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Perhaps even if nothing else has any future our laughter may yet have a future.

Nietzsche

Even a cursory look at some of the Latin American movies with the highest attendance in the history of their respective national industries reveals that comedies have been extraordinarily successful film efforts in the continent: of the ten most-seen Mexican films ever, four are comedies (and two of them are analyzed here in the chapters by Sánchez Prado and Fernández L’Hoeste). In Argentina too, that number is four out of ten. In Peru (Asu Mare, 2013), Chile (Stefan v/s Kramer, 2012), Argentina (Metegol, 2013), and Mexico (Nosotros los nobles, 2013), the most successful national film ever is a very recent comedy. Even more strikingly, in Brazil and Chile, seven out of ten of the most popular films are comedies (one of them examined here by Poblete).

Surprisingly, the cultures of Latin America—which, for the first time, developed a truly continental market with the circulation of Argentine and, above all, Mexican comedies of the —Golden Age (1930s–1950s)—have produced little historiographical or critical material investigating their rich past and current production at the intersection of humor and cinema. Although the relative paucity of research on the comedic as such in the continent is parallel to an equally limited state of development for the general history of film in Latin America (compare it to the overwhelming American discourse on Hollywood, in general, and on Hollywood comedies, in particular), it does seem surprising that no comparative history of Latin American film comedies exists. This volume, alas, will not be able to truly remedy this gap. It is, however, offered as a contribution to
developing such an effort. To begin exploring these issues, this introduction is divided into four parts: first, a general review of broader theorizing on the history of the comedic in the West; second, a review of the history of film comedy and, more broadly, the comedic traditions in the Latin American twentieth century; third, a review of the main genres of classic comedy in the region; and, last, a brief overview of the volume and its organization.

**Theorizing the Comedic**

In his edited volume *The Philosophy of Laughter and Humor*, John Morreall groups theories of humor into three different types, depending on which central humor mechanism they emphasize: superiority, relief, or incongruity. Superiority-based theories of humor include those of Aristotle, Plato, and Hobbes. They explain, according to critic Simon Critchley, a basic functioning of humor, especially of the ethnic variety:

Humor is a form of cultural insider-knowledge, and might, indeed, be said to function like a linguistic defence mechanism. Its ostensive untranslatability endows native speakers with a palpable sense of their cultural distinctiveness or even superiority.

(Critchley 88–89)
In this sense, humor functions like “a secret code” that is shared by all those who belong to the *ethnos*, and it produces a context and community-based *ethos* of superiority, expressed in two ways: first, foreigners do not share our sense of humor or simply lack a sense of humor; and, second, foreigners are themselves funny and worth laughing at.

Relief-based theories of humor originate “in the nineteenth century in the work of Herbert Spencer, where laughter is explained as a release of some pent-up nervous energy” (Critchley 3). The most famous exponent of this mechanics or pressure-based theory is Sigmund Freud. In Freud, humor economically disposes of energy that is otherwise used in repression. The net effect for the subject is a feeling of relief.

The third kind of theory that Morreall distinguishes corresponds to incongruity-based hypothesis. In this case—Kant, Schopenhauer, and Kierkegaard included—humor is the result of the incongruity between our structure of expectations and the punch line of the joke that surprises us. This cognitive disappointment, this “evaporation of expectation to nothing” (Kant, as quoted in Critchley 5) is the basis of Critchley’s philosophical approach to humor (that also combines elements of the other two types of theories).

For Critchley, in order for that incongruence effect to take place, there has to be a basic congruence between the structure of the joke and the cultural presuppositions of a particular society (what he calls a *sensus communis*). While the said common sense is affirmed in racist or xenophobic humor, it is also questioned, both, by the residue of awareness about our own racism the joke produces and, in other types of humor, by a certain critical detachment from that shared everydayness. In the best humor, Critchley proposes, the subject does not laugh at others, but at himself or herself, and the result is not just pleasure but a critical awareness of their contingency, of the contingency of the subject and her circumstance. Humor, thus, produces not simply a confirmation of our belonging to a social group with all its shared certainties, but also an *epoché*—a bracketing of the naturalized belief in those presuppositions. Although acknowledging that a significant portion of humor is, in fact, reactionary, Critchley proposes what he calls his own *sense of humor*—a counter-thesis to explain the self-mockery and defamiliarization characteristic of what he deems the best humor:

First that the tiny explosions of humour that we call jokes return us to a common, familiar domain of shared life-world practices, the
background meanings implicit in a culture…. However, second, I want to claim that humour also indicates, or maybe just adumbrates, how those practices might be transformed or perfected, how things might be otherwise.

(Critchley 90)

This critical distancing from the known, accepted, and expected is what Critchley calls the capacity of the best types of humor “to project another possible sensus communis, namely a dissensus communis distinct from the dominant common sense” (Critchley 90).

As such, Critchley’s concept of best humor is what Jan Walsh Hokeson in his exceptional book on *The Idea of Comedy* would call a transmodern perspective on comedy. According to Hokeson, there are two main Western and modern traditions on the comic and comedy: the satiric and the populist. Both take for granted the idea of the social oppositionality of comedy or what Hokeson calls “the social premise” of comedy theory:

Proponents of both views assume that comedy is based on social opposition: social superiors, we laugh at the comic butt who is brought back into consonance with normative conventions, or, less aloof, we laugh with the festive rogues and knaves, clowns and fools who mock their social betters, and who are in a carnival just temporarily…[liberated from social norms]…either the butt is the Other to society [and thus we laugh at the butt], or society is the Other to the underdog [and we laugh with the comic hero].

(Hokenson 149–150)

This broader and shared premise of otherwise rival theories on the comic and comedy—that comedy is a social genre (as opposed to the ethical or metaphysical claims made for tragedy) —has structured more than two millennia of critical thinking on the comic and comedy. According to Hokeson, it has also had negative consequences for our ability to think comedy and comedic texts that go beyond or fall outside the social premise. Such texts and comedic practices include medieval fools as much as post-Becket asocial comedies, and they expand the register of the idea of comedy beyond “the consensual model of comedy as mirror of the social spectacle” (Hokenson 17), thus opening up the ethical, metaphysical, cognitive, and other modes as potentially relevant to comedy.

