# The Pusan International Film Festival, South Korean Cinema and Globalization

SooJeong Ahn

香港大學出版社
Hong Kong University Press

Hong Kong University Press
14/F Hing Wai Centre
7 Tin Wan Praya Road
Aberdeen
Hong Kong



ISBN 978-988-8083-58-9 *(Hardback)*
ISBN 978-988-8083-59-6 *(Paperback)*



British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed and bound by Liang Yu Printing Factory Ltd. in Hong Kong, China

# Contents

# Introduction

## Film Festivals between the National and the Regional in the Age of Globalization

This book examines an international film festival in South Korea, the Pusan International Film Festival (PIFF), 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, and identifies a series of self-definition processes it used 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.[2] 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.

In this book, I aim to address these gaps by specifically focusing on the 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 the PIFF's regional approach towards East Asia, synergized by the global visibility of South Korean cinema, displays a distinct agenda and sociocultural context different from that of Euro-American film festivals.

Moreover, the 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 festivals play in the global film economy. In addition to the roles conventionally associated with film festivals, namely exhibition and distribution,

this book uncovers the significant role festivals play in production by investigating the Pusan Promotion Plan (PPP), a project market run alongside the PIFF.[3] It is my contention that the PIFF provides a unique discursive site through which to understand the tensions and negotiations among cultural and economic forces locally, regionally, and globally.

The PIFF, Korea's first international film festival, is held annually in Pusan, a southeastern port and the second largest city in Korea. With a focus on Asian cinema, the PIFF has achieved enormous success since its inauguration on September 13, 1996, attracting huge local audiences—around 180,000 visitors per year—and receiving positive critical response from foreign participants.[4] Building upon this unanticipated success, the PIFF has become the leading international film festival in Asia, 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.[5]

It is widely believed that the PIFF's success coincides with an increased global interest in South Korean cinema.[6] 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.[7] Consequently, the evolution of the PIFF seems to be closely inter-related with the status of Korean cinema in the global economy.

Alongside the importance of the PIFF's intimate links with the national film industry, the festival's self-determined conceptualization and manipulation of an Asian identity in order to approach the global market provides a distinctive case study, as this systematic regional approach has not been evident in any other film festival. While the 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 more broadly as a showcase for Asian cinema in order to survive in a highly competitive global film market. I seek to explore this ambivalent combination of regional and national politics brought about by global forces.

The PIFF's unique regionalization strategy and its complex relationship with Korean and Asian cinema require serious consideration and raise important questions. As home to 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 the PIFF have to conceptualize a regional identity and actively build up industrial regional networks? How have the PIFF and the Korean film industry inter-related over the past decade? Why did the PIFF establish the PPP, a project market, and try to brand its products in the name of Asian cinema? Finally, how does the successful establishment of the PIFF help us understand the various facets of interaction among local, national, regional, and global forces? These specific research questions will be addressed in the following chapters.

This book seeks to shed new light on the worldwide phenomenon of film festivals by bringing the discussion of film festivals into a non-Western context. A proviso is necessary, however. By using the term "non-Western" here, I do not intend to lend credence to the binary division of the West versus the non-West. Countless scholars in cultural and media studies have pointed out the problems of this dichotomy. As Stuart Hall has argued, terms such as "the West," "the non-West," or "the Rest" are historically constructed notions embedded within global power relations.[8] Indeed, an irreflexive "West versus non-West" divide is too simple a way of approaching the issue. At the same time, however, this concept can still be used as a methodological tool to question such assumptions rather than to accompany and reinforce them. Thus, being aware of the problematic nature of this term, I will critically employ the notion of the "non-West" in this book to challenge and complicate the binary oppositions often produced in discourse surrounding film festivals. By concentrating on one film festival in a non-Western region, I will address the limits of previous accounts of film festivals and draw attention to hitherto unexplored aspects of this subject.

More than this, the reason I focus on the PIFF is not only because of the lack of previous work on non-Western film festivals, but also because it reflects wider changes both in Korean society and East Asia more generally. As will be argued in the following chapter, research on the PIFF also reveals the recent trend of film festivals that have begun to brand and promote world films via the festival circuit within the changing global cultural economy. For example, the emergence and development of the PIFF in the global film market is also related to the rise of non-American international film festivals in many parts of the world since the 1990s. Overall, my prime concern in this book is to show how the PIFF stands out from the wider panorama of film festivals, both in Asia and worldwide.

As this book cannot aim to address all aspects of film festivals, it targets instead 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, the PIFF can be more broadly seen as a representative case study of film festivals in Asia, as it demonstrates changing regional responses to economic and cultural globalization. At the same time, however, it stands out for its self-determined construction of regional identity and its distinctive ties to the fast-growing Korean film industry. The value of this research lies in its analysis of the diverse sides of contemporary film festivals, such as their economic viability and relations to national and regional film industries, through considering both typical and unique aspects of the PIFF.

## Critical Self-Positioning

This study initially evolved out of my own personal experience working at the PIFF. Having been employed by this organization between 1998 and 2002, following a career in the film industry, my knowledge of the 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 labor 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 the 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 the 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 book seeks to address these basic questions. By closely examining how the PIFF and the Korean film industry have coped with the impact of globalization 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, world cities, spatiality and temporality, to cultural industries and branding culture. Hence, this subject cannot be approached through one single dominant methodology. As Julian 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."[9] In the case of the PIFF, the use of an interdisciplinary approach helps disentangle the complex relationship between the national and regional film industries in the specific sociopolitical context of Korea and East Asia.

My research combines ethnographic investigation—including interviews, participation observation, and archival research—with textual analysis of primary materials. Through this, I seek to address a crucial gap in the existing largely theoretical scholarship on film festivals: a lack of empirically verified research methodologies. Rather than being fixed and self-contained, this book aims to follow the diverse, rapidly changing festival landscape by creatively employing a mobile, flexible, and interdisciplinary approach that draws upon writings on film festivals,

Korean cinema, East Asian studies, area studies, and cultural studies. In so doing, I am aware of the differing perspectives between Western and Korean literatures in examining the film festival phenomenon. In this respect, it is both a challenge and a benefit to be looking at a single non-Western film festival, as this means developing the debate on film festivals through a new critical paradigm.

In this research, ethnography is mainly composed of interviews between 2003 and 2007, and participation observation conducted during the fieldwork in Pusan for four months between September and December in 2005. This was during the tenth anniversary of the PIFF, as I will discuss in the final chapter. Rather than sketching a wide range of different people, my interviews focused on selected film professionals and were arranged to take an in-depth look at interviewees.[10] Personal one-to-one interviews were conducted in places such as Seoul and Pusan in South Korea, along with London, Paris, and Karlovy Vary.

