

The Busan International Film Festival as a Field-Configuring Event: How a festival redefined Korea's film culture both locally and globally.

Roberto Bossa

A Thesis
In
The Department
of
Film Studies

Presented in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Masters of Arts (Film Studies) at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

April 2013

©Roberto Bossa, 2013

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

School of Graduate Studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared

By: Roberto Bossa

Entitled: The Busan International Film Festival as a Field-Configuring
Event: How a festival redefined Korea's film culture both locally
and globally.

and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (Film Studies)

complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with
respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the final Examining Committee:

_____ Chair

_____ Examiner

Marc Steinberg

_____ Examiner

Will Straw

_____ Supervisor

Peter Rist

Approved by _____
Chair of Department or Graduate Program Director

_____ 2013

Dean of Faculty

Abstract

The Busan International Film Festival as a Field-Configuring Event: How a festival redefined Korea's film culture both locally and globally.

Roberto Bossa

Since the 1990s, no film culture has reached a higher level of international as well as national success than the South Korean film industry. Shifting from an obscure national film culture to an Asian dynamo in a timespan of only 20 years, the expansion and development of the country's film industry allowed Korea to develop into the top cultural hub in Asia. This shift was possible thanks to various state institutions who encouraged and supported new production practices through various legislation. In 1996, taking advantage of the resurgence and development of the Korean film industry, various film industry members, in participation with municipal, provincial and state organizations, organized the first international film festival in Korea's history, held in the southern port-city of Busan. This event would eventually play a crucial role in the success of Korean films both locally and on the global level. As a 'Field-Configuring Event', the Busan International Film Festival would be dedicated to the promotion, support, funding and development of the Korean film industry. Since its inception in the mid-1990s, BIFF has played a pivotal role in the success of Korean motion pictures across the globe, most notably in various A-list international film festivals, and at home, where market shares have soared to over 80% in 2013.

Notes to reader

This thesis follows the Romanisation of the Korean language by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism in 2000, which is the translation of sounds of a foreign language into English letters to allow those who can't read Korean to phonetically pronounce it. Consequently, due to this procedure, the spelling of Pusan was changed to Busan, along with most of the vocabulary. Originally named the Pusan International Film Festival (PIFF), the event followed this cultural shift as it changed its name in 2011 to the Busan International Film Festival (BIFF). Although this thesis refers to the host city as Busan, all quotes have been preserved in their original form. Hence, this implies that discrepancies may occur in the spelling of the host city's name in certain quotes.

Moreover, the names of film industry members follow the Korean style of presentation with the surname first followed by given name. Hence, the director of *Oldboy* (2003) is Park Chan-wook and not Chan-Wook Park. All Korean film titles are given in English as well.

All Korean words or terms are italicized, for example the conglomerates that were involved in the film renaissance of the 1990s are *jaebols*.

In the rare occasions that a quote is translated from French, the translation is mine unless specified in parentheses.

Table of contents

Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1	Film Festival Studies and the Field-Configuring Event.....12
	Methodology and Sources.....5
	Film Festival Studies: from Bazin to de Valck.....18
	The Filed-Configuring Event (FCE).....24
	Case Study: The Cannes International Film Festival.....34
	Conclusion: Korean and the festival network.....43
Chapter 2	Korea’s film history: state and foreign interventions.....47
	Methodology and Sources.....48
	National cinema tied to the nation-state.....51
	1903-1945: Korea under Japanese Colonialism.....54
	1945-1955: U.S. Occupation and the Korean War.....60
	1955-1969: The Golden Age.....64
	1970:A dark period in Korea’s film history.....71
	The 1980s and 90s: the Age of Globalization.....74
	Conclusion: 1996 and beyond.....83
Chapter 3	BIFF: Changing Korea’s film culture locally and globally.....86
	Methodology and Sources.....87
	The advent of BIFF: from concept to event.....89
	BIFF as a field-configuring event.....92
	BIFF: supporting, promoting and changing Korea’s film culture.....105
	New Currents and A window on Asian Cinema: Regional strategy.....111
	Korean Cinema Today and the Korean Retrospective: Local strategy...116
	From Showcase to industry actor: The Asian Project Market.....128
	Conclusion: redefining a film culture.....130
Conclusion	In sync with Korea’s film culture.....133
Endnotes.....	143
Bibliography.....	158
Appendices.....	164

Six years (and a heap of local government coin) later, the smile is on Pusan's face. Rarely has an event carved out a profile so rapidly in the overcrowded fest scene, with the Pusan International Film Festival now regarded as the premier East Asian gathering point, overshadowing the Tokyo fest and long-established Hong Kong events.¹

-Derek Elley (*Variety*, 2001)

In 1996, the southern port-city of Busan, second largest metropolis in South Korea², launched the first edition of the Busan International Film Festival (BIFF), a novelty in the country's history. Recognized mostly for its commercial aspects and as a recreational venue for tourists, the city of Busan soon developed into one of the most important destinations in Asia for films. As Derek Elley and Patrick Frater suggest, this change in identity was quite a surprise, as "not even a seer with a crystal ball would have expected a festival in a South Korean port-cum-vacation center to become Asia's premier one-stop event"³. With film festivals occurring daily throughout the world⁴, the new festival in Busan was faced with the challenge of establishing itself within an already saturated market. To distinguish itself became the most obvious obstacle for the organizers at BIFF. However, through a precise programming strategy focused on Asian content, most importantly Korean films, the first international film festival in Korea certainly established itself quickly as a legitimate contender. Undoubtedly, since its inception in the mid-1990s, BIFF has become a true cultural hub in Asia. Not only has the event profoundly altered and contributed to Korea's film culture, it has also affected the development of many Asian film cultures through the promotion and support of emerging filmmakers. This was achieved in part thanks to the event's programmers and director, Kim Dong-ho, who focused the festival on one particular objective, the constant promotion and support of Asian cinema. This allowed BIFF to establish and maintain its position as a focal point in Asian film culture. Supporting this point, head of

programming Park Do-Sin stated: “the Busan International Film Festival has been the window to the world for Asian films, including Korea’s”⁵. This ‘window to the world’ remains a central element in the past and current success of BIFF worldwide.

Since the beginning of the 1990s, Korea’s entertainment industry has gradually established itself as a hot commodity in Asia, and later the West. With the Korean Wave of the late 1990s and early 2000s, also known as *hallyu*⁶, Korea seized a sizeable piece of the Asian market and established its importance as a key player in Asia. As Frater notes:

In terms of pop culture, perhaps no country has ever experienced a greater renaissance than South Korea. In film, TV drama, rock music, cell phones and other areas, the nation has spread its imprint across Asia, with the U.S. its next major target.⁷

The prime element of Korean culture at the forefront of the country’s expansion was the motion picture industry. This development, which resulted in local and international success, generated an increase in global attention. Consequently, numerous film critics, authors and scholars have recently discussed the subject of Korea’s film renaissance at length in academia and in various film publications. The subject of Korean national cinema has suddenly become very popular. Through these reviews, essays and books, the growth and shifts that occurred in the film industry have been laid bare and the film culture of this small East Asian country has been exposed to western eyes. Moreover, many of these studies published in recent years have recognized the crucial role that BIFF played in the development of Korea’s film culture. Additionally, as BIFF slowly established its place within the festival network, members of the press acknowledged the emergence of the event as a nodal point within global film culture. The result has been an increase in the press coverage of the event, from film related to non-

film related journals. In 2006, Heejin Koo, of the *International Herald Tribune*, pointed to the growing global interest that BIFF generates: “Pusan this year has attracted *Variety*, the Los Angeles-based weekly magazine that reports on the movie industry [and] plans to publish six daily editions in the city for the first time[...].”⁸ Six years later, in 2012, the attention BIFF generates from scholars, critics and bloggers seems exponential, as the event remains the top film festival in Asia and is now included in the same discussions as Cannes, Toronto, Rotterdam and Berlin.

Objective of the thesis

The primary thesis question that forms the basis of this study is as follows: since its inception in 1996, how has the Busan International Film Festival contributed to the development of the film industry and to the international success of the Korean film culture? This main question has a two-part structure. The first part is focused on a more local approach, as it relates to the contribution of BIFF to the infrastructure, development and expansion of the national film industry in Korea. The second section of the question has a much broader scope, as it focuses on the global reach of BIFF, as the event allowed the film culture of the country to cross borders and become an international phenomenon. Moreover, this central inquiry raises many secondary questions. Whether regarding the study of film festivals, the advent and development of national cinemas, the history of the film culture in Korea or the relationship between film festivals, the film industry and state institutions, the present thesis attempts to address the subject on a number of levels in order to offer the most comprehensive account of BIFF’s impact.

With the existence of BIFF dating back to 1996, many years have passed during which a multitude of screenings, conferences, master classes, markets and various types of sidebars have occurred, which greatly influenced the country's film industry and culture. More importantly, BIFF has expanded and greatly altered its structure, shifting from a showcase event to an industry actor, participating in the completion of many film projects. It has become evident that with each edition, BIFF has put its stamp on Korean, Asian and even international film culture. It is not possible for this thesis to cover all aspects of BIFF since its inception. Consequently, choices must be made regarding which elements of BIFF are examined. Restrictions must be established in order to focus and guide the study of BIFF on particular points of interest. These focal points are: the local Korean film industry, its history and development, feature length fiction films, Korean filmmakers, with a side note on Asian *auteurs*, the relation between the state, BIFF and the film industry and, perhaps most importantly, the push towards globalization in Korean culture in the late 1990s. The correlation of the thesis question with these focal points of interest offers us a series of secondary questions such as: how did BIFF contribute to our understanding of Korea's film history, what was the role of the state in BIFF's creation or how does BIFF fit into the country's film history? The fundamental objective of this process is to allow an inexperienced reader, who is foreign to the subject, to read this thesis and understand how BIFF, as the first international film festival in Korea's history, played a crucial part in Korea's success locally and globally. Hopefully, the reader will end up with a relatively comprehensive understanding of the subject, from Korea's film culture to BIFF and the film festival network.

Methodology and Sources

This thesis has three chapters each of which tackles key notions regarding BIFF and its role within Korea's film culture both locally and globally. It is important to point out that each chapter has a section explaining the principal sources utilized and the methods through which the chapter's subject is studied. Hence, a detailed enumeration and description of each major source and method is unnecessary at this stage. However, there are three principal areas of study that serve as the foundation for this thesis and which should be briefly explained beforehand. These areas of study are: film festival studies, studies regarding national cinemas and management studies.

The area of film festival studies is represented by a variety of authors and books from the field of film studies. Most notably, authors such as Marjike de Valck, Bill Nichols, Julian Stringer and Thomas Elsaesser are central to this thesis. Each author has contributed to the study of film festivals and to the comprehension of their impact on global film circulation and film culture. Individually, these authors explore different facets of the film festival dynamics, from geopolitics and networking (de Valck⁹ and Stringer¹⁰), the role of international film festivals in globalization and global cities (Stringer), the discovery of novelties in national cinemas (Nichols¹¹) and the importance of film festivals in the circulation, exhibition and distribution of films (Elsaesser¹² and de Valck). Together, they offer a comprehensive look at the role of film festivals within global film culture. Moreover, this thesis utilizes at length essays found in the anthologies *Dekalog 3: On Film Festivals*¹³, edited by Richard Porton, and *Film Festival Yearbook: The Festival Circuit*¹⁴, edited by Dina Iordanova. These two works provide this thesis with an assortment of essays, from case studies, interviews, historical accounts and

personal experiences of festival programmers. These essays are complementary to the principal authors named above, as they fill in the gaps and offer supplemental information regarding the festival circuit. A final source utilized at length throughout the chapter on BIFF is Soojeong Ahn's doctoral thesis¹⁵ entitled *The Pusan International Film Festival 1996-2005: South Korean cinema in local, regional, and global context*¹⁶. Ahn offers a comprehensive look at the inner workings of BIFF and examines key elements that strongly contributed to its success locally and globally. Her work is central to our comprehension of the structure of BIFF, how it came to fruition and how its creators designed it.

The chapter on Korea's national film culture and film history utilizes essays from film studies authors as well as film historians, who mainly focus on Asian and Korean cinema. With over 100 years of film history and with each distinct period having an impact on the film culture of the country, it becomes necessary to understand the context in which BIFF was introduced. Three major works on the subject contribute to this study on Korea's film history. First, Brian Yecies and Ae-Gyung Shim's book *Korea's occupied cinemas*¹⁷ serves as the basis of the study on the early years of Korea's film history, chiefly from the early 1890s to the late 1950s. This is a period defined by Japan's occupation of Korea, two world wars, constant state intervention and a civil war. Through a detailed look at periodicals of the period, film reviews, advertisement, market shares, production reports and various state legislations, Yecies and Shim examine how the context of the period affected the development of the local film industry. Second, the years following the Korean War (1950-1953) are covered by two authors. The first of these two authors is Darcy Paquet, who created the online source koreanfilm.org, the first

English language website dedicated to Korean cinema. This online resource offers an abundance of essays from various contributors. Of these essays, Paquet's "A short history of Korean film" stands out as a primary source for the entire discussion of Korea's film history. Concise yet thorough, it divides Korea's history into logical sections, which the chapter utilizes as a framework for its study on the subject. The second author utilized for the period following the Korean War is Jinhee Choi. Her work entitled *The South Korean Film Renaissance*¹⁸ examines the various elements that led to the success of Korean cinema locally and globally in the late 1980s and on. Together, these authors, coupled with secondary sources, offer a comprehensive look at the events that led to the inception of BIFF and the context in which the event made its entrance.

The final element utilized in this study on BIFF derives from the field of management studies, the concept of the 'field-configuring event' (FCE). This concept offers a new method through which one can study the phenomenon of the film festival. It offers a vocabulary and a set of markers that allow us to understand the inner workings of a festival in a new and different way. The FCE includes events such as trade shows, conferences and festivals. Through this concept, it is possible to analyse how such events shape and structure a particular field, such as the field of fiction film, hence the name 'field-configuring event'. Through the concept of the FCE, this thesis can examine in depth the role of BIFF within the field of fiction film in Korea. Coupled with the notions derived from the field of film festival studies, this method stands as the basis of the study on BIFF. The authors who most contributed to the use of the FCE concept in this thesis are Amalya Oliver, Kathleen Montgomery, Anand Narasimhan, Brittany C. Jones and Charles-Clemens Ruling. The first four authors, who are in fact a pair of co-authors,

published their work on the ‘field-configuring event’ in the *Journal of Management Studies*. Both works begin by defining key concepts of the FCE before applying it to a particular case study. They offer definitions of key concepts such as the ‘field’, the field ‘actor’, ‘shared cognition’, ‘common sense-making’ and ‘co-evolution’, which are all explained in detail in the chapter on the FCE. Additionally, each work demonstrates how an event can create or reproduce field norms and practices, thus either altering the field or strengthening it. These authors allow us to view the film festival as an event that generates change in a field and where a field such as fiction film can take shape, be altered or further reproduce its practices. The last author, Charles-Clemens Rüling, utilized the concept of the FCE to study the Annecy International Film Festival¹⁹. His essay bridges the gap between fields, film festival studies and management studies. Rüling offers an example of how this new methodological tool can be utilized to demonstrate the role of a film festival in the creation and shaping of a field, which is “animated films” in this case. Utilizing most of the concepts explained by N. Anand and company, Rüling’s essay stands as a starting point in this thesis’ attempt at utilizing the ‘field-configuring event’ to study the Busan International Film Festival.

Thesis Structure

As stated, the present thesis is separated into three chapters, which all focus on a particular aspect of the subject at hand. These chapters are designed to progress in a logical way, offering the information necessary to comprehend the contribution and impact that BIFF has had on the film culture of Korea. By beginning the thesis on a wider area of study (methods, history, socio-political context) and subsequently focusing on the event itself, BIFF’s place within Korea’s film culture becomes more evident. In essence,

the objective of this arrangement is to allow the reader to have the necessary information regarding the context of the period and to have a better knowledge of the methodology utilized before the analysis of BIFF occurs. The chapters are as follows.

Chapter 1: Film Festival studies and the Field-Configuring Event

Fundamentally, this chapter is dedicated to the two major areas of study utilized throughout this thesis, film festival studies and management studies, more precisely the concept of the 'Field-Configuring Event'. It is an extended section on the two primary methods that constitute the study of BIFF. The first of these two conceptual threads, film festival studies, is considered as a relatively new area of study within the field of film studies. Although considered a novelty, this has not prevented the study of film festivals to grow exponentially in academia throughout the last 20 years. This chapter examines the development of this new area of study through a brief look at a few of its major authors (Elsaesser, Stringer, de Valck, Nichols) and explains a few of its main threads. The concept of the 'field-configuring event' derives from the field of management studies. Through this concept, it is possible to examine the inner workings of such events as festivals, tradeshows and conferences in order to comprehend their influence on a given field. This concept contains its own proper vocabulary and key notions that must be defined and explained before being utilized in the analysis of BIFF. Once explained, the FCE concept can be applied in conjunction with approaches and ideas developed in film festival studies. This offers a new methodological framework through which a film festival can be studied. Last, this first chapter ends with a case study of one of the most renowned international film festivals in the world, the Cannes International Film Festival. Through this case study, it is possible to demonstrate how Cannes, as a field-configuring

event, is able to enact its influence on global film culture through its film market, various prizes and press coverage. The object of this case study is to offer a concise example of how the concept of the FCE functions in an analysis before applying it in depth to examine BIFF.

Chapter 2: Korea's film history: state and foreign interventions

Before one can fully understand how BIFF influenced the film culture of Korea, it is crucial to be aware of the cultural and socio-political context of the period. Spanning over 100 years, Korea's film history is very complex and should be studied in its entirety in order to fully understand the context of the 1990s, the decade of BIFF's inception. The events leading up to the advent of BIFF certainly have a crucial role in our understanding of where the festivals fits in Korea's film culture. Consequently, this chapter serves as a quick introduction to the most important events that shaped and influenced the development of the film industry in Korea. Adopting a linear model, this chapter divides the film history of Korea into distinct periods and examines the major events that affected them. Exhibiting the various obstacles that hindered the development of the film industry, this chapter demonstrates the difficulties Korea's film culture faced in its attempt to establish itself locally and globally. Whether due to the Japanese colonisation, state intervention or war, the film industry was only able to gain a measure of local and global success towards the end of the 20th century, which coincides with the advent of the Busan International Film Festival.

Chapter 3: BIFF: changing Korea's film culture locally and globally

With this chapter, the elements discussed in the two prior sections are utilized in conjunction to analyse the significance of BIFF within Korea's film culture. First, this

chapter attempts to situate BIFF within the cultural context of the period, which was defined by an overabundance of social, political and cultural changes. Second, the concept of the ‘field-configuring event’ is utilized at length to demonstrate how BIFF was crucial in Korea’s success locally and, more importantly, globally. This chapter demonstrates how BIFF was able to establish itself as a cultural hub in Asia and have an impact on the international flow of global film culture. Through a look at its programming, sidebars and networking, this chapter explains how it was possible for BIFF to become such a nodal point in Asia. Moreover, the event’s contribution to the local film culture, through its focus on being the ideal showcase for local talent, its retrospectives and film funds, is also discussed. Hopefully, the elements discussed in all three chapters will offer sufficient evidence of how BIFF has contributed to and ‘configured’ the film culture of Korea.

Chapter 1

Film Festival Studies and the Field-Configuring Event

Beginning in the years following the Second World War, international film festivals have become a common worldwide phenomenon. According to Kenneth Turan²⁰, everyday of the year, somewhere around the globe a film festival is taking place. With most big cities holding up to 20 film festivals each year, Montreal alone has at least 15 yearly events dedicated to the art of filmmaking²¹, it is safe to state that the number of venues for films has exceeded the amount of films available to screen. This fact has been the topic of many studies on the film festival network and its particular dynamics. With more ‘screen time’ than ‘reel time’, films circulate at astronomical rates across the globe. Consequently, this worldwide film circulation undoubtedly has an impact on the global film culture, a fact that has only recently been studied by film scholars. Although a sustained network of film festivals was only established in the post-World War II period with Venice (1932)²², Cannes (1946) and Berlin (1951) as the recognized top three festivals, the study of these international events began relatively late in academia. The topic of film festival studies has only recently gained the proper attention it deserves with authors, scholars and critics such as Thomas Elsaesser, Bill Nichols, Julian Stringer, Richard Porton, Marijke De Valck, Janet Harbord, and Kenneth Turan leading the field. Thanks to these authors and many more, much academic work has been published in the last 20 years which has shaped the field of film festival studies and created even greater interest. This is the inherent quality of the relatively new field of film festival studies; it still remains wide-open for exploration and study. While scholarship on film festivals has grown exponentially in the last decades, many facets remain unexplored due to the fact that there is so much ground to be covered, with just over 400 recognized film festivals of

international stature being held each year²³. In addition to the number of festivals, there are many years to catch-up on, many festivals to study and new theoretical concepts through which the phenomenon can be studied. These qualities render this field of study quite appealing for scholars in search of new material to examine.

Another interesting aspect of this relatively new field of study is its capacity to utilize non-film related methods to explore the phenomenon. Many studies on film festivals attempt to shed new light on the subject through original theoretical approaches. The present thesis continues in this tradition as it utilizes theories developed by previous authors alongside new theoretical concepts developed by academia in recent years. Thus, the following chapter utilizes essays from film scholars and critics such as André Bazin, Nichols, Elsaesser, de Valck in conjunction with authors working in the fields of social science and management studies such as Joseph Lampel, Alan D. Meyer, Anand Narasimhan and Brittany C. Jones. Combined, these authors and scholars create a framework through which the impact of the Busan International Film Festival (BIFF) on the film culture of Korea can be properly comprehended.

Throughout its development, the field of film studies has developed the capacity to mesh together various non-film related theoretical concepts in order to analyze a variety of topics. The film festival is a global phenomenon that is most often strongly linked to the host city's identity, the host nation's culture, the socio-political context and even the country's legislative and economic context. Hence, film festivals are complex events that demand a broader scope than that offered by film studies. The answer can be found through the use of methodologies which find their sources outside the field of film studies. The present thesis also follows along those lines. With the

overabundance of international film festivals and the assortment of approaches through which they can be studied, it becomes necessary to take a position within this theoretical terrain in order to offer the most comprehensive study possible. This can be achieved by following a particular train of thought already established. Thus, before moving on to the BIFF and its role within Korea's film culture, it is necessary to lay down the foundations of this thesis by exploring the theoretical field that is film festival studies. Second, it is useful to introduce the external concept through which this thesis examines this particular phenomenon. Hence, at the outset, the present section will first offer a brief overview of the development of the relatively new field of 'film festival studies', from its early stages to its most recent developments. Through this overview, this chapter will introduce the concepts and ideas that serve as the framework for this thesis. Secondly, this chapter will introduce the key elements which structure the concept of the 'field-configuring event'; a new theoretical thread through which the impact of film festivals on film culture can be studied. Third, to link the two concepts together, this section ends with a quick case study of one of the most recognized and mediatized international film festivals in the world, the Cannes International Film Festival. Through this brief case study, it will be made clear how the concept of the field-configuring event can be utilized to analyse the impact of international film festivals.

Methodology and Sources

No film festivals study would be complete without the contribution of authors such as de Valck, Elsaesser, Nichols and Stringer. These authors have become canonical regarding film festival studies and form the basis for this thesis. Bill Nichols' early essay entitled "Discovering Form, Inferring Meaning: New Cinemas and the Film Festival

Circuit”²⁴ is viewed as a possible starting point in film festival studies. Nichols’ essay is a prime example of initial opinions regarding the role of film festivals, that is to say a place of discovery. His account of Iranian cinema and the experience of the ‘new’ and ‘uncanny’ situate film festivals in the arena of the encounter with novelty. Nichols’ interpretation of film festivals is focused on how we, as viewers, view foreign films and create an opinion of national film cultures through the festival experience.

De Valck’s 2007 book entitled *Film Festival: From European geopolitics to global cinephilia*²⁵ presents its readers with a comprehensive view of the development of the first film festivals as well as their role in Europe and on the global stage. In her work, De Valck focuses on the socio-political as well as the cultural roles that film festivals play within the global film business, regarding the festival circuit as an alternate and transnational distribution and exhibition network. Her chapter on “Venice and the Value-Adding Process”²⁶ is quite insightful, demonstrating how festivals play a great role in the duration and popularity of films within the festival network, through positive reception and various prizes. Elsaesser’s anthology *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood*²⁷, in which can be found his essay “Film Festival Network: the New Topographies of Cinema in Europe”, is also an important work on which this thesis is grounded. Much like de Valck, Elsaesser focuses on the role film festivals play in the circulation of films and on the creation of new trends within global film culture. Combined together, these two works display how film festivals can create trends and influence global cultural flow within the film industry.

As for Stringer, his contribution to this thesis mainly stems from his essay “Global Cities and the International Film Festival Economy”²⁸. Through this essay,

Stringer demonstrates the role of international film festivals in the phenomenon of ‘globalisation’. As nodal points of cultural flow, festivals become key players in global film circulation as well as struggling to maintain their places within the global network. Moreover, Stringer also demonstrates the strong bond between the festival and its host city, which utilizes the event in order to establish itself as a global city. Alongside the authors mentioned above, one more anthology is central to this thesis, which is the third edition of the *Dekalog* series focused on film festivals²⁹. This issue, edited by Richard Porton, a recognized author and film scholar, contains numerous essays that offer a wide variety of views and opinions on the different roles played by film festivals in the global film economy. Ranging from how these events shape modes of production to personal accounts from film directors or festival programmers, *Dekalog 3* offers a comprehensive look inside various film festivals from around the globe. These works, combined to those of de Valck, Elsaesser and Stringer, form the framework to this chapter’s look inside film festival studies.

The concept of the ‘field-configuring event’ (FCE) can be explained mainly through the use of three significant essays, two from management studies scholars and one from a film scholar. First, Oliver and Montgomery’s essay “Using Field-Configuring Events for Sense-Making: A Cognitive Network Approach” sets the framework for our comprehension of the impact of field-configuring events on any given field. Grounding much of their work on Paul DiMaggio and Walter Powell³⁰, key theorists of the concept, Oliver and Montgomery offer a concise description of many central elements that constitute the field-configuring event. More precisely, both authors concentrate on the capacity for a field-configuring event to create and alter common cognition among field

members, which can be described as the recognized norms, practices and shared beliefs within a unit. Through their essay, Oliver and Montgomery attest to the field-configuring event's inherent capacity to allow a field to evolve, progress and create shared knowledge among its members. Second, Anand and Jones' article in the *Journal of Management Studies* entitled "Tournament Rituals, Category Dynamics, and Field Configuration: The Case of the Booker Prize" demonstrates how events that endow awards, such as many key film festivals, can "substantively shape the content of what is produced within the field"³¹. Without focusing their study on film festivals, the authors suggest that the key elements of the FCE can be applied to all forms of ceremonies, from the Grammys, the Booker Prize or the Oscars. Anand and Jones argue that these award galas and ceremonies take on the form of the 'ritual', with determined structures, norms and hierarchies. Through the attribution of a prize, these norms and hierarchies are altered, creating trends as other members of the industry attempt to copy the success of the field member who is championed by the event. Essentially, both authors explain that these tournament rituals are agents of change within the field. Anand and Jones also offer useful definitions of key terms within the concept of the field-configuring event. These definitions become key to the comprehension of the concept.

Third, Charles-Clemens Ruling's essay "Festivals as field-configuring events : the Annecy International Animated Film Festival" published in the anthology *Film Festival Yearbook*³², another collection of essays crucial within this study, presents the reader with a case study of the Annecy International Film Festival as a 'field-configuring event'. In his essay, Ruling demonstrates how this type of event can structure a field during its initial stages, ultimately playing a crucial role in its creation. Key notions on which

Rüling bases his study on the concept of shared cognition and common sense-making. This theory implies that the field-configuring event allows disparate field members to reduce their cognitive distance and share common knowledge regarding the field and its evolution. This shared knowledge becomes indispensable to the progress of the field and its members. Through various film markets, conferences and exhibitions, the festival as a field-configuring event becomes a space for networking, allowing filmmakers, producers and sales agents to make deals, get projects off the ground through funding and demonstrate new developments within the film industry. Combined together, these three essays offer us a new perspective on the role of the film festival within global film culture through their comprehensive explanation of the field-configuring event and its key features.

Film Festival Studies: From Bazin to De Valck

The first written works to concentrate on the phenomenon of the international film festival were primarily found in film journals and trade papers. Moreover, it was quite common for various catalogues and pamphlets to be produced in participation with the festivals themselves, which is a practice that still exists today. As Marijke De Valck notes, more often than not, initial publications on film festivals would “recount the history of one selected film festival” and would often be “realized in cooperation with the festival organization”³³. Consequently, these texts were often biased, with a clear agenda focused on the promotion of the festival. A second type of publication on film festivals was geared towards reports and reviews of the event, its films and ceremonies. Their methodology was mainly based on the experiences of the authors and presented a very personal view of the event. Various film critics and journalists would write their opinions

in the form of festival reports or reviews. Often, these essays did not carry much academic value, merely offering a judgement of taste and value. In subsequent years, a third type of publication appeared in trade papers focused on the business side of the events, reporting deals and statistics regarding attendance or revenues. Hence, it is safe to state that, before the advent of film festival studies, coverage of the event was primarily reserved for the tabloids, film journals and trade papers, instead of in academia. Paradoxically, in contemporary studies on the subject, these reports, pamphlets and reviews have become a prime source of information in film festival studies as they form the primary body of empirical data for past and current festivals. They are a chief example of how film festivals can create trends and add or diminish critical value to a film. These short reviews, editorials and reports serve as proofs for theories and material for discussion regarding festival studies.

Bazin: The ritual aspect of film festivals

The earliest essay on film festivals that deserves attention in this thesis was written by one of the most important figures in film studies, André Bazin. Recognized as one of the top film scholars of his time, Bazin introduced a new way of looking at film festivals less focused on the films but rather on the various procedures that construct the events. Originally published in 1955, this essay has been republished on numerous accounts. The anthology on film festivals *Dekalog 3* begins with Bazin's essay, perhaps a sign that his analysis remains relevant even today. In essence, the French critic recognized the ritualistic aspects of Cannes' ceremonies and procedures, which he introduced in an essay through a very personal, almost cynical, position. In 1955, Bazin wrote "The Festival viewed as a Religious Order" in the renowned French film journal

Cahiers du Cinéma. In his short essay, Bazin criticises the international event through his comparison of the film festival at Cannes to a religious order, which contains a series of rituals and well-established hierarchies. As he states:

Its history is comparable, I would suggest, to the foundation of a religious Order; fully-fledged participation in a Festival is like being provisionally admitted to convent life. Indeed, the Palace which rises up on the Croisette is nothing less than the present-day monastery of the moviemaker.³⁴

With these words, Bazin set the groundwork for the study of film festivals as sites of passage for films. Through his words, the film festival begins to be viewed as space with specific hierarchies, power relations, schedules and agendas, whether political or economic (business). Bazin also points out the intrinsic role of film festivals as a place of adoration for films and film cultures, with the festival space as ‘convent’ and film as the religion. He explores the network constituted by industry members, festival attendees, festival staff and various members of the media as the members of this film cult. Most importantly, although Bazin most likely never intended this, every one of these elements argued by the French critic have become central topics of various contemporary essays on the film festival phenomenon, from power relations, the festival’s internal network of industry members and the festival’s agenda. Through his opinionated essay on Cannes, Bazin shifted the focus to the context of the event and less on the films themselves, which begins to direct the study of film festivals in a new direction. Bazin was more curious about how this festival context affected his experience of the films and film culture in general. Thus, through his study of Cannes, Bazin would slowly shape the way film festivals would be viewed and discussed in contemporary film academia.

Nichols, Stringer and Elsaesser: key figures in film festival studies

In the years following Bazin's essay, the volume of critical essays on film festivals would not increase in any significant way. In fact, the field of film festival studies would have to wait until the 1990s to see a substantial upsurge in the interest; perhaps proving a disinterest or due to the prevalence of other topics. During this period, according to De Valck, the discipline of film studies was at a transitional stage. For the longest time, film scholars were focused on the films themselves, the industry and its members. However, during the 1990s, new film historians and scholars changed the focus of the field. These new scholars shifted "the attention away from the filmic texts and their relation to the novel and theatre plays, to the intertext and context of the film" as there would be a "growing interest in socio-economic, political and cultural factors"³⁵. These new interests would allow the field of festival studies to explode onto the scene, develop to be a very vibrant field and to explore a multitude of theoretical paths.

