheon.
■ The first Asian Film Academy (September 24 - October 14):	Co-hosted by the Korean Academy of Film Arts and Dongseo University (Director of AFA: Hou Hsiao-hsien)
The 8th PPP: October, 10-12, 2005	
1,100 participants from 320 companies of 30 countries; 27 official projects; 6 NDIF projects. Total of 600 official meetings	
<u>PPP Project Awards</u> ■ Busan Award : Lee Kwang-mo's <i>Fairy Tale of a Picture Tree</i> ; Thunskas Pansittivorakul and Sompot Chidgasornpongse's <i>Heartbreak Pavilion</i> ■ Kodak Award : Park Chan-ok's <i>Paju</i> ■ MBC Movies Award : Hong Ki-seon's <i>Broken Piece of Mirror</i> ■ Cineclick Asia Award: Siddig Barmak <i>Opium War</i> ■ BFC Award : Djamshed Usmonov's <i>To Get to Heaven First You Have to Die</i>	<u>NDIF Project Award</u> ■ LJ Films Award: Park Eun-young's <i>A Girl from 4th Dimension</i> ■ Barunson Award: Chung Hee-sung's <i>Stay with Me</i>

Source : The 10th PIFF official website (accessed September 12, 2007)

Appendix 5. PPP Project Accomplishments (1998-2005)

(project title/director/country)

The 1st PPP (1998) - 7 projects completed

The Student Spy / Hwang Chul-min / Korea
Thousand Dreams Such As These / Sudhir Mishra / India
The Road Taken / HONG Gi-sun / Korea
The Camel(s) / PARK Kiyong / Korea
Gojoe / Ishii Sogo / Japan
Lagarista / Mel Chionglo / Philippines
Platform / JIA Zhang Ke / China

The 2nd PPP (1999) - 12 projects completed

Unni / Murali NAIR / India
The Monkey / Aktan ABDYKALYKOV / Kyrgyzstan
Little Cheung / Fruit CHAN / Hong Kong
The Poet / Garin NUGROHO / Indonesia
Address Unknown / KIM Ki-duk / Korea
Betelnut Beauty / LIN Cheng-sheng / Taiwan
The Ballad of Love / Farhad MEHRANFAR / Iran
The Circle / Jafar PANAHI / Iran
The Paper / Ding Jiancheng / China
The Face / SAKAMOTO Junji / Japan
The Unforgettables / SHINOZAKI Makoto / Japan
The Beijing Bicycle / WANG XiaoShuai / China
Paradise in the City / Tang Danian / China

The 3rd PPP (2000) - 9 projects completed

Rice Rhapsody / Kenneth BI / Hong Kong
The Summer Palace / LOU Ye / China
Uniform / YINAN Diao / China
There Was Once A Time When / Viet Linh NGUYEN / Vietnam
Resurrection of the Little Match Seller / JANG Sun-Woo / Korea
All About Lily Chou-Chou / IWAI Shunji / Japan
Weekend Plot / ZHANG Ming / China
Mask de 41 / MURAMOTO Taishi / Japan
The Road / Darejan OMIRBAEV / Kazakhstan

The 4th PPP (2001) -11 projects completed

The Moon also Rises / LIN Cheng Sheng / Taiwan
Living Fish / Bakhtiar KHOUDOINAZAROV / Tajikistan
One Summer With You / Xie Dong / China
My Right to Ravage Myself / JEON Soo-Il / Korea
One Night Husband / Pampika TOWIRA / Thailand
Monrak Transistor / Pen-ek RATANARUANG/ Thailand
Cry Woman / LIU Bingjian / China
Oasis / LEE Chang-dong / Korea
Border Line / LEE Sang-il / Japan
Nothing to Lose / Danny PANG / Hong Kong, China
The Bow / KIM Ki-duk/ Korea

The 5th PPP (2002) - 11 projects completed

Story Undone / Hassan YEKTAPANAH / Iran
Woman is Man's Future / HONG Sangsoo / Korea
Coal Mine (Day and Night) /Wong Chao /China, France
Let the Wind Blow / Partho SEN GUPTA / India
The Floating Landscape / Carol LAI / Hong Kong
Osama / Sedigh BARMARK / Afghanistan-Iran
Three Times / HOU Hsiao- Hsien/Taiwan
The Texture of Skin /LEE Sung Gang/Korea
Gie / Riri RIZA /Indonesia
Dam Street / LI Yu/China
Starfish Hotel / John Williams / Japan, U.S.A

The 6th PPP (2003) - 4 projects completed

The Buffalo Boy (Mua Len Trau) / Minh NGUYEN-VO / Vietnam
Waiting for Nike /PANG Ho Cheung/Hong Kong
Loft / Kurosawa Kiyoshi / Japan
The Aggressives / JEONG Jae-Eun / Korea

The 7th PPP (2004) - 4 projects completed

Grain in Ear / ZHANG Lu / China, Korea
0430 / Roystone TAN /Singapore
Big River / Atsushi FUNAHASHI / Japan
Poet of the Waste / Mohammad AHMADI/Iran
Magdalena(Santa Santita) / Laurice GUILLEN /Philippines

The 8th PPP (2005) - 6 projects completed

Raised from Dust / GAN Xiao'er /China

Pure Coolness / Ernest ABDYJAPAROV /Kyrgyzstan

Tireless Mountain / KIM So-yong /Korea

Sakai's Happiness / Mipo O /Japan

3 Days Forever / Riri RIZA/ Indonesia

Butterfly /CHANG Tso-chi / Taiwan

Source: *The 8th PPP Projects* (Pusan: 10th PIFF, 2005), 16-19.

The official website of the PPP: <http://ppp.asianfilmmarket.org/eng/main.asp>
(accessed April 27, 2008)