There are three categories of interviewees in this book: international critics in academic journals and industrial magazines; professionals associated with the Korean film industry; as well as festival organizers and workers. The second group included Korean film journalists and those involved in policy making such as the general secretary of the Korean Film Council (KOFIC). However, due to fast shifts in the Korean film industry when conducting this research, the position of each interviewee often overlapped. For example, film director Park Kwang-su was interviewed not only as a former organizer of the PIFF but also as a founder of the Busan Film Commission (BFC). Therefore, this division was fundamentally intended to interpret each interviewee's attitude and perspective towards the Korean film industry and the 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 that examines how textual sequences coordinate consciousness, actions, and ruling relations.[11] This methodology preserves their presence as subjects rather than objects. Thus, the interviewees recognize that researchers are in the same world as that which 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."[12] They are more willing to open up to people with shared understanding. For example, had I not been regarded as a former member of the local film community, it would have been very difficult as an outsider to understand fully the circumstances. However, at the same time, due to my position as a former "insider," it was also a challenge to deal with the interviewees' skepticism towards my relationship with the PIFF. 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 the PIFF.

Participation observation was conducted during the fieldwork in 2005. From the opening night to the closing party, key programs and sidebar events were examined in detail for the final chapter of this book. Among a number of special events to celebrate the PIFF's tenth anniversary, I paid particular attention to two: the PPP seminar titled "Advanced Window Marketing" on October 11 at the Paradise Hotel Pusan, and the international conference "Asia/Cinema/Network: Industry, Technology, and Film Culture" held from October 11 to 13 at the Westin Chosun Pusan Hotel.[13]

Finally, archival research was one of the important methodologies that I conducted. In this study, it was appropriate, as one of my priorities was to use primary rather than secondary sources. It allowed me to gain a sense of reality about this project and better understand the topic.

My position as former staff and my industry-related background also provided me with more opportunities to get access to materials "hidden" from the public.[14] When starting this research in 2002, there were no actual archives in the offices of film festival organizing committees, including the PIFF, and film companies in Korea (which will be illustrated in Chapter 3 when discussing retrospectives at festivals). This meant archival materials were dispersed in several places or not organized at all. For example, around August every year, all staff in the PIFF's branch office in Seoul make the move into its headquarters in Haeundae, Pusan to prepare for the event. Furthermore, until the PIFF decided to give up the festival venues in the 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 meant that all the materials had to move around with the people who worked with them. In addition, researchers were not allowed to search the computers or bookshelves of film festival organizing committees. 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.

## Framing Film Festivals

Over the past two decades the number of film festivals has increased rapidly and become a global phenomenon. Their recent proliferation in non-Western regions deserves particular attention because it offers different contexts from existing prestigious film festivals in the West, such as Cannes, Berlin, and Venice. Despite its most visible emergence outside of the West in recent years, however, it is widely believed that the film festival is a Western invention.[15] Europe is considered the origins and "cradle" of film festivals. Apart from the Venice Film Festival under Mussolini in the 1930s, film festivals in Europe had been established within

the specific European geopolitical situation during the war: Cannes in 1946, Edinburgh in 1947, and Berlin in 1951. The Berlin Film Festival, for example, was established as an outpost of postwar culture sanctioned by the occupying Allied forces in West Berlin, who were rebuilding it as a new cultural center.

In mapping film festivals in this region, however, it is important to point out how they are influenced by and closely tied to Hollywood in complicated ways. We see this not only from the fact that the Berlin Film Festival was initially supported by America, but also in the presence of Hollywood stars and glamour in Cannes.[16] Yet, for decades, Cannes has remained the most prestigious venue for the *auteur*, as a center of a new alliance against Hollywood products.

Outside western Europe, the Sundance Film Festival devoted to independent films was founded in 1978 in the United States. In Asia, the Hong Kong Film Festival has played an important role in showcasing Asian cinema to the West since 1977, while festivals in urban global cities such as Tokyo (1985), Singapore (1987), and Shanghai (1993) had been subsequently established. In the late 1990s, in particular, a cluster of international film festivals in South Korea had almost concurrently been launched in Pusan, Puchon, Seoul, and so forth.

While the origins of "major" film festivals are marked by urban regeneration projects after the Second World War and during the postwar period, it is distinctive that such events staged outside Europe have been organized under the forces of economic and cultural globalization since the 1990s. For example, the global emergence of film festivals in Asia, such as the Pusan and Singapore film festivals, is closely related with Asia's position in the international economy and the rise of "Asian cinema" in the global film industry since the 1990s.[17] In this context, mapping film festivals in East Asia, for example, is key to understanding the forces and transformation of ongoing globalization in the region. It is widely agreed that decentered cultural globalization has prompted the shift from an emphasis on center-periphery relations to a diffusion of cultural power. This point is particularly pertinent to the film festival phenomenon. As such events can be found scattered around the world, it raises the question of whether or not it is still possible to pinpoint exactly where its center is.[18] It also helps extend the boundary of the discussion of intraregional cultural flows and consumption in the region, as will be argued in this book.

With the proliferation of film festivals, the structure of the festival world has substantially transformed over the past two decades within a highly competitive global cultural economy. For instance, festivals vie with each other for the limited number of films produced in the annual festival calendar.[19] Furthermore, their functions in relation to the global film industry have become more influential and expansive at the levels of exhibition, distribution, and even production.

Despite its importance in global film culture and industry, little scholarly work on film festivals was produced until the 1990s, at a time when their worldwide

proliferation was becoming increasingly visible. The majority of earlier studies 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. 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-centered 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.

Earlier work on film festivals largely tended to focus on the issue of discovering 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*.[20] Under the influence of the Pesaro Film Festival in Italy, which had introduced new cinema from Latin America, these critics began to recognize 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 into a focused critical study of film festivals.

More recently, however, there has been a growing interest in film festivals, and it can be divided into three main areas based on the focus of this book. The first is concerned with the ways in which film festivals are framed by the idea of the national, while the second concerns the relationship between globalization and film festivals, particularly by focusing upon festival space—cities—with different levels. The third looks at film festivals from a regional rather than national perspective.

## Film Festivals and the National

Historically, film festivals have been discussed predominantly in conjunction with the notion of the national. This is partly because the emergence of film festivals was closely aligned with regeneration projects focused 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.[21] It is widely believed that film festivals have served as "a kind of parliament of national cinema" or an Olympics of films, comprised of host and participant nations.[22] 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 in film and media studies have tried to address this close but complex relationship between film festivals and the concept of the "national." 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.