Firstly, Bill Nichols' 1994 essay "Discovering Form, Inferring Meaning: New Cinemas and the Film Festival *Circuit*" could be viewed as a starting point for the question this thesis poses. In his essay, Nichols' explores how film festivals shape our views of a national cinema. In fact, the first line of his essay poses a question that has been the basis for many subsequent works: "How do we encounter cinemas, and cultures, not our own?"³⁶ His research yearns to understand how film festivals' influence the viewer's opinion and interpretation of national cinemas. Nichols argues that film festivals are spaces of discovery, a window onto the world, and he also discusses the concept of international film style.³⁷ Through film festivals, an audience can 'discover' the back alleys of a country unknown to them. This circulation of national cinemas allows the flow

of knowledge, which creates awareness regarding other national cinemas. In turn, these national cinemas can gain recognition as a new discovery in film culture. The concept of film festivals as crucial players in the formation of national cinemas has been reiterated numerous times and still remains at the core of film festival studies. Without an alternative distribution and exhibition system through which national cinemas can circulate and take part in the global cultural flow, how could their existence be fully acknowledged on the global stage? The question remains relevant.

Second, film scholars Stringer and Elsaesser are two authors whose essays are essential in the development of film festival studies. In separate ways, they have both contributed to the acknowledgement of international film festivals as important actors in the global circulation of culture and as crucial players within the film culture of a nation.³⁸ Through “Global Cities and the International Film Festival Economy”, Stringer has demonstrated that festivals are important actors of globalization. His study of the festival network, its politics and its relations to the host cities, nation-states and their film culture has proven that festivals play a crucial role in how films are produced and consumed globally. Festivals strive to find a place within the global network of nodal cities and are constantly engaged in power struggles with each other in order to gain and keep their position within the global cultural economy. In an attempt to gain global prestige and remain in such a position, global cities utilize film festivals in order to distinguish themselves internationally. In turn, this has an impact on how festivals are structured, they need to be “similar to each other, but at the same time different”³⁹ in order to be both local (city identity) and global (similarity with other cities). This identity is often related to the host city, whether Cannes, Toronto or Busan, the state and other

global cities that neighbour it. The success of a festival is thus determined by its capacity to maintain its cultural identity as well as establishing itself as a global force within the festival network.

As for Elsaesser, his anthology entitled *European Film: Face to face with Hollywood* is one of the most acknowledged studies of national cinemas in recent academia. With studies on entire European nations to those on singular directors, including essays on common film practices and on production norms, his work is most likely the most comprehensive study of European film culture to emerge in the last decades. Moreover, his essay “Film Festival Networks: the New Topographies of Cinema in Europe” contains discussions that relate to all film festivals, whether they are European or Asian.⁴⁰ Essentially, Elsaesser demonstrates how film festivals can ‘add value to films’, which is a key element that has continually been studied by film studies authors throughout the years. Through the attribution of a prize or an award, film festivals bestow cultural prestige and value on a film. This concept of value-adding is instrumental for the comprehension of the role some film festivals have within the network.⁴¹ Additionally, Elsaesser notes that film festivals have the ability to set agendas for film production, with directors making films destined for the festival market. Elsaesser writes:

With respect to Europe, the festival circuit, I want to claim, has become the key force and power grid in the film business, with wide-reaching consequences for the respective functioning of the other elements (authorship, production, exhibition, cultural prestige and recognition) pertaining to the cinema and the film culture.⁴²

Elsaesser continually explains the role film festivals have in creating and shaping film culture and production. He notes that film festivals create power structures

which regulate how directors and producers plan their projects, hence creating and regulating the flow of film production.

When taken together, Elsaesser, Stringer and Nichols offer an ideal framework through which this thesis can examine the film festival phenomenon. These events can thus be analyzed as ‘global actors’, which have an immense impact on the film culture of a nation. International film festivals such as Busan have developed into regulators for the film culture in Korea, providing distribution and production opportunities, acting as a global showcase for local productions, creating networks with other global actors and attributing cultural and critical value to films. In addition to this framework, the present study utilizes a rather new concept taken from management studies, which has recently been employed to better comprehend how film festivals function and enact their influence. This concept is the field-configuring event.

The Field-Configuring Event (FCE)

The key characteristics of FCEs can be summed up as follows: (1) they assemble in one location actors from diverse geographies and organizations. (2) Their duration is limited, running from a few hours to at most few days. (3) They provide unstructured opportunities for face-to-face social interaction among participants. (4) They feature and depend heavily on ceremonial and dramaturgical activities. (5) They are occasions for information exchange and collective sensemaking. (6) They generate social and reputational resources that can be deployed elsewhere and to other purposes.⁴³

This enumeration of the various features that constitute a field-configuring event can seem unclear to a reader unfamiliar with this concept. However, anybody who has attended or studied film festivals may find elements that resonate with the structure of a festival. Most notably, not only does this list of features resonate with those of the film festival, once studied more closely, it becomes possible to make much deeper

connections between the FCE and the film festival. This will be made apparent here through a description of the field-configuring event's components, how they relate to film festival studies and, finally, through a case study of the Cannes film festival, which will integrate both theoretical threads. The concept of field-configuring has steadily developed since the late 1980s in the field of management studies. The prime objective of this concept is to explore the structure of an event within a given field and the influence this given event has on it. The term conveys this quite well, the configuring or structuring of a field through an event. To achieve this, one must examine the various participants of an event, their positions within the field and how their interactions, discussions and activities can shape or restructure the field itself. To better comprehend how the concept works and how it can be applied to the film festival network, it is necessary to define basic elements of the concept.

The 'field' in Field-Configuring Event

The first component that must be defined is the term 'field'.⁴⁴ Once defined, this first element sets the boundaries of this conceptual framework. As Anand and Jones note, the notion of 'field' has been attributed more importance in organizational theory in recent years and the exact definition has been under constant debate. Often confused with the term 'industry', the concept of 'field' covers a larger spectrum. According to Anand and Jones, "the concept has wider connotations than 'industry' which conventionally refers to organizations competing to make the same goods or services".⁴⁵ Regarding film studies, the term 'field' would not concord with the concept of film 'industry' or even film festivals, as both could fall into the category of 'industry' through their constant competition in the production and distribution of similar 'goods'. The question remains,

how can the concept be utilized? To answer this, Anand and Jones offer a definition based on DiMaggio and Powell's essays:

The generally accepted definition of field is 'those organizations that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life: key suppliers, resources and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organizations that produce similar services and products'. The virtue of this definition is that it is agnostic as to whether the field is constituted by organizations, individuals, or other combinations of actors.⁴⁶

These two definitions of 'what is' and 'what isn't' a field complement themselves. They are open definitions through which our understanding of the term 'field' becomes more evident. The first defines the 'field' as a wider concept that includes a variety of elements; the second definition holds nuances that allow us to grasp what the 'field' might contain. A field is a gathering of 'actors', which includes all and every type, from institutions to individuals, who participate and contribute to a recognized 'institutional area'. This definition, which is 'agnostic' in its description of its participants, borrows from the Actor-Network Theory (ANT). This network theory has developed more recently with the upsurge in studies on globalization. In layman's terms, ANT is the study of the various networks that constitute contemporary society. Developed by such social studies authors as Bruno Latour, Michel Callon and John Law in the late 1980s, ANT examines how these various networks are structured and how each individual actor co-exists and interacts with the other actors.

The primary tenet of actor-network theory is the concept of the heterogenous network. That is, a network containing many dissimilar elements. These coextensive networks comprise of both social and technical parts. Moreover, the social and technical are treated as inseparable by ANT. When buying produce from a supermarket, for example, the actor-network involved would include the purchaser and the cashier, as well as the cash register, the money and the produce involved. It also includes other, less obvious objects, such as the

clothes the purchaser wears, without which they would most likely not be served. The task of trying to identify all of the heterogeneous elements in an actor-network like this can be difficult, and is ultimately up to the discretion of the researcher. This is known as the problem of selection.⁴⁷

This social studies theory can allow us to understand the definition of ‘field’ through its tendency to flatten the various participants of a network on the same plane. ANT has no hierarchies and denotes no differences between non-human and human participants. Every actor within a network, from computer programs, cinephiles, trade papers, the projection equipment, the theaters and staff members are interdependent and act upon the network. This concept resonates with the ‘agnostic’ definition of the field proposed by Anand and Jones. Thus, any entity that participates within a recognized institutional life is part of a field. In film studies terms, the field would reach much farther than the film industry and, in fact, it would include it within a network of other ‘actors’. Thus, the ‘field’ designated in this study includes producers, directors, state committees, audiences, cinephiles and film critics. Basically, the film industry is part of the field, which, in this instance, could be defined as film culture in general. Although this would result in a field that seems too broad to tackle in such a study, the present thesis will focus mostly on feature length fiction films. Hence, the ‘field’ referred to within this study is the domain of fiction films produced within the film culture of Korea.

Although useful to some extent, as De Valck points out, the actor-network theory is valid only to a certain extent. Although the theory’s levelling of field entities is useful in the definition of a field and its participants, the lack of hierarchies and power relations is flawed when utilized to study film festivals, which constitute a network in themselves. Some festivals are nodal points within the network and impact it in much more

significant ways thus eliminating the notion of equality. For example, the Cannes International Film Festival carries much more cultural value than the Festival du Nouveau Cinema in Montreal and sales agents are much more important within the film festival network than the volunteers. Yet, by demonstrating how a network is constituted of various interdependent actors, all playing a specific role within the network, the ANT paradigm remains useful in our comprehension of the components within the field. For example, volunteers are essential to the survival of smaller festivals with limited budgets. Through their contribution, festival programmers and stakeholders save considerable amounts of money.

The Actors within the field

Another key notion that must be defined in order to better comprehend the concept of field-configuring event is the central notion of ‘actor’. As explained above, the ‘field’ can be defined as a group of “organizations that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life: key suppliers, resources and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organizations that produce similar services and product.”⁴⁸ It is these “organizations that produce similar services”, fiction films in this case, that constitute the field ‘actors’. They are individuals or groups with defined objectives and ideologies that shape the field through their actions and interactions with each other. Throughout various studies on film festivals, authors have referred to these actors using different terms. In her essay “The Film Festival Circuit”,⁴⁹ film scholar Ragan Rhyne names these actors ‘stakeholders’. Each group of stakeholders has its own recognized discourse within the film festival and each group has a different impact on the event and the ‘field’. Rhyne identifies five different groups of stakeholders:

- 1- Filmmakers and producers
- 2- Journalists
- 3- The film industry of financiers, lawyers, distributors and studios
- 4- Tourist and ancillary industries
- 5- Policymakers, funders and festival managers

These ‘stakeholders’ identified by Rhyne represent the ‘actors’ within the ‘field’ which this study refers to.⁵⁰ The field-configuring event’s primary feature is its capacity to gather these ‘field actors’ together for a defined duration.

Common Cognitive sense-making

Charles-Clemens RÜling defines field-configuring events as “social organizations such as tradeshows, fairs and festivals”.⁵¹ These events listed by RÜling have in common the fact that they are all designed as meeting grounds or spaces for display. They are time-events, regulated by a strict schedule during which transactions and discussions of all sorts take place. They can showcase novelties within the field or debates on current issues related to the field itself. Moreover, as RÜling states, “by assembling various actors in a limited setting, they create opportunities for social interaction including the construction of reputation and status”.⁵² Thus, this resonates with Elsaesser’s approach, who states that film festivals are important actors due to their ability to add value to a film and to national cinemas. Field-configuring events such as festivals act accordingly to this definition in their ability to construct the ‘reputation’ and ‘status’ of diverse films, either through prizes or simply through their circulation along the festival network. The various members of the ‘field’ i.e., producers, cinephiles,

festivals programmers, critics, jury members, gather with a common goal, to discuss and exchange opinions and ideas concerning films and the film industry.

Furthermore, as Ruling explains, this meeting ground allows the cognitive distance between the various 'field actors' to diminish. This implies that, through the exchanges that take place during the field-configuring event, the participants can share knowledge that eventually creates shared views and opinions or eventually creates and reproduces field norms. This shared opinion through common cognition is termed 'shared sense-making', which is another vital feature of the field-configuring event as it defines its potential to influence field construction and modification. This shared opinion or sense-making can refer to a single film, which gains cultural and critical value through the festivals it travels to, or to an entire national film culture. For example, the festival network has often been described as an alternative distribution and exhibition system to Hollywood through which films from national cinemas can circulate and gain vital cultural value. These films circulate, are viewed by a multitude of field actors and, as they make their way through the network, they gain value with every prize or review. Some films can thus survive and have a global existence thanks to the festival network.⁵³ Moreover, common sense-making can also refer to new technologies or novelties within the field. Often, events such as the film festival will hold conferences or markets during which new developments within the field will be displayed. This can also refer to new actors within the field i.e., new film companies, agencies or special effects companies, which make their first appearance at film festivals. Thanks to these special events within the festival, field actors become acquainted with these novelties, discuss their impact and develop an opinion on the subject.

Common cognitive sense-making is a crucial aspect of the field-configuring event in regards to the concept of the value-adding process. As Elsaesser notes, the film festival network is a space where films “can gather the cultural capital and critical prowess necessary to subsequently enter the national or local exhibition markets on the strength of their accumulated festival successes”.⁵⁴ However, the opposite is just as valid as some films can see their life span diminish due to negative reception on the festival network. Thus, through such common knowledge, mutual objectives and shared opinions, the international film festival can act as a powerful player and opinion maker in regards to national cinemas and how these film cultures are viewed globally. As Olivier and Montgomery state:

Field-configuring events, such as formal and informal meetings, can provide the arena or occasion for such group sense-making. For example, participants might agree to come together in pursuit of a shared interest, but each may bring a distinct cognition about how to move forward.[...] FCEs can facilitate the emergent process of shared sense-making at a pivotal moment for a particular group- such as social movement, a political party, a voluntary association, or a professional group- that has the potential to alter the relevant field.⁵⁵

Additionally to its ability to create shared opinions and common goals regarding film cultures, the field-configuring event can also have an impact on dominant field norms and logics. In this instance, Elsaesser, Stringer and Nichols’ approaches can be linked to the concept of ‘field-configuring event’ once more. On the one hand, Elsaesser stated that film festivals could attribute value to a film and also create ‘agendas’ for film production. These agendas refer to film directors and distributors who target certain key festivals on the calendar. Their films are scheduled to premiere at these festivals and are structured according to a film ‘style’ most appropriate for the festival network i.e, horror, sci-fi or ‘queer’ films. Additionally, each film festival has its own

particular agenda or strategy, whether it is political (human rights, homosexual rights) or economic (business centered such as Cannes, Toronto). Its selection will be geared towards films answering to its identity. Consequently, the result is a variety of films that answer to the requirements of a certain brand of festival. This implies that festivals have the ability to dictate how films are produced around the world.

Shared cognitive sense-making not only refers to common norms in film production, it also suggests that actors within the film festival network acknowledge a new national film culture once displayed at an event. As spaces for the exhibition of the new, festivals are geared towards the search for novelties within global film culture, which resonates with Nichols essay on discovery. Very often, this ‘dogma of discovery’, as De Valck terms it, becomes the drive behind the agendas of festivals. There is always a new cinema or new wave to be discovered and film festival programmers never want to be left behind. Consequently, national cinemas are often catapulted onto the network once discovered. Within a short time frame, films produced from the same country are acknowledged as a part of a ‘new wave’ within the festival network. As Felicia Chan notes, “this drive for discovery, which has also been attributed to deep cinephilia, when accompanied by power and influence can have a significant impact on national industries[...]”.⁵⁶ Moreover, second and third tier film festivals have the tendency to follow trends created by more recognized international festivals. In turn, when such festivals screen films designated as ‘new wave’, they are reinforcing field norms and logics established by the ‘important’ A-list film festivals. Through their inherent agendas, film festivals, working together as a network, have the ability to establish what is defined as ‘new waves’ or national cinemas; in turn, other film festivals and field actors

legitimize and support the established order by acknowledging these films as such. This is how the film festival, as a field-configuring event, can enact its role within global film culture. De Valck notes:

I argue that film festivals can be seen as obligatory points of passage, because they are events- actors- that have become so important to the production, distribution, and consumption of many films that, without them, an entire network of practices, places, people, etc. would fall apart. Film festivals are particularly important for the survival of national cinema, art cinema, and independent cinema[...] The leading film festivals- such as Cannes, Berlin, Venice, Toronto, and Sundance- are particular bustling nodes of activity where people, prestige, and power tend to concentrate.⁵⁷

These nodal points of passage, which De Valck mentions above, are those festivals that create the ‘buzz’ around a national cinema. They create and establish attitudes and beliefs that resonate through the festival network. Of course, with each edition, festivals can either prolong the field norms or alter them. If films from the same nation keep screening at various events around the globe, the festivals thus endorse the decision to attribute critical value to the particular national cinema in question, reinforcing the film culture’s place within the global market. Inversely, if film festival programmers have ‘discovered’ a new film culture or film style to share, the norms and logics of the field will shift. Thus, to a certain extent, film festivals can make or break a national film culture and its place in the global market. Of course, with the advent of the Internet, national film cultures no longer rely solely on the festival network to gain global awareness, yet it remains a key factor in the success of films on the global stage. One of the most salient examples of this at work is Cannes, which can set standards and grant prestige to a national cinema all by itself.

Case Study: the Cannes International Film Festival

The Cannes International Film Festival, which is held in the coastal city of southern France every spring, is considered as one of the most prestigious film related events in the world. Often included with Venice and Berlin, Cannes forms the festival trio recognized as the big three, with Toronto tossed into the mix on some occasions. This role as cultural hub makes Cannes a prime example of how a field-configuring event is structured and how it enacts its role on global film culture. Utilizing festival reports and reviews of recent editions, this case study will display how cultural value and prestige is attributed to films and, in turn, how national cinemas are validated at Cannes.

In his essay on the assorted models of film festivals, Mark Peranson argues that there are two leading types of festivals: the Business festival and the Audience festival.⁵⁸ According to Peranson, both models answer in different ways to the various interest groups, or ‘field actors’, which constitute a festival. The Business festival, or ‘behemoth’ festival as Peranson terms it, is primarily defined by its massive budget, its premiere oriented format, its major corporate sponsors, the presence of an abundance of market and business representatives, its structure as a major competition, its large staff and the presence of Hollywood industry members.⁵⁹ Inversely, the Audience festival is much smaller in scale and relies more on word of mouth, subsidies and a niche audience to survive. Consequently, the Audience festival’s impact on global film culture is limited. Its involvement is more present in micro markets i.e., genre cinema, local or indigenous films, and niche films. Of course, as Peranson notes, many film festivals fall in-between the two models and most festivals have elements pertaining to both models. Additionally, a festival can change models along the way. A festival can begin small with relatively no

budget or international exposure and become an important industry actor within a few years. Nevertheless, the Business festival remains the model with the most impact on global film culture. Cannes undoubtedly follows this model. The event holds substantial power and influence on the global market.

In Peranson's description of the Business festival, many elements are enumerated that find resonance with the concept of the 'field-configuring event'. Peranson notes the overabundance of field actors present at Business festivals, which is a prime quality of the field-configuring event. In 2010, Cannes had an astounding 25,369 accredited industry guests, with: 1,087 filmmakers, 4,338 distributors and 4,479 producers.⁶⁰ Moreover, through these 25,369 guests, 123 different countries were represented. With numbers such as this, there is no doubting Cannes' global reach and size. Of course, all these individual actors have individual agendas. As a Business festival, the prime reason for a trip to Cannes remains just that, business. Nevertheless, these personal goals do not impede on the interactions that take place within the various spaces of the festival. On the contrary, the 'prime' objective of business drives these actors to interact with other industry members and exchange projects, ideas, films and opinions. Through its various sidebars, galas, conferences, markets, enumerable banquets and parties, Cannes becomes the ultimate network of 'actors'. This is an internal and intrinsic feature of a film festival such as Cannes. Through the event's ability to gather this pool of industry members, Cannes answers to one of the most important requirements of the FCE. In fact, with the numbers listed here, Cannes represents one of the best, if not the best, examples of how field-configuring events are structured as spaces for interactions between various 'field actors'.⁶¹

The FCE gathers disparate industry members and gets them involved with one and other. As explained, this creates shared sense-making and diminishes the cognitive distance between actors. In Cannes' case, the various industry members become aware of the films that are circulating within the film festival network and of projects in the making. This affords a broader view of the field to its actors. As Meyer and Lampel note, "at the cognitive level field members gain awareness of the field in its totality, and acquire identity as field members".⁶² Consequently, the numerous actors who play a vital role in the circulation of films on the global market gain knowledge of the various films from around the world, including up-and-coming national cinemas. Lee Mi-Jeong, former programmer of the Korean section for the Montreal Fantasia film festival, notes the importance of other film festivals in the distribution and networking of film knowledge:

Through your visits to Film Festivals, automatically, you come in contact with other Film Festival programmers. We exchange information and network. This is true for all film festivals. You can thus get information on what is being produced and what is the hot topic or film at the time. Films are screened and reviews start being put out on them. We spend much time trying to find the next theme for next year or the tendencies of the film industry.⁶³

Hence, through the network created by the assembling of various field actors, Cannes represents a critical nodal point within the global flow of film culture and film knowledge. This is further increased thanks to its film market, which expands its role from networking of information to being a much more direct industry actor.

A second vital element noted by Peranson in his definition of the Business model is the presence of a film market. The presence of such a marketplace is a central component in the field-configuring event's role within global film culture. Once more, both conceptual threads converge. In his essay, Ruling explains that "the event can

change its role through time [...] ⁶⁴ shifting from ‘showcase event’ to ‘industry actor’”. This is possible through the various film markets and funds available at the festivals which target and support independent films. This shifts the role of the event to a more hands-on role with an active participation in film production and distribution. Through its film market (Marché du Cinéma), Cannes cements its role as a crucial nodal point for international films and global film culture. In 2010, Cannes had a total of 876 films attending its film market, which lasts less than two weeks. This is an impressive quantity of films in display as Kenneth Turan aptly notes:

For unlike most festivals, Cannes has a film market officially attached, where international buyers swoop in to view and possibly purchase the rights to something like six hundred films displayed in thousands of screenings in nearly thirty rooms. When you add in the nearly hundred films shown at the festival proper [...] what results is a cinematic triathlon [...]. ⁶⁵

To reiterate, the main objective of this film market is business. Through it, film projects are funded, film rights are bought and they are sent around the world. From independent genre films to arthouse films, all originating from around the globe, the Marché du Cinema represents one of the most varied and multicultural events of its kind. It allows Cannes to play a crucial role in global film culture through international funding and distribution opportunities. It also participates in creating a transnational film culture, one where films find their roots within a multiplicity of nations.

Moreover, field-configuring events are often spaces where new technologies or techniques are tested and developed. To continually enact its influence on the field, the FCE must constantly reinvent itself by introducing novelties that may have an impact on how things are done. As Meyer and Lampel explain, field-configuring events “can enhance, reorient, or even undermine existing technologies, industries, or markets; or

alternately, they can become crucibles from which new technologies, industries, and markets emerge".⁶⁶ For example, in 2010, Cannes' Marché du Cinéma utilized and developed new technologies to ameliorate the networking between industry members. As Elsa Keslassy of *Variety* magazine writes:

The Marché's latest innovation is a free B-to-B streaming service allowing sales agents to upload their films for select buyers. It's safer, faster and more economical than sending screeners via Fed/Ex. [...] The market's online network, Cinando, connects nearly 24,000 people and 9,350 companies working in various areas of the film biz. The database includes more than 10,500 film listings updated daily.⁶⁷

This novelty is designed in accordance with the Marché's leading objective, which is always centered on business through networking. Additionally, with added screening rooms equipped with high-definition digital projectors (10 out of 33), including 3D technology, the Marché du Cinéma has also followed technological trends set by the industry.⁶⁸ These technologies strive to render the interactions between the field actors more efficient and simpler. Thus, whether it is through novelty or following trends, the Marché has implemented all resources possible to heighten networking and make it more efficient.

One final element regarding the festival's influence on global film culture that deserves our attention is its ability to bestow prestige and value upon a film. As declared earlier, the field-configuring event has the capacity to construct reputation and create field norms and logics. This is possible through a wide variety of processes. The first and most obvious process is an award. To win an award in one of the categories at Cannes, with the Official Selection at the top of the list, grants a film exceptional international exposure and immediate cultural value. In fact, to win an award at any A-list festival i.e.,

Berlin, Venice, Toronto, grants immediate benefits for the film in question. As for Cannes, which is designated as an official competitive event by the FIAPF,⁶⁹ the festival answers to a specific type of field-configuring event designated as tournament ritual. As the term implies, the tournament ritual is designed as a contest where various actors are involved for the title of ‘champion’. Through the granting of an award, the festival acknowledges the cultural value of a film and, in turn, elevates its position within global film culture. In their study of the Grammy Awards, Anand and Watson state:

In addition to engaging a range of actors in interaction, tournament rituals can influence activity in a field through the selective and ceremonial judgment of worth bestowed on award winners. The outcomes of tournament rituals are consequential because of the possibility of winner-take-all benefits that can shape field evolution, such as greater exposure, further commercial success, and career longevity.⁷⁰

As this quote explains, tournament rituals such as Cannes have the ability to bestow value on a film through its ‘judgment of worth’. By ‘championing’ a film, the festival acknowledges the work as worthy of cultural value and prestige. In terms of national cinemas, a string of award winning films, or even films in its Official Selection, has a direct effect on the exposure of a country and its film culture. The general assumption is that the winner of the Palme d’Or is one of the best films of the year worldwide. Whether this is the case or not is greatly disputable. What is undeniable is that the grand prize at Cannes bares significant importance in cultural standards. In addition, a place in the Official Selection at Cannes almost guarantees distribution in France and most of Europe as well as North America. Films selected in the top categories at Cannes, from Directors Fortnight to Un Certain Regard, utilize the publicity this situation affords them to advertise themselves across the globe. These films often display

the Cannes hallmark leaf emblem in their trailers, publicity and on their DVDs. This international attention and the status it offers is possible thanks to the impressive amount of media coverage the event generates.

The Palme d'Or is unquestionably one of the most mediatized prizes awarded in film culture. With 3,767 journalists from 88 countries covering the event in 2010,⁷¹ Cannes' global reach is unmatched within the festival network. Such media coverage has a multitude of effects on global film culture and the film festivals themselves. First, it is crucial to consider the media coverage in field-configuring event terminology. Accordingly, the film critics, journalists, radio and television hosts and bloggers who attend the event are all intrinsic 'actors' who play a crucial role within the field of film culture. Their interactions, their networking and their various publications contribute to the event's ability to generate field norms and logics as well as grant prestige and value. As De Valck notes, the various members of the media "are indispensable to film festivals, because media coverage constitutes a tangible link between the local and global".⁷² In turn, this generates what De Valck and Ragan Rhyne both term the 'written festival'. For Rhyne, the 'written festival' is what shapes the global perception of the event.⁷³ Most film enthusiasts, who don't have the luxury of attending the event, will gain awareness of the event, its development, its prizes and the gossip surrounding it thanks to these sources. Through reviews, festival reports and interviews, the media becomes the window unto the festival. Trades papers such as *Variety*, film journals like *Cineaste*, *Film Quarterly*, *Positif*, *Cahiers du Cinéma*, tabloids like *Premiere* and newspapers such as *Le Monde* (France), *The New York Times* (USA) and *La Presse* (Canada) are all a part of the media network which constructs our interpretation of the event. Through their

contribution, the field norms and logics established by the festival are transmitted across the world. Whether in Montreal (Canada), Paris (France) or Seoul (Korea), all will know which film won the Palme d'Or, who was selected as best actress and so on. In their study of the Grammys, Anand and Watson explain:

Scholars theorizing about field formation have argued that not all events are attended to equally, and the ones that are attended to prove critical as aids for making sense of what is happening within a field. [...] the enactment of an award ceremony is one of the few times of the year when the national press turns its gaze however briefly on the music industry, and hence it serves as a good indicator of what's hot at the moment.⁷⁴

Clearly, this description can be utilized in our case study of Cannes. The 'making sense of what is happening' definitely resonates with the field-configuring event's sense-making and shared cognition processes. Not only do the various reports and reviews transmit news on what films are 'hot at the moment', trade papers, and tabloids to a lesser extent, allow other field actors, such as cinephiles or other filmmakers, to be aware of diverse film projects and new technologies in the works. They share information which, in turn, reduces cognitive distance between the various actors of the field. Consequently, the various media bodies play a crucial role in the field-configuring event's role within global film culture.

The link between the media and the film festival is multifaceted. The most prominent role that the media plays in this relationship is the redistribution of cultural prestige and value, first bestowed by the festival itself. Jointly, the two actors contribute to global cultural prestige through what many film festival theorists term the 'value adding process'. The more prizes a film obtains, the more coverage it will acquire. In turn, through this heightened exposure, a film is more likely to attract the attention of a

sales agent or distribution company, which might decide to acquire the rights to the film and distribute it globally. Utilizing Pierre Bourdieu's theories, De Valck explains this process in three steps.⁷⁵ First, a film gains value through a prize won at an international film festival such as Cannes, this is termed 'festival value' by De Valck. 'Media value' is acquired next as the various media bodies publish a plethora of reports and reviews which pass along the festival's acknowledgement of the film as critically and culturally important. Whether the authors of the various publications agree or disagree with the decision, the news of the prize remains the same⁷⁶ and is published worldwide. The extensive media coverage focuses all the attention onto the award winning film, thus bestowing a higher status on it as an important cultural product to be showcased. The third step transfers the festival value and the media value into 'economic value'. This occurs when distributors buy the rights to an award-winning film for distribution in theatres and on DVD. Consequently, these three forms of value can be encompassed within a singular form, cultural value. Through them, a film acquires and accumulates this cultural value across the globe, which shapes and influences global film culture. All three contribute to the FCE's intrinsic role as generator of field norms and logics through the attribution of prestige and value.

Conclusion: Korea and the festival network

The present chapter has demonstrated how film festivals, as international and cultural events, play a crucial role in establishing global film standards and norms. Although the field of global film culture was established much before the advent of film festivals, the role of these events within the 'field' has been exponential since their inception. The FCE not only has the capacity to shape and create a 'field', it also has the

ability to alter a 'field' already established. Through these various international film festivals, global film culture has been able to circulate more fluently across nations and borders. Their involvement has shaped global film culture and our opinions of independent, arthouse and national cinemas. Moreover, Cannes, along with other recognized international film festivals, has the ability to bestow prestige and value to various films and even a national film culture itself. By acknowledging the film's cultural value with an award, the festival, as a tournament ritual, establishes field norms and logics; thus, this raises the position of the film and its national roots within global film culture. As this section has demonstrated, this is possible through the intricate network of field actors gathered at the event who participate in the establishing and reproduction of field norms through shared cognition and common sense-making. In turn, national cinemas, such as that of Korea, have the opportunity to build a reputation and to take a place within global film culture.