The first of the modern (and modernist) critical traditions on the comic—the satiric—holds that we, the readers or spectators, are meant
to feel superior to the comic butt who, comically of course, deviates from social norms. It is a tradition based on a particular understanding of Aristotle’s median or average social type. The second modern (and modernist) critical tradition—the populist—originates with the German romantics and reaches to Bakhtin’s carnival and its celebration of the comic hero as a temporarily liberated underdog endowed with (some) subversive potential vis-a-vis dominant ideologies and values. Butto hero-oriented, both theories of comedy place at their center a figure who “disfigures something that is usually referred to as ‘the norm’—whether construed as ‘the good’ (Plato), ‘the average’ (Aristotle), ‘the civilized’ (Freud), ‘accepted social norms’ (Lauter), ‘normal patterns of human behavior’ (Torrance), ‘the norm of congruence’ (Levin), ‘Symbolically Lawful language’ (Purdue), and similar conceptions of yardstick to measure the socially desirable” (Hokeson 24).

In that, both types of dominant theories share “unstated assumptions about social value as measured by norm” (24). Both leave out certain comic characters who “engage in no real contest with society and offer no alternatives to extant social norms” (150). This is what Hokeson calls the key elision of the Middle Ages in modern theories of the comic. What is elided is the tradition of texts having the fool as a protagonist. And what is not understood is their mode of producing the comic: ironic references to “human inadequacy” within, not outside, the absolute and divine order of Christianity. The fool cannot be explained by reference to the comic hero or the comic butt:

Conjoining hero and butt on the social level, he combined in the Middle Ages the blessed innocence of the child, the naïf, the idiot sacred to Christ, whose comic ignorantia gave license to level the vain pretensions of philosophers and theologians, with the grotesque blasphemy of the saturnalian, the profaner, the unrepentant sensualist mocking all mortal authority on this stage of fools, his own first and last. (Hokeson 152)

Not only are the medieval fool and farce not reducible to the modern dual system of the comic that divides it into satiric (Olson and Frye) and populist (Torrance and Bakhtin), but they also point to an alternative tradition of comic theorizing that emerged with Baudelaire and Nietzsche, continued with Bergson, and reached to Deleuze and Guattari and other contemporary theorists of affect and the postmodern.

In his 1855 L’Essence du rire, Baudelaire began this effort to escape the social premise that had dominated so much of Western thought on comedy by distinguishing “significative comedy” or comedy of
manners from “absolute comedy.” The latter was centered on the grotesque and farcical and “he stressed its essence as anti-social, indeed Luceferian in its comic mockery of social harmony and moral precepts” (Hokeson 41). This entropic element was picked up by Nietzsche who, in *The Gay Science* (1882), placed the comic at the center of his deconstructive effort against the social and the rational in Western metaphysics and society. *Gay Science* celebrated, thus, a “species joy,” radically opposed to “self- or species-exultance” and gravity (44). Bergson’s theory of the mechanical as the source of humor, properly read, insists Hokeson, “is not [that mechanicity in humor is] an offense against social conventions or any specific, relatively insignificant standards of propriety, but [that] it is an offense against sociability itself” (49), that is, an affront to our capacity as humans to use, not just instinct, but intuition and intellect in our inhabiting of the social. This human defining elasticity is contradicted by the comic, understood here as its opposite—a form of rigidity or mechanicity, a human lapse into the mechanical or the type-casted. This becoming asocial (but not necessarily immoral) is what is comic in the lack of social adaptability that defines comedy and comic characters for Bergson. In later postmodern and in what Hokeson calls transmodern theories of comedy, the tradition of folly and the Bergsonian vitalist emphasis are combined as affect-based relations and “joy in unreason,” including semantics and somatics, sense-making and non-sense, or excessive logic as cognitive and even evolutionary endeavors, adventures in subject-positioning and role-playing, the “mastery of discrepant stimuli…[within] the cognitive model of reference” (Hokeson 220–221).

In the end, Hokeson defines the comic as an aesthetic category including, but not limited to, the laughable (the latter being simply “a physiological category of behavioral response”) (20). For him, “the comic is an assemblage of techniques, styles, and methods of provoking amusement in order to achieve certain ends, which may differ according to cultures and periods,” (20) and are certainly dependent on historically located diverse spectators. What, we may ask, have been the techniques and styles, and which are the historically specific ends, of film comedy in Latin America? How would a distinction between the butt or the hero in comedy and, more specifically, Hokeson’s criticism of what the social premise underlying the distinction leaves out of the analysis, help in understanding the success of Latin American film comedians such as Cantinflas, Luis Sandrini, and Amácio Mazzaropi? While this introduction will not answer these questions, it is partially meant to help formulate them and understand their significance.
Comedies

Clearly, modern Latin American film comedies are one kind of film in which the national product can compete with Hollywood in a much more leveled field than in almost any other film genre. What, in big historical dramas, action movies, or science fiction films sometimes manifests as the poverty of production values, is in Latin American films (at least from the viewpoint of hegemonic cinema) is compensated, perhaps with an advantage, when it comes to comedies. In this genre, the settings are often simple, the actors are frequently already well-known nationally for their work in similar comedic national radio or TV shows, and a significant portion of the primary material is itself the national situation and the national language, that is, something that Hollywood can do best only for the American context. This constitutes a vernacular advantage or, if you will, the advantage of the vernacular in Latin American film comedies. If the physicality and visuality of Chaplin or Keaton-like slapstick can be said to evolve in close connection with the conditions of silent cinema, how have the material conditions of production of Latin American film affected or empowered its comedies? How have they taken advantage of such an advantage? Has this plus been their condition of possibility?

Figure I.2 The Taxista at home. *Taxi para tres*, directed by Orlando Lübbert, Chile, 2001.
traditions have thus developed on the continent? Have they emphasized neoaristotelian structural elements such as plot, character, language, and endings or have they neopopularly focused on subversion and laughter itself? Is their continental popularity and success fully explained by either satiric or populist emphasis? What could be their affective dimension (the latter explored here by Couret)?

In general, Latin American national comedies have often enjoyed what Pierre Bourdieu would have called a heteronomous validation in the field of cinematic cultural production. In other words, they have been very popular with the public (especially if placed in the context of the kind of attention or lack thereof that the same public pays to other national films), while, often, they have also been considered not artistic enough and too commercial to become part of the national cinema later sponsored by the state or recognized by the national tradition emphasized by the critics. In fact, a first periodizing possibility for film comedies in the continent can be posited from the contrast of two different models: film as a business (in the industrial model of classic Hollywood) or a national expressive and critical art (in the anti-Hollywood model of the 1960s New Latin American Cinema heavily influenced by European cinema), with their respective national and regional publics or audiences. In the first—perhaps paradoxically as they are emulating the Hollywood business model—comedies, along with melodramas, are a crucial component of the relative success in filmic import-substitution reached in the main countries of the region (Mexico, Argentina, and Brazil). In the second model, comedies all but disappear from the critical radar as production is seen as concentrating exclusively on serious socioeconomic issues such as uneven development, cultural transitions in/to modernity, and political transformations.