In his 1994 article, "Discovering Form, Inferring Meaning: New Cinemas and the Film Festival Circuit," Bill 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.[23]

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 recognizes 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."[24]

While Nichols explores the process of acknowledgement of new titles from (mostly, non-Western) "others" circulated at Western film festivals as aesthetic texts, this book is more concerned with how this particular process of discovery unfolds as a result of institutional intervention and can therefore be maneuvered at diverse levels. In other words, I focus 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 Julian Stringer points out, film festivals are *situated* sites.[25] In this context, Nichols' reading of the festival circuit leaves little room for explaining how films are shown at non-Western film festivals. This book 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, I suggest that the particular exhibition arrangements and subsequent reception histories of Korean cinema at its own film festival—the PIFF—in South Korea is different from that which is likely to be experienced at Cannes or Tokyo.

The process of discovering new cinemas at film festivals is also highlighted in an article by Dudley Andrew, who 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."[26] 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. 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.[27]

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. Despite the difference in approaching the film festival, obviously, both Nichols and Andrew look at film festivals within the national framework. Nichols also alludes to new films which are "discovered" by Western festivals, and therefore can be conceptualized as representative of distinct national cinemas.

In his 2002 book, *Screening China*, Yingjin Zhang critically analyzes Western influences on Chinese film production—the Fifth Generation films—through the international film festival circuit.[28] 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. 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.[29]

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."[30] 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" recognizable 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 festivals 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 the 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, it is worth looking at Chris Berry's writing on the relationship between Korean cinema and its international recognition through the film festival circuit. 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 "Korean Retrospective" program at the 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."[31]

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."[32] According to Berry, Kim's unique, distinctive style fits the critical organization of the international art-house circuit, which seeks films by *auteur* directors with a noticeable style and national distinctiveness.[33] 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 book takes Berry's argument in a slightly different direction. Although he presents the example of Kim Ki-young's reception at the PIFF, rather than at Western film festivals, his observations are based on the reception of Western audiences who participated in this event. Hence, the PIFF itself is not considered as the specific exhibition context within Berry's work. This means that culturally and locally specific arrangements, which can affect 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 book. This research is more concerned with understanding the PIFF, rather than Korean cinema itself. It explores how the PIFF attempts to frame the local, regional, and global reception of Korean cinema by using various institutional arrangements such as programming politics and promotional strategies. More specifically, I look at the PIFF as

both a mediator of and a prime showcase for Korean cinema in the global market. In this context, the position of the 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.[34]

A few years on after this observation was made, the 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 I explore is how the PIFF is engaged with this newfound global attention on regional, national, and international levels.

In understanding the relationship between a national industry and its associated festival, Liz Czach's work on the Toronto Film Festival and the Canadian film industry is helpful.[35] 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.[36] 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 inter-relation with its national film industry. I will explore these issues in detail as they relate to the PIFF in Chapter 3.

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 not discussing 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 the PIFF and the film festival phenomenon in general.[37] 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 globalization. He claims that "our current era seems to feature *both* rising economic globalization and rising political nationalist tensions."[38] 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."[39] 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."[40]

Modifying Berry's framework, I claim that film festivals can be a crucial means to reveal the tension, contradiction, and negotiation between the global, the regional, the national, and the local. Particularly, I focus upon the very relationship between the regional and the national in terms of the strategic uses of the regional and its tension with the national by specifically looking at the PIFF's case. 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 regional, the global, and the local are also permeated throughout the contemporary dynamics of film festivals as they operate within the forces of economic globalization, as well as transnational finance and technologies. Within this context, I define the PIFF as a discursive space wherein the ambivalences of the relationship between the national and regional appears in conjunction with the impact of economic and cultural globalization in this region. For example, regionalization and expansionism are distinctive modalities apparent in the PIFF that have accompanied the global spread of film festivals over the past decade. Furthermore these two tendencies demonstrate the 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.

In exploring the specific national context in this respect, Korean scholar Kim Soyoung's argument on film festivals is significant in reading the phenomenon encompassed by the rise of film festivals in Korea in the late 1990s. 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."[41] 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.[42] 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 globalization and economic liberalization launched with the establishment of the civil government in 1991.[43] 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, the 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.[44]

Kim's argument provides a crucial clue to understanding the cultural politics of contemporary Korean society, especially to acknowledging the complicated structure of articulation working through the various film festivals, and to exploring the issue of globalization in Korea. Her perceptive reflection on film festivals within the historical, sociopolitical context of Korea pioneered a critical analysis of non-Western film festivals that had not previously been systematically studied.

According to Kim, there are three categories of film festivals in South Korea: 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 Festival, Human Rights Film Festival, and the Queer Film Festival which have been organized 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, which was a crucial moment for the nation in terms of its social formation and redefinition of self.

> 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.[45]

Following her categorization and mapping of film festivals layered onto an understanding of Korean cultural politics in the 1990s, Kim aptly points out that the importance of the PIFF lies in its geopolitics.[46] Overall, her argument about the 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 some questions. The categorization 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 Kim's original investigation in the late 1990s, there are inherent limitations in her theory's ability to fully explain the current variety of film festivals with only these definitions and categorizations. For instance, the Women's Film Festival, which was a minor festival organized by feminist activists at the time of its launch in the 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 public. Despite receiving relatively less financial support, the Human Rights Film Festival has also differentiated itself from other local film festivals by focusing on human rights issues with a clear festival identity. The initial identities and sociopolitical aims of both film festivals seem to have become diluted over time, as they became increasingly well-established in Korea and well-received by audiences, funding bodies, and the media.

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. In looking at the PIFF from this perspective, this research does not limit its scope to Korea. Rather, to effectively elucidate the whole process of cultural globalization in this region, including Korea, the book is concerned with the PIFF in the East Asian context of historical, political, and cultural globalization.

## Globalization and Film Festivals: Global Cities

Discourses on film festivals have been prompted by the rise of the global circulation of media and dramatic transformations of technology within global capitalism. Most of the work seems to rely on theories of globalization, 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 respectively.

Although Appadurai's work does not directly speak to the phenomenon of film festivals in particular, his 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."[47] His 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, the PIFF's reliance on a strategy of regionalization 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 theorized by Appadurai.