Although no empirical data exists that can prove that Cannes played a crucial role in the circulation and popularity of Korea's film culture, its capacity to elevate national cinemas is undeniable. Korea's presence on the festival network is a relatively recent phenomenon considering its film culture dates back to the first half of the 20th century. The first instance of the participation in a Western film festival was in the 1980s. During this decade, the country began the production of prints with subtitles in order to send the films to international film festivals such as Cannes, Venice and Montreal.⁷⁷ While the film culture of the country was in a transitional era, the state and film industry targeted prestigious film festivals in hopes of obtaining global recognition. These global aspirations were encouraged in part by the state, which sought to expand the cultural

reach of Korea. However, it was not until the late 1990s and the early 2000s that Korea began to be recognized on the international film festival circuit as a national cinema on the rise. Concordantly, more and more films from Korea began to appear in Cannes's selections during this period. In fact, a Korean film has been in competition for the Palme d'Or in nine of the last twelve years. In both 2010 and 2012, two Korean films were part of the competitive section of Cannes: *Poetry* (Lee Chang-dong, 2010), *The Housemaid* (Im Sang-soo, 2010), *In Another Country* (Hong Sangsoo, 2012) and *The Taste of Money* (Im Sang-soo, 2012). Although no film has won the prestigious award, the fact remains that a Korean film has been considered for the prize on a consistent basis. Thus, this has attracted attention towards Korea as a persistent film culture, which produces quality films year after year. Moreover, since 2000, there has been at least one Korean film present at Cannes on a constant basis. In 2008, a total of five films in three categories represented Korea at Cannes. This continuous and growing presence has granted much exposure for Korea's film culture as Hwang Dana of koreanmovie.com notes in 2012:

The eyes of the world's movie fans will be on the forthcoming Cannes Film Festival, which kicks off on May 16. For its 65th edition on the Riviera, five movies directed by Korean filmmakers will join the lineup of artistic creations embracing innovation and a creative spark. Having topped Cannes' Un Certain Regard category with Kim Ki-duk's *Arirang* last year, Korean films have continuously garnered attention and critical praise at one of the most acknowledged annual festivals. This year's competition slate will premiere an enriching mix of world cinema including two Korean feature films -- Hong Sangsoo's *In Another Country* and Im Sang-soo's *The Taste of Money*.⁷⁸

Cannes' ability to garnish films and national cinemas with prestige and cultural value is well recognized within the field. Consequently, through the continuous selection of Korean films, Cannes has played a crucial role in elevating Korea's film culture to its

current status as one of the leading Asian film industries. Through the presentation of various filmmakers and films, Cannes has allowed the world to ‘discover’ Korean cinema. As Elsaesser notes, “when one is in the business of making new authors, then one author is a “discovery”, two are the auspicious signs that announce a “new wave”, and three new authors from the same country amount to a “new national cinema”.⁷⁹ With recurring directors representing Korea at Cannes, it seems Elsaesser’s assertion rings true. In fact, although a total of 10 films have been in competition since 2000, they represent the work of a total of only six directors. Thus, directors such as Park Chan-wook, Hong Sang-soo, Lee Chang-dong and Im Sang-soo have become regulars at Cannes and have come to represent an important facet of Korean film culture on the global stage. Unfortunately, this also implies that a large part of the Korean film culture remains in the dark at Cannes as only a finite number of Korean directors have had their work displayed at the prestigious festival.

There exists no empirical proof that links success at Cannes with international success, yet Park Chan-wook’s career certainly shifted thanks to his Grand Jury Prize in 2004 for his film *Oldboy*. In fact, Park returned to Cannes in 2009 with *Thirst*, which won the same prize, and, in 2013, he will release his first Hollywood film *Stoker*. Of course, whether or not directing a Hollywood film is a sign of success is debatable. Yet, on a business and career level, to cross cultural and national borders as a director both in Korea and in Hollywood is quite an achievement. This is a feat made possible by the participation within an international film festival of the magnitude of Cannes and within the festival network itself. However, as Cannes represents the summit in terms of film festivals in Europe, the Busan International Film Festival’s impact within Asian film

culture is undeniable. Not unlike the model followed by Cannes, BIFF has developed an identity of its own geared towards the production, distribution and promotion of Asian cinema, most notably Korean. This pro-Asian festival identity is at the heart of the next chapter.

Chapter 2

Korea's film history: state and foreign interventions

Since the first public screenings held in a warehouse situated in Seoul at the beginning of the 20th century (c.1903), motion pictures have been an important part of Korean mass entertainment. However, this is a fact that most people might ignore. Commonly, due to the fact that Korean films only began screening worldwide at international film festivals in the late 1980s and reached global recognition at the outset of the 21st century, Korean national cinema is considered as a relatively new phenomenon. As recent academia has demonstrated, this could not be further from the truth. Playing a crucial role in how Koreans were introduced to the rest of the world and vice-versa, films have not only amused the masses in Korea for over 100 years, they also acted as a catalyst in the country's transition from an agriculturally based society into a 20th century industrialized modern country. As Dziga Vertov's *Man With a Movie Camera* (1929) demonstrated how the camera could capture and explore the wonders of the modern world, motion pictures presented the marvels of the industrial West to Koreans in an effort to open its borders. Moreover, in much later years, films also allowed Korea to export its culture across borders. Understandably, this shift and growth of the film industry was a long and strenuous process complicated by innumerable complexities and obstacles.

As historical facts demonstrate, Korea's film history spans over one hundred years. Yet, in retrospect, this rich film history remains almost completely invisible to most cinephiles, young scholars, students and festival attendees.⁸⁰ The present chapter aims at shedding further light on Korea's obscure film history and, more importantly, it aims at demonstrating how the film industry of the country is intrinsically linked with

Korea's identity on a global scale. More precisely, through an overview of the various periods that constitute the film history of Korea, this chapter will demonstrate how the national film industry of the country was constantly and greatly affected by two main and recurring driving forces: the government in power, whether Japanese or Korean, and foreign interest groups such as Hollywood. These two key components had a crucial role in the creation and development of the national film industry of Korea. Their constant interventions had a direct impact on the film culture's identity.

Methodology and Sources

The object of the present chapter is twofold. First, as a basis, it strives to display Korea's rich film history in order to offer greater knowledge of the subject to the reader. This knowledge is indispensable to the comprehension of BIFF's impact on the overall film culture of the country. Second, and most importantly, this chapter aims at demonstrating how the socio-political context of Korea has had an enormous influence on the film culture of the nation. During its 90 years of film history, with the first recorded 'film' produced in Korea dating back to 1919,⁸¹ Korea's film industry has been strongly tied to the state through rigorous legislation and censorship.

The complete account of Korea's film history is an undertaking that falls outside the scope of this thesis. Hence, it becomes necessary to focus on key elements. Consequently, this study examines two major points of interest of the 90 years that constitute Korea's film history: state and foreign interventions. The former refers to state legislation and censorship; the latter suggests the unrelenting efforts by foreign distribution companies, most notably Hollywood, to take control of the film market in Korea. The result of this study is a sequence of relatively concise subsections which

focus on key events relating to these two focal points. Key works utilized in this study are Jinhee Choi's *The South Korean Film Renaissance*, Brian Yecies and Ae-Gyung Shim's *Korea's Occupied Cinemas* as well as various essays by Darcy Paquet. Combined with other scholars i.e., Michael Robinson and Lee, Young-II, these three authors constitute the core of the elements found within this chapter. These four authors offer quality insight on the development of the film industry and culture in Korea at different periods of its history. Choi focuses on the last 20 years in Korea, when the film industry changed into one of the most important in all of Asia. She offers a detailed look into the various elements that allowed such a shift. Not only focusing on the infrastructure of the industry, Choi examines the cultural shift in the mode of production and exhibition that occurred in the late 1990s.

Yecies and Shim concentrate on the first half of the 20th century, a period marked by Japanese colonisation. Their work examines the impact of strong political interference on the film industry as well as the relentless pressure applied by Hollywood for control of the local film market. Through a detailed look into Japanese legislation, Yecies and Shim demonstrate the difficulties Koreans faced in their aspirations for a national film culture. Furthermore, their study also demonstrates the constant outside pressure applied by foreign distributors in an attempt to bypass laws and regulations in order to obtain a bigger piece of the pie. During the first 40 years of the 20th century, the Korean film market was up for grabs for whoever had the power and money to take it. Yecies and Shim demonstrate this through a study of the market dynamics i.e., the ratio of foreign films to Japanese and Korea films, the number of screens made available to foreign films versus local products, the lifespan of the films and the measures put into place by the

state in an attempt to protect its market. Essentially, in an attempt to offer empirical evidence, Yecies and Shim utilize sources of the period, such as newspapers and tabloids, in order to get an accurate notion of the actual figures and statistics. The result is quite revealing, accurately demonstrating the market's dynamics at the time and its shifts throughout the first half of the 20th century.

Linear progression of events

Although events in history aren't designed in a linear fashion, with events lining up sequentially in a cause and effect pattern, the present section follows a quite linear point of view. Thus, in an attempt to best demonstrate the film industry's progress or deterioration, Korea's film history is divided neatly into periods with finite beginnings and ends. In order to achieve this division of history, Darcy Paquet and Lee Young-II's essays are utilized as primary sources. Paquet's short essay "A short history of South Korean Film" divides Korea's film history into six distinct periods.⁸² Although not officially recognized and quite subjective, these divisions remain pertinent as they offer us a useful and succinct overview. To separate each period in Korea's film history, Paquet has selected important events that had either a profound impact on the society or on the film culture of Korea. Just as the field of film studies has the tendency to create groups, genres and periods, Paquet's fragmentation is typical in its simplistic yet accurate delineation of events and films. His date and film selection is not set in stone but rather acts as a guideline for this study of Korea's film history. As for Lee, his essay is focused on the film industry of Korea under Japanese colonisation, which spans the larger part of the first half of the 20th century. His essay reveals the inherent intent on the part of the Korean people to produce their own brand of films, which was hampered by Japanese

rule and censorship. As the objective of this thesis is not a detailed study of Korea's film history but rather a look at how BIFF fits into the historical relationship between the state and Korea's film culture, the present study will only focus on certain key events.⁸³

National Cinema: tied to the nation-state

Despite a large number of essays and books on the topic, the concept of national cinema remains a debatable issue in contemporary film studies. Questions such as 'what defines a cinema as belonging to a singular nation' or 'how does a national cinema take shape' constantly bring film critics and authors to their pens and computers to discuss. Often, an author can shape his or her own definition, one which best benefits his study, further complicating the issue. Moreover, the age of globalisation, along with its 'isms' (such as postmodernism, post-colonialism, multiculturalism) has further complicated the notion of the nation-state. Not only has the concept of national cinema been heavily debated in cultural studies, the notion of nation-state has been complicated by authors who argue that borders have given way to global cities such as Tokyo or New York, which resonate more with other global cities than with their country of origin. Hence, for the benefit of this chapter and thesis, it is necessary to outline the proper conceptualisation of the term 'national cinema' from the outset.

First, although it remains contested whether films should be considered as a cultural/artistic production or as a commercial commodity open for trade, our definition situates the film industry within the sphere of cultural production and merchandise. As a cultural product, motion pictures thus fall within UNESCO's designation of cultural goods which is as follows:

Consumer goods convey ideas, symbols, and ways of life. They inform or entertain, contribute to build collective identity and influence cultural practices. They are the result of individual or collective creativity.⁸⁴

This definition contributes to our inquiry by stipulating that films, as cultural goods, have a role within a culture. Films build ‘collective identity’, display ‘ways of life’ and are the result of ‘individual or collective creativity’. Let us not forget that films also exist within a context which greatly influences the shape of the product. Consequently, the definition of national cinema that would be most suitable for this thesis is as follows: films produced within the confines of a nation, including production conditions, legislations and demographics, which bares the socio-cultural characteristics (ways of life) of the country itself.⁸⁵ Another important element to this definition is the designation of the said ‘confines of a nation’ in which the films are produced. This is made possible through an understanding of the imperative role of the state in Korea’s film industry.

Second, in his 1993 anthology on European cinema, Thomas Elsaesser argues that the concept of national cinema “implies that, consciously or not, the industry wants to be an institution of the state” and that, consequently, the film industry becomes “entangled with the nation’s economy and politics, complicating the relationship with the nation-state.”⁸⁶ This simple yet accurate assertion acts as the proper starting point for the study of any national cinema, with Korea’s film culture as a prime example. As Elsaesser claims in his study of national cinemas, it is crucial to consider how the state acts upon the film industry and shapes the production of the country. Through severe censorship, selective funding, tax reductions or strict legislation, the film industry and even the film culture of a given country become intrinsically linked to the state. This is the reason

behind this section's look into the past, as Korea's film culture certainly makes no exception to Elsaesser's claims. Moreover, in his essay on contemporary cultural production in Korea, Michael Robinson further supports this argument:

No discussion of Korean film or culture is meaningful without considering its production within, until recently, an extraordinarily unstable political context. [...] Indeed, the entire history of Korean film has been marked by government interference.⁸⁷

It is quite clear that our comprehension of the films originating from Korea will only be possible through our comprehension of its ties with the state. Production, distribution and even reception are tied to this correlation. Most importantly, this comprehension of the production and distribution context is linked to a central concern to this thesis, which is the development of Korea's film culture on a global scale. While film production began early on in the 20th century, the fact remains that Korean films were not present on the international market until the late 1980s and 1990s.⁸⁸ This almost total cultural exclusion from the rest of the world was caused by an unstable socio-political context, which hampered any form of production or distribution. This early lack of presence on the international market can be attributed to the state's stranglehold on the film industry. Soojoeng Ahn elucidates just how state legislation and strict censorship led to Korea's invisibility on the global stage:

The development of the Korean film industry is inseparable from the political, social and economic situation of contemporary Korean society. Despite a history of colonization, war and economic recovery, Korea - as a nation-state - has remained a "blank and unimagined space" for the West. In a similar vein, Korean cinema was virtually unseen outside Korea until very recently.⁸⁹

To change this 'unseen', 'blank and unimagined' film culture into a global phenomenon, a venue of worldwide proportions would be necessary. Coincidentally, the

global awareness of Korean films began when the state initiated a push for a stronger presence on the international film festival circuit in the 1980s and 90s. Eventually, Korean motion pictures would explode onto the global scene in the 1990s with what would be termed by many critics and authors as the Korean New Wave. During this same decade, Korea would also host its first international film festivals with the Busan International Film Festival, an instrumental player in Korea's success on the global film market. This first international festival, which is geared towards the promotion of the nation's film culture, would emerge through the cooperation of state and municipal institutions, all working closely with members of the film industry. As in many instances in Korea's film history, this collaboration between the state and the film industry would have a direct effect on the end result.

1903-1945: Korea under Japanese colonialism

Motion pictures have been a part of Korea's history throughout the 20th century. However, the early years of the Korean film industry were almost entirely outside the control of Korean filmmakers and entrepreneurs themselves. In fact, the film culture was mostly developed through foreign interest groups of various origins, from missionaries, filmmakers, businessmen, entrepreneurs and, most importantly, the Japanese colonial government. This outside influence would end up as the driving force behind Korea's film industry for over half of the 20th century and, most notably, would deny the control of the film industry by Koreans. Albeit, Koreans were able to produce their own films despite the confines of the socio-political context, the first 40 years of Korea's film history remain the story of foreign actors and less that of national filmmakers. Notably,

the territory of Korea became ground zero for a relentless tug-of-war between two cinematic powerhouses, the United-States of America and Japan.

Early stages of film exhibition: a foreign matter

The first steps of film distribution in Korea were primarily the construction of American entrepreneurs seeking an opportunity to enlarge their business. According to Lee Young-II, “the first public screening of an imported film was on June 23rd, 1903 at Hansong Chonki Hoesa Kigyechang (Hansung Electric Company Machine Warehouse) in Dongdaemun, Seoul”.⁹⁰ American businessmen interested in exploiting business opportunities in the newly opened Korean market introduced these first screenings as a by-product of modern technologies. These foreign entrepreneurs were quick to take advantage of the immense interest in the motion picture phenomenon⁹¹, gathering large numbers of Koreans to their screenings and making an immense profit. In essence, early films were utilized by a variety of foreign groups, from U.S. and British missionaries to Japanese and American businessmen, in an effort to claim a part of the newly available market. Whether used as a religious tool, commercial product or a tool for propaganda, films opened new horizons in Korea, but primarily for foreign interest groups which benefited greatly from the high interest level. Hence, films were imported onto Korean soil by foreign distributors and not produced within the country, thus creating “a nation of image consumption and not image production”.⁹²

Moreover, as Brian Yecies and Ae-Gyung Shim argue, films served a dual purpose. On the one hand, promotional short films depicting the marvels of the modern American way of life were utilized in order to gain “lucrative contracts for electrification, the expansion of transportation [and] mining”.⁹³ In some cases, short fiction films were

linked together through added commercials. James Augustus Thomas, a salesman for the American Tobacco Company, utilized films as a means of advertisement for his tobacco products between 1903 and 1905, splicing-in adds of his cigarettes between travelogues and shorts films. Film would thus serve a commercial purpose, one which attracted numerous investors. On the other hand, films would also allow Koreans to have a direct contact with modern technologies and slowly become acquainted with this foreign lifestyle, thus helping to introduce modernity to the country.

According to Yecies and Ae-Gyung, Korean audiences were quite engrossed by travelogues, newsreels and educational films. Koreans were a curious group hungry for novelty and images of modernity. The case of Burton Holmes offers a salient example of how films were utilized as a promotional tool for modernity. This adventurous filmmaker was a pioneer of the travelogue. Most importantly, Holmes privately screened his films to King Gojong and his son Prince Youngchin in the royal palace in 1901.⁹⁴ This demonstration of modern technology further reinforced “the king’s determination to introduce Western-style development and culture to Korea, and to continue the process of opening up the country to the outside world”.⁹⁵ In addition to the film screenings such as the ones held at the Seoul Electric company warehouse, Korea and its people came into contact with the world and vice-versa. As Yecies and Shim explain “there was a far more dynamic, two-way flow of culture and images in and out of Korea than has been acknowledged- a process which in turn facilitated cross-cultural exchanges, albeit mediated by ‘Westernness’, and expanded Korean’s views of the world.”⁹⁶ This first screening, which introduced the world to Korea, would only be the beginning of a tug-of-war for possession of the Korean film market between foreign distributors, Korean

entrepreneurs and the colonial government. The latter exercising excessive control over all aspects of film culture in Korea.

The effects of the Hermit Kingdom

The first public screening held at the Seoul warehouse occurred eight years after the Lumiere's *Cinematographe* invention in 1895, considered as the birth of cinema. Although this is not an astonishing time difference, it remains five to six years after Japan and China, which are close geographical neighbours of Korea. This can be explained by an understanding of the socio-political context in which motion pictures were introduced in Korea. Lee explains this tardiness:

Historically, the reason for such delay can be attributed to the fact that the national seclusion policy of the late 19th century, suppressing Korea's modernization, spilled over to the 20th century. But the real reason lies in the overall debilitation of Korean politics, economy, diplomacy and culture under Japanese colonialism.⁹⁷

This quote contains two important elements that are crucial to our comprehension of the period. First, as Lee notes, the 'national seclusion policy' of Korea was still relatively in effect at the beginning of the 20th century. This refers to Korea's attempt to defend the nation and its traditions from outside cultural imperialism and colonialism. Essentially, before the advent of Japanese colonisation, Korea was under the rule of the *Joseon* dynasty (1392-1910)⁹⁸. It is from this dynasty, the longest in Korea's history, that the cultural roots of the nation stemmed and it was these traditions that the country yearned to defend. To achieve this, the country voluntarily isolated itself from outside forces and influences to maintain its sovereignty. International trade and commerce through the country's ports was kept at a minimal and foreigners were strongly supervised. A consequence of this voluntary seclusion was the country's isolation from

technological and industrial progress, which was chiefly introduced by western countries and industrially advanced Asian nations such as Japan. In turn, this resulted in the country's seclusion from 'modernity' itself. Although the country was not devoid of foreigners i.e., missionaries, entrepreneurs or soldiers, the nation remained split between past and future, tradition and novelty. This situation undoubtedly complicated the transition into modern times for Korea. Robinson explains this difficult position Korea and its people found themselves in:

As in many non-Western societies, the failure of the ancient regime, in Korea's case the [Joeson] dynasty (1392-1910), to defend its sovereignty against Western and Japanese imperialist onslaught in the late nineteenth century cast a pall over its entry into the modern world system. [...] In the end, the progressives were caught in a dilemma that informed cultural development in Korea for the better part of the 1990s. That is, modernisers in Korea took their inspiration from the very forces (most notably Japanese) that threatened the political and cultural autonomy of what they hoped might become a modern Korean nation.⁹⁹

The crucial element to retain here is Korea's reluctance towards modernisation to the detriment of its cultural traditions and the precarious socio-political environment which originated from it. Second, as Lee notes, Japan's rule would have a crushing impact on the overall culture of Korea in the first half of the 20th century. As Robinson explains, "Japan annexed Korea with the long-range intention of assimilating Korea into Japanese society,"¹⁰⁰ thus eliminating Korea on the world map. This plan included "the destruction of native Korean culture, its language, mores, customs, in short all those things that made Koreans culturally distinct from Japanese."¹⁰¹ Towards the end of the occupation, Koreans were banned from speaking their own language in public spaces and many families were forced to change their surnames to Japanese. Thus, not only did the

country isolate itself early on from outside influences, which proved inefficient, it was also incapable of asserting its own identity at home due to Japanese rule. Consequently, both these elements would lead to Korea's nonexistence on the global market, whether culturally or in any other way.

Modernity and motion pictures in Korea

Although Korea, as a nation, remained extremely cautious regarding the introduction of modernity within its borders, it is important to note that this situation did not completely obstruct the country from partaking and developing its own film culture, a quite modern phenomenon. After the first screenings in 1903, an exhibition network slowly developed as various film theatres were built and numerous warehouses transformed into public screening spaces. Slowly, local theatre owners and businessmen, both Korean and Japanese, also began to invest in the production of Korean motion pictures. These first films constituted the beginning of the country's film culture, termed *Joseon* films. Yet, until the late-1980s and 1990s, this film industry knew almost nothing but hardship and complications which hampered its production and development. As Lee has pointed out, during the Japanese occupation, every aspect of Korean culture was strongly if not completely controlled by Japan. This colonisation of Korea by its Eastern neighbour did not completely eliminate the country's film production.¹⁰² However, all aspects of film production were strongly scrutinized by state leaders. Although it was possible to produce films, most projects could only be produced within the system established by Japanese legislation and were chained to strict guidelines established by the colonial government. The few projects allowed shooting were only permitted distribution once submitted to a strict censorship board¹⁰³. By 1942, "Korean-language

films were banned outright by the government”.¹⁰⁴ Consequently, Korean film production was kept to a minimum for the first half of the 20th century.

Moreover, film distribution and exhibition were no more favourable for the few Korean films. Although many film theatres had been built in the first two decades of the 20th century, “these theaters were mostly Japanese owned” and “exclusively showed foreign films.”¹⁰⁵ Unfortunately, Korea’s film industry could not compete with the production value of western films.¹⁰⁶ These foreign films were preferred by Korean patrons due to their “artistic and entertainment quality” and the fact that “they provided new knowledge and liberal views”.¹⁰⁷ Thus, although there existed a group of Korean investors, artists, directors and film theater owners who attempted to encourage Korean films, screens were relatively unavailable for the local works themselves. Coupled with the extensive Japanese control over production and distribution, Korea’s film culture was kept in the dark from local patrons and completely unavailable for an international audience. Most importantly, a large portion of the films of the period was destroyed in subsequent years. This results in a film history that primarily exists in books.

1945-1955: U.S. occupation and the Korean War

With Japan defeated in World War II, it was believed that Korea could finally regain its cultural and political independence. However, like many newly liberated countries, this transition was not a simple undertaking. In fact, the country’s complete liberation from oppression would have to wait for the people of Korea in this post-war era. Not long after its emancipation from Japanese occupation, Koreans saw their country divided and occupied by two different nations and, most importantly, two different ideologies, which split the country in half at the 38th parallel. “Within a month of

liberation, the United-States and Soviet Union had imposed a joint occupation setting the stage for the division of Korea and the continuing nationalist conflict that is now organised around two opposing political systems.”¹⁰⁸ Henceforth, the country was split into North and South, with the former a communist regime and the latter an industrial capitalist nation. Still today, these two regimes exist, with North Korea (Democratic People’s Republic of Korea) constituting one of the most secluded and self-contained countries in the world and South Korea an important industrial country. This socio-political split created further conflict within the country, which undoubtedly had an impact on the film culture itself.

During the period between the U.S. occupation (1945) and the end of the Korean War (1950-1953), the country and its film culture was devastated in a manner unlike anything before. As the first 40 years were a period of administrative and legislative obstacles that limited film production, the following years affected the film industry on a more physical and quantifiable level. Essentially, during this short wartime period, the film industry and its infrastructures were almost completely destroyed. On the technical level, most of the theaters, film studios and archives were destroyed or abandoned due to constant bombings or enemy raids. The film culture’s development was obstructed on a whole new level and was made utterly impossible. Darcy Paquet explains the extent of the damages when he states that “much of the country’s film reinfrastructure was destroyed”¹⁰⁹ placing the concept of a film industry on the back burner. Constant attacks and raids also forced the state to temporarily displace the center of the film industry from Seoul, capital of Korea, to Busan. The creation of a Korean film culture freed from obstruction would thus have to wait.

Korea's film culture under the USAMGIK regime

As the Korean War destroyed the film industry on a more physical level, the intervention of the U.S. government, referred to as the U.S. Army Military Government of Korea (USAMGIK), had an impact on the film industry on a more legislative and administrative level. Once again, Korean filmmakers and production companies had their hands tied by strict and restrictive legislation, now originating from another political oppressor. As Yecies and Ae-Gyung explain, with the advent of U.S. occupation came the adage 'trade comes with the flag'.¹¹⁰ In essence, "USAMGIK film policy, which was a close copy of laws promulgated by the former colonial government, kept Korean filmmakers subservient, albeit temporarily, to an authoritative agenda".¹¹¹ These film policies and laws were put in place to allow American film distributors to regain the level of business they had before the interference of the Japanese colonial government.¹¹² The consequences of these new administrative changes were quite evident within the film industry of Korea. As soon as the country was within America's grasp, film theaters were flooded with Hollywood motion pictures.

During the Second World War, U.S. motion pictures were strongly censored and subsequently banned from Korea by Japan. Once WWII was over, the roles were reversed with American productions dominating the nation's film theatres and Japanese films banned from distribution within Korea. In control of the market, Hollywood had an abundance of movies just waiting to reach a curious audience craving the entertainment value American films could offer. With Korea now open for business and the USAMGIK at the head of the state, the country became prime real estate for Hollywood film distributors. Hence, Korean films remained segregated by legislations enforced by an

outside power and, moreover, they were outclassed by Hollywood productions, leaving Korea's film industry primarily outside the hands of its own people. Additionally, in *The South Korean Film Renaissance*, Jinhee Choi adds: "the Korean film industry was negligible, producing fewer than thirty films a year."¹¹³ How could a film industry, ravaged by War and producing such few films, compete with the production value and quantity of Hollywood films?¹¹⁴ It can't. Thus ensues a battle not unlike David versus Goliath. Echoing the first half of its film history, Korea's film culture was found in a state of crisis; it was tied to the political condition of the country, which is destroyed and divided. The cultural imperialism of the past years is reiterated through a new powerhouse, one determined to champion a different rhetoric, freedom and democracy, yet with the surreptitious objective of enforcing its own concepts onto Korean culture.

Although a negative era in general for film in Korea, one event stands out during this short period that could arguably stand as the beginning of Korea's attempt at a revival of its film culture. In 1953, President Rhee Syngman¹¹⁵ exempted the film industry from all taxes in hopes of encouraging filmmakers and businessmen to invest larger sums of capital within film production. This could be viewed as a starting point in the state's efforts to encourage film production in Korea. This attempt was somewhat successful, as it allowed Korea to produce more films and create a stronger base for its film culture. The appeal of tax evasion resulted in a boost in film companies and production. Additionally, thanks to the support of the USAMGIK in the country's rebuild, which was not all destructive, Korea and its film industry benefited from "foreign aid programs" that "provided South Korea with film technology and equipment".¹¹⁶ Coupled with the country's slow commercial and industrial development,

these factors acted together as catalysts in the birth of a successful Korean film industry and to its finest hour yet.

1955-1969: The Golden Age

The splicing of history into sections or periods with finite beginnings and ends can seem quite arbitrary. Yet, it seems this process is also necessary for our comprehension of the progress of events. Obviously, most often these divisions are designed by academics, researchers and authors, who, through a common consensus, determine which dates or events mark the break or dawn of a period in history. The following era in Korea's film culture is quite possibly one of the most recognized sections of its film history, the Golden Age of the 1960s. This successful period of Korean cinema begins in the late 1950s, as Korea would begin to take hold of the local market, reaches its apex in the middle of 1960s and end with the decade concluding. The central features of this period can be summarized as follows: before returning into the shadow cast by Hollywood and its motion picture extravaganza, the 1960s saw Korean films momentarily take control of the local film market while remaining relatively invisible on the global stage. All this during a post-war period filled with political and economic uncertainty, as head of state Park-Chang Hee worked hard during his regime (1962-1979) to raise the country out of the ashes and into a prosperous economic period.

During the Golden Age (1955-1969),¹¹⁷ as the country was slowly developing into a viable industrial and economic nation, Korean patrons witnessed the emergence of some of its most talented and memorable directors. Fuelled by the interest of a fiscal paradise exempted from taxes, businessmen and entrepreneurs began investing more heavily in the film industry. Accordingly, the 1960s saw production companies grow in

numbers. A side-effect of this enhancement in film production was an increase in the market share, which saw Korean patrons returning to the film theatres to view local products. This period also marked one of the most prolific and creative periods in Korea's film history, with record numbers in both films produced and box-office successes. Undoubtedly, this success can be linked to the country's economic rehabilitation, which was a result of foreign U.S. aid in the post-war period. As David Ekbladh explains: "by the mid-1960s, South Korea appeared to be turning the corner economically. U.S. economic aid declined as the country's industrial and export economy began to expand".¹¹⁸ Although the era is primarily recognized as a prosperous time, the period was not void of obstacles to the national film industry and its development. Behind the silver lining of the 1960s, the Korean film industry remained in jeopardy and in a delicate state. Two recurring elements obstructed the film culture. First the state, which recognized motion pictures as a strong ideological tool, constantly searched for control over the industry and refused to loosen its grasp on it. Second was pressure from foreign distributors, most importantly Hollywood-based, which had as objective to regain and remain in control of the Korean film market.

The influence of the Korean Military Dictatorship on the film industry

In the first instance, similarly to the colonial period and post-war period, the state institutions perceived motion pictures as a powerful tool in the dissemination of its ideology. After the Korean War and the subsequent division of the country, the nation was led by a series of Military Dictators, not selected through a democratic process but rather self-appointed, who enacted their power through force and control. Acknowledging the strong ideological power of motion pictures, these state leaders understood that the

film industry's development needed to be regulated by the government. Accordingly, the production of motion pictures was put under the control of the state in order to assure the proper regulation of information flow. Especially, with a strong anti-communist and traditional standpoint, the military government was on constant lookout for films considered pro-communist. Any motion picture that questioned the regime in place or depicted imagery and themes counter to Confucian tradition i.e., sexual content, defiance to authority, filial piety, were heavily censored or banned. This control was enacted through the creation of new legislation. As Choi explains, Korea not only saw its film industry boom, it also saw the state take greater control on the industry through legislation.

The MPL [Motion Picture Law] was first legislated in 1962 with the aim of accelerating the industrialization of the Korean motion picture business. The government wished to model the Korean film industry after the Hollywood studio system by eliminating small, unstable production companies. Such an attempt only resulted in further instability of the industry with many small-to mid-sized companies going bankrupt. Despite these drawbacks, Korean cinema enjoyed its first renaissance in the 1960s with the emergence of new production companies and commercial success at the box office.¹¹⁹

The Golden Age of Korea's film history thus had two prime features, the success and proliferation of locally produced films and the growing obstructions caused by state interference. Ironically, the success and failure of the local film industry was a direct result of the states enactment of the Motion Picture Law (MPL), the elements that marked the period.

A viable film industry in Korea

During this period, motion pictures slowly gained in popularity and became one of the favourite leisure activities of the people of Korea. Local productions began to take

a larger share of the Korean market. In 1960, the ratio of foreign films to Korean films was just above two foreign films for each local production. According to statistics presented by Lee Young-II, 273 screens were available for motion pictures that year. Out of the 300 films which screened throughout 1960, 208 were foreign, a domination of foreign films, which were mostly Hollywood productions. However, this relationship was reversed by the end of the 1960s. In 1969, there were two Korean films for each foreign import, with 229 locally produced films for 79 imported movies. This trend continued into the 1970s until declining in the middle of that decade. This boost in production and local interest in Korean films can be attributed to a growing awareness on the part of Korean patrons. Out of all the possible cultural activities, “cinema was easily the most popular entertainment form” as “nearly half of the 170 million tickets (the entire population was just over 30 million) in 1972, for instance, were sold for the screening of local films”.¹²⁰ Not only was the film industry of Korea progressing, there began a growing fascination on the part of the people of Korea for their own film culture.

Moreover, the film industry gradually established its production centre in Seoul, where it developed into an impressive production hub. Like Hollywood, Korea found a proper space to serve as the nexus for the film industry.

Throughout the 1960s and the early 1970s, Ch'ungmuro, a district in Seoul, was home to one of the most profitable and active industries in the world, producing at its peak (1968–1971) over two hundred films a year.