The historical arc of Latin American comedies could, thus, be roughly presented along three clear moments: a long first moment of introduction and then significant success (1920–1950s); a second moment in which the ascendancy of experimental third cinema and the political ethos of the Cuban and other revolutions seem to have resulted in the critical occlusion of comedies (1960–1980), and a third moment that would extend from the return of democracy in many of the regional countries to the now more than two decades long critical and commercial success of what has been called the New New Latin American Cinema and Cinema da Retomada, including a significant number of comedies.

In 1986, in one of the first comprehensive attempts at a continental panorama of Latin American cinema, the German critic Peter B. Schumann, perhaps inadvertently, showed the ambivalence of
Marxism-inspired film criticism when it comes to the popular success of early Latin American film in the region. Referring to the early period of Argentine cinema after World War I and before the 1929 crisis, Schumann stated:

Cinema –disdained by the bourgeoisie as “degoutant,” since they continued to prefer opera, found its public in those proletarian masses. It offered them, at a low cost, a distraction to forget their needs and problems. And it proposed subjects they were interested in: historical issues, daily life themes from the capital city, the pampas, the countryside.

Both ideological distraction and authentic popular interest—and analogous to the later tango films offering a cinema that was, according to Schumann, simultaneously “affirmative, escapist, populist” and “a medium the masses considered theirs” (20)—Latin American film comedies were often conceptualized by Schumann and others as, on the one hand, the historical basis of the industrial development of national cinema, and, on the other, little more than a light form of entertainment, as important economically as irrelevant culturally. Similarly, evaluating the critical tradition on Brazilian musical comedies or *chanchadas*, Sergio Augusto reminds us of early negative criticism based on their dependence and inferiority *vis-à-vis* Hollywood musical comedies, and moral denunciations of their eroticism. Then, noting that many of the Cinema Novo directors got their first technical training working in secondary positions in *chanchadas*, Augusto summarizes their complicated oedipal relation with the genre:

The polemics around the *chanchada* did not raise its level with the participation of heads better equipped for debate during the 1960s and 1970s…. In his book *Revisão crítica do cinema brasileiro*, [Glauber Rocha] accused the *chanchada* of being Cinema Novo’s main enemy. Later he revised his opinion to the point that in another book he talked of “The recovery of national-popular forms such as the *chanchada*.” Even then he called it “vulgar” (p.146), “reformist cancer of underdevelopment” (p.321), “alienating music” (p.322).

Rocha’s hesitations highlighted the paradox of a movement, *Cinema Novo*, which had set out to truly represent the people, their culture, and their politics, but had mostly failed to attract those people to the
movie theaters. Addressing the same unresolved cleavage in the history of Cinema Novo and its audiences, the director Carlos Diegues—at around the same time he was starting work on Xica da Silva (1976), which, along with his Bye Bye Brazil (1980), became one the great popular successes of Brazilian cinema—stated:

Now we begin again with the great popular project of Cinema Novo and take one step further: the people will be on the screen and at the theatre. Now we have to make films that are both political and popular, films with a sense of humor, full of hope and capable of representing the original culture of the people and their political aspirations.

(Quoted by Schumann 106) 

Augusto, on the other hand, described chanchadas—the very popular Brazilian musical comedies of the 1940s and 1950s—as one of the two “cultural miracles” of Vargas’ Estado Novo (the other being Radio Nacional), therefore, highlighting not only their undeniable commercial success, but also their true cultural and social significance. Finally, in discussing the chanchada as a national genre, that is, as a set of conventions that operated in Brazil both at the moment of production and at the moment of reception, Shaw and Dennison conclude by referring to the nationalizing effect of chanchadas:

Focusing on the processes of reception and consumption, we can argue that, by seeing the chanchada as an intrinsically national film style of which they could be proud, in spite of the disdain of high-brow journalists, audiences were drawn into an imagined community.

(Shaw and Dennison 77)

With the latter statement, the critical pendulum has swung back from the alleged cultural and aesthetic irrelevance of chanchadas to their claimed central place in the constitution and experience of the national-popular in Brazil.

Another clear Brazilian example of the separation between the most influential critical tradition based on the artistic avant-garde, the commercial success of national comedies, and the different audiences they catered to is afforded by the case of Brazilian comedian Amácio Mazzaropi, studied here by Maurício Bragança. Mazzaropi (1927–1980) participated in 32 comedies, 21 of which he wrote, produced, and directed. Many of these films were big commercial successes, and yet, critical analysis of his work has been very limited.
Countering this critical neglect with her Amálio Mazzaropi in the Film and Culture of Brazil, Eva Paulino Bueno comments:

To do any work on Mazzaropi’s career means, at this point, to go against the grain of the established criticism. It means to try to maintain that a body of work that has been critically shunned up to this day deserves and needs to be studied. This book is an effort to foster the opening up of the canon of the Brazilian cinema to include the work of those who, like Mazzaropi, do not frequent the intellectual elites of the major cities and do not participate in international film festivals, but who create their cinema with the intent of dialogue with the public.

(Bueno XIII)

Bueno goes one step further, declaring that “As a cultural practice, Mazzaropi’s work can be theorized as contestatory of the hegemonic Cinema Novo film industry in Brazil,” while adding that, contrary to Glauber Rocha, “Mazzaropi’s work formed a loyal audience, and, to this day, his films figure among some of the most popular in Brazil” (Bueno XI). For Bueno, this popularity is not simply equivalent to commercial success gained through base comic means; on the contrary, it can only be explained by Mazzaropi’s representation of the rural or “caipira” culture and language of Brazil and by the fact that his comedies “use the language the people understand, tell stories the people relate to, and in the process, dramatize issues that matter to people’s lives” (Bueno 149).