Amongst existing work on film festivals, Julian Stringer's arguments perceptively map out many of the key roles of film festivals on a global scale by considering the spatial relationships and organizational logics of festivals. His article, "Global Cities and the International Film Festival Economy," introduces 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.[48] He 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."[49]

It is significant that Stringer contextualizes 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. He also outlines a common strategy amongst many festivals to market and project a city's own "festival image" within the global space economy.[50]

In explicating the logic of film festivals by focusing on "location," Stringer's emphasis on cities can be incorporated with Michael Curtin's notion of "media capital." Curtin argues how a specific location contributes to the operation of the media capital by facilitating: accumulation of the capital, creative migration, and forces of sociocultural variations.[51] According to Curtin, the spatial dynamics of media capital have played a structuring role in the film and media industries since the early twentieth century. He writes:

> Cities such as Cairo, Mumbai, and Hong Kong lie across significant cultural divides from their Hollywood counterparts, which helps to explain why producers in these cities have been able to sustain distinctive product lines and survive the onslaught of a much more powerful competitor.[52]

As he argues, the concept of media capital helps explain why some places become centers of cultural production and therefore tend to be more influential in shaping the emerging global system.[53] For instance, the logic of accumulation is useful in explaining that the film and media industry has tended to redeploy its creative

resources and reshape its terrain of operations in order to survive competition and enhance profitability.[54] The dynamics of agglomeration can provide a useful framework to read the current trend in film festivals and cultural industries more broadly. Many contemporary film festivals are compelled to seek efficiencies through the extension of markets in order to survive, as will be seen in the tenth anniversary of the PIFF in Chapter 5.

While the PIFF has attempted to become a sustainable cultural cluster at the local and regional levels, it has also tried to broaden its roles and diversify its functions so as to effectively cope with the transformations of the global/local economy. For example, one of the significant new roles that festivals have begun to play in the global film industry is producing talents through various education programs such as the Asian Film Academy (AFA).[55] As the migration of creative labor to a place enhances its attraction to other talents (which, in this case, may include audiovisual industries), film festivals are reliant on creativity as a core resource and began to pay special attention to pools of labor.[56] Curtin describes: "patronage drew artists to specific locales and often kept them in place for much of their working lives, and they, in turn, passed their skills along to succeeding generations and to newly arrived migrants."[57] In this context, by establishing education programs, festivals can act as a powerful attraction to those who aspire to make films in the region and the world. Thus, in order to adapt to shifting global circumstances, each festival should maintain its infrastructure for organizational learning, even with massive infusions of capital or government subsidies.[58]

Moreover, in the case of the PIFF, the operation of media capital—specifically, forces of social variations such as government regulation and policies—has acted as an influential enabler that fostered the festival's growth in Pusan, South Korea, in the late 1990s. Within this context, I examine how the PIFF uses its particular location—the city of Pusan—geopolitically, economically, and culturally, and discuss how it has tried to link its distinctive festival image to the city's image in order to remain competitive in the global market.

Argument about the importance of cities as nodal points also enables us to include the larger context of a festival's 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 centers (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.[59] This suggests that film festivals and notions of the national are interacting with each other in more complicated ways than previously imagined. Therefore, as this topic should be reconsidered from a new direction, I approach it 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 a consideration of the PIFF's programming politics and film markets.

By drawing on globalization discourses of "spatial effect" and "cultural flow" from Castells and Appadurai, Janet Harbord attempts to conceptualize film festivals in the disjunctions between the festival as marketplace and as a forum of aesthetic evaluation. 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."[60] 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.[61]

Harbord's argument 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 coexist. On the other hand, her contextualization 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. From this perspective, festivals effectively "enclave a film, seal it off from general release and, further, restrict it to circulation among and between festivals."[62]

In addition, 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 festival sites. Although Harbord's investigation of the role of journalism and media at festival sites, which up until now has been relatively overlooked, helps to extend the critical discussion to the cultural and industrial dimensions of festivals, her analysis on media and journalism needs to be further explored. 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, with the growing importance and increasing visibility of journalists and media representatives at film festivals over recent years, a hierarchical categorization has been created for their accreditation,[63] and their activities seem to be more and more institutionally controlled and negotiated. Although Harbord emphasizes the close ties 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 industry professionals, including film critics, trade magazine journalists, and sales agents and distributors, the process of festival participation—from registration, traveling 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 practice. Working practices in the industry are thus also very much shaped to follow the annual festival calendar. Although this book 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 the PIFF.

## Film Festivals and the Regional

> "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. 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".[64]

On its tenth anniversary in 2002, the PIFF succinctly outlined and attempted to justify its ambivalent stance between Korean and Asian cinema. The above speech suggests how the PIFF sees itself: a crossover between Asian and Korean films. This observation provides the key to understanding contradictions and tensions in positioning the festival in national and regional contexts. Obviously, by making "Asian identity" a key concept to promote the festival, the PIFF fashioned itself as a regional "hub" that appealed to the global film market. Why has the PIFF tried to construct a regional identity so as to be a "hub" of Asian cinema? How do we account for the PIFF's regional approach in the increasingly competitive global economy? What does it mean in a wider context? Unlike the national perspective, the significance of regional frameworks in looking at film festivals has not been profoundly explored in film and media studies. The critical recognition of the regional tends to be 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 Asia. In attempting to address these gaps and questions above, it is necessary to interrogate the development of the idea of the region in Asia and analyze how this

process of conceptualization is related to the PIFF's efforts to build a regional hub to promote the festival.

The term "Asia" has been used ambiguously both as a geographical location and a symbolic destination. The fact that differences exist among Asian nations in social, political, economic, and cultural backgrounds, especially in language, ethnicity, and religion, is often overlooked in discussing the concept of Asia. Importantly, the definition of Asia can be read as "an artefact of Asian reaction to Western colonialism."[65] As Leo Ching notes:

> Asia is neither a cultural, religious or linguistic unity, nor a unified world. The principle of its identity lies outside itself, in relation to (an) Other. If one can ascribe to Asia any vague sense of unity, it is that which is excluded and objectified by the West in the service of its historical progress. Asia is, and can be one, only under the imperial eyes of the West.[66]

In the same vein, Ching suggests that Pan-Asianism must be understood as a historically constructed idea, which is "'invented' or 'imagined' in direct opposition to another putative unity of the West," rather than "a self-reflexive realization based on any genuine culture commonality."[67]

Koichi Iwabuchi also discusses Japanese cultural power in Asia and the Japanese discursive construction of Asia in relation to the rest of the Asian nations and the West. 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."[68] 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 he discusses.