This overabundance of films was sparked in part by the Motion Picture Law, which “mandated that film companies must produce at least 15 films per year and that all films should be commercial by design”.¹²¹ The MPL also “allowed film companies to

import one foreign feature for every three local movies produced”.¹²² This central element of the law played a key role in the demise of the Korean film industry. Essentially, although local films were gaining in popularity as the film industry was gaining in size and technological expertise, distributors and local theatre owners still sought to import foreign films to attract business. By design, the MPL would create a legislative loophole that allowed more foreign films to flood the local market, thus creating an internal conflict. Consequently, filmmakers were under great pressure to make as many films as possible to meet the one for three ratio established by the MPL. These films came to be known as the ‘quota quickies’, films produced in record time and on a low budget. Some directors could produce up to eight films a year during this period only in the ultimate goal of importing foreign films. This model allowed both the proliferation of the Korean film industry as well as offering the tools to its own destruction.

One effect of this ample production and inclination towards the Hollywood model was diversity in film styles and genres. Consequently, this period saw the emergence of the most important production of genre cinema in Korea’s short film history. Although the industry produced a wide variety of genre-oriented films, from war movies to martial arts films, the melodrama remains the genre that defines the period. Films such as *The Housemaid* (Kim Ki-young, 1960), *The Houseguest and My Mother* (Shin Sang-ok, 1961) and *The Student Boarder* (Jeong Jin-woo, 1966) remain trademark films of the Golden Age.¹²³ Furthermore, as the film industry produced a plethora of successful films, the local market dynamics slowly shifted in its favour. As the chart displays (appendix 1), the roles were clearly reversed during the peak of the Golden Age,

as Korean films would take a stronghold on the market. This bustling film industry and growing local interest amounted to the first instance in Korea's film history when the nation displayed its own film culture to its people and on its own screens. Added to the growth in film production, the Korean film industry witnessed the rise of its most talented and creative filmmakers. With an increase in film production came a greater number of opportunities for local film directors to express themselves. Consequently, this allowed these filmmakers to assert themselves as outstanding directors. Filmmakers such as Kim Ki-young, Shin Sang-ok, Lee Bong-rae among others, demonstrated their immense talent and were finally able to express themselves. These directors created their own brand of films, resulting in the beginning of film *auteurs* in Korean. Not since *Arirang* (Na Un-kyu, 1926) did directors truly mark a period in Korea's film history. Filmmakers such as Kim Ki-young were capable of expressing themselves despite the strict government control and censorship. Kim and his fellow directors allowed the film industry of Korea to flourish unlike anytime before. In subsequent years, film festival would hold retrospectives of these filmmakers, further acknowledging their importance as Korean *auteurs*. Unfortunately, this short success was thwarted by strong state interference, which ultimately brought the Golden Age to an end.

The beginning of the end of the Golden Age

While Korea's film industry was at its apex, producing successful and entertaining films, it was forced to deal once more with strict state regulations that complicated the situation. These complications came in the form of the Motion Picture Law's regulations, which "strengthened government control over all aspects of the industry."¹²⁴ Although the MPL did allow the motion picture industry to prosper to a certain degree, its primary

objective was control and regulation over film business in Korea, a trademark of the period. Unfortunately, the MPL's "restrictive policies would ultimately have severe effect on the industry's creativity."¹²⁵ First, just as during the colonial period, the state would enact its control over the film industry through severe censorship. Newly liberated and facing a precarious socio-political environment, the military dictatorship of the Republic of Korea utilized censorship to keep all film productions within ideological barriers established by the state, hence, creating another system to which filmmakers must abide to. As Paquet notes:

Once completed, movies faced a strict government censorship board, which would often ban or delay films based on either political/social content (Yu Hyun-mok's *Obaltan*), alleged pro-communist sympathies (Lee Man-hee's *Seven Women Prisoners*, for which he was briefly arrested), or sexuality (Shin Sang-ok's *Eunuch*).¹²⁶

Although directors developed creative ways to circumvent censorship through the use of metaphors or suggestive elements and were also able to thrive as film *auteurs* during this short period, the constant and harsh censorship inevitably took its toll. The production system created by the state's legislation unavoidably led to a decrease in the number of films produced and, importantly, in their production values. The cheap nature of the quota quickies rendered them as inappropriate rivals to Hollywood motion pictures. Added to the decrease in film quality and severe state censorship, the Motion Picture Law also weakened the film industry through its drive to emulate the Hollywood system as it eliminated 'small, unstable production companies', which had been established in the previous years. Slowly, but surely, Korea's film industry would be incapable of sustaining its production level and, as the state's control would grow even stronger, the Golden Age would end with a decrease in theater attendance as well as the

quantity and quality of film production. Inevitably, foreign films would regain control of the film market as fewer and fewer local films competed with them. The next decade saw Korea's film culture enter much darker days before entering a new film renaissance in the last decades of the 20th century.

1970s: A dark period in Korea's film history

In retrospect, dark periods of anguish and pain are often seen as necessary for a rise to success, the darkness before dawn. The 1970s in Korea's film history are a good example of this, a period of darkness before a rise to global success. After brief national success in the 1960s, Korea's film industry "entered a long period of declining admissions and increased levels of government censorship."¹²⁷ Prolonging and refining the administrative processes it had begun in the 60s, the state tightened its grip on the industry, further driving it deeper into an abyss. Although the local film industry was able to produce some interesting work, the 70s was a dark period for the Korean film industry on the whole. As the numbers show (appendix 2), film production went from 209 films in 1970 to 96 in 1979. Total admissions went from 166,000,000 to 66,000,000 as well. This was the result of many factors established during the previous decade. Paquet adds:

Many people look back on the 1970s as the darkest era of Korean cinema. Under Korea's military regime, harsh censorship combined with constant governmental interference in the industry to essentially destroy the robust film culture that had grown up in the 1960s. Directors were given very little artistic freedom, pressured instead to produce a very limited range of genres and styles for the promotion of government policy. Over the decade, attendance levels plunged as audiences turned to television or other forms of entertainment over film.¹²⁸

Evidently, this decade became a testament to the ever growing and constant obstacles put upon the development of the film culture in Korea as 'many people look

back on the 1970s as the darkest era of Korean Cinema'. This period might remain as the time during which state intervention and foreign pressure reached an apex in Korea's film history, driving it into the ground. Yet, in contrast to the darkness of the period, the 70s still set the groundwork for the ensuing film renaissance of the country. First, faced with growing external pressure to open its market to international trade, Korea, as an industrial country, entered the initial stages of globalisation, a key element to its future success. Second, the state began a new phase in its desire to save and, more importantly, develop the culture of Korea, including motion pictures.

First, with the U.S. involvement in the industrial and economic rebuild of the country, Korea's economy and industry entered the global stage and began to rely highly on international trade.¹²⁹ However, this global trade business only went one-way as Koreans remained wary of foreign interventions. Jaydan Tait notes that "Korea continued to export at high volumes yet remained virtually closed to foreign imports" and that "until the late eighties [...] Seoul remained almost exclusively the domain of Korean business and foreigners were still rarely seen on city streets".¹³⁰ This continuous cautiousness toward foreign interjection and interference, perhaps a side effect of the *Joseon* isolated hermit period, caused the country to come under pressure from foreign industries to "liberalize its import policies and financial markets for all industries, including film".¹³¹ Perhaps one of the most persistent of these many international businesses was America's film industry. Once more, Hollywood was on the offensive as it yearned to regain power within a market it once dominated much more forcibly. Stuck in a period of transition from third-world agricultural country ravaged by war into an industrialized nation, Korea's film industry did not have the resources at its disposal to rival Hollywood's,

which was flooding the screens with films that the Korean audiences wanted to see. Nonetheless, there were some positive aspects during this period that are of concern to this study.

Second, in 1973, the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism, founded in 1948, established the Korean Motion Picture Promotion Corporation in 1973 (precursor to the Korean Film Council) in hopes of reviving the local film industry once more. The KMPPC was created for the prime purpose of supporting and promoting Korean films.¹³² Through a wide variety of resources, such as funding and various aid programs, the KMPPC became an important part of Korea's film infrastructure. In addition to an institution dedicated to the promotion of film production in Korea, the state also established the Korean Film Archive (KOFA) in 1974, a first attempt at a proper form of conservation and cataloguing of the films of Korea and, thus, the film culture of the country. Coupled with the Motion Picture Law, this demonstrated the government's strong desire to better secure its film industry, which was faced with strong foreign pressure. Although it seemed the state had the film industry at heart, the results were not as hoped due chiefly to reforms to the MPL later in 1973. Key changes in these reforms would see the Motion Picture Law switch from a registration system, cataloguing the various film projects in production, to a licensing system, controlling what gets made more forcefully. Henceforth, film companies were required to have a license in order to produce films, which significantly reduced the quantity of films produced. Essentially, "a production license was given only to film companies with studio facilities and capital",¹³³ which eliminated smaller independent companies. The result would be a snowball effect. Fewer motion picture companies would cause a drop in the number of films, which

caused a decrease in revenues. In turn, this would open the door to foreign productions, such as Hollywood and Europe, to screen their films and keep control of the market in Korea. The unfortunate result, once again, is a film industry repeatedly obstructed decade after decade, either through internal administrative regulations or foreign cultural occupation. Fortunately, the subsequent decades saw Korea's film industry regain a measure of control, prosper and attain its second 'renaissance'.

The 1980s and 90s: The age of globalisation

The last two decades of the 20th century are quite possibly the period during which Korea's film industry went through the most numerous changes and the most important modifications. Notwithstanding the fact that the entire film history of Korea is defined by constant changes and fluctuations, this era presents us with what could be argued as the birth of a national film industry freed from heavy constraints and one gaining national and international popularity. It is during this period of great social, cultural, political and economic transformations that Korea's motion picture business developed into the Asian dynamo it is today.¹³⁴ It is also during this period that the Busan International Film Festival first made its appearance, a key point in this study which is addressed at length in chapter 3. The number of modifications that came about during these two decades, which strongly affected the film industry and the country itself, is simply staggering and overwhelming. Although the detailed study of these 20 years is quite extensive and beyond the scope of this thesis, it is possible to satisfy our curiosity through a simplified division of the changes into two paradigms: globalization (foreign affairs) and democratization (state legislation). The first refers to the advent of Korea as a

major player on the international commercial and technological market, affecting the country's economy and deeply impacting the country's culture. The latter encloses political, legislative and cultural changes that end up affecting cultural production, distribution and consumption in the country. Obviously, one can't omit the fact that these two spheres are interdependent and worked together in the country's development locally and globally. Essentially, this era witnessed Korea's ascension from an obscure and weakened East Asian country to one of the leading nations in Asia and also witnessed a boom in film production, distribution and consumption. This globalization, along with the legislative modifications brought on by a newly founded democratic government yearning to develop and protect the country's film culture, created an environment in which a Korean national film culture could prosper.

Globalization

During these two decades, the country's commerce and cultural production entered the global market in hopes of taking part in the international phenomenon of globalization. As a commodity to be sold and exported, cultural production, whether television, music or film, was a central concern to the state. Thus ensued a period of unsurpassed cultural and economic development across many East Asian countries known as the Korean Wave or *Hallyu* of the 1990s and 2000s. Yet, this prosperous period was not exempt from the same difficulties as the previous ones. Once more, the cultural development of the country was strongly linked to the state's involvement. However, for the first time in its film history, this period witnesses the state intervention shift from a negative role of obstruction to a positive role much more supportive of the

film culture. This led to a new set of rules and regulations for the film industry, which benefited it and encouraged its creativity.

From the late 1980s, the Korean film industry began a process of two-way expansion—from the outside in and the inside out—with the number of foreign film imports reaching 2,705, or an average of 338 films annually between 1989 and 1996. Even more significant changes came with the formal removal of censorship regulations and practices. In 1996, under the government of Korea's first civilian president, Kim Young-sam, the South Korean Constitutional Court declared film censorship to be illegal. Since this landmark ruling, new spaces for freedom of expression have opened up and censorship is now considered a tool of the authoritarian regimes of the past.¹³⁵

Although Yecies and Shim's statement would lead us to believe that much was resolved late in the 1980s for the Korea motion picture business, the truth is quite contradictory. During this decade, Korea faced one of its most important obstacles yet. As mentioned above, Korea entered the age of globalization and thus, as its market would open to the world, it would come in direct competition with the world.

The concept of globalization remained a double-edged sword for the country as its film industry continued to feel growing external pressures from international distribution companies wishing to exploit the country's market. To open its economy and culture to the rest of the world meant to open the floodgates, allowing all that the hermit kingdom was wary about to simply walk right in. In fact, "with the country's rapid economic growth in the 1970s and 1980s, the Korean government was under pressure to liberalize its import policies and financial markets for all industries".¹³⁶ Harking back to Jaydan Tait's description of Korea's early inclinations for export and cautiousness towards foreign import, this newfound desire to open to the global market was an invitation to international companies to exert further pressure on the market. This external pressure

acted be the catalyst for a variety of important changes that affected the Korean film industry on a multitude of levels. It is crucial to note that although globalization might have been an important factor in the renewal of the film industry and in the country's industrial development, it remains that the concept of globalization also carries many negative factors. The age of globalization has brought such issues as corporate 'outsourcing', the spreading of fast food culture, the broadening of the gap between the rich and the poor and much more. Although, the present subsection seems to celebrate this paradigm, it is crucial that the reader keep in mind that globalization is a complex concept fraught with both positive and negative aspects.

In 1984, the state attempted to secure its domestic market through another of many reforms to the motion picture law.¹³⁷ Among the numerous changes to the MPL, the screen quota system for production and distribution remains of top interest to this study.¹³⁸ In essence, this system was designed to "encourage reinvestment in film production using distribution revenue".¹³⁹ Film companies were only allowed to import and distribute a certain number of foreign films according to its production of local motion pictures. Thus, the objective of the screen quota system was to get film companies to reinvest their revenues, which were gained through the distribution of foreign films, into the production of local films. Yet, as with the 'quota quickies' of the 1960s, this screen quota had the same effect on the film industry as producers sought to make films with haste in order to import foreign films.

Although the screen quota system would unfortunately have the reverse effect at the outset, one essential feature favoured local productions and remained crucial to the dynamics of the domestic market. In addition to controlling the number of films imported

and local films produced, the screen quota also assured a minimum of screen time for the national motion picture business. At its inception in 1966, the screen quota system stipulated “that local theatres screen Korean films for 106 to 146 days per year, depending on various factors”¹⁴⁰. Albeit, this did not assure that Korea’s local audience would flock to film theatres to see the latest Korean motion pictures, at least it allowed a certain measure of control on the domestic market. Although this revision of the Motion Picture Law was a valiant effort to support its national film industry, the external pressures from Hollywood took their toll and forced another revision that would have an even deeper impact on the film industry. As Paquet explains:

The sixth revision, in contrast, was a product of outside pressure rather than a reform propagated from within. In 1985, the Motion Picture Export Association of America (MPEAA) issued a strong complaint to the South Korean government with regard to the country’s various restrictions on film imports and, after subsequent negotiations between the two governments, a Korea-US Film agreement was signed later that year.¹⁴¹

In 1988, the Motion Picture Law was revised again and took into consideration the Korea-US Film agreement. This major modification to its legislation came in three forms. First, a change in policy allowed Hollywood studios to establish distribution offices in Korea. This permitted Hollywood to directly supply local film theaters with their products. Korea thus had to compete directly with Hollywood blockbusters, which were distributed through a local branch setup in Korea, usually in Seoul or close-by. Second, the revision abolished the 100-million ₩ (won) tax charged on imported foreign films. These funds were previously used for a film-promotion fund for the KMPPC. Thus, through administrative interference, the state obstructed the film industry

financially. Third, import quotas i.e., the ratio of foreign films in regards to local productions, was abolished, allowing the floodgates to open for Hollywood. Consequently, the Korean market was defenseless against Hollywood blockbusters and, through the loss of the 100-million ₩ tax, also lost revenues previously utilized in the production of local films. “To compensate for these changes, the Screen Quota system [...] was retained and the government pledged more fully to enforce it”.¹⁴² Korea would thus take part in a re-enactment of David versus Goliath with its sole defense coming in the form of the Screen Quota system.

Even with a strengthened Screen Quota system, the local film industry still faltered, as Korean audiences preferred American blockbusters rather than local productions. The most evident proof of this comes in its market share of the period, which diminished throughout the first half of the 1990s (appendix 3). In fact, in 1993, Korean cinema represented only 15.9% of the share of the local film admissions, the rest going to foreign film corporations.¹⁴³ The weakness of local films at the box office sparked a reaction within the film industry and the state leaders. That same year, realizing the gravity of the situation, the Korean Motion Picture Promotion Corporation wrote in its annual publication that the Korean film industry was at “the edge of a cliff, where it [was] about to fall”.¹⁴⁴ Moreover, only a year later, a annual financial report was published by the state, its contents acted as a catalyst that altered how state officials viewed the global media market, more importantly film. The financial impact of the film market on Korea’s economy suddenly became much clearer. As Paquet states:

In 1994, the Presidential Advisory Council on Science and Technology reported to President Kim Young-sam an eye-opening statistic showing that profits from the Hollywood blockbuster *Jurassic Park* (Us, 1993) equalled the export revenue of 1,5 million

Hyundai cars, and it urged him to promote the high-technology media industry as a strategic national industry. Since Hyundai cars are the symbol of Korea's economic growth, the comparison underscored the need for the active promotion of the culture industry, and thus became a decisive factor in revolutionising the Korean government's approach to the media industries.¹⁴⁵

Through such evidence, the state realized the gravity of the situation as Korea's film industry was not only in jeopardy, but the country's economy as well. With such a comparison between American cultural imperialism (blockbusters) versus Korean industrial product (automobiles), the state and the film industry was presented with a proper symbol to fight against. Consequently, echoing the rest of its history, the local film industry was forced once more to face outside pressure in the form of foreign films; a lack of interest from the Korean audience for local productions; a lack of support; and a series of laws and legislations which hampered its production. The answer to the crisis of the early 1990s came in the form of a newly rejuvenated film industry supported by a government willing and longing for local as well as international success.

Increased production and production value

It is possible to focus on key elements that acted as the main catalysts in the various changes which shook the film industry to its core and turned it into what is now considered a dynamo in Asia. These alterations can be divided into two sets, state interventions, once again, and the advent of new forms of funding, production and distribution. First, Kim Young-sam's appointed government would have "the thorny task of revitalising the Korean economy by enhancing its international competitiveness".¹⁴⁶ This was made possible through many reforms regarding legislation and new forms of support for local film production. In 1995, the state would establish the Basic Motion

Picture Promotion Law, which, as both Shin and Paquet acknowledge, had no practical measures. The law was designed in the specific goal of encouraging “relevant government bodies [to] create conferences, policies and funds for media promotion”.¹⁴⁷ Thus, its basic objective was to reinforce and encourage the promotion of local media. In December of the same year, the Motion Picture Law would be changed to the Film Promotion Law. Perhaps the most important modification to take place during this period, this law allowed the film industry to restructure its production and funding processes. Among the many contributions of the new law, two stand out. First, the Film Promotion Law would allow distribution companies to export their films overseas and production companies to create co-productions with foreign companies without the pre-approval of the Ministry of Culture and Sports, which was a prerequisite before 1996. Hence, “by making the international co-production and exports of Korean films easier, these devices encouraged the globalisation of Korean cinema”.¹⁴⁸ Second, the Film Promotion Law would introduce the Film Promotion Fund. This new fund would be designed to encourage the local film industry through greater economic support. Thus, through its inclination towards the globalisation of the Korean film industry and its reinforcement of financial support, the advent of the Film Promotion Law allowed the film industry to elevate its production value in hopes of competing with global juggernauts such as Hollywood as well as promoting itself abroad.

In addition to the Film Promotion Law, the state installed tax breaks that highly encouraged various large corporations to enter the film production business. Thus began the *jaebols* era of Korean film production, which lasted until 1998. These *jaebols* were important Korean business corporations, or conglomerates, such as Hyundai, Samsung

and Daewoo, which began investing in the film industry. The contribution of these *jaebols* created a vertically integrated system in which the corporations invested in production, distribution and exhibition of films. Moreover, their financial involvement allowed the film industry to increase the production value of its films and compete with Hollywood mega-productions. The Korean motion picture business inevitably became just that, a business. The increase in investments spread out through all aspects of film production and promotion. Special effects companies heightened their production value quite considerably and film promotion became an important point in the success of local film. Although a lucrative business, the involvement of the *jaebols* was short lived as Korea, and most of East Asia, would be hit by a financial crisis in the late 90s known as the IMF crisis. By 1997-98, the *jaebols* would be replaced by venture-capital companies, which invested vast amounts of money in film production, thus continuing where the conglomerates left off. Today, “major conglomerates such as CJ, Lotte and the Orion Group remain the industry's most powerful players”.¹⁴⁹

The overall result of the various revisions and modifications that occurred during the 1980s and 90s is a production and distribution model that resembles the one in Hollywood; an industry model geared towards entertainment and genre oriented films. Albeit the industry also produced, to this date, quality art-house and independent films geared towards an international film festival market, the national success was made possible thanks to these ‘Hollywood model films’. Thanks to the increased production value, coupled with the state’s promotion of the film industry through tax exemptions and new legislations, the film industry was able to shift its production model towards a more entertainment driven one, producing ‘blockbuster’ type films in order to compete with

foreign productions and to secure its domestic market. This turn towards entertainment and High Quality films¹⁵⁰ was undoubtedly effective, as the market share for Korean films would continue to grow through the 1990s and into the 2000s. In 1996, the local market share for Korean films would be only 23.1%. In 2001, this number jumped to 50.1%, a remarkable increase in only five years. Hence, for the first time in its history, Korea's film industry presented unprecedented success locally and began its journey onto the global stage. A national film industry was undoubtedly taking shape, one that was relatively free of state censorship, excessive foreign cultural impediment and one that was viewed by its people. On a rather symbolic level, Korea's film culture was finally truly in the hands of Koreans.

Conclusion: 1996 and beyond

As this chapter has demonstrated, for most of its history, Korea's film industry has been relatively invisible to its own people and to the rest of the world as well. Whether due to Japanese colonisation, U.S. occupation, civil war, strict state legislation, severe censorship or internal and external pressures, the film industry of Korea has had to withstand substantial obstacles. Although the film industry would take its fair share of the domestic market during its Golden Age in the late 50s and 60s, Korea was often forced to compete with foreign film industries with much greater technological knowhow and higher production value i.e., Hollywood and, before 1945, Japan. Most importantly, this chapter has also illustrated how Korea's film culture is tightly bound to the state as well as to the political and economic context of the country. Consequently, when globalisation became the driving force behind the country's economic structure and cultural

production, the motion picture industry took part in a socio-cultural reform that would transform its films into national products to be promoted and exported locally and abroad.

As a consequence of the drive for globalisation, the mid-1990s bore witness to various shifts in domestic market dynamics and to the launch of the Korean film industry onto the global market, where it gained critical recognition. During this period, Korea's motion picture business began to take a stronghold of its domestic market, taking back what foreign films and blockbusters had taken since the 1970s. Although foreign distribution companies were allowed to setup branches on Korean soil, local films were able to compete more adequately thanks to an increase in the production value and a shift towards an entertainment based mode of production. Accordingly, the statistics from the period speak for themselves, as the market share for Korean films jumped from 20.9% in 1995 to 63.8% in 2006, which was a record year at the local box office for Korea. Hence, the Korean film industry finally had a presence, and a strong one at that, within its borders. No longer would Korea's film culture be in the shadows of an oppressing external force. Instead, it became a driving force within Asian cinema and took control of its own film history. An element of great importance and which greatly aided in Korea's growth locally and, more notably globally, was the advent of the Busan International Film Festival in the mid-1990s.

The year 1996 holds much importance in the context of this thesis, as it bears witness to the creation of the first international film festival in Korea's history. In September of 1996, the port-city of Busan was the host for the first Busan International Film Festival (BIFF). As numerous authors have recognized, this event played a pivotal role in Korea's efforts in getting its films onto the global market. Moreover, BIFF not

only played a crucial role in establishing Korea's film culture internationally, it also had an impact on local film production and distribution, creating film funds and an Asian Film market to encourage local and transnational film projects. The advent of this international film festival help to reshaped the motion picture business of the country and propelled its film culture into the age of globalisation. The subsequent chapter focuses on the Busan International Film Festival, as it demonstrates the full extent of the event's influence on the film industry of Korea, from its inception to its most recent iteration.

Chapter 3

BIFF: changing Korea's film culture locally and globally

The 1990s were a time of great change in Korea. Every facet of the country, from the political, the cultural, to its economy, was significantly altered in some way as Korea was thrust into an age of globalization. In terms of its film culture, Korea experienced a complete shift in its production practices and infrastructure. This cultural shift was driven by the state and film industry's desire for local success as well as global recognition. It is during this period that a small group of film industry members from various backgrounds decided to take advantage of the resurgence of the local film culture in an attempt to establish the first international film festival in Korea. Supported by state and municipal institutions, these various film industry members were able to create an event unlike any other in Korea's film history. Thus, in 1996, the first edition of the Busan International Film Festival (BIFF) took place in the southern port-city of Busan. Unbeknownst to the founders of the festival, BIFF would later be regarded as the top Asian film festival and, more importantly, the festival would reshape the Korean film industry into one of the leading ones in Asia. As SooJeong Ahn states in her doctoral thesis on BIFF:

Recent scholarship on Korean cinema tends to agree on the key role that BIFF has played in promoting Korean cinema and its globalisation. Consequently, the evolution of BIFF is very much interrelated with the boom in the Korean film industry and its increasing visibility worldwide.¹⁵¹

Through the growing cooperation of local and national institutions, the city of Busan and its festival were able to become an international hub for Asian cinema. One specific element that has allowed it to achieve this status and that defines it is its ability to

change and react to variations in global film culture. Between its inception in 1996 and its most recent edition, the festival has been in constant flux. Through the years, there have been numerous transformations, whether regarding the programming, the infrastructure, the various sidebars, the funding or much more. Without insinuating that BIFF and only BIFF is responsible for the success or failure of the Korean film industry in the last 20 years, it is not an exaggeration to state that these changes within the festival have had an enormous influence on the film culture of this East Asian country. The relationship between the Busan International Film Festival and the Korean film culture is at the heart of this chapter.

Although the influence of the film festival in global film circulation is well recognized, the role may shift when a film festival is linked to a national cinema in particular. This is the case with the Busan International Film Festival. BIFF was created through a joint effort on the part of the state and the film industry. This collaboration was made possible thanks to a common goal shared by both parties, the local and global success of Korea's film culture. In sum, the number of 'actors' who impacted the development of the event through the years is most likely innumerable. With independent goals and approaches, these 'actors' created the fabric of the field-configuring event that is BIFF. Consequently, through this joint effort, the festival was designed as a showcase and platform for local Korean talent on the global stage. Its identity is shaped by a common desire to allow Korea's film culture to establish a global presence. Whether through its programming, its sidebars, its Asian Project Market¹⁵² and Asian Film Market or its intricate international network of industry actors, the festival in Busan has always had the same objective as a driving force through the years.

Methodology and Sources

To comprehend what kind of impact the Busan International Film Festival had during the period of flux at the end of the 20th century, it is crucial to grasp the events that led to its creation, how its founders structured it and how the event succeeded in achieving the objectives set out by its founders. Hence, the first part of this chapter takes on a more historical and cultural approach as it focuses on the years leading to the first Busan International Film Festival. Utilizing as a primary source SooJeong Ahn's Doctoral thesis on BIFF coupled with various essays by Darcy Paquet and the anthology *New Korean Cinema*,¹⁵³ co-edited by Julian Stringer, this historical perspective will depict the elements that structured the Korean film industry and the creation of BIFF.

Understanding the impact of BIFF on the Korean film industry in its entirety is beyond the scope of this thesis. Elements will always escape the grasp of this text. For example, this thesis relies completely on secondary sources such as festival reports and reviews. Having never gone to Korea, or BIFF for that matter, numerous elements, whether cultural, geographical, political or social, will undoubtedly be overlooked due to my lack of first-hand experience. Fortunately, the field of film festival studies has developed the proper tools to analyze festivals through these secondary sources. As explained, through the management studies' concept of 'field-configuring events', it is possible to examine how BIFF played a determining role within Korea's film culture both locally and globally.

The advent of BIFF: from concept to event

To say that the undertaking of an international film festival is a complex and challenging task is quite an understatement. Especially when the film culture of a nation

is so tightly bound to the state, its policies and legislations. New film festivals are created on a daily basis all around the world yet many of them never succeed, are forgotten or disappear. Some books would list four hundred international film festivals, as other books and film festival guides would have over five hundred in their inventory¹⁵⁴. Obviously, the recipe for a successful film festival remains a secret. An element that remains clear is that the creation of a successful international film festival demands the correlation of many factors. Like the pieces of a huge jigsaw puzzle, each element must fall into place to allow a film festival to reach the success level that BIFF has reached through the years.

First, timing can be an important factor in the success of an event. In this respect, BIFF made its appearance as Korea's film industry was entering a period of fruition within the country and on the global scale. Accordingly, during this period, Korea, as a nation-state aspiring for globalisation both culturally and commercially, coupled with a reinvigorated film industry, was ripe for such an event as the Busan International Film Festival. Second, an event must often find a way to distinguish itself from its counterparts. Often, this distinction becomes the driving force that guides the choices and objectives of the event. Consequently, a central concern throughout this section is the identity of the festival and the objectives set out by the founders of BIFF.

Segyehwa: the driving force behind Korean culture in the 21st century

Late in the 20th century, after colonisation, two World Wars, the liberation from Japan's hold in 1945, the division of the country into political rivals and the subsequent Korean War, Korea was finally on the threshold of rebuilding itself culturally, economically and socially. During the Korean War, the North Korean army destroyed most of South Korea and its capital Seoul. Thus ensued a dramatic rebuild of the country,

which transformed it from an agriculturally based society to an industrial juggernaut. This shift was abrupt and was not without its bumps and bruises. Jaydan Tait describes this shift in his essay on the globalisation of Seoul and Korea:

Millions of Koreans were killed and displaced by the conflict and the country was in ruin. Twice North Korean forces overran Seoul and fierce battles left little remaining of the original city. The surviving Koreans immediately began to rebuild the city. Backed by the US military and the post World War 2 American economic machine, Seoul rebuilt dramatically.¹⁵⁵

Moreover, in 1993, after a decade long push for democratization, Korea shifted from a military dictatorship to a democracy with the first popularly elected leader Kim Young-Sam. This is a crucial element in the development of Korea as a country and for the progress of its film culture. A new political model would offer new freedoms and opportunities for members of the film industry. As president of Korea, one of Kim's first mandates was to implant the concept of *segzehwa*. This new idiom became the driving force behind the country's economic and sociocultural rebuild. Essentially, *segzehwa* is the Korean reconceptualization of the postmodern notion of globalisation. However, in Korean terms, the concept takes on more weight, as the state would attempt to reshape all facets of Korean life based on *segzehwa*. The nation's industry and culture would be moulded in relation to this primary concept. As Tait explains, *segzehwa* would encompass all aspects of Korean life:

The term is "far more comprehensive, embracing political, cultural, and social open-mindedness" (Kim, 2000). *Segzehwa* was adopted as an official policy of the national government in 1993, and Korea institutionalized the process to guide its international trade policy. As the North Korean government embraced a policy of *Juche*, which resembles a xenophobic self reliance, the South Koreans [...] adopted a policy that understood the prosperity of the nation is inextricably attached to the vitality of the rest of the world.¹⁵⁶

The state and its various institutions were thus reaching a point in the 1990s where

they wanted to open to the rest of the world and become involved in the global flow of culture and capital. The state yearned to reach out and take hold of a part of the global market. This drive for globalisation would also originate from the 1988 Olympic games held in Seoul, which “opened the country as no event had previously” and acted as a “catalyst to further propel the economy”¹⁵⁷. The Olympic games and the perspective of hosting such an international event not only had an impact on the economy but on the film industry as well. The state was well aware of the global value of films, an internationally widespread commodity that could influence the proclivities and opinions of foreigners regarding Korea. During most of its history, the state utilized motion pictures as an ideological tool in an attempt to control the views, values and opinions of its population. Contrarily, in the last decades of the 20th century, the state utilized films in an attempt to bring attention from outside viewers and change the international attitude regarding Korea. Consequently, this shifted the role of the state within film culture from negative to positive. Remaining a key factor in the production of films in Korea, the state would loosen its grip on the film industry, thus offering creative freedoms and financial opportunities. Ahn explains how films were useful in the *segvehwa* strategy:

Throughout the 1980s, the government gradually eased the laws governing the production and release of films, partly in an attempt to bring the 1988 Olympic Games to Seoul. [...] Numerous small production companies thus began operating without official permission from the state and began to produce films. In these ways, the status of the Korean film industry has been enormously influenced by political and social turbulence in Korean society.¹⁵⁸

Furthermore, as Kim Kyung-Hyun explains in his book on Im Kwon-Taek, the 1980s saw the emergence of Korean film prints with subtitles as the government began to

encourage the participation of Korean films at important Western international film festivals.¹⁵⁹ In some instances, the state rewarded films that were bestowed with prizes at these various film festivals. Obviously, Korean cinema was going global, yet it lacked an international film festival of its own. It was during this era of globalisation that BIFF made its appearance. With the new appointed state leaders propelling the country on to the global market and a film industry entering a period of unsurpassed freedom and abundant creativity, the concept of *segye* became a key factor in the development of Korea's film culture. Films thus developed into the ideal representative of Korean culture overseas as it crossed borders and entered new frontiers for Korea. Mi-jeong Lee, founder of CineAsia and long-time programmer for the Asian section of the international film festival Fantasia, maintains that Korea's government "chose cultural productions such as film and television as focal elements of Korean culture to be exported abroad".¹⁶⁰ The state thus took on the daunting task of moving its film culture from national to transnational. To kick-start this transition, state-leaders and the film industry needed to create an event that would act as a gateway to the world. To achieve this, state representatives collaborated with important industry members in order to create and shape the first international film festival in the country.