The Rio de Janeiro-based chanchada tradition and the Sao Paulo-based comedies of Mazzaropi then serve as good examples of the critical ambivalence, especially of the leftist intelligentsia, toward popular comedies (for another example, this time Colombian, see Suárez here). Like melodramas (López, “Tears”), comedies in Latin America have, more often than not, been a test for our critical understanding of the popular, the national-popular, and popularity itself.

Jesús Martín-Barbero, Carlos Monsiváis, and Renato Ortiz have all emphasized the significant role that a high degree of continuity between pre-mass media forms of popular entertainment—such as the comedy-circus, the vaudeville show, and carnival—and their mass media inheritors—such as film, radio, and television—have had in the history of mass-mediated Latin American popular culture. For Martín-Barbero, such a development follows the history of popular cultural matrices that, in turn, respond to the history of national societies, sociabilities, and cultural imaginaries in the continent. For
these three authors, popular cinema, in the classical national-popular period from 1930s to 1950s, functions as a highly influential and educational medium helping Latin Americans become simultaneously national, urban, and modern. At the same time, all three authors are very attuned to the cultural and industrial specificities that the technical aspects of the medium and its production in the continent, its relationship with the significant output of Hollywood movies, and the cultural level and needs of their Latin American spectators produced. In these accounts of the emergence of popular culture and the role of cinema in that process, comedies and melodramas play a crucial role in what Monsiváis called the “re-signation” of film in the continent. With “resignation,” the Mexican critic was referring simultaneously to the coexistence of potentially hegemonic (resignation as acceptance) and contestatory (re-signation as reworking) cultural aspects and effects in these two popular Latin American genres. Speaking of the “duties of the comedian” in the continent, he added that he had “to belong to the masses and be able to express themselves in their language and in their movements (not to speak of facial expressions). The Comedian should be likable and obedient, lascivious and subordinate, treacherous and honest, . . . to avoid any class conflict and merely represent the limitations of the dispossessed” (Monsiváis, “Cantinflas” 66).

Elsewhere, the same critic would describe the importance of Latin American cinema of the Golden Age in the following, more encompassing terms:

Cinema is the cultural phenomenon, in its wide anthropological sense, with the deepest impact in the life of Latin America in the period from the 1920s to the 1950s. Cinema selects, perfects, and destroys from within many of the traditions theretofore thought unshakeable; it implanted behavioral models, elevated idols . . . stabilized popular sounds, sanctioned idiolects and styles . . . and, above all, determined the most real meaning of reality.

(Monsiváis, “De las relaciones” 51)6

In this capacity to select and deselect, prolong, revive, transform, and eliminate traditions, cinema—and especially comedy and melodrama as its most popular genres in Latin America—was performing what Angel Rama called a transcultural process. Such process regulated the relations of national and regional cultures with their “outsides” and with their own “insides.” In the case of film, this meant both a significant degree of persistence of historical aspects of the emerging popular cultures of the city before the arrival of cinema (including
vaudeville, carnival, circus, popular performances) in the new film genres of comedy—the *chanchada*, the comedia ranchera, the musical comedy in general—as well as a high degree of transformation modeled after Hollywood genres and its processes of production, distribution, and reception. At stake were two concepts of the popular that have had a complicated relation in the continent. On the one hand, popular meant of the people, belonging to their cultural practices before the transformations brought about by modernity, and, more specifically, before the development of cultural industries. On the other hand, popular also meant culture-industry generated and commercially successful with a broad share of the population.

There is then a paradox or, perhaps, some form of disconnection in the Latin American critical tradition about national cinemas, and it has affected our ability to properly evaluate comedies. Of course, I am not suggesting that the national cinema framework is the only one that could be applied to these films. I am simply pointing to a tension that has seemed constitutive of Latin American cinema and its criticism and has influenced the appraisal of comedy’s significance. On the one hand, Monsiváis and others credit classic Latin American cinema with a nationalizing effect—an effect that would have occurred mostly when the national Mexican industry was based on the commercial production of popular comedias rancheras and melodramas. In this view, comedias were integral to the modernizing and nationalizing project. On the other, the national critical tradition in Argentina and Brazil is based more often than not on the avant-garde and more obviously political work of the New Latin American Cinema of the 1960s. Famously, the New Latin American Cinema’s best-known manifesto, Solanas and Getino’s 1969 “*Para un Tercer Cine*” (Towards a Third Cinema) envisioned a new form of the popular. In their proposal, such new articulation between the artistic medium, its producers and publics, and their political aspirations was based on revolutionary premises of radical social *transformation* rather than on the populist ones of social *representation* that had linked the Golden Age classics to their respective political regimes in the 1930–1950 period. Cinema could then be *national* in a number of (sometimes contradictory) ways: (1) it could be national because it involved a national industry in the production, distribution, and exhibition of nationally produced commercial products, such as comedias and melodramas, as it did in the Golden Age of Brazilian, Mexican, and Argentine cinema in the 1930s and the 1940s; or (2) it could be national because it used the critique of the nation-state and dominant nationalism as ideological platforms to denounce both the international hegemony of dominant Hollywood cinema and
its forms and that of national dominant oligarchies and their power, as it did in the new Third Cinema and Cinema Novo. Certain comedies, like the Cuban post-revolutionary tradition of satires of the remnants of the old bourgeois regime, could sometimes manage to bridge this distance (as shown here by Marting’s reading of Cuban director Tomás Gutiérrez Alea’s early films); but most comedies did not seem to fit the bill. Although the questions will not be answered here, they are worth positing: how is the national in “national cinema” being defined when it comes to comedies? What is their relevance economically, aesthetically, and culturally in the history of Latin American cinema?

**The Classical Genres of Latin American Film Comedies**

Even though, as Geoff King and Andrew Stott reminds us, “Comedy in film, generally, is best understood as a mode rather than as a genre . . . a manner of presentation in which a variety of different materials can be approached” (King 2; also Stott 2), there are, at least in Hollywood, some genre regularities that allow for the identification of long-standing comedic genres such as slapstick or romantic comedies or even older satire and parody, and relative newcomers such
as the “gross-out” comedy. What, we may ask, have been the genre
vehicles of the comedic mode in Latin American film industries? If,
as Jesús Martín-Barbero states, genres operate “articulating reception
practices with the logics of production, [they are] strategies of anti-
picipation of expectations and ‘symbolic pact’ between the industry and
the audiences” (Martín-Barbero, “Recepción” 19), what then have
been the generic symbolic pacts Latin American film industries and
publics have entered into around comedy and the comic?