It is widely argued that recent regionalism and regionalization phenomena were driven by globalization. However, the debates on regionalism in relation to Asia tend to focus on particular economic, political, and security issues. Cultural aspects of regionalism in relation to globalization in Asia have been relatively neglected in academic discourses. Indeed, the concept of "the region" is helpful to explicate the complex relationship between the global and the local, which stand as an "ongoing cultural negotiation" rather than as a binary opposition.[69] In this respect, while regionalism has been driven by globalization 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."[70] In this sense, globalization and regionalization are "complementary processes."[71] Emphasizing the "constitutive" relationship between globalization and regionalization, Ching further suggests today's regionalist

formations—commercialized popular culture—is radically different from earlier imperialistic high culture of the 1930s.[72] According to him, this shift in discussing Asianism has prompted some structural and historical changes in the ways Asia is perceived as "both a mode of production and a regime of discursive practice" in the Japanese imaginary.[73] As he explains:

> If the earlier Asianism was conditioned on the unequivocal difference between Asia and the West, where Asia existed as the absolute other to the increasingly colonized world system—its exterior—in today's Asianism that difference itself exists only as a commodity, a spectacle to be consumed in a globalized capitalist system precisely at the moment when exteriority is no longer imaginable."[74]

In the wake of this mass cultural Asianism, today's Asia has become a market and "Asianness" has become a commodity circulating globally through late capitalism, as he suggests.[75] Under conditions of globalizing market forces, both the nation and the region can be reified as brands at the same time as they operate—often at cross-purposes—as political and ideological forces.[76]

It is widely argued that decentered cultural globalization has prompted the shift from an emphasis on center-periphery relations to a diffusion of cultural power. This point is particularly important in accounting for Asian regionalism as this helps extend the boundary of the discussion of intraregional cultural flows and consumption in Asia. Referring to decentering globalization processes, Iwabuchi explains the rise of Japanese cultural power through which the Japanese conception of being "in but above" or "similar but superior to" the region is rearticulated.[77] While admitting the power asymmetry between Japan and other Asian nations, he claims that it may be wrong to simply consider Japanese spread of culture as unidirectional—a straightforward economic and cultural domination of Asia by Japan. Although it is uneven, transnational media and cultural flow in Asia becomes more multilateral, as he points out.[78] For example, it is a sense of coevalness that Taiwanese favorable consumption of Japanese popular culture is sustained by. Thus, it is important to consider such difference and rupture in consuming and perceiving Asian cultural products—between a sense of coevalness and a sense of nostalgia that Taiwanese drama invokes to Japanese audience, for instance—in properly understanding the regionalism in Asia.[79]

Indeed, it has become culture—popular and media culture, in particular—that transcends national borders and constitutes regional identity. Various approaches to the re-labeling 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. Within this context, the current emphasis on culture in East Asia closely relates with the logic of market functionalism or corporatism in constitut-

ing the concept of Asia as a region.[80] In other words, the economic role of culture in the construction of the region becomes normative goals in East Asia.[81]

Viewed from this angle, the PIFF's recent drive to be a representative of Asia shows how film festivals today tend to change their approaches to the global market. In this context, the PIFF's regionalization strategy requires particular recognition at multiple levels.

First, the PIFF's self-assertion of being a hub in the region was prompted by both the recent rapid growth of cultural industries and the economic-oriented globalization in South Korea. As argued by Kim Soyoung, the rise of film festivals in Korea in the 1990s is closely linked with the issue of globalization, *Segyehwa*. In addition to analyzing Korean cultural politics in the 1990s, Kim briefly delineates the development and promotion of a regional identity as a strategic concept of film festivals, using the PIFF's vision of an Asian identity as an example:

> Evoking its geographic proximity to the rest of Asia, Pusan claims the region as its main focus. The highlighted programme 'A Window on Asian Cinema' is an attempt to locate the city of Pusan as a new focus for Asian cinema in competition with the Hong Kong and Tokyo international film festivals. With rising interest in the Asian region, and North-East Asia in particular, Pusan selectively promotes Asian identity to reach out towards the global.[82]

The particular regional identity promoted by this program—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. In this respect, it is global forces that have both promoted the regional identity and caused tensions between the regional and the national identity. Globalization in this particular sense seems to influence the trend of regionalization that is inter-related to the recent growth in cultural exchange at the regional level. For example, while national 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).[83]

Second, the PIFF's regionalization presents its most dynamic link to globalization as its initiatives are driven by "the city." The festival combines a regional identity with the civic identity of Pusan and simultaneously attempts to integrate the festival image into the region of Asia. The festival's approach recognizes the multi-dimensional process of globalization while at the same time it reinforces ties with the national and local economy. In other words, as the following chapter will argue, PIFF's regionalization drive interacts with other approaches at the local and the national level on two fronts: urban regeneration and global networks.

It is important to note that rapid growth of modern Asian cities is linked with Asian regionalism. Iwabuchi stresses on the role of the globalized capitalist

modernity which was significant in exploring the meaning of being Asian in the 1990s. According to him, it is between urban places, between global cities such as Tokyo, Seoul, Hong Kong, Taipei, and Shanghai that propelled today's Asian interconnections being forged by the flows of commercialized popular culture.[84] The emergence of the PIFF in the city of Pusan as a cultural, global city in a particular period of the 1990s in Asia can be explained in a similar context.

The 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. Significantly, 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 globalization, 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.[85] In this sense, the PIFF's urban regeneration project is interlinked with its global networks strategy which was simultaneously carried out. In order to differentiate itself from the Hong Kong and the Tokyo Film Festivals, the 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 programs: the Hong Kong-Asia Film Financing Forum (HAF) and the Tokyo Film Creators' Forum. In short, the particular process of regional approach shown at the PIFF and Pusan corroborates the argument that globalization is a complex, dynamic coexistence of overlapping and contradictory modes at local, national, and regional levels.

Third, the PIFF's regionalization shows its inevitable contradiction in approaching the national and the global. Despite the deliberate elusion of the national, the festival's exploitation of the regional inherently reveals its national attachment. Ching situates the prevalence of regional discourse in Asia within global capitalism and brings the issue of contradiction whose nature exists within capitalism itself to explicate the complicated relations between the national and the regional. According to him, the contradiction is "between the immanent logic of capital and its historical manifestations, because of the processes of imperialism, colonialism, and decolonization, circumscribed it within the nation form."[86]

This observation also indicates the contradictory position where the PIFF stands. To put it differently, whilst Pusan and the PIFF both have long desired to position themselves beyond the nation-state of South Korea, and establish a regional identity to cross the national boundary, they have also deliberately

attempted to boost the national film industry. The concept of Asia that the PIFF has struggled to establish was materialized through placing a priority on Asian films in programming and launching a pre-market 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 national film industry that had been growing and changing, as will be considered in the following chapters. As a result, the PIFF had to give a privileged position to national films in key programming sections and created an exclusive smaller section for national projects in the PPP.