BIFF as a Field-Configuring Event

The creation of an event such as the Busan International Film Festival requires the correlation of a great number of elements and individuals. As Ahn writes, BIFF "was largely prompted by the intersection of several political, economic and social conditions".¹⁶¹ Through these intersections, the event took shape and was able to have a tremendous impact on the film culture of Korea. It is here that the concept of the 'field-

configuring event' takes on its full value as it serves as the central methodological tool during the entirety of the discussion of BIFF.

Transorganizational structures: shaping the identity of BIFF

A field-configuring event such as BIFF is designed as a meeting ground for discussions and exchanges of ideas and concepts. Undoubtedly, such a space of exchange and debate requires a form of structure. Before a field-configuring event can exist and enact its influence, there must first be common interests and issues that incite the founders of the event to create this meeting ground. This is possible thanks to 'transorganizational structures'. As Anaud and Jones argue, these structures are what shape the field-configuring event and make these meetings and exchanges possible.

Formally defined, transorganizational structures are those that allow disparate constituents to become aware of their common concerns, join together, share information, coordinate their actions, shape and subvert agendas, and mutually influence field structuration. When transorganizational structures are dynamic, they tend to have a vigorous and definitive influence on field formation [...]¹⁶²

Anaud and Jones explain that primary examples of transorganizational structures are the various committees that organize the event and the interest groups that represent the field. A host city can also act as a transorganizational structure. Hence, in the case of the Busan International Film Festival, the transorganizational structures are defined as the committees that shaped the event, which were headed in collaboration by the festival director Kim Dong-ho, his associates and the various institutions of city itself. At its inception, the organising body of the festival was divided into two separate committees: the Organising committee and the Executive committee. A singular committee named the Busan International Film Festival Organization Committee, which officially hosts the event every year, has now replaced these committees. At the festival's inception, it was

these two committees which formed the transorganizational structure of the event and that helped shape the event into the powerful meeting ground it is today.

Organising Committee: funding BIFF

Before anybody can discuss an actual meeting ground, this space must first be constructed through funding. Consequently, the costs of an event such as BIFF are quite substantial. This primary task was the responsibility of the first committee: the Organising committee. In this instance, various state bodies, local and non-local institutions, public and private societies merged in an effort to fund the first international film festival to be held in Korea. First, the government's desire to export and promote the film industry on the global stage allowed the Organising committee to fund such an event. The government's "globalisation drive, *segyehwa*, had affected the film business by offering tax incentives, making it a highly profitable investment option. These conditions encouraged corporations to fund cultural institutions, a situation of which PIFF took full advantage."¹⁶³ This represents the first and most crucial correlation for a field-configuring event such as BIFF. As obvious as it may seem, without funding or support, no event is possible. What distinguishes BIFF is the obvious concerns of the period of its inception (*segyehwa*) which strongly advantaged it. The success of Korean films abroad were the concern of many groups. The state's involvement and drive towards this globalisation rendered the festival possible through its legislation and funding. Although the state only provided a fifth of the budget the first year (approximately USD \$300,000),¹⁶⁴ its contribution has grown exponentially through the years. Added to the funding of the state, the local Busan municipal government added \$250,000 as did the Daewoo group, one of the leading *jaebols* of the film industry at the

time. As Kim Dong-ho states himself, the remaining funding for the \$2 million event “came from other corporations like Samsung and CJ Entertainment”,¹⁶⁵ both huge players in the film industry. These institutions, whether private or public, saw in BIFF an opportunity to invest in the promotion of the local film industry on an international level. Thus, the initial funding of BIFF was made possible through the collective effort of various institutions which all shared a common objective, the promotion of the Korean film industry and film culture.

Non-profit organisation

The funding of BIFF resembles the model used by most events of the same nature. Events such as film festivals, music festivals, tradeshows and other cultural organizations utilize the model of the non-profit organization. This non-profit model allows the festival to rely on a multitude of sources for funding, from public to private institutions in addition to profits generated from ticket sales. Its investors do not benefit from the financing of the event; the only benefit that their direct sponsoring contributes is exposure. Hence, the only direct ‘capital’ that is generated for the private sponsors through their direct funding can be found in the exposure they get from their participation. Additionally, any profits made by the festival must be reinvested into the institution itself.¹⁶⁶ The festival thus exists within a space situated between the state and the market. It is run by an organisation that is neither part of the state nor of the film industry. This position offers BIFF’s Organising committees with a certain degree of freedom in their decisions, which greatly benefited the festival as it established “a certain autonomy to be maintained.”¹⁶⁷ By taking advantage of the state’s tax reductions and the growing interest on the part of industry and state members in the promotion of Korea, the

event's Organising committee was able to create this meeting ground. Through this correlation of Korea's film industry members and state members, BIFF would slowly take shape as a space where ideas can be exchanged and common concerns addressed. These interests and concerns became the driving force behind the Executive committee's objectives.

Executive Committee: shaping the identity/institutional logic of BIFF

The Executive Committee, as the second transorganizational structure, gathered the 'field actors' for a different purpose. It was designed to have greater control on the identity of the festival through its programming. This committee ultimately had the goal of creating a distinct identity for the festival that would distinguish it from other Asian fairs of the same kind. This identity became the event's institutional logic, the key element that drives and guides the field-configuring event. This dual transorganizational structure (Organising/Executive Committee) was one of BIFF's strong points according to Ahn.

Whilst the Executive Committee was in charge of envisioning the festival identity, programming and recruiting staff, the Organising Committee was responsible for financial affairs. In this structure, the central decision-making power was in the Executive Committee. The relatively smooth process of negotiation was partly attributable to the well-organised distribution and balance of roles played by the local and non-local founding members.¹⁶⁸

To begin with, Kim assembled a team with varied credentials and origins. This variety of 'actors', who are linked together by a common objective or goal, is a basic element of the FCE. This kind of event has the ability and serves this purpose of gathering disparate individuals to encourage a common goal. The Busan International

Film Festival thus achieved something quite unique in Korea's film history by gathering these actors in one space for the first time.

While most of the founders hailed from Busan's film community, the Executive Committee quickly expanded to include a broad range of social groups, including an opposition party and non-party politicians, various religious groups, and women's organisations in Pusan. This network also grew to include foreign film festival consultants such as Tony Rayns, Simon Field, Paul Yi and Wong Ainling.¹⁶⁹

The prerogative of the Executive committee was centered on creating the distinct identity of BIFF. This identity, which developed and became stronger through the years, was driven by the festival director's willingness to promote Asian cinema like no other festival before. To accomplish this goal, festival director Kim Dong-ho "tagged three strategies: to free up the selection by not becoming an A-category event; to champion Asian cinema (from Iran to Japan); and to promote South Korean moviemaking."¹⁷⁰ This institutional logic, based around 'Asianness', was structured by the key concepts of regionalism and globalism. In essence, BIFF was designed as a promotional tool for Asian films, with a strong focus on local Korea talent. Hence, Asia was the 'region' on which the festival focused on and was the central element to the institutional logic of the event.

Between regional and global: "Asianness" as a programming strategy

It is important to note that the concept of regionalism is constantly debated among contemporary authors and academics. Its definition can complicate our interpretation of the event. Briefly explained, the complications arise from the fact that Asia is immense and to consider it as a unified region implies that there exists a certain degree of cohesion

between the various sections of Asia. Yet, with the differences in language, religion, culture and tradition, Asia represents a heterogeneous space constituted of distinct units. Moreover, an element that further complicates the debate is the concept of the global city. In an age of globalisation, nation-states become effaced and replaced by global cities through which flows cultural and economic capital. Cities such as New York, Paris and Tokyo have become nodal points within the global economic and cultural system. Julian Stringer argues that global-scale festivals, such as Cannes, Berlin or Toronto, are caught between the national and the global. These festivals compete with other global festivals, often situated in other global cities, and attempt to differentiate themselves through their self-conscious affiliation to a region. BIFF's self-proclamation as Asia's cultural hub is set within dual goals: to have global reach and to remain unique through a tie with Asia, more specifically Korea. Hence, the concept of regionalism is further complicated by the advent of global cities and the slow evaporation of nation-states.

Often interpreted as a defense mechanism against cultural imperialism, the "concept of Asia as a collective identity has been developed and transformed responding to specific Asian problems and historical experiences - colonialism, nation building and the regional impact of the Cold War".¹⁷¹ Some might argue that the notion of Asia as one region would be an attempt to reproduce the concept of Europe, where a unified front allows one to defend itself from cultural imperialism and colonialism. This can result in a dichotomy such as America versus Europe. Additionally, the definition of Asia's borders is quite ambiguous. What countries are included in Kim Dong-ho's definition of Asia? Consequently, this definition greatly altered the programming of the festival depending on what constitutes an Asian country for the programmers. According to Ahn, in the early

years of BIFF, the event mostly focused on the countries of Northeast Asia such as Japan, Taiwan and Hong Kong. As the event gained validity and global attention, it needed to include more ‘Asian’ countries to reinforce its self-proclaimed position as an Asian cultural hub.¹⁷² In order to strengthen this position, the event expanded its scope to include a broader range of ‘Asian’ countries. As Ahn writes, “in order to meet the key concept of the Asian hub, the festival had to include other parts of Asia such as India, the Philippines, Malaysia and Indonesia, as well as Iran”¹⁷³.

Early in its decisive years, the concept of regionalism and, most importantly, Asia, complicated the definition of the event as a window onto Asian cinema. Nevertheless, Kim Dong-ho and his executive committee did not stray from their path and were able to create a festival that many would consider to be the most representative event in Asia today. In 2007, *Variety*’s Patrick Frater wrote: “the Pusan fest has long sought to connect the disparate parts of Asia’s film industry, which is no easy feat, considering vast differences in language, culture and economic development. After South Korea’s 2007 performance, that impulse has become an imperative”.¹⁷⁴ This was undoubtedly one of the greatest achievements of BIFF as a field-configuring event. The festival was able to gather films and industry members (field actors) from all over Asia in an attempt to promote the region to the world, a task which had been reserved in prior years to Hong Kong’s film festival.

To better comprehend the position of the event, it is crucial to note that Busan was not the first international film festival in Asia nor the first to attempt the promotion of Asian cinema. Before BIFF, the Hong Kong International Film Festival (HKIFF) was the prime destination for Asian cinema and also acted as the cultural hub of the region. As

Stephen Teo notes, the HKIFF “became known as the most prestigious film festival in Asia in the 1980s for its comprehensive selections of the best of Asian cinema”¹⁷⁵ and, most importantly, the festival developed into “the best festival for foreign critics to watch new Asian films and make discoveries which could then be introduced to the whole world.”¹⁷⁶ However, with growing problems stemming from the imminent handover to China, HKIFF was losing its lustre and its grip on its position within the film festival network. BIFF, armed with its prerogative towards Asian cinema, took advantage of the situation as Ahn explains.

Although Hong Kong had established an official platform for Asian cinema over the past two decades, it had been deteriorating since the mid - 1990s. PIFF hoped to take its position. The widespread use of rhetoric elevating “Asianness” to promote the festival was evident in a number of cases.¹⁷⁷

Thus, as the HKIFF was waning, BIFF was able to shift the power relations and turn the limelight towards Korea. The *segye-hwa* drive also allowed BIFF to take on the role as Asian cultural hub. As Choi argues, the festival “was initiated with the aim of transferring the cultural foci from other Asian cosmopolitan cities such as Hong Kong and Tokyo to the local cities of Korea”.¹⁷⁸ Additionally, as Derek Elley explains in an article for *Variety*, “with Hong Kong returning to the mainland in ’97, and Tokyo too influenced by major Japanese studios, Kim felt BIFF could steal a march on the region’s two longtimers.”¹⁷⁹ Therefore, the Busan International Film Festival appeared at a time of transition within the cultural power relations in Asia. With the economic and cultural boom in Korea, coupled with the *segye-hwa* drive, BIFF benefited from a great opportunity to take an important place within the festival network as a nodal point in Asia. Moreover, the ‘Asianness’ that Ahn and Choi refer to was henceforth the driving

force behind BIFF's takeover as Asia's prime showcase.

The Executive committee of BIFF utilized the concept of 'Asianness' to structure the festival's rhetoric. The primary objective of this rhetoric was to elevate the festival within the network as well as to situate it as the "new" Asian cultural hub. Yet, one could argue that this rhetoric hides a secondary goal, which aims to situate Korea's film industry on the same plane as Hong Kong's and Japan's, which were undoubtedly the powerhouses in Asia at the time of BIFF's inception. By focusing on Asia as a singular region to promote, power relations are diminished by creating an inclusive definition of the region. This inclusive rhetoric based on 'Asianness' allows Korea to take its place besides such film industries as Japan. Similarly to all cases of labelling, creating a singular category of films, for instance film genres, has the effect of assembling disparate components together. During the years as BIFF's director, Kim Dong-ho has constantly reiterated that the festival yearned to "discover, promote and support Asian cinema."¹⁸⁰ This focus on Asia allowed Kim to enhance the exposure level of the event and consequently to augment the exposure level of Korean cinema as well. Although there is no tangible proof, the use of this rhetoric has deeply impacted the event and allowed it to explode onto the global scene.

The concept of "Asianness" as an institutional logic

Translated in terms used by the authors of the field-configuring event, this 'Asianness' creates an institutional logic, which stems from 'joint cognition' and 'shared sense-making'. It is well and good to gather funding in order to create this meeting ground around which various field actors can exchange concerns and ideas. However,

there must be a common goal or concern otherwise the field-configuring event loses its purpose. The drive to promote Asia on the global scale and to have a direct impact on the film production became the common goals for the various participants of the field-configuring event that is BIFF. Essentially, every field contains its own particular institutional logic, which Almaya and Montgomery define as “the belief system and associated practices that predominate a field”.¹⁸¹ In the case of BIFF, the institutional logic is defined by the drive to discover, promote and support Asian films. This drive was a central feature of the identity of the event.

The institutional logic provides “the organizing principles and practice guidelines for field participants- individually and collectively”.¹⁸² This logic stands as the element that structures how the various actors act within the event and the field. This is rendered possible thanks to shared cognitive sense-making within the field-configuring event’s participants. Events such as BIFF “enable participants to promote ideas about the way work in the field ‘ought to be done’ and anchoring them to moral ideologies” and they also “serve as opportunities that enable shared cognitive sense-making”.¹⁸³ This ‘moral ideology’ stands for the institutional logic, or more precisely the promotion and support of Asian cinema. Thus, cognitive sense-making enables a group to share common knowledge and ideas in hopes of influencing the field itself. Furthermore, shared cognitive sense-making also serves the purpose of reducing cognitive distance between field participants. Instead of unrelated individual participants placed at the periphery, a unified center allows for greater control and exchange of knowledge. Through this process, “the professional group arrives at a unique, collective identity, which can serve as a potent force to alter the field”.¹⁸⁴ Therefore, these field actors can have a direct

impact on the field through their joint efforts. The result is the funding of film projects, the development of emerging filmmakers through master classes, conferences and Q&A sessions as well as the exhibition of the region's films, most of which would most likely never be screened unless at a festival such as BIFF.

Co-evolution

A final point regarding our understanding of BIFF as a field-configuring event is what Oliver and Montgomery call co-evolution. As they explain, fields are never static, “but rather shift over time and include a changing cast of participants that in turn shape and reshape the field's institutional logics.”¹⁸⁵ A salient example of this concept is the definition of Asia in the event's programming. As discussed, to maintain its identity as a cultural hub, BIFF needed to expand its definition of Asia. With new national film cultures developing in Asia and the middle-East, the institutional logic of ‘Asianness’ was altered to include these emerging filmmakers. Thus, the advent of these new ‘field actors’ (filmmakers, producers) obliged the organizers to slightly alter the definition of Asia in their programming (institutional logic).

The field is in constant flux, which is partly due to the field-configuring event itself. Throughout the history of BIFF, various actors have departed; new actors have joined in; and power relations within the festival have shifted. New groups bring in new concerns, ideas and technologies which influence how the event functions. The concept of co-evolution refers to the process of outside industry members who join the event and end up having an impact on the structure and, vice-versa, the event having a direct impact on the field and the outside industry members. The most palpable example of this is BIFF's

Asian Project Market (changed from Pusan Promotional Plan in 2011) and its Asian film Market, which turned the festival from a promotion showcase model to an industry actor. These sidebars, which have become crucial to the event, introduced new industry actors (producers, writers, directors, sales agents) within the event and have brought greater attention to the event. Both sidebars will be studied in more detail later. Moreover, while constantly implementing novelties in its sidebars, BIFF has strived to maintain a certain stability throughout its programming. Throughout the years, the festival has grown in popularity and also in size with constant innovations and renewals. This has allowed it to maintain a certain degree of freshness while staying true to its first objectives, the showcase of Asian cinema.

In the end, as in the beginning, Kim Dong-ho and his committee would strive to promote and discover the top films of Korea and East Asia as well as fund some of the local and regional talent. The festival gathered a wide-range of industry actors, both from local industries as well as from international markets, in a common and unifying objective. Through the participation of a varied group of actors, from industry members to international film critics, Kim Dong-ho and his committee created a film festival unlike any other in East Asia. Whether this ambitious objective was achieved or not is debatable. However, what is factual is that the Busan International Film Festival has become “Asia’s premier film festival”¹⁸⁶ and is considered by many as an Asian cultural hub.

Rarely has an event carved out a profile so rapidly in the overcrowded fest scene, with the Busan international film festival now regarded a the premier East Asian gathering point, overshadowing the Tokyo fest and long-established Hong Kong events.¹⁸⁷

This global recognition was achieved through the festival's intense participation and action upon the field of film production and distribution. Furthermore, through the event's programming and through extensive networking with other international film festivals and industry members, Busan achieved its goal of turning Korea's film culture from national to transnational.

BIFF: supporting, promoting and changing Korea's film culture

It has been stated that BIFF was no novelty in the film festival network, borrowing from other established international film festivals. The event was not the first international film festival in Asia nor will it be the last. Although BIFF's structure, programming selections and sidebars resonate with other film festivals from around the world, sometimes almost copying them, it is nonetheless crucial to take into consideration the importance and impact that BIFF had on the film culture of Korea and, on a wider scale, Asia. As with any market or network, power relations between international festivals and national cinemas shift constantly. Accordingly, BIFF appeared at a particular transitional period in the festival dynamics of Asia, with Hong Kong and Tokyo in decline. Consequently, the festival benefited from this vacant space within the Asian festival network to both promote its own film culture and to become a showcase for national cinemas. The organizers at Busan designed its programming and sidebars by borrowing elements from other successful international film festivals as well as introducing its own identity and innovations. This blend of something borrowed with something new, or more precisely the 'Korea brand', would allow BIFF to take a stronghold on the Asian market and maintain its place within the film festival network.

As Elley explains:

The international fest landscape has changed dramatically during the past decade, with even the European majors battling bitterly for titles. But BIFF has maintained its profile as the key Asian event through perpetual innovation and cherry-picking the best ideas of the West- the Pusan Promotional Plan, inspired by Rotterdam's CineMart, a nascent talent campus modeled on Berlin's and even beachside pavilions with an uncanny resemblance to the ones at Cannes.¹⁸⁸

Always through the rhetoric of 'Asianness', Busan cemented its position as a bridge connecting various parts of the world with Asia. Its programming and sidebars defined it as an important international promotional tool and as a crucial industry actor. Key elements that have defined BIFF's programming and allowed it to achieve the success it has today include: the dual-structure of the event as a non-competitive festival with one competitive section and four categories that define the festival's programming strategy, which are New Currents, A Window on Asian Cinema, the Korean Retrospective and the Korean Cinema Today sections.

Dual structure: between non-competitive and competitive festival

The first element regarding the politics of the programming of BIFF, which had a great influence on the festival's identity, is the initial decision to define the event as a non-competitive festival. Obviously, competitive A-list festivals such as Cannes, Venice and Berlin are prime destinations for films looking for a huge boost in terms of critical value, usually attributed through an award.¹⁸⁹ Competitive festivals act as key actors regarding the value-adding process, offering films the opportunity to accumulate prestige and value. However, A-list competitive festivals are in constant competition with each other to acquire those few films that merit such global attention.¹⁹⁰ Consequently, their

selections can be hampered by their status. Ahn explains:

According to the rules of the FIAPF, once festivals are classified as competitive, they are not supposed to accept or exhibit films which have previously been in competition at other festivals. For example, films screened at Cannes are automatically excluded from selection for Venice. Such a stipulation helps determine the hierarchical positions between festivals [...].¹⁹¹

Being a competitive festival certainly grants the event a certain prestige yet it also limits the possibilities for its programming and creates intense competition within the festival network. This process can be bypassed by having the film screen outside of the official competition, thus benefiting from the international exposure the event raises. Yet the main attraction of these festivals remains the prize. For BIFF, by avoiding this road, Kim allowed his festival greater freedom and was able to concentrate on the important aspect of being a festival focused on the discovery and promotion of Asian cinema. Kim admits: “We wanted to concentrate on being an Asian festival [...] and Tokyo already had a competitive event, we opted to take the non-competitive route”.¹⁹² Thus, if designated as an official competitive festival, Busan would have had to compete with established international festivals such as Tokyo, Cannes, Venice and Berlin in order to acquire certain films. This was a fight which it could not win at its inception. As Ahn explains, “BIFF had to self-consciously position itself as non-competitive to survive in the competitive global festival world which consists of uneven power and hierarchical relationships”.¹⁹³ Hence, the non-competitive route allowed greater leeway in the festival’s selection and allowed the event to take its place within the network. However, as with other international film festivals striving to promote arthouse and national cinemas, this position as a non-competitive festival became ambivalent.

Although Busan was first designed as a non-competitive festival, its desire to be the ultimate showcase in Asia and a nodal point within the festival network would bring it to slightly alter its initial position. The event thus included a single official competition section within its catalogue: the New Currents section. This provided the event with a dual structure tiptoeing between competitive and non-competitive. This dual structure brought a certain degree of interest on the part of industry members and critics as a prize often does. As the event evolved into a key actor within global and Asian film culture, the more the award gained in prestige and attention. Although not as significant as the Golden Bear or Palme d'Or, the New Currents Award assures a certain degree of exposure for the awarded film. In addition to the New Currents award, Busan grants various prizes throughout its programming. Thus, without focusing on the competitive aspect, the festival bestows a wide variety of awards and prizes to films and directors from around the world, with a direct focus on Asia. As a result, these prizes allow BIFF, as a field-configuring event, to enact its influence on the field. Awards and critical prestige shape field norms by acknowledging the value of certain films, filmmakers or even national film cultures. Undoubtedly, Busan has become a prime showcase; yet, in order to cement its position as a cultural hub, granting prizes became a necessity. Awards become an obligation in order to heighten the attention the festival gets from other industry actors such as critics, sales agents and festival programmers. Thomas Elsaesser notes:

All the players at a festival are caught up in the “illusion” of the game. They have to believe it is worth playing and attend to it with seriousness. In doing so, they sustain it. With every prize it confers, a festival also confirms its own importance, which in turn increases the symbolic value of the prize.¹⁹⁴

This aspect of BIFF further supports its position as an important FCE. Through its network of field actors, the event engenders support for local and regional talent through its various awards and prizes. Here, we bear witness to the field-configuring event at work. Disparate members are united for a concise period in a common goal. Most importantly, these awards follow the institutional logic of the event. They are less designed to create competition but rather to promote and encourage the best of national arthouse and independent films through the various funds, which are attributed with each award. The prizes reward the winner with both cultural value and, most importantly, a fund destined to allow the filmmaker to continue onward with his career. (This process is further detailed, with examples, in the segment on the New Currents section of BIFF programming) Once more, the type of promotion through various prizes and funds is nothing new within the festival network. The Rotterdam festival is the best example; yet Busan's case is crucial to us due to its proclivity towards the promotion of the local Asian and Korean film industry. To recap, the festival designed its main body as a non-competitive event, with one competitive category, the New Currents section, which heightened and cemented the festival's position as cultural hub. Busan also decided to award prizes to various films in an attempt to breathe life into the local film industry and aid up-and-coming filmmakers through the various funds attached to these awards. Through its dual structure and funds, the festival was granted greater freedom in its selection and was able to focus on its institutional logic.

Sections at BIFF

Of course, the institutional logic of BIFF also had an impact on its sections and selections. Essentially, Busan has had 9 categories in its program that have remained

throughout the years: Opening and Closing galas, A Window on Asian Cinema, New Currents, World Cinema, Open Cinema, Wide Angle, Special Program in Focus, Korean Retrospective and Korean Panorama (changed to Korean Cinema Today in 2006). Most of these categories, such as World Cinema, Open Cinema and Wide Angle, could be called ‘automatics’ in the design of an international film festival which promotes alternative, arthouse and independent world cinemas. They aim to represent films from around the world that, in most occasions, will circulate through the festival network in hopes of being bought by an international distributor or simply in hopes of obtaining as much global recognition as possible. These sections legitimize BIFF’s role as a cultural hub within the Asian market and allow it to maintain its place within the festival network. Each section at BIFF reinforces the festival’s role as an important field-configuring event. These three sections don’t differentiate BIFF from other international film festivals. As more and more independent filmmakers, producers and sales agents designate BIFF on their festival calendar as the top event in Asia, they will continually reinforce the recognized field norm that Busan is a cultural hub. Hence, the World Cinema, Open Cinema and Wide Angle sections contribute in maintaining the position of Busan within the festival network. In fact, the opposite occurs, through these sections, BIFF resembles other important festivals. Fortunately, certain sections in the event’s programming allow BIFF to distinguish itself within the festival network. These are the central sections of the programming which are devoted to the institutional logic of the event. They position the festival in regards to Korean and Asian cinema.

New Currents and A Window on Asian Cinema: Regional strategy

Following its institutional logic centered on the concept of ‘Asianness’, two categories were established at the festival’s inception which were designed as showcases for Asian cinema at large: New Currents and A Window on Asian Cinema. Both these selections still remain today, they continue to screen important Asian films and have become crucial elements in the festival’s programming. Putting more emphasis on new Asian cinema, with a strong proclivity for independent and arthouse cinema, the festival’s programming developed a certain hierarchy within its categories. Consequently, New Currents and A Window on Asian Cinema stand at the top of the list of categories at BIFF. This practice is quite common in film festivals, with a few principal sections acting as the main attraction of the event. Similarly to Cannes and its Official Selection, both sections have become the core of BIFF and have brought much attention to the event. Through a perpetual renewal and discovery of new talent, these two sections have cemented Busan’s position as the definitive showcase for what is ‘hot’ in Asia. As Elley states:

Heart of the fest still remains the competitive New Currents section (devoted to Asian filmmakers) and regional panorama Window on Asian Cinema. These are two of the reasons why scouts, buyers and [critics] jet in each year- and it’s through them that BIFF has nailed its increasingly indie colors to the fest mast.¹⁹⁵

Further supporting this argument of Busan’s drive to novelty, Kim Dong-ho admits that the festival is “dedicated to young Asian directors who are presenting their first and second films”(translated from French).¹⁹⁶ Consequently, these two sections give weight to the festival’s position as Asia’s top showcase. Both New Currents and A Window on Asian Cinema are prime examples of how the institutional logic can have a

direct impact on the structure of the field-configuring event.

Both sections play an important part in BIFF's programming strategy, which consists of complex relations between local/global, Korean/Asian and national/transnational. These two sections constitute the strongest Asian programming in the event and, if BIFF achieves its goal each year, they represent the most comprehensive look at Asian arthouse and independent cinema in the world. Their success testifies the growing interest in BIFF and Asian cinema in general. Furthermore, both A Window on Asian Cinema and New Currents represent one side of the complex relation Asia/Korea or, more precisely, transnational/national. On one side, these categories define BIFF as the leading showcase of Asian cinema and attract a wide variety of international industry members and critics; on the other side, they allow the event to achieve a secondary goal, which is to promote the local film industry through categories aimed specifically at Korean film culture.

A Window on Asian Cinema

In 1996, A Window On Asian Cinema had 18 films in its selection representing 10 countries, mostly East Asian countries such as Japan, Taiwan and China. In 2006, only ten years later, the section screened 36 films from 15 countries, including Singapore, Vietnam and Tadjikistan. The section has grown into the most comprehensive representation of the independent films produced all over Asia. In a report on the 12th edition of BIFF, Elley explains:

On the plus side, Southeast Asia is more strongly represented this year [2008], with the Philippines prominent. And Central Asia, represented by Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, is very visible [...] Malaysia, Iran

and Kazakhstan broaden the selection away from purely Asian fare, though Japan, as always, is heavily represented.¹⁹⁷

In addition to explaining how the Window on Asian Cinema selection has broadened its borders, Elley's quote also demonstrates the constant debate regarding what the region of Asia truly encompasses. His definition of Malaysia, Iran and Kazakhstan as not 'purely Asian fare' reiterates points which this thesis has already explored. What remains important is the concept of 'Asia' that BIFF has established for its programming. To the director and programmers of BIFF, in order to better represent Asia and continue in its institutional logic, it was necessary to expand the limits of the region to include close and distant neighbours. As these Asian countries begin to produce quality arthouse cinema, BIFF is required to include them within its programming. As explained, this shift in programming is a direct consequence of the process of co-evolution, where changes in the field (new national cinemas) alter the institutional logic (what is determined as an Asia country). Moreover, by including these films, the event recognizes these new national cinemas as important Asian productions, altering established norms and shared cognition. Through the 'discovery' and the screening of these new Asian talents, field actors, such as film critics, sales agents, producers, have access to new arrivals on the Asian film scene and are able to share new knowledge regarding what is 'hot' in Asian cinema. This process allows BIFF, as a field-configuring event, to legitimize new talent and, in reverse, the attention these films bring the event legitimizes the event's status as a cultural hub. Consequently, countries such as Kazakhstan have been included in the section, giving equal opportunities to a wide variety of countries to benefit from BIFF's exposure.

This central and constant drive to represent all regions of Asia is part of the inherent strategy of BIFF in becoming the prime cultural destination in Asia. It follows the rhetoric explained by Ahn and contributes to the ambivalence of BIFF as local/global, Korean/Asian and national/transnational. The Window on Asian Cinema stands as another building block within the event that serves the purpose of international exposure, which is then transferred to the host country and its film industry. Although the Window on Asian Cinema excludes films from Korea, except on the occasion of a co-production with other Asian countries, it remains critical to the festival and to the local film industry due to the fact that, as Elley explains, the section attracts an abundance of international film industry members to the event looking for Asia's top independent films. Once more, the rhetoric and institutional logic of Asianness allows Korea's film industry to promote itself alongside the rest of Asia.