According to film historian Paulo Antonio Paranaguá, the main
sub-genres of Latin American comedy during the classical epoch or
what he calls the “espejismo industrial” (industrial mirage) are: “the
ranchera comedy, the Brazilian musical comedy or the carnivalesque
chanchada. Parody, stemming from the circus and the popular the-
ater is [also] very important, even in countries with less production”
(Paranaguá, América Latina 258).

In what follows, I will sketch a description of some of these classic
sub-genres and provide some examples of their defining films, stars,
and characters.

Argentina’s film industry—like that of Mexico or Brazil (but also
that of Peru with Amauta films)—begins with two strong connec-
tions to popular culture: to music, and here specifically tango, on
the one hand, and to the comic stars of the radio and vaudeville, on
the other. Examples of the latter are two famous Argentine actors
whose comedies are analyzed in this volume: Niní Marshall and Luis
Sandrini. Niní Marshall (Marina Esther Traverso) created, wrote
for, and popularized, first in radio and then in film, two famous
comic characters who were the stars of a series of films developed
by the three main production companies of Argentina at the time
(Lumiton, Efa, and Argentina Sono Films). First, Catita, a badly
spoken arribiste and an indiscreet Italian immigrant whose dreams
of social mobility fit perfectly within the ambiguous terrain of domi-
nant ethnic humor (in which the ethnic is the butt of the joke) and
social criticism (in which the ethnic can illuminate prejudice and
produce compassion). Catita is the star of such films as: Divorcio
en Montevideo (1939), Casamiento en Buenos Aires (1940), Luna de
miel en Rio (1940), Yo quiero ser bataclana (1941), and Porteña de
Corazón (1948).

Then, Cándida, an illiterate Galician maid who becomes the core
character of a series of films that obtain great national success (Los
Celos de Cándida, 1940 and Cándida millonaria, 1941) and then
have an expansive continental market in mind: Una Gallega en México
(1949), Una Gallega baila mambo (1950), Los Enredos de una gallega
(1951), and *Una Gallega en La Habana* (1955). In both cases—like in Cantinflas or Peruvian Carlos Revolledo, El Cholo—a significant part of the humor is based on an exploration of language itself—the language of contact between standard and popular varieties in the context of migration and immigration.

Luis Sandrini (1905–1980) literalized this concentration on language by making the stutter, defining his embodiment of a certain type of popular porteño (or Buenos Aires dweller) —a central aspect for the production of humor (as analyzed here by Couret.)

Defining his characters, Sandrini declared:

I wanted to create a type, create a character as they exist everywhere in the world. Let us not talk about the great, I really don’t want to compare [myself to them] simply mention they exist: Chaplin is a prototype, Cantinflas in Mexico, Sordi in Italy….And Chaplin acts as Chaplin, Sordi as Sordi, and Cantinflas as Cantinflas. I acted as Cachuso, i.e. as Sandrini.

(as quoted by Posadas 11–12)  

Cachuso and other similar characters were crucial to the success of Sandrini’s comedies, including: *Los Tres berretines* (1933), *Riachuelo* (1934), *Don Quijote en el altillo* (1936), *El canillita y la dama* (1938), and *Chingolo* (1940). Like those of his contemporary Niní Marshall, Sandrini’s comedies had the distinction of marrying a melodramatic plot that divided the world into two social and moral classes (the rich and the poor), with a comedic strand that included everything from popular music to slapstick. In Matthew Karush’s opinion, this made Marshall’s and Sandrini’s characters “stand outside the moral universe of melodrama and import a more transgressive populism into their films” (Karush 117).

In Mexico, the *comedia ranchera* has been credited with creating the conditions for the emergence not only of the Mexican film industry of the 1930s and 1940s (García Riera, 128), but also of a whole gamut of musical comedies throughout the continent. The latter attempted to reproduce *comedias rancheras*’ sure mix of popular songs, famous singers, humor, and nostalgic or reactionary costumbrismo in order to replicate its phenomenal success. Although preceded by the 1929 *El Aguil a y el nopal* that included many of its defining traits, the key film here is the well-known *Allá en el rancho grande* (1936) directed by Fernando de Fuentes and starring singer Tito Guizar and Esther Fernández. Of the 39 full-feature Mexican films made in 1937, 9 were direct follow-ups to de Fuentes’s film,
while 11 new production companies made their debuts that year with comedias rancheras (Vidal, 10). In 1943, a Colombian production tried to reproduce the success of *Allá en el rancho grande* with the slightly adapted *Allá en el trapiche*, while, in Peru, Amauta films used the Mexican formula to explore the barrios of Lima (Paranaguá, *América Latina* 278).

*Allá en el rancho grande* has been variously described as the first Mexican blockbuster—a sign of the emergence of the concept of entertainment in Mexico; a contradictory modernizing proposition that simultaneously “praises the customs that are disappearing and criticizes the modernity that is being promoted” (Monsiváis, “All the People”, 150); or in Rafael Medina de la Serna’s words:

> The first genuinely Mexican film genre, characterized by optimism, a profusion of popular songs, bucolic scenes of rural customs, simple humour, the mythification of provincial life and morality, and an explicitly reactionary ideological message.

(Medina de la Serna 163)

The already mentioned modularity of this film manifested also in the proliferation of a series of characters deriving from the original model. The picturesque ranchero was further developed by Carlos López “Chaflán” in films such as *Los Millones de Chaflán* (1939) and *Hasta que llovio en Sayula* (1940) and by Armando Soto la Marina’s, *el Chicote*, in productions such as *Me he de comer esa tuna* (1944), *No basta ser charro* (1945), and *Hasta que perdí Jalisco* (1945). Tito Guizar’s *Allá en el rancho* singing lover was followed into those three comedies by characters played by Jorge Negrete, the swaggering and singing charro, and then by the even more famous Pedro Infante in films including *Los Tres García* (1946) and *Los Tres Huastecos* (1948). The two-male-singing-stars model, featuring Negrete and Infante or Infante and Luis Aguilar, exploited the *comedia ranchera* genre by emphasizing the latent homoeroticism of the titular couple of singers or by exploring urban settings for such relationship in films such as *Dos tipos de cuidado* (1952), *A toda máquina* (1951), and *¿Qué te ha dado esa mujer?* (1951). Obviously, given the popularity and importance of Cantinflas and Tin Tan as developed below, Mexican comedies were not exhausted by the *ranchera* model and included other musicals of Porfirian nostalgia as well as burlesque and picaresque comedies (Medina de la Serna, 163–166).