Furthermore, the 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. According to 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."[87] Indeed, since the 1990s it has been widely argued that throughout East 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."[88]

As Julian Stringer points out, the historical backdrop of all major festivals suggests that film festivals may reinforce the continuation of the nation-state system.[89] The PIFF's regionalization strategy through the redevelopment of Pusan shows a different process and context from other major European festivals after the post-war period since the leading actor was the local initiative existing beyond nationally orchestrated propaganda. From this perspective, it is useful to consider how European cinema and European film festivals are inter-related, and how their relationship has affected the position of the regional in the global film culture.

Thomas Elsaesser explains European cinema's renewed global position and linkages with other parts of the world through the film festival circuit within the regional perspective. 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 both the cultural and industrial dimensions of film festivals in European contexts. 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."[90] He argues that although film festivals have always been recognized as fundamental to European cinema, their crucial relation with the author, national cinema, and hostility to Hollywood, which are the three most significant issues for a new understanding of European cinema, has rarely been investigated.[91]

Elsaesser tries to link the thriving festival circuit with the current status of European cinema faced by renewed competition from Hollywood and the challenges posed to national cinemas. He tries to challenge the existing binary perception of Hollywood as a cultural and economic threat to the European film industries by suggesting European cinema has always been in dialog with Hollywood even though the exchange of ideas has often been asymmetrical.[92] Despite his new approach to the relationship between Hollywood and Europe, however, he clearly admits that Hollywood, also referred as Europe's "bad other," still continues to occupy Europe's cultural imaginary. The contemporary cross-border collaboration in filmmaking in Europe such as the European Documentary Network (EDN) can be proof of shared economic concerns born of an "ingrained anti-Americanism" and designed to defy Hollywood's dominance.[93]

Apart from the regional perspective in festival context, one of the benefits of this approach is to help explain some background of the rise of non-American film festivals since the 1990s in terms of branding and promoting world films as an alternative network and a new alliance against Hollywood products. It is noticeable that Elsaesser attempts to look at festival networks to explain "the new topographies of cinema in Europe" by developing Bruno Latour's "actor-network-theory."[94] For him the significance of film festivals lies in when it is seen as a network (with nodes, flows, and exchanges). Viewed from this angle, it is in the non-Hollywood sector that film festival-aided distribution, marketing, exhibition, and even production have emerged as one of the most distinctive features of the global film industry since the 1990s.

For example, as I will discuss in Chapter 4 on the PPP, more festivals outside of America—notably in Europe and East Asia—have established film project and/or co-production markets for promoting and branding national/transnational films such as the co-production markets in the Berlin, Locarno, Rotterdam, and Hong Kong film festivals. In this context, it can be argued that the rise of non-American film festivals since the 1990s can be seen as a counter-movement in responding to the worldwide domination of US cultural products. These festivals located outside of Hollywood have been trying to brand their products as world cinema via film festival networks, "face to face" with Hollywood. Like Pusan, claiming strong regional identity, the Pan-African Film Festival of Ouagadougou (FESPACO) in Burkina Faso also reflects this aspect.[95]

## Conclusion: Voices from Industry

So far, I have contextualized various academic discussions on film festivals, particularly from the national and the regional perspectives and sought to demonstrate there are complicated, ambivalent, and multi-layered factors in reading the rapid growth of film festivals in Asia in the light of decentering globalization. By

examining the establishment and development of the PIFF between 1996 and 2005, this research aims to demonstrate how and why the PIFF has used its Asian identity as its most visible marketing strategy to differentiate itself from its counterparts, such as the Hong Kong and Tokyo film festivals. In conjunction with the festival's strong industrial drive within regional film industries, the book also considers the complexities brought by the rapid transformation of the South Korean film industry that has sought to reach out to the global film market since the late 1990s. As illustrated, in exploring the PIFF's evolution, its particular relationship with the Korean film industry that initially helped the festival rise to global prominence is crucial.

In closing, to illuminate this point, I will draw voices from industry. Aside from academic research, which is often late in reflecting what is currently going on in film industries, voices from industry are helpful in filling gaps which academic research can sometimes overlook. As a non-scholarly but insightful participant-observer account of festivals, the writings of Derek Elley deserve specific mention in order to highlight the politics of film festivals in the East Asian context.[96] In particular, his 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:[97]

> 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.[98]

## Chapters

This book comprises five chapters. Chapter 1, "Why Pusan?: The Political Economy of a Film Festival" closely examines the PIFF's establishment in 1996 and its subsequent evolution across the following decade. The chapter seeks to demonstrate and understand how and why the PIFF has constructed and used its

Asian identity as its most visible marketing strategy, thus bringing to light a series of regional self-definition processes that the festival has used to differentiate itself from its regional counterparts in, for example, Hong Kong and Tokyo. While the first half considers the successful establishment of the PIFF in Pusan as the result of the motivated interests of different groups within the specific social, political, and economic context of South Korea, the second half of the chapter shows how the PIFF conceptualized and manipulated the notion of regionalization so as to be competitive in the rapidly changing global film market. In this chapter, I further explore the 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 the PIFF's formulation of regionalization, Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 specifically examine festival programming. Chapter 2, "Negotiating a Place between Korean Cinema and Asian Cinema: Programming Politics," analyzes 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 an 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.

Chapter 3, "Re-Imagining the Past: Programming Retrospectives," argues that similar to how the PIFF positioned contemporary Korean and Asian cinema in programming, it 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, I demonstrate how the PIFF sought to play a key role in sanctioning old films made in Korea as a legitimate agent of memory, while highlighting old Asian films in an attempt to justify its 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 4, "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 PPP, a project market in which new Asian feature film projects can seek co-financing and co-production partners, I argue 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 the PIFF's regionalization strategy was ultimately furthered and achieved by the PPP.

In Chapter 5, "Remapping Asian Cinema: The Tenth Anniversary in 2005," I examine the 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. I illustrate the PIFF's focus on Asian identity by investigating key special events and programs 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 programs such as Asian Pantheon, Remapping Asian Auteur Cinema 1, and Special Screening for APEC Films further testify to the PIFF's desire to act as a critical hub in the Asia region. Paying particular attention to the AFA, a new education program which aimed to serve as a nodal point between the critical and industrial levels, I argue that the PIFF's strategic arrangement of diverse audience-friendly public events reflects the festival's awareness of its changing relationship with local audiences.

In conclusion, I summarize my findings and refocus attention on the relationship between the national and the regional. Then, I suggest research on the PIFF furthermore reflects on shifting dynamics of cultural industries in the region. Pondering on how the successful establishment of the PIFF helps us understand the various facets of interaction among local, national, regional, and global forces, this final chapter ends with a reflection on the prospects of the PIFF in a broader context.