New Currents

The New Currents section, the only official competitive section of the festival, is devoted to the first and second films of Asian directors, including Korean talent. It has allowed wonderful exposure for the new generation of Asian filmmakers looking to make their mark on the global film stage. Often, through such recognition from various international film festivals, these directors can build their career and reputation. In turn, such directors frequently become important national filmmakers and are viewed as representatives of the country's film culture. A prime example of this is the Chinese director Jia Zhangke. In 1998, Jia presented his first feature film *Xiao Wu* (1997) at BIFF. His first feature went on to win the New Currents Award that year and continue its route on the festival network. Though BIFF is not the only reason *Xiao Wu* would eventually

know success on the international film festival network, the fact that it contributed to its success demonstrates how BIFF, as a field-configuring event, is capable of creating and reproducing field norms. Through his success at BIFF, Jia Zhangke established himself as an emerging talent in Asia. Field norms or trends begin at a particular FCE, such as BIFF, and are echoed by subsequent festivals. The discovery and critical praise of a new Asian sensation can be transferred and reproduced by other events across the globe. As a crucial nodal point within the festival network, BIFF can set trends as well as reproduce them. Thus, *Xiao Wu* not only knew success at BIFF, the film was also recognized throughout the festival network, which allowed Jia to achieve a certain level of global recognition. From 1998 to 1999, *Xiao Wu* would win prizes at festivals such as the Berlin International Film Festival (NETPAC award), the San Francisco International Film Festival (SKYY prize) and The Vancouver International Film Festival (Dragons and Tigers Award).¹⁹⁸ This success on the international film festival circuit most definitely benefited Jia.¹⁹⁹ Kevin Lee of the online film journal *Senses of Cinema* explains that this festival success “led to a partnership with Japanese director Takeshi Kitano’s production company”,²⁰⁰ which led to Jia’s second feature film in 2000 with *Platform*. Thus, BIFF aided to established Jia and allowed him to jumpstart his career on the festival network.

As for local talent, the New Currents Section has also acted as a wonderful platform for Korean filmmakers. A salient example is Park Ki-yong, who debuted his first feature film *Motel Cactus* (1997) at the 2nd Busan International Film Festival. His film won the New Currents award that year and the FIPRESCI prize at the Rotterdam International Film Festival a year later. Although his first feature only won two prizes worldwide, Park remained an important figure in Korean film culture. In fact, Park Ki-

yong is presently the Executive director of the Korean Academy of Film Arts and the co-director of the Cinema Digital Seoul Film Festival. Examples like these occur at almost every edition of BIFF as most winners of the New Currents award have had subsequent careers after their first feature film, whether as filmmakers or through another role within the film industry. Obviously, this section plays an important role within BIFF's programming and it is a prime example of how BIFF, as a field-configuring event, can create and reproduce field norms. It contributes to the event's rhetoric of 'Asianness', as it promotes the first features films of up-and-coming Asian directors. More so, the section participates in the dual structure of BIFF as Korean/Asian and local/global through the promotion and exposure of local talent. Since most of the winners of the section acquire a certain degree of global recognition and exposure through the festival circuit, BIFF reaffirms its place within the network as a nodal point for Asian cinema.

Korean Cinema Today and The Korean Retrospective: Local strategy

Two other film categories in BIFF's catalogue are of great interest to this thesis: Korean Cinema Today and the Korean Retrospective. These two sections represent the flip side to the dual structure of BIFF. If New Currents and A Window on Asian Cinema are showcases for Asian cinema and appeal to the festival's drive to promote the region to the world, these two sections appeal to the festival's desire to promote the local film industry and to shape the local film culture. Once again, the inherent strategy, which aims to link the local to the global through the cohesive institutional logic of 'Asianness', is present in the relation between these four sections.

Korean Cinema Today: promoting the present

Korean Cinema Today, changed from Korean Panorama in 2006, acts as a platform for local Korean films made during the year. Through this section of BIFF's catalogue, the event can introduce local films to various international industry members and allow films to make their way onto the international film festival network. This section constitutes the true original purpose of the event, which was to promote Korea's culture and cinema to the world, initiated by the 'segyehwa' drive. As Kim Dong-ho states, "the promotion of Korean films abroad remains the primary objective of the Busan International Film Festival" and "the contribution offered by [the] festival is much more determined".²⁰¹ These comments originate from the same interview in which Kim admits that the festival was dedicated to the promotion of Asian cinema and young Asian directors. Once more, through these contradictory answers, the dual structure of the event's institutional logic is revealed. In this instance, the Korean Cinema Today section is situated within the Korean spectrum of the dichotomy Asia/Korea. It allows Korean films to have a level of international exposure never before seen in the long film history of the country. In approximately 90 years of film history, never has Korea benefited from such an exceptional platform. The impact of such a showcase on the success of Korean films abroad is undeniable. With a total attendance of 196,177 in 2011, including 11,268 accredited guests of which 1,217 were from overseas,²⁰² the festival puts up impressive numbers which have catapulted the local film industry onto the global scene. As a field-configuring event, Busan gathers these 11,268 industry members (critics, international film festival programmers, sales agents, producers, etc.) in order to market the local film industry to the world.

Along the years, the selections for the Korean Cinema Today section have slightly changed. Although it has constantly screened films that became both international and local hits, films such as *Secret Sunshine* (Lee Changdong, 2007), *The Host* (Bong Joon-ho, 2005) and *Poetry* (Lee Changdong, 2010), this section has always followed the local industry's activities, its ups and downs. Similarly to national cinemas, field-configuring events are subject to external pressure. These can be of a political, cultural, sociological or of an economic nature. As the production conditions and power relations change within the Korean film industry, through legislations, the advent of new industry players or the rise in popularity of new Asian cinemas i.e., Thailand or Indonesia, so does the institutional logic of a field-configuring event change. This is another instance of the process termed co-evolution. This capacity to follow the flux in the local film culture has allowed BIFF to remain relevant in its selections and, consequently, to endure its position as cultural hub. One of the most salient examples occurred in 2006 as the category was rechristened Korean Cinema Today, with two subsections entitled Korean Panorama, the prior name, and Visions. These new subsections were designed to represent more appropriately Korea's film industry, which was producing both entertainment oriented blockbusters and arthouse films. As Elley reports in 2008:

The Korean Cinema Today section, once a catch-up on the local movies released during the year, has morphed into more of a premier lineup of smaller-scale titles, seemingly in response to the industry's travails. Its Panorama subsection corrals several interesting commercial releases, including "Public Enemy Returns", "The Chaser" and "The Good, the Bad and the Weird." More edgy stuff is in the Visions subsection.²⁰³

These 'edgy' films are the independent arthouse films produced in Korea by newcomers and independent filmmakers, who are given a push by Busan onto the film

festival network. In 2006, more than a third (9 of 21) of the films screened in the Korean Cinema today section were world premiers. In 2011, the number had jumped to 15 out of 25, more than half the films were premiering at Busan. However, Korea's most established filmmakers i.e., Park Chan-wook, Lee Changdong and Bong Joon-ho, disregard BIFF and often decide to premiere their films at more prestigious Western film festivals. As a consequence, the films premiering at BIFF are regarded as second tier productions. Nonetheless, Korean Cinema Today and its two subsections remain an excellent showcase for the best Korean films of the year. Along with internationally successful films such as *Old Boy* (Park Chan-wook, 2003) and *Peppermint Candy* (Lee Changdong, 1999), the section also screens film less recognized in the hopes of enhancing global awareness. Thus, it is hard to ignore BIFF's role in introducing local films to the world. If we follow Felicia Chan's logic when she states that a film festival is a space that "regulates- in accordance with economic, political and cultural forces- what is allowed to flow through it",²⁰⁴ then Busan's role becomes undeniable. The event allows the local films to flow through the international festival circuit by including them in its selection and by focusing on them. Once on the film festival circuit, there is no way of knowing what will happen to a film, but to be on the circuit is already an important step in the progression of any film. This is the objective of the Korean Cinema Today section, to get Korean films out onto the global market and the international film festivals.

Korean Retrospective: Promoting the past and acknowledging the film culture

The second section focused on Korean cinema is one of the most important sections at BIFF. The Korean Retrospective section has allowed the festival to enact its

influence on the film culture of Korea, both locally and globally, in a prominent way. Through this section, BIFF has been able to rewrite its film history and to get significant films from its past onto the screens and into the minds of many.²⁰⁵ This re-appropriation and global exhibition of Korea's film history makes the Retrospective section a key part of BIFF's programming. In fact, Ahn explains just how important retrospectives can be:

Exhibiting old films produced in host countries is one of the most important programming features of film festivals around the globe. Despite considerable national variation, retrospective sections serve to justify and legitimate the current status of each national cinema, often coalescing with the festivals' interest in promoting their own events. In this respect, by connecting the past to the present through its Korean retrospective programme, PIFF has attempted to both establish and maintain a sense of "continuity" in Korean cinema as well as to solidify the position of the festival in the local and the global market.²⁰⁶

Moreover, as the chapter on Korea's film history demonstrated, the national film culture of Korea has been invisible to its own countrymen, not to mention the rest of the world, throughout much of its history. Unfortunately, many film prints were destroyed, either due to war, poor conservation or severe censorship and numerous films were thought lost forever. Luckily, in cooperation with film archives, from various countries such as Japan, Russia and China, along with several film institutions, many film prints have been recovered, restored and screened. In cooperation with the Korean Film Archive (KOFA)²⁰⁷ and the Korean Film Council (KOFIC), which were both institutions first initiated by the state, BIFF has been able to acquire quality prints of many films from Korea's past. Through the collaboration between the festival and these separate institutions, the event has been able to produce comprehensive retrospectives of high

quality. This has allowed BIFF to fill the gap between the past and the present. Thus, the Retrospective section of BIFF follows along the lines of a secondary institutional logic of the event set by its director, which is focused on the promotion of local Korean films, whether recent or old.

As Ahn points out, “it is an often overlooked fact that film festivals have provided a significant location for screening “old” films”²⁰⁸. This aspect of film festivals is often neglected due to the fact that film festivals have this inherent drive for discovery. With an overabundance of films produced every year, festival programmers are always on the lookout for the next New Wave in global cinema. Furthermore, to complicate the situation, this constant drive for novelty and discovery is often the central focus of many studies on film festivals. Bill Nichols’ original piece on cinephilia and film festivals is a prime example of the kind of work done in the field of festival studies.²⁰⁹ Ironically, as Nichols’ viewed film festivals as windows onto national cinemas, it seems quite fitting that one of the most important sections at BIFF is named ‘A Window on Asian Cinema’. Consequently, not much has been written on the role that retrospectives play within film festivals and the various national film cultures they represent. However, Julian Stringer offers us an opportunity to better grasp the role film festivals can play in regards to ‘old’ films as he explains:

The international film festival circuit now plays a significant role in the re-circulation and re-commodification of ‘old’ and ‘classic’ movies. Taking the form of revivals, retrospectives, special gala screenings and archive driven events, the contemporary exhibition of such historical artefacts provides a powerful means of extending cinephilia into the second century of cinema.²¹⁰

Stringer’s concepts of re-circulation and re-commodification are central to our

comprehension of the impact of the retrospectives held at BIFF through the years, as these two terms offer the proper tools to study Retrospectives.

At a basic level, re-circulation designates the recurrence of a component. In the case of BIFF, re-circulation has two meanings, the recurrence of classic films and the redistribution of film knowledge. In the first instance, BIFF's Retrospective section has the obvious and mandatory duty of screening films, which are of significant importance, from Korea's film history. This is complicated by the fact that prints of films dating from before the Korean War are relatively scarce. Consequently, as Ahn explains, this implies that "just as new exhibitions at museums are often influenced by research taking place in academic circles, the retrospective programme at festivals often relies on the work of scholars who are specialists in related fields."²¹¹

1996: The Korean New Wave Retrospective: Acknowledging its film culture

Perhaps constraints forced the programmers at BIFF to focus the first retrospective in 1996 on the recent Korean New Wave, which took place earlier in the decade. Hence, the Korean Retrospective section of the first Busan International Film Festival was comprised of films such as *Sopyonje* (Im Kwon-taek, 1993), *Mandala* (Im Kwon-taek, 1981) and *Black Republic* (Park Kwang-su, 1990). Perhaps these relatively recent films don't fall in the definition of 'old films', yet their screening concurs with Stringer's notion of re-circulation and re-commodification. These filmmakers and their works represent a shift in Korea's film history. Thanks to these Korean 'auteurs', the country's film culture was able to dig itself out of an abyss and have success locally. As Korea's film culture was on the cusp of global success, an event such as BIFF can play an

enormous role in acknowledging the role these films had in the success of the country's films abroad. As Ahn explains:

In this respect, PIFF's choice of "Korean New Wave" as the first Korean retrospective suggests that the festival self-consciously sought to position these recent Korean films within a legacy of Korean cinematic history in order to forge a sense of "continuity" between the past and the present.²¹²

Through its first retrospective, BIFF was able to re-circulate these films and allow them to be viewed by a wide variety of field actors from around the world. For many of these field actors, this was the first contact with these films and with Korea's rich film culture. Perhaps chosen due to a lack of sufficient film prints, the selection of these films at this particular instance in Korea's history, a moment of transition from local to global, remains significant. They too represent a transition in Korea's culture. Most of these films had already screened in western film festivals, through retrospectives or official selection and were ripe for additional exposure. BIFF's acknowledgment of these works demonstrates its awareness as an important member of the festival network.

Most importantly, by assembling and re-circulating these films that have known success abroad, the first retrospective at Busan reaffirmed the changes within its film culture and celebrated its most accomplished filmmakers. More importantly, the organizers at BIFF were not satisfied with only screening these important films, they were also devoted to the circulation of information regarding them. In fact, with every retrospective, the festival produces a booklet that acknowledges the filmmakers and films of that year. These short works are" designed to provide systematic and in-depth analyses on Korean cinema, as part of the retrospective programs of Korean filmmakers at the Pusan International Film Festival."²¹³ Through these booklets, which are handed out to

accredited guests, the various field actors who attend the festival acquire additional knowledge regarding the film culture of Korea. In these booklets, various essays review not only the films screened in the retrospective, but also the entire career of each filmmaker celebrated in the retrospective. Very comprehensive and succinct, each essay is designed to instruct the reader of the importance of the filmmakers and their work within the context of the period. In turn, this creates shared cognition amongst field actors, which allows them to acknowledge and recognize the country's rich film culture. This intent to inform and reach an international audience is evident in the foreword of the first booklet published in 1996:

The reason that we are holding a Korean Retrospective section in the first PIFF is to convey a clear image to the audiences from Korea and abroad who are interested in understanding the Korean cinema. We do not expect to accomplish everything through this initial attempt, yet we do expect that we will open a new venue for international cultural exchanges and discussions, which should include not only appraisals but also sharp criticism of Korean cinema.²¹⁴

Most importantly, through this acknowledgement, these films are re-commodified as key films within Korea's film culture. Not only do they fall within the 'legacy of Korean cinematic history', these films legitimize Korea as a country with a rich film culture. They are accompanied with the label 'significant film' when screened in a section such as the retrospective. This occurs with every retrospective at any film festival. However, some cases are more significant than others.

1997 to 2005: Acknowledging Korean *auteurs* of the post-War period

A salient example of the re-commodification and re-circulation of Korean films is the two different retrospectives of the Korean filmmaker Kim Ki-Young, a prominent

film *auteur* of the 1960s Golden Age. The first retrospective occurred during the second edition of the Busan International Film Festival in 1997. This retrospective was the first in a series that lasted until 2005, which focused on important Korean filmmakers from the post-war period. The series included: Yu Hyun-mok (1999), Shin Sang-ok (2001), Kim Soo-yong (2002), Chan wha Chung (2003) and Lee Man-hee (2005). Every single one of these Korean *auteurs* has been an important figure in Korea's film history. Like the first retrospective on the Korean New Wave, these retrospectives were designed to celebrate and champion some of the most accomplished filmmakers in Korea's history. Moreover, through this celebration of their work, these filmmakers were introduced to the rest of the world. Accompanied by a booklet published by the festival organizers, these retrospectives offered a crash-course in Korean film history. Consequently, festival attendees and field actors became aware of the talent and importance of these Korean *auteurs* and gained complementary knowledge regarding the film culture of the country.

Of these filmmakers, perhaps none of them has the same status as Kim Ki-young. Described as “a prolific and creative filmmaker”²¹⁵ who “played a significant role in the history of Korean cinema”,²¹⁶ Kim's influence on the film culture of Korea is explained at length in the booklet that accompanied his retrospective entitled *Kim Ki-young: Cinema of Diabolical Desire and Death*. Throughout the essays that survey his career, it becomes clear that Kim is considered a unique filmmaker in Korean history. Described as a “liberal dreamer”²¹⁷ whose “films pave the way for Korean cinema to improve themselves endlessly”,²¹⁸ the various authors who contributed to the work that accompanied the retrospective depicted an *auteur* with a unique vision and sensibility. Of the eight films screened at the retrospective, perhaps none is more important than

Kim's 1960 film *The Housemaid*. Recognized as a classic in Korean film culture, this film has become a symbol of the period in Korea's film history known as the Golden Age. Most importantly, in 2008, during the 13th edition of BIFF, a remastered version of the film was screened in a second retrospective of Kim's work. This remastered version, which premiered at Cannes the year before, was provided by Martin Scorsese's World Cinema Foundation.²¹⁹ Although Kim's films were already circulating throughout the festival network in various retrospectives, this new and restored version of the film attracted much attention to BIFF and Korea's film culture. Interestingly enough, this second screening of the film, eleven years later, can be interpreted as a symbol of the progress that Korean films made during the period. In 1997, Kim's film, which was nothing more than an obscure film of the 1960s for field actors unfamiliar with Korea's film culture, was introduced to the world. Eleven years later, with Korea's film culture and BIFF established as top players in Asia, Kim's film is remastered (re-circulated) and presented once more, but this time as a key piece of the retrospective. Like the film industry of Korea, Kim's 1960 film became much more important within global film culture. As a field-configuring event can alter field norms, it can also support these norms. By screening *Housemaid* in its remastered version as a central part of its retrospective section, entitled 'Archaeology of Korean Cinema', BIFF reiterates the film's importance in Korea's film history. The festival thus supports the common knowledge, shared by field actors across the festival network, that Kim's 1960 work is a key film of the Golden Age.

Moreover, various members of the press often supported this 'common knowledge'. For example, when addressing the various films screened at the

retrospective, Christopher Bourne writes: “one of these was Kim’s undoubtedly most famous work, “*The Housemaid*,” which screened in a new digital restoration [...]”²²⁰ Jose-Luis Moctezuma quotes Kim’s film as a “landmark in Korean Cinema”²²¹ and Jon Pais asserts that “perhaps the most renowned (and notorious) of these [Golden Age filmmakers] was Kim Ki-young [...]” and that the print was “gorgeously luminous, with jet blacks and velvety greys, enabling viewers to marvel at cinematographer Kim Deok-jin’s incomparably beautiful lensing”.²²² These quotes demonstrate the role of a retrospective within a film festival such as BIFF. The event, along with field actors (members of the press), reproduce field norms and logics. Here, BIFF screens a film that it defines as a ‘classic’ of Korean film culture, and which is recognized as such worldwide by film critics, bloggers and authors who acknowledge and support the choice through positive reviews.

The notions of re-circulation and re-commodification proposed by Stringer are in fact substitutes for the field-configuring event’s concepts of ‘common sense-making’ and ‘shared cognition’. Through the circulation of ‘old’ films of Korea’s film history, the retrospectives at BIFF, such as the two case studies discussed here, allow disparate actors, along with festival attendees, to become aware of the country’s film culture. In turn, this reduces cognitive distance between industry members regarding the films of Korea’s history and creates shared cognition. Moreover, the branding of these films as ‘key’ films of the past also raises awareness within the field regarding important filmmakers as well as their work. Through the publication of pamphlets detailing the history of these key figures in Korean film culture and the various Q&A sessions or conferences that accompany some of these

screenings, additional information is offered to these various actors. This recognition and acknowledgement refers to common sense-making, which occurs when an event allows its actors to become aware and reach a consensus on a given subject. Consequently, BIFF, as a field-configuring event, allows Korea to expose its film history and spread knowledge across a wide variety of actors, who thus acknowledge and recognize its legitimacy as a film culture.

From showcase to industry actor: The Asian Project Market

As demonstrated throughout this section, the Busan International Film Festival was designed primarily as a showcase for Korean and Asian cinema on the global stage. At its inception, it was designed for the promotion and support of local Asian and Korean films. In his essay on the festival network, Mark Peranson distinguishes two types of festivals: the Audience festival and the Business festival. The first has a limited impact on global film culture, is much smaller in scale, is geared towards a niche audience and is mostly subsidised by state institutions and grants. The latter is more influential, is geared towards a more active participation in global film culture and is much greater in scale. Both film festivals are composed of the same actors, termed interest groups in Peranson's essay, yet each festival has a different relationship with each actor. As Peranson notes, most film festivals fall somewhere in between each type, with a strong inclination towards one in particular. Additionally, he notes that a festival's identity can shift through the years from an Audience festival into a Business festival. The Busan International Film Festival is a salient example of this shift from showcase to industry producer with its world renowned Asian Project Market. Through this market, the event

has established itself as a key player within Asian film culture, contributing to many film productions worldwide.

Asian Project Market

Established in 1998 during the third edition of the Busan International Film Festival, the Pusan Promotion Plan, rechristened the Asian Project Market (APM) in 2012, was the first attempt on the part of the event's directors to become an active participant in the local (Korea) and regional (Asia) film business. This side-event promotes itself as a space "where promising directors and producers of Asia are given opportunities to meet with co-producers or financiers".²²³ Whether this initiative was a success is no longer debatable. Based roughly on the CineMart established at the Rotterdam Film Festival, this sidebar has allowed BIFF to distinguish itself within Asia and the festival network. Elley argues that "BIFF has maintained its profile as the key Asian event through perpetual innovation and cherry-picking the best ideas of the West-the Pusan Promotional Plan, inspired by Rotterdam's CineMart [...]".²²⁴ Moreover, this addition to BIFF also allowed the event to shift from a newcomer to a game changer within the festival network. As Darcy Paquet explains:

Project markets have become increasingly trendy in the past five years, with festivals across the world taking on the role of matchmaker for intriguing new projects and potential financiers. But the Pusan Promotional Plan ranks as one of the pioneers.²²⁵

Since its inception, the Asian Project Market has developed into more than just a simple sidebar. It has defined BIFF as an important field-configuring event within Asia's film culture. Through this Project Market, which includes films from all over Asia, the Busan International Film Festival has further cemented its position as an Asian cultural

hub and as a pathway towards the global market. Essentially, the field-configuring event “has the potential to alter the relevant field”,²²⁶ its norms and its production through its gathering of field actors, who exchange, interact, come to a consensus and make business deals. This is the exact role of the Asian Project Market. In the same *Variety* article, Paquet explains that “the growth and maturation of the PPP has coincided with the expanding interest on the part of Western festivals to showcase Asian films [...] as a result, an expanding number of investors and sales companies are taking the trip to Busan to try and get their hands on the hottest new projects”.²²⁷ In 2003, Hollywood film distribution companies such as Columbia, Universal Pictures along with Japanese companies such as NHK and Shochiku took part in the Asian Project Market. Obviously, the APM reaches companies ranging from regional (East Asia) to global (US). This global reach has allowed the market to attain a level of unsurpassed recognition and has positioned it as a key player within Asia. Patrick Frater notes:

As co-production markets go, the Pusan Promotional Plan is neither the oldest nor the largest. But it can claim to be one of the most influential anywhere on the planet-it’s certainly the strongest in Asia.²²⁸

Throughout the years, the Asian Project Market has contributed to the production of such films as *Oasis* (Korea, Lee Chang-dong, 2002), *The Circle* (Iran, Jafar Panahi, 2000), *Platform* (China, Jia Zhang-ke, 2000), *The Host* (Korea, Boon Joon-ho, 2006) and many more. Through its support, the APM has allowed films such as these to get international financing and distribution deals. Whether still in script form or in search of additional funding for completion, this market has supported numerous projects that have evolved into wonderful and critically acclaimed films. In doing so, it has greatly contributed to the film culture in Asia, from Korea to China.

Conclusion: redefining a film culture

When the different members of the industry, accompanied by state and municipal institutions, set out to create an international film festival in the port city of Busan, their objectives were quite clear: promote and support the local film industry. Undoubtedly, these goals have been achieved and even surpassed. Starting at 169 films from 31 countries in 1996 along with 224 invited industry guests from 27 nations, the event went on to screen 304 films from 75 countries with 11,519 invited guests in 2012. Not only has the number of films screened and industry members attending skyrocketed, the event has constantly shifted and evolved through the years in order to establish itself as a leading festival in all of Asia. Always following its institutional logic geared towards the promotion, support and funding of Asian cinema, with a clear prerogative towards Korean films, the Busan International Film Festival has become the uncontested champion of East Asia. Celebrating the achievements of Korea's film industry, the event has constantly searched and screened the best of past and present Korean filmmakers. Shifting from showcase event to heavy participation in funding and distribution of film projects, the film festival in Busan has strongly contributed to the production of films in Korea, Asia and also worldwide. The accomplishments of BIFF as a field-configuring event have been made evident in this chapter, yet only a fragment of the event's influence on the country's film industry has been demonstrated here.

Perhaps one of the more prominent examples of the impact that BIFF has had on the film culture of Korea can be found in its effect on the host city of Busan. As Stringer has argued, an international film festival is often tightly bonded to its host city. The event will represent the city and vice versa. The film festival at Cannes is a prime example.

Despite the fact that Cannes only last roughly two weeks and takes place on a small portion of the beach area know as ‘La Croisette’, the entirety of the city of Cannes is dedicated to the film festival. Through the immense attention this event generates, the tourist season reaches its peak during this period and produces more profit than during all of the remainder of the year. This phenomenon is reproduced in the case of Busan and its film festival. Throughout the years, the festival organizers, along with municipal and state institutions, have implemented various infrastructures that have shaped the city of Busan into a leading film city in Korea. Striking examples of this are the Busan cinema center and Centum City project. Both projects aim at the creation of infrastructures focused on the film industry. The first is a center for the Busan International Film Festival, with an estimated budget of \$137 million,²²⁹ that aims to “build Busan into a heavyweight cinema center”.²³⁰ Its completion in 2011 completely altered the cityscape of Busan and offered BIFF with a venue which would make any film festival jealous. The latter, not yet completed, has been developed in the hopes of further raising Busan’s position within global film culture as a hub. Han Sunhee explains that “the Centum City has been developed as an infrastructure for film industry. Department stores, hotels and production outfits pepper the center along with the Busan Cinema Center and Bexco, the city’s convention center.”²³¹ Essentially, these two centers are developed in the hopes of making Busan “Asia’s real content hub, in terms of hardware.”²³² Coupled with the enthusiasm demonstrated by the inhabitants of Busan, these two centers have contributed to a shift within the film culture of the city. Since 1996, Busan has become a center for the film industry of Korea, with Seoul as a second, not secondary, film center. These

elements have contributed to the advent of BIFF and Busan as the film capital of Asia, a remarkable feat.

Conclusion

In sync with Korea's film culture

Close to two decades have passed since the introduction of the Busan International Film Festival in Korea (BIFF). During this timespan, the event's programmers and organizers have continuously changed the festival's structure in an effort to be in sync with the progress of the nation's film industry and to uphold its position as an Asian powerhouse. Created both as a global promotional tool and to support local filmmakers, BIFF's role has greatly expanded since 1996. On a first level, the size of the event itself has grown exponentially, from the number of films screened, the number of sections in its programming, the quantity of sidebars and the number of attendees and international industry guests. On a second level, the scope of the event has widened significantly to include not just filmmakers from East Asia, but also young talent from all over the globe. Whether from Japan, Iran, Georgia, Europe or Canada, if these young developing filmmakers are of Asian descent or plan to film in Asia, BIFF has made it a prerogative to support them in any way possible through various prizes, master classes and markets. This constant drive for supremacy in Asia as well as the event's proactive participation in Asian and global film culture has allowed BIFF to establish a network of 'field actors' like no other film festival in the East. Comparable to western festivals film markets such as Cannes and Toronto, Busan has become a key player and has undoubtedly contributed to the recent development of the Korean film industry.

The role played by BIFF in the development of the Korean film industry has been explained at length in this thesis. The most crucial aspects that have been at the core of this study are connected to the capacity of the event to organize and gather the various industry members, termed 'field actors', in an attempt to generate various exchanges and

interactions, which, in turn, have had a direct impact on the film industry itself. From its creation to its most recent edition, every element of BIFF is structured through a joint effort on the part of a wide variety of actors, whether industry members or state and municipal institutions. As demonstrated in the chapter on BIFF, in 1996, the foundation of the first international film festival in Busan was the result of a relatively small group of people from various professional backgrounds who worked in cooperation and who were supported by a state willing and desiring to offer its culture with a global venue. Moreover, the structuration of BIFF was possible thanks to a goal shared by these various actors, which was the promotion and support of Korea's film industry. This assembling of disparate members in a common goal is a key element that defines BIFF as a 'field-configuring event'. Through its growth in size and attendance, most notably in its sidebars such as the Asian Film Market and Asian Project Market, the event has continually broadened its network of 'actors' and created an environment perfectly designed to answer to the event's initial goal. Consequently, since its inception, BIFF has established itself as a key element in the 'configuration' of the film industry of Korea.

The Busan International Film Festival has not only played a key role in the development of the Korean film industry, as well as various Asian film industries, it has also acted as a crucial player in the dissemination of Korea's film culture abroad. Through its focus on the film culture of the host nation, the event has allowed much of the world to come in contact with the country's rich film history and to become aware of its growing film industry. This is another crucial feature that defines BIFF as a 'field-configuring event'. Through such programming sections such as Korean Cinema Today and Korean Cinema Retrospective, the event has projected the rich film culture of Korean

onto the screens of the world and into the minds of many. Termed ‘shared cognition’ and ‘common sense-making’ in the theory of the field-configuring event, BIFF has allowed the various actors who constitute the network at the festival to become aware of the culture and, in turn, to share knowledge regarding its present status and past achievements. Not only has the event screened various new and old films, it has also been active in the distribution of information regarding its own film culture. In fact, the organizers at BIFF were not only satisfied with the simple exhibition of past films, they were also active in educating foreign film industry members, film critics, scholars and historians through the numerous Retrospectives and various detailed booklets that accompanied them. Through the production of written works to accompany each retrospective, BIFF allowed distinct ‘actors’ to share and acquire knowledge. In turn, through the circulation of various reviews, DVD box sets and presenting retrospectives at western film festival, Korea’s rich film culture was first recognized and secondly championed throughout the world. Without such a venue to exhibit and advocate the film culture of Korea, it is quite possible that most of this knowledge would have remained invisible and unknown. Thankfully, the festival in Busan and the people behind the event were determined to propel the film industry and the film culture of Korea onto the global stage and into the curious minds of all who were interested in this small East Asian country, destined for greater things.

Growing with BIFF

In an article published on October 16, 2000 in *Variety*, Derek Elley briefly pointed out the fact that the Busan International Film Festival had reached a high level of

success within Asia, the international festival circuit and global film culture. Elley wrote of a flawed event reaching maturity and progressing constantly.

After several years of roller-coaster growth, the Pusan Intl. Film Festival finally came of age in its fifth edition (Oct. 6-14) with more films, more audiences, more industryites-and a few organizational problems. The fest now generates the same kind of buzz and excitement in the region as the Hong Kong festival did in the mid-'80s, with Asianphiles trekking from the four corners to peruse the latest regional offerings[...]²³³

The title of Elley's article is "Korean pix grow up at Pusan", which is most likely intended to suggest the importance of the event in the production and support of local films. This view puts much emphasis on the influence of BIFF on the film industry and less on the influence of Korea's film industry on the festival itself. Another title that would be more representative of the relationship between BIFF and the film culture of Korea would be "Korean films grow *with* Busan".

As this thesis has demonstrated, although BIFF contributed to the success of Korean films locally and globally, the event was not the single and only reason behind such an international success. In fact, as the Korean film industry was reaching a new level of critical and commercial success throughout the festival circuit, BIFF was also establishing itself as a leading film festival in Asia. These were parallel activities, which subsequently built a mutual relationship between both the film industry and the festival. As the film industry was offering a multitude of quality films for BIFF to showcase, the event was using the country's growing popularity in western film festival to attract attention. As Elley explains in an article which appeared in 2000:

Just as Hong Kong's fest rose on the back of the burgeoning interest in Chinese-speaking cinema, so Pusan has hitched a ride on Korean cinema's local B.O. bounceback and growing international renown. The latter was belatedly acknowledged by this year's Cannes festival, which featured a

South Korean movie in each of its four sections, capping an *annus mirabilis* for Korea's industry.²³⁴

Basically, BIFF had a deep effect on the film industry and vice-versa. In 'field-configuring event' terminology, this process is called 'co-evolution'.