In one of the few book-length treatments of a Latin American national popular cinema, that of Brazil in this case, Stephanie Dennison and Lisa Shaw define the *chanchada* as: “a particular
tradition of comedy film that features interludes of music and dance, and which grew out of the so-called ‘filmes cantantes’ or sung films of the silent era” (26, note 2).

Radio was also a big influence. In fact, José Carlos Avellar has characterized the *chanchada* as “sophisticated radio” because, especially early on, the actors were motionless and verbal explanations of what was going on were thought to be required at all points. Emphasizing the high continuity between *chanchadas* and the “*teatro de revista*” or Brazilian music hall, Dennison and Shaw speak of “a celluloid continuation” that poked fun at authorities and used many of the classic topics of *teatro de revista* and performing circus: the mockery of “outsiders” including foreigners and especially “dim-witted Portuguese immigrants” (11) and other stereotypes such as the “illiterate hick,” the “indolent civil servant,” the “wily mulata,” etc. Moreover, it took advantage of other traditional circus and classical comedy staples such as slapstick, drawing from carnival, mistaken identity, and characters in drag.

The ur-text of the *chanchada* tradition, itself emanating from earlier cinematic footage on the carnival, is the film *Aló, Aló. Carnaval!* (1936) starring Carmen and Aurora Miranda and directed by Adhemar Gonzaga. It brought to the formula, later exploited by the Atlantida *chanchadas* of the 1940s and 1950s, two crucial components: “the use of Rio’s carnival celebrations and their accompanying music, together with the back stage plot” (Dennison and Shaw, 38). Other famous *chanchadas* include: *Não adianta chorar* (1945), *Este mundo é um pandeiro* (1946), *Carnaval no fogo* (1949), *Colégio de brotos* (1956), *Rico ria toa* (1957), *O Camelo da rua larga* (1958), etc.

*Chanchadas* would be followed in Brazil—decades later in the late 60s, 70s, and 80s, by then under military dictatorship conditions—by so-called *pornochanchadas*. Like comedies in general, *pornochanchadas* presented an opportunity for national film production as their cost was only a fraction of that of other national films, while their appeal was wide and long lasting. In particular, *pornochanchadas* became a cheap way for exhibitors to comply with the Brazilian government’s imposition of mandatory screen quotas for national films. Under those conditions, during the 70s and early 80s, the Boca do Lixo district in Sao Paulo produced more than 700 *pornochanchadas*, which accounted for two thirds of the national film production during this period (Shaw and Dennison 90–91). As a genre, they were more erotic than pornographic and, depending on who is evaluating them, may have expressed the levels of psychic repression prevalent in Brazilian society; been the dictatorship’s quasi-sponsored privileged form of distracting entertainment.
for the (male) masses; or represented a subversive ritual against the established order in their celebration of fun and their rejection of hard work and cleanliness. With titles such as As Secretárias que fazem de tudo (Secretaries Who Do it All, 1975), Banana mecânica (Clockwork Banana, 1974), Nos tempos da vaselina (In the Days of Vaseline, 1979), and Como e boa nossa empregada (How Good is Our Maid, 1973), the pornochanchadas revived, after a 20-year hiatus, some of the characters and situations of the chanchada, the teatro de revista, and circus, thus establishing a long line of continuity for the rowdy popular comedy in Brazil (Shaw and Dennison 90–99).

Film parodies were another important sub-genre of the Latin American comedy. Reflecting on their abundance, Paranaguá stated in 1996: “Parody, as we know, is the ambiguous weapon of the colonized, a typical intertextual relation from a culture subjected to matrices that, at the point they are being ridiculed, confirm their universality, and, thus, their superiority” (Paranaguá, América Latina 265).

The parodied texts were provided by classics of European literature, their Hollywood version, or by classic Hollywood films themselves. Beyond his peladito original and most creative comedies, Cantinflas went on to star in many film parodies of important Western literary texts such as Los Tres Mosqueteros (1942) and Romeo y Julieta (1943). Other famous Mexican comedians, including Germán Valdés, alias Tin Tan, would follow his lead in films such as La Marca del zorrillo (1950), Simbad el mareado (1950), El Ceniciento (1951), El Bello durmiente (1952), El Visconde de Montecristo (1954), and a long series during the 1950s ending with Tintansón Crusoe (1964). In Brazil, Oscarito and Grande Otelo—two of the leading comics in the chanchada tradition—starred in parodies of Hollywood films including Nem Sansão nem Dalila (Neither Samson nor Delilah, 1954) and Matar ou corer (Kill or Run Away, 1954), parodying Cecil B. de Mille’s Samson and Deliah (1949) and High Noon (1952), respectively. In Argentina, Luis Sandrini was the star of at least two parodies: Don Quijote del Altilllo (1936) and Don Juan Tenorio (1949).

Monsiváis, Martín-Barbero, and Paranaguá have all also emphasized the importance the star system—borrowed from the Hollywood production model—had in the history of popular film comedies in the region. Mario Moreno, “Cantinflas” in Mexico, Niní Marshall and Luis Sandrini in Argentina, and Oscarito in Brazil are all examples of the centrality of the lead comedian to the genre’s success. The first three are studied in this volume in articles by, respectively, Williams, Laguarda, and Couret. An equally important later Brazilian comedian
star, the already-mentioned Amácio Mazzaropi is also analyzed here in Bragança’s chapter. A later example is La India María. Almost all these comedic stars also share a common professional origin in the vaudeville and the so-called “género chico” and are, thus, living links connecting two crucial moments in the history of cultural industries in Latin America.