# Notes

## Note to Reader

1. Although I have tried to provide the exact page number(s) of newspaper reports, this has not always been possible because of complicated research processes.
2. KOFIC published this book in order to establish and promote the consistent listing of Korean film titles and names of directors and actors in English. The system used in this publication is identical with the rules of the Revised Romanization in 2000.

## Introduction: Film Festivals between the National and the Regional in the Age of Globalization

1. Hereafter abbreviated to PIFF. Following the revision of the Korean Romanization system in 2000, "Pusan" became "Busan." However, the festival committee decided to retain "Pusan," hence "PIFF" rather than "BIFF." Since February 24, 2011, when this book has been finalized, the official festival name was finally changed to "Busan International Film Festival" from "Pusan International Film Festival." The festival explained it is because there has been constant confusion with the names between the city and the festival. Upon the decision, "Pusan Promotion Plan" was also changed to "Asian Project Market."

   In this book, however, "Pusan" is used for two reasons. Firstly, this book focuses upon a decade (1996–2005) when this festival was PIFF. Secondly, it is significant to this research that the festival tried to keep its own name under any (political) circumstances for ten years after the revision. This point closely links to the key argument of this book. Therefore, I use Pusan (name of the city) and PIFF to be consistent. Apart from this, "Busan" is used when referring to other relevant organizations that changed their names following the revision in 2000, such as the Busan Film Commission (BFC).

   Source: http://www.biff.kr/artyboard/mboard.asp?Action=view&strBoardID=9611_05&intPage=1&intCategory=0&strSearchCategory=|s_name|s_subject|&strSearchWord=&intSeq=9407 (accessed July 12, 2011).
2. In particular, the Cannes Film Festival has been the most frequently studied subject and is often positioned as representative of all the others. Kieron Corless and Chris Darke's book, *Cannes: Inside the World's Premier Film Festival* (London: Faber and Faber, 2007), also focuses on the politics of the Cannes Film Festival.

3. The PPP is a co-financing and co-production market for Asian films established in 1998 as a sidebar 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 4. As explained earlier, this book uses the Pusan Promotion Plan (PPP) although the festival changed "Pusan Promotion Plan" to "Asian Project Market" since February 2011.
4. 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.
5. As a political term, "region" usually means an integrated area beyond the nation-state, such as East Asia and Western Europe. I will explain this term in detail in Chapter 2.
6. Jeeyoung Shin, "Globalisation and New Korean Cinema," in *New Korean Cinema*, eds. Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005), 54–5; Darcy Paquet, "The Korean Film Industry: 1992 to the Present," in ibid., 49.
7. The term "Korean cinema" here designates films made in South Korea, not North Korea.
8. Stuart Hall, "The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power," in *Formations of Modernity*, eds. Stuart Hall and Bram Giebens (Cambridge: Polity, 1992), 276–95.
9. Stringer, 2003, 12.
10. See bibliography for a list of interviewees.
11. Dorothy E. Smith, "Institutional Ethnography," in *Qualitative Research in Action*, ed. Tim May (London: Sage, 2002), 17–9.
12. Ibid., 28.
13. This was to: 1) examine the film festival-related marketing and distributing system through the PPP; 2) understand how Korean and Asian cinema are perceived internationally; 3) acknowledge the way in which the PIFF organized these special events in a different direction (i.e., critically or industrially).
14. One of the rare materials is *The 10th PIFF Documentary* DVD (D&D Media, b/w, 60 min., 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 film magazine *Film 2.0*.
15. Thomas Elsaesser, *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005), 83–5.
16. Janet Harbord, *Film Cultures* (London: Sage, 2002), 60–7.
17. Mitsuhiro Yoshimoto, "National/International/Transnational: The Concept of Trans-Asian Cinema and Cultural Politics of Film Criticism," in *The First Jeonju International Film Festival Symposium*, ed. Soyoung Kim (Jeonju: JIFF, 2000), 61–9.
18. Julian Stringer, "Global Cities and the International Film Festival Economy," in *Cinema and the City*, eds. Mark Shiel and Tony Fitzmaurice (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 143.

19. Film trade magazines such as *Variety* and *Screen International* often use the term "festival calendar." The meaning is attributed to the fact that many film festivals are usually annual events held for a limited time. It also implies a similar term, "festival circuit," which characterizes close links and interdependency among festivals. For further discussion, see ibid., 134–44.
20. See festival reports in *Framework* between 1976 and 1983. Richard Allen, "Pesaro 1: Festival Review," *Framework*, no. 22/23 (Autumn 1983): 74; Don Ranvaud, "Italian Festivals," *Framework*, no. 21 (1983): 54; Ian Christie, "Rendezvous a Bruxelles," *Framework*, no. 14 (Spring 1981): 55; Paul Willemen, "Pesaro," *Framework* (Summer 1981): 96–8; Paul Willemen, "Rotterdam," *Framework*, no. 20 (1983): 41–4.
21. Marijke de Valck discusses the international film festival circuit and cinephile culture based on her research on four major European film festivals in her Ph.D. thesis. Marijke de Valck, "Film Festivals: History and Theory of a European Phenomenon that Became a Global Network," (Ph.D. thesis, University of Amsterdam, 2005).
22. 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.
23. Bill Nichols, "Discovering Form, Inferring Meaning: New Cinemas and the Film Festival Circuit," *Film Quarterly* 47, no. 3 (Spring 1994): 16, 21.
24. Ibid., 20.
25. Stringer, "Global Cities and the International Film Festival Economy," 137.
26. Dudley Andrew, "Waves of New Waves and the International Film Festival," in *Asia/Cinema/Network: Industry, Technology, and Film Culture*, Tenth PIFF symposium booklet (Pusan: PIFF, 2005), 256.
27. Ibid.
28. Yingjin Zhang, *Screening China: Critical Interventions, Cinematic Reconfigurations, and the Transnational Imaginary in Contemporary Chinese Cinema* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002), 33.
29. Ibid., 28.
30. Ibid., 35.
31. 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 the University of California, Irvine, 1998), 39–47.
32. Ibid., 42.
33. Ibid., 46.
34. Ibid., 40.
35. Liz Czach, "Film Festivals, Programming, and the Building of a National Cinema," *The Moving Image* 4, no. 1 (2004): 82. http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/the_moving_image/v004/4.1czach.html (accessed September 19, 2006).