In most cases, co-evolution "occurs as an iterative structuration process, where changes in the field's structure have the potential to bring about changes in the field's institutional logic, and vice versa."²³⁵ As Amalya and Montgomery explain, this co-evolution refers mostly to processes that effect the field and its own internal logic. Hence, if utilized to analyze Korea's film renaissance in the 1990s, co-evolution would translate into the introduction of new actors within the field i.e., the *jaebols*, new producers and young talented filmmakers, the decrease in state censorship and increase in state support, which were all factors that altered how films were funded, produced, promoted and distributed. Hence, these changes to the structure of the Korean film industry resulted in a shift in production practices and a revival of the film culture in Korea. Yet, as this concluding chapter argues, this process of co-evolution should not be limited to the field and its logic. It should also be applied to the relationship between BIFF and the film industry of Korea. Essentially, both the film culture of Korea was altered by the film festival and, in turn, the success and development of the Korean film industry altered the structure of BIFF and allowed it to establish itself internationally. As Ahn explains:

The international recognition of Korean cinema has mainly been achieved through the festival circuit in the West and the remarkable growth of the national film industry since the 1990s. Consequently, the evolution of PIFF seems to be closely interrelated with the status of Korean cinema in the global economy.²³⁶

Moreover, BIFF has significantly changed since its creation in 1996. Key additions to the event have been the Asian Project Market, Asian Film Market, Asian Film Academy as well as a multitude of conferences, master classes and Q&A sessions. As demonstrated, these elements have allowed BIFF to enact its influence on the field of fiction films in Korea, to ‘configure’ the field in a sense. Yet most of these additions were created in response to the growth in Korea’s film industry. As the number of independent filmmakers and production companies grew, so did the festival. With an overabundance of young filmmakers, the festival promoters were obligated to broaden their scope and create new forms of support for this growing film industry.

PIFF organizers have worked to increase the scope of their festival, inviting more international buyers and showcasing the work of a more varied range of Asian directors at the Asian Film Market that runs side-by-side with the event.²³⁷

With the promotion of young Asian and Korean talent as a primary objective or institutional logic of BIFF, the event needed to continually alter its structure to follow the local film industry’s developed and growth. As the quote points out, the festival programmers widened their horizons by increasing the number of films screened and by diversifying the nations represented throughout the event. For example, in 1998, 16 film projects from 7 different countries were included in the Asian Project Market (Pusan Promotional Plan at the time).²³⁸ Ten years later, the number of projects had almost doubled with 30 films from a staggering 20 different countries,²³⁹ ranging from Thailand to Georgia. This increase in the number of selections and the diversity of nations is a salient example of how the development of various film industries has forced BIFF to broaden its selection and thus alter its structure. Moreover, by expanding its selection, as

noted in this thesis, BIFF changed the name of its sidebar from the Pusan Promotional Plan to the Asian Project Market. Although this change in title was partially due to the Romanisation of the Korean language, changing the name of the festival from Pusan to Busan, this slight modification also points to the willingness on the part of BIFF's organizers to be more inclusive in their selections. The simple change and addition of the term 'Asian' reinforces the festival's rhetoric of 'Asianness'.

Similarly to a cycle, as BIFF allowed more and more industry members to meet, make production and distribution deals and inject money into the film industry of Korea, the production value and global interest in Korean films has augmented. Thus, more funding and distribution opportunities were demanded from BIFF. Each element supported the other. Although it is true that the increase in budget was mostly the result of the *jaebols*, the Asian Film Market and sidebars at BIFF have also contributed to the budget boom in Korean cinema. In 2000, Elley pointed out that the average film budget had doubled from an average \$2 million in the 1990s to \$4 million in 2000.²⁴⁰ In 2012, the budget of the Korean international spy thriller *The Berlin File* (Ryoo Seung-wan) was estimated at \$9 million²⁴¹ and attracted much international interest, screening in various western countries. The element that stands out is BIFF's capacity to contribute to the expansion of Korea's film industry as well as its capability to follow and react to this expansion.

In addition to the relationship between the festival and the film industry, a second connection exists between the event and the host city of Busan. As the closing section of the chapter on BIFF briefly demonstrated, BIFF's reach goes beyond just the film industry in Korea. Its inception has greatly altered the host-city of Busan. Once more, this

influence on the city relates to the process of ‘co-evolution’. As BIFF has constantly strived at being a cultural hub in Asia, the city of Busan, coupled with municipal and state institutions, has transformed itself into the film capital of Asia. Through the addition of the Busan Cinema Center and Centrum City, the city of Busan has offered the festival a prime venue like no other in Asia. Moreover, these two centers would not have been possible if the Busan International Film Festival was not so successful. These two centers are a direct result of the expansion and success of the event, which generates both international attention and capital, mostly through an increase in tourism during the event. As BIFF was growing in size, popularity and attendance, the event was facing “growing problems with screen availability”²⁴² and was also facing complex logistic difficulties as international critics, producers, filmmakers, festival programmers, sales agents and all sorts of film enthusiasts ventured to Busan in droves. With the Busan Cinema Center and Centrum City, these problems were resolved. Consequently, it becomes evident that the Busan Cinema Center and Centrum City were designed to answer to the growing interest generated by the festival and, through the state-of-the-art venues they offered the event, these centers further supported the role of BIFF as a cultural hub in Asia.

Korea and BIFF’s next challenge: remaining relevant

According to Patrick Frater, “the *hallyu*, or Korean Wave in Japan, has melted away in the past year [2006], and some fear the disinterest may continue.”²⁴³ This disinterest, which has not only struck Japan, raises questions regarding the position of Korea’s film culture in Asia and across the globe. Now established as a leading Asian film industry, the initial ‘buzz’ surrounding Korean films has effectively diminished

without disappearing completely. Korean motion pictures are no longer a novelty within global film culture, but rather an established film culture with standards to maintain. Still widely present on the festival network, Korea's film industry remains present and is still in the discussions regarding the top Asian national film cultures. Yet, to maintain this position and presence demands active participation on the part of BIFF. Still regarded as the window to Asian cinema and the gateway to the West for Korean filmmakers, the Busan festival must not become complacent and must remain proactive instead. As Elley points out:

PIFF's biggest challenge during the next decade is to avoid the twin traps of any new non-Western festival: sustain its international profile as big-name locals increasingly premiere their pics at Western majors, and ride any future dip in the South Korean industry on whose back the fest initially came to global prominence.²⁴⁴

As Elley points out, the situation in Korea has become precarious as global attention has diminished somewhat in the last few years. To maintain the dynamic established in the early 2000s, BIFF must constantly reinforce its position as an Asian cultural hub while Korean films must continue to attract global attention at Western film festivals. Both instances require each element to have success in order to allow Korea's 'authority' in Asia to be sustained. This implies that, for Korea's film culture to continue having success, it must continue to **grow with BIFF**. As the film festival keeps expanding, attracting record attendance numbers in 2012, and the local film industry reaching box office records in 2013, with 82.9% of the market shares in February and 100 million tickets sold in 2012,²⁴⁵ it seems that the Korean film industry and its rich culture are not on the verge of disappearing. On the contrary, the members of the film industry and the organizers at BIFF seem determined to maintain the level of success and

prestige the country has become accustomed to in the last decade. Ultimately, BIFF and Korea's film industry have become firmly interconnected and, as long as this relationship lasts, it is safe to state that the film culture of Korea will continue to flourish locally and globally.

End notes.

Introduction:

¹ Elley, Derek. "Spotlight: Pusan Int'l Film Festival". *Variety*. (Aug 27, 2001-Sep 2, 2001) *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (48)

² The Republic of Korea, also known as South Korea, will be referred to as Korea for the rest of this present thesis. Any mention of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will be referred to as North Korea.

³ Elley, Derek and Patrick Frater. "Fest grows with what it knows : PIFF finds success amid competitish by sticking to its programming guns" *Variety*. (Oct 3-Oct 9, 2005) *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (7)

⁴ The exact number of film festivals around the world is unknown. Montreal alone has over 20 film festivals yearly. Moreover, www.torontofilmfestivals.com lists over 80 film festivals in the Canadian city.

⁵ "Pusan festival opens window wider to world to stay on top" *Journal Internet AFP* (2009). *eureka*. Web.

⁶ The term originated in the late 1990s and designates the various aspects of the Korean entertainment industry (mostly television, films and music) that have crossed borders in East Asia and the rest of the world. 'Hallyu' has spawned numerous websites and blogs dedicated to the movement. K-Pop, a musical version of 'Hallyu', is a prime example of the format this phenomenon can take. The recent success of Korean pop signer Psy, with his international hit single *Gangnam Style*, is a salient example of this.

⁷ Frater, Patrick. "Asia's monstrous showbiz push: South Korea's creative wave crosses globe." *Variety* (Oct 23-Oct 29, 2006). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (11)

⁸ Koo, Heejin. "Pusan film festival starts to draw raves." *International Herald Tribune*, (2006). *eureka*. Web.

⁹ De Valck, Marijke. *Film Festivals: from European geopolitics to global cinophilia*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007.

¹⁰ Stringer, Julian. "Global Cities and the International Film Festival Economy." *Cinema and the city: film and urban societies in a global context*. Ed. Mark Shiel and Tony Fitzmaurice. Oxford, U.k.; Malden; Mass: Blackwell Publishers, 2001

¹¹ Nichols, Bill. "Discovering Form, Inferring Meaning: New Cinemas and the Film Festival Circuit." *Film Quarterly* 47 No. 3 (1994). *JSTOR*. Web.

¹² Elsaesser, Thomas. "Film Festival Networks: the New Topographies of Cinema in Europe." *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005.

¹³ Porton, Richard., ed. *Dekalog 3*. London: New York: Wallflower, 2009.

¹⁴ Iordanova, Dina and Ragan Rhyne., ed. *The Film Festival Yearbook*. St. Andrews, Scotland: St. Andrews Film Studies, 2009.

¹⁵ It is important to note that the present thesis utilizes the doctoral thesis submitted by Ahn and not the book of the same title, which was published in 2011. Any discrepancies between the two works, which might have occurred during the transfer of the thesis into a book, aren't taken in consideration here.

¹⁶ Ahn, SooJeong. *The Pusan International Film Festival 1996-2005: South Korean Cinema in Local, Regional, and Global Context*. Hong Kong [China]: Hong Kong University Press, 2011

¹⁷ Yecies, Brian and Ae-Gyung Shim. *Korea's occupied cinemas*. New York: Routledge. 2011.

¹⁸ Choi, Jinhee. *The South Korean Film Renaissance: Local Hitmakers, Global Provocateurs*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2010. Print.

¹⁹ Rüling, Charles-Clement. "Festival case studies. Festivals as field-configuring events : the Annecy International Animated Film Festival and Market" *The Film Festival Yearbook*. Ed. Dina Iordanova and Ragan Rhyne. St. Andrews, Scotland: St. Andrews Film Studies, 2009.

Chapter 1: Film Festival Studies and the Field-Configuring Event

²⁰ Kenneth, Turan. *Sundance to Sarajevo: film festivals and the world they made*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2002. Print. (2)

²¹ "Festivals in Montreal" www.montreal.com. N.p., 2012. Web.

²² Although the first edition of the Venice film festival occurred in 1932, the Second World War would prevent a sustained presence of international film representatives and also put a stop to the event as the war broke loose.

²³ Kenneth, Turan. *Sundance to Sarajevo: film festivals and the world they made*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2002. Print. (3)

²⁴ Nichols, Bill. "Discovering Form, Inferring Meaning: New Cinemas and the Film Festival Circuit." *Film Quarterly* 47 No. 3 (1994). *JSTOR*. Web.(16)

²⁵ De Valck, Marijke. *Film Festivals: from European geopolitics to global cinephilia*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ Elsaesser, Thomas. *European cinema: face to face with Hollywood*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005. Print

²⁸ Stringer, Julian. "Global Cities and the International Film Festival Economy." *Cinema and the city: film and urban societies in a global context*. Ed. Mark Shiel and Tony Fitzmaurice. Oxford, U.k.; Malden; Mass: Blackwell Publishers, 2001. Print.

²⁹ Porton, Richard., ed. *Dekalog 3*. London: New York: Wallflower, 2009. Print.

³⁰ Powell, Walter and Paul J. DiMaggio., ed. *The New institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991. Print.

³¹ Narasimhan, and Brittany C. Jones. "Tournament rituals, Category dynamics, and Field Configuration: The Case of the Booker Prize." *Journal of Management Studies* 45 (2008) *Wiley-Blackwell Full Collection – CRKN 2012*. Web (1038)

³² Iordanova, Dina and Ragan Rhyne., ed. *The Film Festival Yearbook*. St. Andrews, Scotland: St. Andrews Film Studies, 2009. Print.

³³ De Valck, Marijke. *Film Festivals: from European geopolitics to global cinephilia*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007. Print. (16)

³⁴ Bazin, André. "A backward glance. The festival viewed as a religious order." *Dekalog 3*. Ed. Richard Porton. London: New York: Wallflower, 2009. Print.

³⁵ De Valck, Marijke. *Film Festivals: from European geopolitics to global cinephilia*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007. Print. (20-21)

³⁶ Nichols, Bill. "Discovering Form, Inferring Meaning: New Cinemas and the Film Festival Circuit." *Film Quarterly* 47 No. 3 (1994). JSTOR. Web.(16)

³⁷ The 'international film style' refers to trends within many art-house films which tour the film festival network. Often viewed as contradictory to the dominant Hollywood film style (i.e. continuity editing, fast cutting and classic cause and effect narrative), these art-house films have in common their refusal to adhere to the dominant norms established by Hollywood. This does not imply that all festival films are alike. On the contrary, most films attempt to be unique in their approach to the art of filmmaking. Unfortunately, it is possible to detect certain trends within the festival network. Perhaps due to the success of certain films on the festival circuit, which influence other filmmakers, or the simple fact that art-house cinema often tends to go against the grain, which is usually recognized as Hollywood, 'international film style' often represents the flip side to Hollywood. The negative aspect regarding Nichols' essay is that it creates a dichotomy between Hollywood and the rest of the world. Although Hollywood does dominate most film markets around the world, there is much more than simply Hollywood and everything else. The distinction must be made regarding the fact that global film culture is extremely varied.

³⁸ As Elsaesser's essays concentrate on Europe, Stringer distinguishes himself from Elsaesser through his tendencies to focus on Asian cinema, most notably South Korea cinema.

³⁹ Vilhjalmsdottir, Linda. *A documentary film festival circuit and film festivals as field-configuring events, adapting to digitalization*. Haskolinn A Bifrost: Bifrost University Press. 2011. (19)

⁴⁰ It is important to note that film festivals studies have been centered on western film festivals for a long period of time. Due to the fact that the 'birthplace' of these events is recognized as being Europe (Venice, Berlin, Cannes), authors have had the tendency to focus on European festivals and their relation to global film culture. More often than not, Europe and its festivals play the central role in global film culture, with other areas of the globe as secondary actors within the network. Only recently has there been an upsurge in studies on festivals from around the globe, such as Asia and South America. This has forced authors to pose new questions and to approach the subject in a new light due to extreme cultural and socio-economical differences in context.

⁴¹ It is important to note that not all festivals give away awards. Many festivals prefer to bestow prizes in the form of funding in an effort to encourage independent filmmakers. Moreover, the degree to which each award adds value is much different depending on the film festival's position within the network. For example, the Palme d'Or at Cannes has much more cultural value than most awards given away anywhere else. Prizes aren't the only form of prestige. A film's positioning within the festival's catalogue has much impact on its value. A premiere or to close the event carries much more value than if it were to screen on the third day of the festival. Value-adding occurs on many levels, yet prizes remain the top form.

-
- ⁴² Elsaesser, Thomas. "Film Festival Networks: the New Topographies of Cinema in Europe." *European cinema: face to face with Hollywood*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005. Print. (83)
- ⁴³ "Field-Configuring Events as Structuring Mechanisms: How Conferences, Ceremonies, and Trade Shows Constitute New Technologies, Industries, and Markets." http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/pdf/fce_call.pdf. N.p., 2005. Web
- ⁴⁴ In field-configuring event, the 'field' is often also termed 'organizational field'. Both are valid and refer to the same concept. This present thesis will utilize the term 'field'.
- ⁴⁵ Narasimhan, Anand and Brittany C. Jones. "Tournament rituals, Category dynamics, and Field Configuration: The Case of the Booker Prize." *Journal of Management Studies* 45 (2008) *Wiley-Blackwell Full Collection – CRKN 2012*. Web (1036)
- ⁴⁶ Ibid.
- ⁴⁷ Wade, Mike and Scott Schneberger. "Theories Used in IS Research: Actor-Network Theory." <http://www.istheory.yorku.ca/actornetworktheory.htm>. York University, 10 September 2005. Web
- ⁴⁸ Narasimhan, Anand and Brittany C. Jones. "Tournament rituals, Category dynamics, and Field Configuration: The Case of the Booker Prize." *Journal of Management Studies* 45 (2008) *Wiley-Blackwell Full Collection – CRKN 2012*. Web (1036)
- ⁴⁹ Rhyne, Ragan. "The Film Festival Circuit." *Dekalog 3*. Ed. Richard Porton. London: New York: Wallflower, 2009.
- ⁵⁰ Although quite clear and helpful in our definition of the field actor, Rhyne's pairings aren't set in stone. Most of the actors Rhyne groups together, for example policymakers, funders and festival managers, might not have the same objectives or philosophies about how to act upon and within the field. What remains a positive aspect of this list is its comprehensive cataloguing of the field actors who have the most impact within the field.
- ⁵¹ Rüling, Charles-Clement. "Festival case studies. Festivals as field-configuring events : the Annecy International Animated Film Festival and Market" *The Film Festival Yearbook*. Ed. Dina Iordanova and Ragan Rhyne. St. Andrews, Scotland: St. Andrews Film Studies, 2009. Print. (51)
- ⁵² Ibid.
- ⁵³ In his essays on Film festivals, Stringer coined the term 'festival film' to designate films which are designed for the network and, quite often, only exist within it. These films might accumulate value along the festival network for many months, to years even, before finding a distributor which will release them on DVD or in arthouse theatres.
- ⁵⁴ Elsaesser, Thomas. "Film Festival Networks: the New Topographies of Cinema in Europe." *European cinema: face to face with Hollywood*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005. Print. (87)
- ⁵⁵ Amalya, Oliver and Kathleen Montgomery. "Using Field-Configuring Events for Sense-Making: A Cognitive Network Approach." *Journal of Management Studies* 45(2008) *Wiley-Blackwell Full Collection – CRKN 2012*. Web (1150)
- ⁵⁶ Chan, Felicia. "The international film festival and the making of a national cinema." *Screen* 52. (2011) Print. (254)
- ⁵⁷ De Valck, Marijke. *Film Festivals: from European geopolitics to global cinophilia*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007. Print. (36)

⁵⁸ Peranson, Mark. "Film festivals: between art and commerce. First you get the power, then you get the money: two models of film festivals" *Dekalog 3*. Ed. Richard Porton. London: New York: Wallflower, 2009. Print.

⁵⁹ Ibid. (27)

⁶⁰ "Tableau comparative des accrédités: 2003-2012" <http://www.festival-cannes.fr/assets/File/WEB%202012/En%20Chiffres/En%20chiffres-Accredites-2012-VF.pdf>. Cannes film festival, 2012. Web.

⁶¹ The distinction must be made regarding the difference between 'film industry business' and 'film business' at Business festivals such as Cannes. The *Marché du Cinéma* is designed to generate business for industry members such as producers, directors or sales agents. Its goal is to allow projects to get funding, distribution deals and for film companies to generate revenue. The festival itself and its selections are designed for film business, which is more oriented towards cultural value. Although both forms of business can generate capital for the films and their representatives, each element has a different inherent objective. Some Business festivals focus more on the film industry business than the film business itself. There are all sorts of film festivals that fall in between both categories and some that answer to one particular type of festival.

⁶² Lampel, Joseph and Alan D. Meyer. "Guest Editors' Introduction" <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2008.00787.x/full>. *Journal of Management Studies*, 7 August 2008. Web

⁶³ Interview with Mi-jeong Lee conducted during the summer of 2012

⁶⁴ Rüling, Charles-Clement. "Festival case studies. Festivals as field-configuring events : the Annecy International Animated Film Festival and Market" *The Film Festival Yearbook*. Ed. Dina Iordanova and Ragan Rhyne. St. Andrews, Scotland: St. Andrews Film Studies, 2009. Print. (60)

⁶⁵ Kenneth, Turan. *Sundance to Sarajevo: film festivals and the world they made*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2002. Print. (14)

⁶⁶ <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2008.00787.x/full>

⁶⁷ Keslassy, Elsa. "Healthy Market Forecast." *Variety* (May 3, 2010-May 9, 2010). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. Web. (A19)

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ The International Federation of Film Producers Associations (FIAPF), which gathers 30 film producers' associations from 27 different countries, is recognized as the organization that offers official accreditation for international film festivals. Through rigorous standards established by the FIAPF, these accredited film festivals obtain a higher status once recognized by the organization. Most, if not all, A-list festivals have this accreditation.

⁷⁰ Narasimhan, Anand and Mary R. Watson. "Tournament Rituals in the Evolution of Fields: the Case of the Gramm Awards Grammys." *Academy of Management Journal*. Vol. 47, No. 1. 2004. Web. (60)

⁷¹ "Tableau de Statistique Presse: 1966-2012" <http://www.festival-cannes.fr/assets/File/WEB%202012/En%20Chiffres/En%20chiffres-Medias-2012-VF.pdf>. Cannes film festival, 2012. Web.

⁷² De Valck, Marijke. *Film Festivals: from European geopolitics to global cinephilia*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007. (126)

⁷³ Rhyne, Ragan. "The film festival circuit." *The Film Festival Yearbook*. Ed. Dina Iordanova and Ragan Rhyne. St. Andrews, Scotland: St. Andrews Film Studies, 2009. Print.

⁷⁴ Narasimhan, Anand and Mary R. Watson. "Tournament Rituals in the Evolution of Fields: the Case of the Grammys Awards Grammys." *Academy of Management Journal*. Vol. 47, No. 1. 2004. Web. (68)

⁷⁵ De Valck, Marijke. *Film Festivals: from European geopolitics to global cinephilia*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007. Print. (128)

⁷⁶ In 2004, *Fahrenheit 9/11* (Michael Moore, 2004) won the Palme d'Or at Cannes. This selection was very controversial as many viewed it as a more political than cultural decision. Most viewed the decision to award the prize to Moore's film as a direct message of discontent regarding the Bush administration, which was at power in the United-States of America at the time. Controversies like these are an integral part of film festivals and occur frequently.

⁷⁷ Kim, Kyung-Hyun. "Korean cinema and Im Kwon-Taek: an overview." *Im Kwon-Taek: the making of a Korean national cinema*. Ed. Kim, Kyung-Hyun and David E, James. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002. Print. (26)

⁷⁸ Hwang, Dana. *Koreanmovie.com*. N.p., n.d. Web.

⁷⁹ Elsaesser, Thomas. "Film Festival Networks: the New Topographies of Cinema in Europe." *European cinema: face to face with Hollywood*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005. Print. (97)

Chapter 2: Korea's film history: state and foreign interventions

⁸⁰ Although books and essays on the subject of Korea's film history have begun to make their way to various libraries, the topic remains relatively unexplored. The efforts of such authors as Jinhee Choi, Ae-Gyung Shim, Hyangjin Lee, Darcy Paquet, Ahn SooJeong and many more have elucidated many important facts about Korea's film culture and have aided in creating an interest in the subject.

⁸¹ Paquet, Darcy. "A short history of Korean Film" *Koreanfilm.org*. N.p., 1 March, 2007. Web.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ For a more detailed look at the history of South Korea's film history see such works as *Im Kwon-taek: the making of a Korean national cinema* (edited by David E. James and Kyung Hyun Kim), *Contemporary Korean cinema: identity, culture, and politics* (Lee Hyangjin) and *Korea's occupied cinemas, 1893-1948* (Brian Yecies and Ae-Gyung Shim).

⁸⁴ Chung, Chul and Minjae Song. "Preferences for Cultural Goods: The Case of Korea Film Market." *Econ.hit-u.ac.jp*. Georgia Institute of Technology, 12 July 2006. Web.

⁸⁵ This definition is my own and, as I recognize myself, is most probably flawed and debatable. Yet, it would seem as accurate as one can get on the subject.

⁸⁶ Elsaesser, Thomas. *European cinema:face to face with Hollywood*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005. Print.

⁸⁷ Robinson, Michael. "Contemporary cultural production in South Korea: Vanishing meta-narratives of nation." *New Korean Cinema*. Ed. Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005. Print. (15-32)

⁸⁸ During the colonial period, certain films would be distributed outside the boundaries of the country. However, their destinations were limited to Japan and its colonies. A prime example is *The Wanderer* (Lee Gyu-hwan, 1937), which was distributed in Japan and Manchuria. Korean films of the period never made it very far.

⁸⁹ Ahn, SooJeong. *The Pusan International Film Festival 1996-2005: South Korean Cinema in Local, Regional, and Global Context*. Hong Kong [China]: Hong Kong University Press, 2011. (90-91)

⁹⁰ Lee, Young-Il. "The Establishment of a National Cinema Under Colonialism: The History of Early Korean Cinema." *latrobe.edu.au*. La Trobe University, n.d. Web.

⁹¹ The Hansung Electric Company Machine Warehouse, also known as the Seoul Electric company, was owned by American businessmen Henry Collbran and Harry R. Bostwick. In 1903, using a state-of-the-art projector acquired from James A. Thomas (another key player in the creation of a Korean film industry), Collbran and Bostwick ventured into the entertainment business with nightly film screenings held from 8:00 to 10:00 pm in their warehouse. For roughly US 3¢, Koreans could enjoy travelogues depicting modern life from around the world. In 1907, the warehouse would officially become a theater and change its name to the Gwangmudae theater, which would be one of the first official theaters equip for film screenings in Korea. Thus, both men played an instrumental part in the introduction and creation of a film industry in Korea.

⁹² Yecies, Brian and Ae-Gyung Shim. *Korea's occupied cinemas*." New York: Routledge. 2011. Print. (55)

⁹³ Ibid. (16)

⁹⁴ This screening would be the first recorded instance of a film projected in Korea. This screening was entirely private and, thus, holds a different place within the film history of Korea. In regards to the country's film industry, the 1903 film screening in the Seoul electricity warehouse acts as a starting point of films utilized as mass entertainment. The first event is isolated as the latter is public and sparked the start of the film industry in Korea.

⁹⁵ Yecies, Brian and Ae-Gyung Shim. *Korea's occupied cinemas*." New York: Routledge. 2011 Print. (30)

⁹⁶ Ibid. (17)

⁹⁷ Lee, Young-Il. "The Establishment of a National Cinema Under Colonialism: The History of Early Korean Cinema." *latrobe.edu.au*. La Trobe University, n.d. Web.

⁹⁸ Before the Romanisation, the original spelling of the dynasty was Chosŏn. The dates of the dynasty's rule are taken from Robinson's essay and may not be exact. However, the fact remains that this dynasty had been in power for a very long period and had thus established strong traditions.

⁹⁹ Robinson, Micheal. "Contemporary cultural production in South Korea: Vanishing meta-narratives of nation." *New Korean Cinema*. Ed. Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005. Print. (19)

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Although film prints of the period are scarce, almost nonexistent, records show that Joseon films were quite successful with local Korean audiences.

¹⁰³ Although Korean filmmakers were banned from including any form of critic against the colonial government, it remained possible to introduce subtle messages thanks to the live narrators, known as Benshis, which accompanied all film screenings during the silent era. These Benshis explained the plot of the films, which were silent or accompanied with subtitles in a foreign languages, and often acted out scenes or commented the events, thus adding to the story. Through them, audiences obtained supplemental information regarding plot, story and characters. Interestingly enough, many Benshis became very famous due to their performances, which altered the movie going experience. Moreover, at the time, film theatres were separated into two distinct groups. First were the theatres for Japanese patrons, screening Japanese films and foreign films accompanied with Japanese Benshis, and second were the theatres reserved for Koreans, with Korean Benshis. The latter group formed the answer to strict state censorship. Through these Korean Benshis, Korean patrons were able to understand the subtle messages found within the films. Depending on the film and the Benshi performing, films could take on a different significance for the audiences present that night, thus circumventing state censorship.

¹⁰⁴ Paquet, Darcy. "A short history of Korean Film" *Koreanfilm.org*. N.p., 1 March, 2007. Web.

¹⁰⁵ Lee, Young-II. "The Establishment of a National Cinema Under Colonialism: The History of Early Korean Cinema." *latrobe.edu.au*. La Trobe University, n.d. Web.

¹⁰⁶ In 1923, Hollywood studios were well established and were producing films with high production costs and great entertainment value. Films such as *Safety Last!* (Fred C. Newmeyer, 1923), *The Ten Commandments* (Cecil B. DeMille, 1923) and *A Woman in Paris* (Charlie Chaplin, 1923). Moreover, in Germany, Ufa was also producing high-quality films with a high production value. Classics such as *The Cabinet of Doctor Caligari* (Robert Wienes, 1920) and *Nosferatu* (F.W. Murnau, 1922). The 20s was a golden age for German cinema. Although there exists no list of the foreign films screened in Korea, it is quite clear that these films had some advantage over the local film production. If these films made their way to Korea, it is quite understandable why they would be popular.

¹⁰⁷ Lee, Young-II. "The Establishment of a National Cinema Under Colonialism: The History of Early Korean Cinema." *latrobe.edu.au*. La Trobe University, n.d. Web.

¹⁰⁸ Robinson, Micheal. "Contemporary cultural production in South Korea: Vanishing meta-narratives of nation." *New Korean Cinema*. Ed. Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005. Print. (19)

¹⁰⁹ Paquet, Darcy. "A short history of Korean Film" *Koreanfilm.org*. N.p., 1 March, 2007. Web.

¹¹⁰ Yecies, Brian and Ae-Gyung Shim. *Korea's occupied cinemas.* New York: Routledge. 2011. Print. (141)

¹¹¹ Ibid. (142)

¹¹² Explain how films were seen as a way to destroy the Japanese canons.

¹¹³ Choi, Jinhee. *The South Korean film renaissance: local hitmakers, global provocateurs*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2010. Print.

¹¹⁴ Although many films have been recovered throughout the years, most of the production of this period has been lost or destroyed due to war or poor preservation. Consequently, half of Korea's film history is nearly blank.

¹¹⁵ Rhee Syngman was the first president of the Republic of Korea. Elected in 1948, he would finally leave the country in 1960 and live in exile after an up rise from the Korean population, most notably the student core.

¹¹⁶ Paquet, Darcy. "A short history of Korean Film" *Koreanfilm.org*. N.p., 1 March, 2007. Web.

¹¹⁷ As for any historical study, dates can be quite arbitrary. The current dates used here offer a proper idea of what the timeframe for this Golden Age was. Some essays place the end of the period around 1973, which coincides with the creation of the Korean Motion Picture Promotion Company.

¹¹⁸ Ekbladh, David. "How to build a nation" *Wilson Quarterly*. Vol. 28, Issue 1 (2004). *JSTOR*. Web.

¹¹⁹ Choi, Jinhee. *The South Korean film renaissance: local hitmakers, global provocateurs*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2010. Print.

¹²⁰ "The Golden Age of Cinema in South Korea." *filmreference.com*. Film Reference, n.d. Web.

¹²¹ Rist, Peter. "An introduction to Korean Cinema" *horschamp.qc.ca*. Offscreen, 16 Oct 1998. Web.

¹²² Paquet, Darcy. "1960-1969." *Koreanfilm.org*. N.p., 8 December, 2010. Web.

¹²³ For a detailed study on melodramas during the Golden Age, read *South Korean golden age melodrama : gender, genre, and national cinema* edited by Kathleen McHugh and Nancy Abelmann and published in 2005.

¹²⁴ Paquet, Darcy. "A short history of Korean Film" *Koreanfilm.org*. N.p., 1 March, 2007. Web.

¹²⁵ Ibid.

¹²⁶ Paquet, Darcy. "1960-1969." *Koreanfilm.org*. N.p., 8 December, 2010. Web.

¹²⁷ Paquet, Darcy. "A short history of Korean Film" *Koreanfilm.org*. N.p., 1 March, 2007. Web.

¹²⁸ Paquet, Darcy. "1960-1969." *Koreanfilm.org*. N.p., 8 December, 2010. Web.

¹²⁹ The most prevalent example of exports that turned the economy around, according to Ekbladh, came during the end of the Vietnam war. The U.S. asked for aid from South Korea, which answered with two division of troops. In response and as a reward, the U.S. ordered much of its supplies from South Korea, boosting its economy and production. According to Ekbladh, during this period, 94 percent of Korea's steel exports was dedicated to the war in Vietnam. Although there was much more than steel sent to the aid of the U.S. in Vietnam, the singular output of this metal was enough to jumpstart any economy. With the war, Korea's chaebols were well on their way to becoming the backbone of the country's economy.