From Cantinflas to la India María, from Oscarito to Mazzaropi, the long process of changes encompassed by modernity, and, more specifically, the different and uneven degrees of modernization, have been one of the main sources of humor on the continent. External and internal migrations converging in cities growing in leaps and bounds, the expansion of the cultural industries and the mass media, and the search for employment in such a context have all provided plenty of opportunities for humor, sometimes at the expense of the newcomer (the butt), more often, in a critical position toward urban life and mores (the hero), and sometimes both—as in the cross-class success of Niní Marshall’s Catita films, as the upper class audiences laughed at the pretentious pushiness of the newcomer (butt) while her working-class audiences identified with “her character’s intense self-esteem and the implicit populism it entailed” (the hero) (Karush 126–127). The ur-situation of comedy in Latin America can then be described as follows: a formally uneducated person from the countryside comes to the city or finds herself in the city, where she has to endure the prejudices of urban people against her kind, and confront (without the appropriate knowledge) the many new experiences generated by urban, modern life, only to come up victorious at the other end of this trajectory, thanks to her inner moral strength and long-held rural, communal values. Jeffrey M. Pilcher has thoroughly explored the case of Mario Moreno, “Cantinflas” (1911–1993), in this context. Cantinflas and the Chaos of Mexican Modernity carefully follows the trajectory of Cantinflas from the carpa theaters to his Hollywood forays, from his peladito most famous character to his political work in the context of the hegemony of the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI; explored here by Williams) to his own emergence as a major producer of Mexican films (“plebeian, politician, and plutocrat” (Pilcher XX)). Thus, Pilcher traces the history of Mexican modernity, the evolution of the popular, and the production of the national popular under PRI hegemony in connection with Cantinflas’ career. What was riding on the image of the peladito (“a certain class of urban ‘bum’ in Mexico in the 1920s” (Monsiváis, “Cantinflas” 51)), and what made him so effective as humor, and thus so exploitable by the politician and the producer, was crucial enough
to provide meaningful clues as to the people’s self-understanding in the midst of modernity. In Pilcher’s words:

Cantinflas offers an excellent portrait of Mexican self-image during a transitional moment from a traditional agrarian society to an industrial urban one. As a shiftless migrant from the provinces, Cantinflas provided an object lesson in adaptation for millions of his countrymen entering the urban economy in the mid-twentieth century. He symbolized the underdog who triumphed through trickery over more powerful opponents – including those from the United States.

(Pilcher XVII)

The process takes decades, and from Cantinflas (Mexico) to Luis Sandrini (Argentina), El Cholo Revolledo (Perú) to La India María (Mexico), from Oscarito to Mazzaropi (Brazil), it involves a displacement from the forms, plots, types of humor, figures, and stars of the carpa-circus and the vaudeville to those of radio and, eventually, television. The trajectory of La India María is another example of the history of this paradigmatic situation of comedy in Latin America. María Elena Velasco (1940–2015), who began as a dancer accompanying musical routines and comic sketches, later had a break representing a funny maid in Mexican theater and film. Finally, she graduated into the character that would make her famous: La India María, in the mid-1960s, in both theater and film. However, it was not until 1969—when she started collaborating as a sketch partner in one of Mexico’s most popular TV programs (Raúl Velasco’s Siempre en Domingo) as La India María—that she reached the level of popularity that would define her long and successful career. Culturally and socially, that trajectory can be encompassed at its beginning and toward the end by two films describing the arc of an important part of the Mexican experience of, and in, the twentieth century. It began in 1972 with Tonta tonta pero no tanto, the first film with La India María as its main protagonist, in which Velasco’s character comes from the countryside to Mexico City for the first time, and culminated with Ni de Aquí ni de allá (1987) in which, La India María comes to Los Angeles as an undocumented immigrant eventually chased by the American Migra police and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). In that interval, Velasco’s fame clearly extended, along with rural Mexican immigrants, well beyond the borders of Mexico, finding a very lucrative and hospitable environment in Spanish-based Latino TV in the United States.

Latin American film comedies did not, of course, end with the classic genres of the Golden Age. Tango, Ranchera, and Chanchada films were
followed, as already stated, by later *pornochanchadas* in Brazil, the many Argentine films of the duo Alberto Olmedo and Jorge Porcel (analyzed here by Pagnoni), and, more recently, the Chilean comedies by popular radio and media Chilean artist-turned-director, Ricardo Artiagoitia, *El Rumpy*, along with films such as *Sexo con Amor* (analyzed here by Poblete). Cantinflas was followed in Mexico by Tin Tan (Germán Valdez) and, eventually, by Roberto Gómez Bolaños’ *El Chavo del 8* and by Amácio Mazzaropi in Brazil. Social and political satire has also had a significant life in the last 20 years, with excellent films such as *Golpe de Estadio* (by Colombian Sergio Cabrera, 1998), *Taxi para tres* (by Chilean Orlando Lübbert, 1999), and *Tiempo de valientes* (by Argentine Damián Szifrón, 2005). Ignacio Sánchez Prado, here and in his recent book on the subject, proposes the neoliberal comedy as one of the defining genres of our times and Freya Schiwy, here and in her *Indianizing Film*, invites us to consider indigenous humor-based visual media production. From the Olmedo-Porcel case in Argentina, it seems possible to posit the comedy under dictatorship or authoritarian regimes as another potential genre to consider. Those are clearly just a few of the highlights of the emerging map of (contemporary) film comedy in Latin America. This volume is also offered as a contribution to that task.

**An Overview of this Volume**

The volume is divided in three parts: The Golden Age classics, The Modern Classics, and Neoliberalism and New Media. The first part includes Nilo Couret’s chapter on Luis Sandrini’s early comedies. In the context of a general study of comedy as a broader cultural form with a long-standing history, in tension with and transformed by realism, the chapter explores the bodily effects of the genre and uses the stutter of Sandrini’s characters heuristically—figuring it within film texts, material film practice, and spectatorial experience. In the second chapter, Gareth Williams examines the relation between Mexican humor and the administration of public matters in the 1930s, concentrating on how the former “*carpa*” comedian Mario Moreno, “Cantinflas,” caught the eye of the Mexico City press by becoming an active, yet absurd, participant in the most discordant political debates of the 1930s. This political background is used to read one of Cantinflas’ most critically acclaimed films, *Ahí está el detalle* (1940) in order to measure changes in the mode of production of representation and, in particular, in the representation of the relation between social class and intellect in post-revolutionary Mexico. In the final chapter of *The Golden Age Classics*, Paula Laguarda focuses on two female comic characters played by Niní
Marshall in Argentine cinema between the 1930s and the 1950s. This historical period saw the emergence of new social and political actors in the country, such as women, immigrants, and urban popular sectors. In this context, Marshall’s characters constitute an entry point to reflect more broadly on the ways in which gender was produced in the social discourse of the time, and the role that cinema, in general, and the films selected, in particular, played in the process.