36. Czach employs the term "critical capital" to refer to the value that a film accrues through its success on the festival circuit. For instance, critical capital is accrued and often determined through the film's placement within the festival structure as well as through being screened at prestigious festivals such as Cannes.
37. "Taiwan Trilogy" is composed of three films: *A City of Sadness* (1989), *The Puppetmaster* (1993), and *Good Men, Good Women* (1995).
38. 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 Willemen (London: British Film Institute, 2006), 148.
39. Ibid., 155.
40. Ibid., 149.
41. Soyoung Kim, "'Cine-mania' or Cinephilia: Film Festivals and the Identity Question," *UTS Review* (*Cultural Studies Review*) 4, no. 2 (1998): 183.
42. Ibid., 178.
43. *Segyehwa* is the Korean term for globalization, 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 equalizing national development in every sector to the level attained by developed nations. Kim, "'Cine-mania' or Cinephilia": 185; Shin, "Globalisation and New Korean Cinema," 54–5.
44. Kim, "'Cine-mania' or Cinephilia," 176.
45. Ibid., 175.
46. Ibid., 183.
47. Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 37.
48. Stringer, "Global Cities and the International Film Festival Economy," 139.
49. Ibid., 138.
50. Ibid.
51. Michael Curtin, *Playing to the World's Biggest Audience: The Globalization of Chinese Film and TV* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 2007), 10–28.
52. Ibid., 19.
53. Ibid., 9.
54. Ibid., 10–1.
55. Film festivals' education programs that aim to produce talents will be introduced in Chapter 5.
56. Curtin, *Playing to the World's Biggest Audience*, 14–7.
57. Ibid., 14.
58. Ibid., 17.
59. Stringer, "Global Cities and the International Film Festival Economy," 138.
60. Harbord, *Film Cultures*, 60.

61. Ibid., 60–1.
62. Ibid., 68.
63. De Valck, "Film Festivals," 155. For further discussion of the role of the media in festivals, see ibid., 135–75.
64. Hyuk-sang Lee, ed, *10 Year's PIFF History* (Pusan: PIFF, 2005), 277.
65. Ashis Nandy, "A New Cosmopolitanism: Toward a Dialogue of Asian Civilizations," in *Trajectories: Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, ed. Kuan-Hsing Chen (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), 142.
66. Leo Ching, "Yellow Skin, White Masks," in *Trajectories: Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, ed. Kuan-hsing Chen (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), 70.
67. Ibid.
68. Koichi Iwabuchi, *Recentering Globalization: Popular Culture and Japanese Transnationalism* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2002), 169–70.
69. Chris Berry, Jonathan D. Mackintosh, and Nicola Liscutin, eds. *Cultural Studies and Cultural Industries in Northeast Asia: What a Difference a Region Makes* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2009), 8.
70. Ibid., 8.
71. Leo Ching, "Globalizing the Regional, Regionalizing the Global: Mass Culture and Asianism in the Age of Late Capital," *Public Culture* 12, no. 1 (Winter 2000): 244.
72. Ibid., 237.
73. Ibid., 236.
74. Ibid., 236.
75. Ibid., 257.
76. Berry, Mackintosh, and Liscutin, *Cultural Studies and Cultural Industries in Northeast Asia*, 10.
77. Iwabuchi, *Recentering Globalization*, 199.
78. Ibid., 18.
79. Ibid., 157, 193–9.
80. Berry, Mackintosh, and Liscutin, *Cultural Studies and Cultural Industries in Northeast Asia*, 4–5.
81. Ibid. For further discussion on the regionalism in Northeast Asia, see introduction to ibid.
82. Kim, "'Cine-mania' or Cinephilia," 183.
83. The term indicates the sudden influx 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.
84. Iwabuchi, *Recentering Globalization*, 200.

85. 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.
86. Ching, "Globalizing the Regional, Regionalizing the Global": 242.
87. Arif Dirlik, "Culture against History? The Politics of East Asian Identity," *Development and Society* 28, no. 2 (December 1999): 188.
88. Kuan-hsing Chen, ed. *Trajectories: Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), 2.
89. Stringer, "Global Cities and the International Film Festival Economy," 140.
90. Elsaesser, *European Cinema*, 98.
91. Ibid., 83, 487.
92. In this book, Elsaesser describes the relations between Europe and Hollywood as being like a two-way mirror. He contends that it is no longer possible to speak of the European/Hollywood stance in terms of confrontation; transatlantic exchange has often shown that the relationship is mutually beneficial and not always a question of asserting economic or aesthetic superiority.
93. Ibid., 17.
94. Ibid., 83.
95. Since its establishment in 1969, FESPACO, Africa's largest film festival, has been mostly focusing on African film and African filmmakers. It has been sponsored by European countries such as Germany, France, and Denmark.
96. Elley has written about a range of topics related to this book in both the international trade magazine *Variety* and the Korean film magazine *Cine21*. 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. 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. On the other hand, as Elley's position as a Western-based critic with twenty-five years' insider knowledge of the global film industry 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.
97. 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. http://www.cine21.com (accessed October 10, 2006).

98. Ibid.

## Chapter 1 Why Pusan?: The Political Economy of a Film Festival

1. In this book, "region" usually means an integrated area beyond the nation-state, such as East Asia or western Europe.
2. For a comparison of the PIFF with other film festivals in Asia around the late 1990s, see Appendix 1. For example, according to *Asian Wall Street Journal*, April 20, 2000, world premieres at the PIFF outnumbered ones in Hong Kong. In addition, in terms of attendance, 102,000 attendees visited HKFF for two weeks in 1999 whereas PIFF had 180,900 for ten days in the same year 1999.
3. For the figures related to the development of the 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, Shanghai, Locarno, and Montreal.
4. Bill Nichols, "Discovering Form, Inferring Meaning: New Cinemas and the Film Festival Circuit," *Film Quarterly* 47, no. 3 (Spring 1994): 68.
5. Soyoung Kim, "'Cine-mania' or Cinephilia: Film Festivals and the Identity Question," *UTS Review* (*Cultural Studies Review*) 4, no. 2 (1998): 182. In the late 1990s, a number of local film festivals were organized: the PIFF, the Seoul Human Rights Watch Film Festival, and the Indi-forum in 1996; as well as the Puchon Fantastic Film Festival, the Seoul Women's Film Festival, and the Seoul Queer Film Festival in 1997.
6. The term *Segyehwa,* the official version of globalization and economic liberalization, was further explained in the introduction. Kim, ibid.: 185; Jeeyoung Shin, "Globalisation and New Korean Cinema," in *New Korean Cinema*, eds. Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005), 52–6.
7. Kim, "'Cine-mania' or Cinephilia," 183. Kim emphasizes 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. Ibid., 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

# Index