¹³⁰ Tait, Jaydan. *Segyehwa: The Globalisation of Seoul*. <http://www.ucalgary.ca/ev/designresearch/projects/Evds723/seoul.pdf>. N.p., n.d. Web. Aug. 2012. (3)

¹³¹ Choi, Jinhee. *The South Korean film renaissance: local hitmakers, global provocateurs*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2010. Print.

¹³² The Motion Picture Promotion Corporation primarily promoted and favored films that followed the ideology in place. Politically incorrect films and works that strongly questioned social structures as well as the state received little support from the government, which remained in control of what was produced and distributed.

¹³³ Choi, Jinhee. *The South Korean film renaissance: local hitmakers, global provocateurs*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2010. Print. (3)

¹³⁴ It is crucial to note that, after a strong push for democratization by the people of Korea in the late 1980s, the country would become an ‘official’ democracy in 1993 as it would hold its first democratic elections. Kim Young-sam would thus become the first elected president of Korea.

¹³⁵ Yecies, Brian and Ae-Gyung Shim. *Korea’s occupied cinemas.*” New York: Routledge. 2011.Print.

¹³⁶ Choi, Jinhee. *The South Korean film renaissance: local hitmakers, global provocateurs*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2010. Print. (3)

¹³⁷ Since 1962, the state would enact its influence on the film industry chiefly through the Motion Picture law. As the Korean film industry would develop and change through the years, so would the Motion Picture Law. Consequently, between its inception in 1962 and 1986, the MPL would be revised six times (1963,1966, 1970, 1973. 1984 and 1986)¹³⁷, with each modification impacting the film industry at various levels.

¹³⁸ In 1984, the revision to the MPL would bring about three other major changes. First, the license system would be replaced by a registration system, allowing for more films to be produced without the need for a license. Second, an independent producer system would be established, allowing independent produces to make one film a year. Third, production and import companies would become two separate entities within the film industry.

¹³⁹ Choi, Jinhee. *The South Korean film renaissance: local hitmakers, global provocateurs*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2010. Print. (3)

¹⁴⁰ Paquet, Darcy. “South Korean Screen Quota System wins temporary reprieve.” <http://www.screendaily.com>. Screen Daily, n.d. Web.

¹⁴¹ Paquet, Darcy. “1992 to the Present.” *New Korean Cinema*. Ed. Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005. Print. (35)

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ Choi, Jinhee. *The South Korean film renaissance: local hitmakers, global provocateurs*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2010. Print.

¹⁴⁴ Paquet, Darcy. “1992 to the Present.” *New Korean Cinema*. Ed. Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005. Print. (33)

¹⁴⁵ Shin, Jeeyoung, “Globalization and New Korean Cinema.” *New Korean Cinema*. Ed. Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005. Print. (53)

¹⁴⁶ Ibid. (52)

¹⁴⁷ Ibid. (54)

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

¹⁴⁹ Chung, Chul and Minjae Song. “Preferences for Cultural Goods: The Case of Korea Film Market.” *Econ.hit-u.ac.jp*. Georgia Institute of Technology, 12 July 2006. Web.

¹⁵⁰ Like the Hollywood idea of the ‘High Concept’ film, which is a film with a simple yet very effective plot, the term ‘High Quality’ film was utilized to designate Korean films which followed the blockbuster model of entertainment, which is often genre driven, while maintaining a high standards in its production and artistic value. Salient examples are *Memories of Murder* (Bong Joon-ho, 2003) and *Oldboy* (Park Chan-wook, 2003).

Chapter 3: BIFF: Changing Korea’s film culture locally and globally

¹⁵¹ Ahn, SooJeong. *The Pusan International Film Festival 1996-2005: South Korean Cinema in Local, Regional, and Global Context*. Hong Kong [China]: Hong Kong University Press, 2011 (176)

¹⁵² Originally called the Pusan Promotional Plan, the festival rechristened the sidebar the Asian Project Market in 2011. On a first level, this was due to the Romanisation of the Korean language. On a second level, this change was also the result of the festival’s programming strategy, which was centered on promoting and supporting Asian filmmakers.

¹⁵³ Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer., ed. *New Korean Cinema*. Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press, 2005.Print.

¹⁵⁴ This list of 400 film festivals only includes international festivals. It excludes regional film festivals and small niche festival that present mostly local films. Hence, the number of film festivals around the world remains a mystery.

¹⁵⁵ Tait, Jaydan. *Segyehwa: The Globalisation of Seoul*. <http://www.ucalgary.ca/ev/designresearch/projects/Evds723/seoul.pdf>. N.p., n.d. Web. Aug. 2012.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

¹⁵⁸ Ahn, SooJeong. 2011 93

¹⁵⁹ Kim, Kyung-Hyun. “Korean cinema and Im Kwon-Taek: an overview.” *Im Kwon-Taek: the making of a Korean national cinema*. Ed. Kim, Kyung-Hyun and David E, James. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002. (31)

¹⁶⁰ Interview conducted with Mi-jeong Lee during the summer of 2012

¹⁶¹ Ahn, SooJeong. 2011 (104)

¹⁶² Narasimhan, Anaud and Brittany C. Jones. “Tournament rituals, Category dynamics, and Field Configuration: The Cae of the Booker Prize.” *Journal of Management Studies* 45 (2008) *Wiley-Blackwell Full Collection – CRKN 2012*. Web (1036-1060)

¹⁶³ Ahn, SooJeong. 2011 (114)

¹⁶⁴ Ibid: (105)

¹⁶⁵ Elley, Derek. “Fest grows with what it knows: PIFF finds success amid competish by sticking to its programming guns.” *Variety* (Oct 3, 2005-Oct 9, 2005). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (B4)

¹⁶⁶ Unknown. “non-profit organization.” http://www.investorwords.com/3331/non-profit_organization.html. N.p., n.d. Web.

¹⁶⁷ Ahn, SooJeong. 2011 (105)

¹⁶⁸ Ibid: (105)

¹⁶⁹ Ibid: (111)

-
- ¹⁷⁰ Elley, Derek. "Fest grows with what it knows: PIFF finds success amid competition by sticking to its programming guns." *Variety* (Oct 3, 2005-Oct 9, 2005). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (B4)
- ¹⁷¹ Ahn, SooJeong. 2011 (133)
- ¹⁷² In addition to reinforcing its role as a cultural hub, BIFF expanded its definition of Asia in order to include films from top East-European, Middle-Eastern and Asian countries. This allowed the festival to follow trends within the field of national film cultures. For example, to be considered a top international film festival, it became crucial to include Iranian films in the 1990s. Thanks to its abstract nature, the definition of Asia can be shaped to fit the needs of the festival, thus allowing the festival to include films from India, Taiwan, Iran and many more countries that might not fall within the definition of other film festivals or academics.
- ¹⁷³ Ahn, SooJeong. 2011 (154)
- ¹⁷⁴ Frater, Patrick. "Korea Reaches out: Nation eyes Asian and Western partners." *Variety* (Oct 8, 2007-Oct 14, 2005). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. Web. (10)
- ¹⁷⁵ Teo, Stephen. "Memoirs and case studies. Asian film festivals and their diminishing glitter domes: an appraisal of PIFF, SIFF and HKIFF." *Dekalog 3*. Ed. Richard Porton. London: New York: Wallflower, 2009. (110)
- ¹⁷⁶ Ibid
- ¹⁷⁷ Ahn, SooJeong. 2011 (141)
- ¹⁷⁸ Choi, Jinhee. *The South Korean film renaissance: local hitmakers, global provocateurs*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2010. (5)
- ¹⁷⁹ Elley, Derek. "Eastern philosophy: Event shapes homegrown biz, pix." *Variety* (Sep 29 2003-Oct 5, 2003). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (C1)
- ¹⁸⁰ Rao, Lalit. "Kim Dong-ho". <http://www.sancho-asia.com>. N.p., 2 July 2005. Web.
- ¹⁸¹ Amalya, Oliver and Kathleen Montgomery. "Using Field-Configuring Events for Sense-Making: A Cognitive Network Approach." *Journal of Management Studies* 45(2008) *Wiley-Blackwell Full Collection – CRKN 2012*. Web (1147-1167)
- ¹⁸² Ibid: 1147
- ¹⁸³ Ibid: 1148
- ¹⁸⁴ Ibid: 1149
- ¹⁸⁵ Ibid: 1148.
- ¹⁸⁶ Choi, Jinhee. *The South Korean film renaissance: local hitmakers, global provocateurs*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2010. (5)
- ¹⁸⁷ Elley, Derek. "Spotlight: Pusan Int'l Film Festival." *Variety*. (Aug 27, 2001- Sep 2, 2001). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (48)
- ¹⁸⁸ Elley, Derek. "Savvy moves boost Pusan fest fortunes." *Variety* (Oct 9, 2006-Oct 15, 2006). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (C1)
- ¹⁸⁹ The big-three (Cannes, Venice and Berlin) are the top A-list festivals. Most other festivals that are considered A-list are recognized as second tier. Toronto, Hong Kong, New York, Sundance, Vancouver, Buenos Aires and others, are considered as big players within the festival network, yet their status is incomparable to any of the big-three. Films compete to get into the three major and, if rejected, turn to their plan B, which is often these other A-list festivals.

¹⁹⁰ The number of ‘quality’ films produced globally each year that merit the attention of competitive A-list international film festivals is relatively small. Consequently, with 14 FIAPF accredited A-list competitive film festivals held in 2012 alone, coupled with the other hundred festival that are non-competitive, the competition between film festivals to acquire these rare ‘quality’ films is very high among programmers.

¹⁹¹ Ahn, SooJeong. 2011 (151)

¹⁹² Elley, Derek. “Eastern philosophy: Event shapes homegrown biz, pix.” *Variety* (Sep 29 2003-Oct 5, 2003). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. Web. (C3)

¹⁹³ Ahn, SooJeong. 2011 (206)

¹⁹⁴ Elsaesser, Thomas. *European cinema: face to face with Hollywood*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005. Print. (97)

¹⁹⁵ Elley, Derek. “Lineup”. *Variety* (Oct 1 2003-Oct 7, 2007). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. Web. (C15)

¹⁹⁶ Rao, Lalit. “Kim Dong-ho”. <http://www.sancho-asia.com>. N.p., 2 July 2005. Web

¹⁹⁷ Elley, Derek. “Pusan ups ante with more pics & preems: Big titles pepper fest’s most ambitious lineup.” *Variety* (Sep 29 2008-Oct 5, 2008). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. Web. (A7)

¹⁹⁸ The Vancouver International Film Festival (VIFF) is regarded as one of the most important film festivals for Asian cinema in North America. Although its programming is not solely dedicated to Asia fare, its Tigers and Dragons section has become a prime destination for Asian cinema in North America.

¹⁹⁹ Jia Zhangke was dean of the Asian Film Academy in 2012 held at BIFF.

²⁰⁰ Lee, Kevin. “Jia Zhangke.” <http://sensesofcinema.com>. N.p., March 2003. Web.

²⁰¹ Rao, Lalit. “Kim Dong-ho”. <http://www.sancho-asia.com>. N.p., 2 July 2005. Web

²⁰² “Pusan festival report.” *BIFF official website*. N.p., 2011. Web

²⁰³ Elley, Derek. “Pusan ups ante with more pics & preems: Big titles pepper fest’s most ambitious lineup.” *Variety* (Sep 29 2008-Oct 5, 2008). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (A7)

²⁰⁴ Chan, Felicia. “The international film festival and the making of a national cinema.” *Screen 52*. (2011): 253- 260. Print

²⁰⁵ Alongside these Korean retrospectives, BIFF has also screened retrospectives focused on other Asian filmmakers. Beginning at its tenth edition in 2005, the festival introduced subsections to the Special Program in Focus section. For example, from 2005 to 2008, a subsection named Remapping of New Asian Auteur Cinema would make its appearance. This subsection screened films from recognized Asian auteurs such as Thai director R.D. Pestonji in 2005, Iranian filmmaker Amir Naderi in 2006 and Iranian director Derioush Mehrjui in 2007. Although the Remapping of Asian Auteur Cinema subsection ended in 2007, BIFF would continue to present retrospectives of the same nature and still continues today.

²⁰⁶ Ahn, SooJeong. 2011 (221)

²⁰⁷ Founded in 1974, the KOFA became a member of the International Federation of Film Archives (FIAF) in 1985. Throughout the years, this non-profit institution has been very active in the conservation, registration and restoration of classic Korean films. The KOFA has been an important part of BIFF's retrospectives and it has also acted separately to recapture and protect the rich film culture of the country.

-
- ²⁰⁸ Ahn, SooJeong. 2011 (219)
- ²⁰⁹ Nichols, Bill. "Discovering Form, Inferring Meaning: New Cinemas and the Film Festival Circuit." *Film Quarterly* 47 No. 3 (1994): 16-30. JSTOR. Web.
- ²¹⁰ Stringer, Julian. "Global Cities and the International Film Festival Economy." *Cinema and the city: film and urban societies in a global context*. Ed. Mark Shiel and Tony Fitzmaurice. Oxford, U.k.; Malden; Mass: Blackwell Publishers, 2001
- ²¹¹ Ahn, SooJeong. 2011 (232)
- ²¹² Ibid: (231)
- ²¹³ Kim, Dong-ho. "Preface". *Kim Ki-young: Cinema of Diabolic Desire & Death*. Busan International Film Festival. 1997. (2)
- ²¹⁴ Kim, Dong-ho. "Foreword". *Korean New Wave: Retrospectives from 1980 to 1995*. Busan International Film Festival. 1996. (5)
- ²¹⁵ Kim, Dong-ho. "Preface". *Kim Ki-young: Cinema of Diabolic Desire & Death*. Busan International Film Festival. 1997. (2)
- ²¹⁶ Ibid.
- ²¹⁷ Oh, Young-sook. "Imagination of Excess or Heresy". *Kim Ki-young: Cinema of Diabolic Desire & Death*. Busan International Film Festival. 1997. (31)
- ²¹⁸ Ibid.
- ²¹⁹ Scorsese's World Cinema Foundation, which works to help developing countries preserve their cinematic treasures, has gone a long way in preserving and promoting little seen, almost lost films from a wide range of countries. Since 2007, the World Cinema Foundation has been involved in the restoration of a select handful of films for special screening at the Cannes International Film Festival. The 2008 edition of the series saw the restoration of Kim Ki-young's *The Housemaid* (하녀/Hanyeo, 1960), a landmark in Korean cinema.
- ²²⁰ Bourne, Christopher. "Kim Ki-young's "The Housemaid"— 2008 Pusan International Film Festival Review." <http://www.meniscuszine.com>. Meniscus Magazine, 22 Jan. 2009. Web
- ²²¹ Moctezuma, Jose. "The Housemaid- A Comparison of Two Korean Films" <http://www.hydramag.com>. Hydra Magazine, 7 June. 2010. Web
- ²²² Pais, Jon. "[13th PIFF] Kim Ki-Young's *The Housemaid* Remastered (1960)." <http://twitchfilm.com>. Twitch film, 19 October. 2008. Web
- ²²³ "Overview: Asian Project Market." <http://apm.asianfilmmarket.org>. Busan International Film Festival Committee, n.d. Web.
- ²²⁴ Elley, Derek. "Savvy moves boost Pusan fest fortunes." *Variety* (Oct 9, 2006-Oct 15, 2006). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (C1)
- ²²⁵ Paquet, Darcy. "Couples Therapy: Pusan Promotional Plan's filmmaker-financier matches have created success stories for tyros and auteurs alike." *Variety* (Oct 1, 2007-Oct 7, 2007). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (C12)
- ²²⁶ Rao, Lalit. "Kim Dong-ho". <http://www.sancho-asia.com>. N.p., 2 July 2005. Web.
- ²²⁶ Amalya, Oliver and Kathleen Montgomery. "Using Field-Configuring Events for Sense-Making: A Cognitive Network Approach." *Journal of Management Studies* 45(2008) *Wiley-Blackwell Full Collection – CRKN 2012*. Web (1147-1167)

²²⁷ Paquet, Darcy. "Couples Therapy: Pusan Promotional Plan's filmmaker-financier matches have created success stories for tyros and auteurs alike." *Variety* (Oct 1, 2007-Oct 7, 2007). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (C12)

²²⁸ Frater, Patrick. "Promo Plan' steps up: Market is Asia's global funding hot spot." *Variety* (Oct 3, 2005-Oct 9, 2005). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (B6)

²²⁹ Sunhee, Han. "Fest maps new future: Busan bids to become regional cinema heavyweight, revamps key elements." *Variety* (Oct 3, 2011-Oct 9, 2011). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (49)

²³⁰ Ibid

²³¹ Ibid

²³² Sunhee, Han. "High-Gloss finish: Flush with coin, fest moves center to posh new digs, highlights infrastructure." *Variety* (Oct 5, 2009-Oct 11, 2009). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (A9)

Conclusion: In sync with Korea's film culture

²³³ Elley, Derek. "Korean pix grow at Pusan" *Variety* (Oct 16, 2000-Oct 22, 2000). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (16)

²³⁴ Ibid.

²³⁵ Amalya, Oliver and Kathleen Montgomery. "Using Field-Configuring Events for Sense-Making: A Cognitive Network Approach." *Journal of Management Studies* 45(2008) *Wiley-Blackwell Full Collection – CRKN 2012*. Web (1148)

²³⁶ Ahn, SooJeong. *The Pusan International Film Festival 1996-2005: South Korean Cinema in Local, Regional, and Global Context*. Hong Kong [China]: Hong Kong University Press, 2011. Print. (3)

²³⁷ "Pusan festival opens window wider to world to stay on top". *Journal Internet AFP* (2009). *eureka*. Web.

²³⁸ "1998 Project." <http://apm.asianfilmmarket.org/eng/database>. Busan International Film Festival Organizing Committee, n.d. Web.

²³⁹ "2008 Project." <http://apm.asianfilmmarket.org/eng/database>. Busan International Film Festival Organizing Committee, n.d. Web.

²⁴⁰ Elley, Derek. "Korean pix grow at Pusan" *Variety* (Oct 16, 2000-Oct 22, 2000). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (16)

²⁴¹ "Boxoffice/Business for: *The Berlin File*." <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt2357377/>. The Internet Movie Database, n.d. Web.

²⁴² Elley, Derek. "Pusan fest to get cinema" *Variety* (Mar 1, 2004-Mar 7, 2004). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (12)

²⁴³ Frater, Patrick. "Asia's monstrous showbiz push: South Korea's creative wave crosses globe." *Variety* (Oct 23, 2006-Oct 29, 2006). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (11)

²⁴⁴ Elley, Derek. "Savvy moves boost Pusan fest fortunes" *Variety* (Oct 9, 2006-Oct 15, 2006). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (C1)

²⁴⁵ Ji, Yong-jin. "Market share of Korean films for February at 82.9%." *koreanfilm.or.kr*. KOFIC, Mar 5, 2013. Web.

Bibliography

- Ahn, SooJeong. *The Pusan International Film Festival 1996-2005: South Korean Cinema in Local, Regional, and Global Context*. Hong Kong [China]: Hong Kong University Press, 2011
- Amalya, Oliver and Kathleen Montgomery. "Using Field-Configuring Events for Sense-Making: A Cognitive Network Approach." *Journal of Management Studies* 45(2008) *Wiley-Blackwell Full Collection – CRKN 2012*. Web
- Bazin, André. "A backward glance. The festival viewed as a religious order." *Dekalog* 3. Ed. Richard Porton. London: New York: Wallflower, 2009. Print.
- Bourne, Christopher. "Kim Ki-young's "The Housemaid"— 2008 Pusan International Film Festival Review." <http://www.meniscuszine.com>. Meniscus Magazine, 22 Jan. 2009. Web
- "Boxoffice/Business for: *The Berlin File*." <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt2357377/>. The Internet Movie Database, n.d. Web.
- Chan, Felicia. "The international film festival and the making of a national cinema." *Screen* 52. (2011) Print.
- Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer., ed. *New Korean Cinema*. Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press, 2005.Print.
- Choi, Jinhee. *The South Korean film renaissance: local hitmakers, global provocateurs*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2010. Print.
- Chung, Chul and Minjae Song. "Preferences for Cultural Goods: The Case of Korea Film Market." *Econ.hit-u.ac.jp*. Georgia Institute of Technology, 12 July 2006. Web.
- De Valck, Marijke. *Film Festivals: from European geopolitics to global cinophilia*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007.
- Elley, Derek. "Eastern philosophy: Event shapes homegrown biz, pix." *Variety* (Sep 29 2003-Oct 5, 2003). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. Web. (C3)
- Elley, Derek. "Korean pix grow at Pusan" *Variety* (Oct 16, 2000-Oct 22, 2000). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (16)
- Elley, Derek. "Lineup". *Variety* (Oct 1 2003-Oct 7, 2007). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. Web. (C15)

Elley, Derek. "Pusan ups ante with more pics & preems: Big titles pepper fest's most ambitious lineup." *Variety* (Sep 29 2008-Oct 5, 2008). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. Web. (A7)

Elley, Derek. "Pusan fest to get cinema" *Variety* (Mar 1, 2004-Mar 7, 2004). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (12)

Elley, Derek. "Spotlight: Pusan Int'l Film Festival". *Variety*. (Aug 27, 2001-Sep 2, 2001) *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*.

Elley, Derek and Patrick Frater. "Fest grows with what it knows : PIFF finds success amid competitish by sticking to its programming guns" *Variety*. (Oct 3-Oct 9, 2005) *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*.

Elley, Derek. "Savvy moves boost Pusan fest fortunes." *Variety* (Oct 9, 2006-Oct 15, 2006). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (C1)

Elsaesser, Thomas. *European cinema: face to face with Hollywood*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005. Print

Ekbladh, David. "How to build a nation" *Wilson Quarterly*. Vol. 28, Issue 1 (2004). *JSTOR*. Web.

"Field-Configuring Events as Structuring Mechanisms: How Conferences, Ceremonies, and Trade Shows Constitute New Technologies, Industries, and Markets." http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/pdf/fce_call.pdf. N.p., 2005.

"Festivals in Montreal" www.montreal.com. N.p., 2012. Web.

Frater, Patrick. "Asia's monstrous showbiz push: South Korea's creative wave crosses globe." *Variety* (Oct 23-Oct 29, 2006). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*.

Frater, Patrick. "'Promo Plan' steps up: Market is Asia's global funding hot spot." *Variety* (Oct 3, 2005-Oct 9, 2005). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (B6)

Frater, Patrick. "Korea Reaches out: Nation eyes Asian and Western partners." *Variety* (Oct 8, 2007-Oct 14, 2005). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. Web. (10)

Hwang ,Dana. *Koreanmovie.com*. N.p., n.d. Web.

Jordanova, Dina and Ragan Rhyne., ed. *The Film Festival Yearbook*. St. Andrews, Scotland: St. Andrews Film Studies, 2009.

Ji, Yong-jin. "Market share of Korean films for February at 82.9%." koreanfilm.or.kr. KOFIC, Mar 5, 2013. Web.

-
- Keslassy, Elsa. "Healthy Market Forecast." *Variety* (May 3, 2010-May 9, 2010). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. Web.
- Kenneth, Turan. *Sundance to Sarajevo: film festivals and the world they made*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2002. Print.
- Kim, Dong-ho. "Foreword". *Korean New Wave: Retrospectives from 1980 to 1995*. Busan International Film Festival. 1996.
- Kim, Dong-ho. "Preface". *Kim Ki-young: Cinema of Diabolic Desire & Death*. Busan International Film Festival. 1997.
- Kim, Kyung-Hyun. "Korean cinema and Im Kwon-Taek: an overview." *Im Kwon-Taek: the making of a Korean national cinema*. Ed. Kim, Kyung-Hyun and David E, James. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002. Print.
- Koo, Heejin. "Pusan film festival starts to draw raves." *International Herald Tribune*, (2006). *eureka*. Web.
- Lampel, Joseph and Alan D. Meyer. "Guest Editors' Introduction" <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2008.00787.x/full>. *Journal of Management Studies*, 7 August 2008.
- Lee, Kevin. "Jia Zhangke." <http://sensesofcinema.com>. N.p., March 2003. Web.
- Lee, Young-Il. "The Establishment of a National Cinema Under Colonialism: The History of Early Korean Cinema." *latrobe.edu.au*. La Trobe University, n.d. Web.
- Moctezuma, Jose. "*The Housemaid*- A Comparison of Two Korean Films" <http://www.hydramag.com>. Hydra Magazine, 7 June. 2010. Web
- Narasimhan, and Brittany C. Jones. "Tournament rituals, Category dynamics, and Field Configuration: The Case of the Booker Prize." *Journal of Management Studies* 45 (2008) *Wiley-Blackwell Full Collection – CRKN 2012*. Web
- Narasimhan, Anand and Mary R. Watson. "Tournament Rituals in the Evolution of Fields: the Case of the Gramm Awards Grammys." *Academy of Management Journal*. Vol. 47, No. 1. 2004. Web.
- Nichols, Bill. "Discovering Form, Inferring Meaning: New Cinemas and the Film Festival Circuit." *Film Quarterly* 47 No. 3 (1994). *JSTOR*. Web.
- Oh, Young-sook. "Imagination of Excess or Heresy". *Kim Ki-young: Cinema of Diabolic Desire & Death*. Busan International Film Festival. 1997.

“Overview: Asian Project Market.” <http://apm.asianfilmmarket.org>. Busan International Film Festival Committee, n.d. Web.

Pais, Jon. “[13th PIFF] Kim Ki-Young’s *The Housemaid Remastered* (1960).” <http://twitchfilm.com>. Twitch film, 19 October. 2008. Web

Paquet, Darcy. “A short history of Korean Film” *Koreanfilm.org*. N.p., 1 March, 2007. Web.

Paquet, Darcy. “Couples Therapy: Pusan Promotional Plan’s filmmaker-financier matches have created success stories for tyros and auteurs alike.” *Variety* (Oct 1, 2007-Oct 7, 2007). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (C12)

Paquet, Darcy. “South Korean Screen Quota System wins temporary reprieve.” <http://www.screendaily.com>. Screen Daily, n.d. Web.

Paquet, Darcy. “1960-1969.” *Koreanfilm.org*. N.p., 8 December, 2010. Web.

Paquet, Darcy. “1992 to the Present.” *New Korean Cinema*. Ed. Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005. Print.

Peranson, Mark. “Film festivals: between art and commerce. First you get the power, then you get the money: two models of film festivals” *Dekalog 3*. Ed. Richard Porton. London: New York: Wallflower, 2009.

Porton, Richard., ed. *Dekalog 3*. London: New York: Wallflower, 2009.

Powell, Walter and Paul J. DiMaggio., ed. *The New institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991. Print.

Pusan festival opens window wider to world to stay on top” *Journal Internet AFP* (2009). *eureka*. Web.

Rao, Lalit. “Kim Dong-ho”. <http://www.sancho-asia.com>. N.p., 2 July 2005. Web.

Rhyne, Ragan. “The Film Festival Circuit.” *Dekalog 3*. Ed. Richard Porton. London: New York: Wallflower, 2009.

Rist, Peter. “An introduction to Korean Cinema” *horschamp.qc.ca*. Offscreen, 16 Oct 1998. Web.

Robinson, Michael. “Contemporary cultural production in South Korea: Vanishing meta-narratives of nation.” *New Korean Cinema*. Ed. Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005. Print.

Rüling, Charles-Clement. "Festival case studies. Festivals as field-configuring events : the Annecy International Animated Film Festival and Market" *The Film Festival Yearbook*. Ed. Dina Iordanova and Ragan Rhyne. St. Andrews, Scotland: St. Andrews Film Studies, 2009.

Stringer, Julian. "Global Cities and the International Film Festival Economy." *Cinema and the city: film and urban societies in a global context*. Ed. Mark Shiel and Tony Fitzmaurice. Oxford, U.k.; Malden; Mass: Blackwell Publishers, 2001

Shin, Jeeyoung, "Globalization and New Korean Cinema." *New Korean Cinema*. Ed. Chi-Yun Shin and Julian Stringer. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005. Print

Sunhee, Han. "Fest maps new future: Busan bids to become regional cinema heavyweight, revamps key elements." *Variety* (Oct 3, 2011-Oct 9, 2011). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*.

Sunhee, Han. "High-Gloss finish: Flush with coin, fest moves center to posh new digs, highlights infrastructure." *Variety* (Oct 5, 2009-Oct 11, 2009). *International Index to Performing Arts (IIPA)*. (A9)

"Tableau de Statistique Presse: 1966-2012" <http://www.festival-cannes.fr/assets/File/WEB%202012/En%20Chiffres/En%20chiffres-Medias-2012-VF.pdf>. Cannes film festival, 2012. Web.

"Tabeau comparative des accrédites: 2003-2012" <http://www.festival-cannes.fr/assets/File/WEB%202012/En%20Chiffres/En%20chiffres-Accredites-2012-VF.pdf>. Cannes film festival ., 2012. Web.

Tait, Jaydan. *Segyehwa: The Globalisation of Seoul*. <http://www.ucalgary.ca/ev/designresearch/projects/Evds723/seoul.pdf>. N.p., n.d. Web. Aug. 2012. (3)

Teo, Stephen. "Memoirs and case studies. Asian film festivals and their diminishing glitter domes: an appraisal of PIFF, SIFF and HKIFF." *Dekalog 3*. Ed. Richard Porton. London: New York: Wallflower, 2009.

"The Golden Age of Cinema in South Korea." *filmreference.com*. Film Reference, n.d. Web.

Vilhjalmsdottir, Linda. *A documentary film festival circuit and film festivals as field-configuring events, adapting to digitalization*. Haskolinn A Bifrost: Bifrost University Press. 2011.

Wade, Mike and Scott Schneberger. "Theories Used in IS Research: Actor-Network Theory." <http://www.istheory.yorku.ca/actornetworktheory.htm>. York University, 10 September 2005. Web

Yecies, Brian and Ae-Gyung Shim. *Korea's occupied cinemas.* New York: Routledge. 2011.

"1998 Project." <http://apm.asianfilmmarket.org/eng/database>. Busan International Film Festival Organizing Committee, n.d. Web.

"2008 Project." <http://apm.asianfilmmarket.org/eng/database>. Busan International Film Festival Organizing Committee, n.d. Web.

Appendix 1

Industry Trends From 1960-1969

Year	Local Films	Imports	Screens	Total Admissions	Ticket Price	Per Capita Adm.
1960	92	208	273	n/a	n/a	n/a
1961	86	105	302	58,608,000	12 won	2.3
1962	113	79	344	59,046,000	18 won	3.0
1963	144	66	386	96,059,000	20 won	3.6
1964	147	51	477	104,579,000	23 won	3.8
1965	189	64	529	121,697,000	23 won	4.3
1966	136	85	534	156,336,000	31 won	5.4
1967	172	64	569	164,077,000	41 won	5.6
1968	212	63	578	171,341,000	51 won	5.7
1969	229	79	659	173,043,000	63 won	5.6

Source: *The History of Korean Cinema* (1988), Lee Young-il and Choi Young-chol.

Appendix 2

Industry Trends From 1970-1979

Year	Local Films	Imports	Total Admissions	Ticket Price	Per Capita Admissions
1970	209	61	166,000,000	73 won	5.3
1971	202	82	146,000,000	80 won	4.6
1972	122	63	119,000,000	83 won	3.7
1973	125	60	115,000,000	88 won	3.5
1974	141	39	97,000,000	104 won	2.9
1975	94	35	76,000,000	168 won	2.2
1976	134	43	66,000,000	207 won	1.8
1977	101	42	65,000,000	307 won	1.8
1978	117	31	74,000,000	389 won	2.0
1979	96	33	66,000,000	715 won	1.7

Source: Korean Film Council (KOFIC).

Appendix 3

Industry Trends From 1990-1995

Year	Local Films	Imports	Market Share	Total Admissions	Ticket Price	Per Capita Adm.
1990	111	276	20.2%	55,000,000	2602 won	1.2
1991	121	256	21.2%	54,000,000	3034 won	1.2
1992	96	319	18.5%	52,000,000	3471 won	1.1
1993	63	347	15.9%	47,000,000	3711 won	1.1
1994	65	382	20.5%	48,000,000	3895 won	1.1
1995	64	359	20.9%	45,000,000	4268 won	1.0

Source: Korean Film Council (KOFIC).