The second part of the volume, The Modern Classics, begins with Diane Marting’s analysis of comedies by Cuban director Tomás Gutiérrez Alea, best known as director of Memories of Underdevelopment. According to Marting, choteo—a special kind of corrosive and antiauthoritarian humor in Cuba—allows Gutiérrez Alea, a supporter of the revolutionary state, to criticize in hilarious ways people and ideas from pre-revolutionary society who are remaining and holding back the country. Three themes found in all of Gutiérrez Alea’s work, serious and comic, are examined as targets of humor in his earliest comedies in black and white (Las doce sillas, La muerte de un burócrata, and Los sobrevivientes): the figure of the artist (and the image of art); Cuban men’s attitude toward women; and rigidity or intransigence. This last abstraction appears in institutions as bureaucracy and in individuals as a robot-like, unthinking behavior, described by Bergson in his essay “Laughter” as the basis of humor. Next, Maurício de Bragança discusses the re-appropriation of the character Jeca Tatu, created by the writer Monteiro Lobato, by the Brazilian comic actor Amácio Mazzaropi in the 1950s. Mazzaropi’s movies, with this rural caipira character at their center, exposed the contradictions of the national project of modernity within Brazilian cultural industry, reflecting an imaginary that persistently erupted despite the codes of Brazilianness forged by the Estado Novo.

In chapter 5, Fernando Pagnoni studies films by two of the directors who worked with the Argentine comic duo of Jorge Porcel and Alberto Olmedo. The chapter argues that the films Enrique Cahen Salaberry made with the duo reflect conservative political interests manifested in the military dictatorship that took power in Argentina in the mid-1970s. Thus, the prevailing humor in these films reflected a moralizing intention operating through punishment and ridicule. The films of Hugo Sofovich, on the other hand, introduced small doses of absurdist humor into the ridicule. Such humor, then, could function as critique of this politically and morally oppressive reality.

In chapter 6, Juana Suárez focuses on two directors of comedies. Colombian productions by Gustavo Nieto Roa and Dago García span a period that begins in the 1970s and reaches to our present.
Suárez critically evaluates their model of popular comedy and the construction of humor in their films—contrasting a formulaic financial model for filmmaking (for the production of popular comedies) and a generalized construction of a questionable national identity or Colombianness.

The final part, on Neoliberalism and New Media, opens with Héctor Fernández L’Hoeste’s essay on Mexican films that have the naco (tacky, uneducated individuals) at their center. They include films such as Carlos Cuaron’s Rudo y Cursi (Tough and Tacky, 2008), Capulina’s El naco más naco (1982), and Julio Aldama’s El charro más naco del ejido (1998). In these films—seen here as representative of the increasing cultural visibility of naco protagonists in contemporary Mexican cinema—humor is used as a measure of political resistance and as a tool of defiance against an entrenched social order.

Chapter 9 by Ignacio Sánchez Prado focuses the evolution of the romantic comedy genre across a sampling of representative films released in Mexico between 2012 and 2015, to discuss how the genre has adapted to existing media ecosystems in the Mexican film industry. He shows how the two elements of the genre—humor and romance—allow for ideological and allegorical readings of the films in relation to the cultural challenges raised by late neoliberalism in Mexico.

In “Who’s Laughing Now? Indigenous Media and the Politics of Humor” Freya Schiwy explores the uses of humor in a selection of indigenous and community videos made in Mexico (Turix), Brazil (Video in the Villages), and Bolivia (CEFREC-CAIB). She asks what the comic elements in these videos might tell us about their affective politics of decolonization, including the complex negotiations of community and identity where humor is found in the interaction between filmmakers and their diverse indigenous and non-indigenous audiences. The laughter these videos incite produces, according to Schiwy, a shared affect and, thus, a feeling of community among rural viewers and the diasporic audience of urban migrants. At the same time, these videos also interpelate non-indigenous audiences, making them laugh with and on the terms established by indigenous media activists.

In the final chapter, I analyze three contemporary Chilean films: Taxi para tres (2001), Sexo con amor (2003), and Super, Todo Chile adentro (2009). My contention is that, through humor, these three films help us understand the dual nature of neoliberal globalization in Chile and, more specifically, a certain dominant and widely spread Chilean self-understanding in such transformation. The three comedies outline an arch that goes from the external satirical denunciation of the new (im)moral codes of conduct resulting from that
transformation (*Taxi para tres*) to their thorough and complete internalization at the diegetical and extradiegetical levels in *Super, Todo Chile adentro*.

Ultimately, as Nilo Couret emphasized at a recent Latin American Studies Association LASA panel in Chicago, the tradition of film comedy in Latin America and, I would add, the relationship of Latin American comedy with both the continent’s traditions and modernity itself, force us to face the need to go beyond the critical dichotomy between being critical and being funny. Couret proposed a re-examination of the dynamic distance/closeness (comedy is conciliatory because the spectator is too close to the text to read it critically or as in parody or satire, the spectator is provided with a distance that becomes crucial to “read” the text critically) in order to interrogate how critical is distance for what we normally call “critical distance”? Could comedy be, when successful, an example of non-ironic (non-distancing) critical spectatorship? Could it be an instance of an alternative mode of cultural experience that is both cognitive and affective? Could the sensuous and physically involved popular spectator of Latin American comedies announce, perhaps, a new or a different form of politics?

**Notes**

1. “No hay duda, en América Latina el cine de humor es un reducto vigoroso de lo nacional: “Sólo nosotros nos reímos de estas cosas, sólo nosotros captamos el doble sentido, el peso específico de algunas palabras, el ritmo popular” (Monsiváis, “South” 69–70).

2. If we remember Jorge Schnitman’s distinction between restrictive, supportive, and comprehensive state support policies in Latin America, we could ask: What has been the relationship of the state and state policy—or what, in the Mexican context, Octavio Paz called the philanthropic ogre—with the national comedies of Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico to name only its most developed examples? (Schnitman 46). See also Johnson.

3. “El cine rechazado por la burguesía como ‘degoutant’; pues ella seguía prefiriendo la ópera, encontró así su público en esas masas proletarias, pues les ofrecía, a bajo costo, una distracción que les hacía olvidar sus necesidades y sus problemas. Y les proponía temas que les interesaban: temas de su historia, de su vida cotidiana, de la capital, de la pampa, de la provincia” (Schumann 18).

4. “A polêmica em torno da chanchada não melhorou de nível com a intromissão de cabeças mais bem-dotadas para o debate, nas décadas de 60 e 70. . . . Em seu livro Revisão crítica do cinema brasileiro, [Glauber Rocha] acusava a chanchada de ter sido o primeiro inimigo do Cinema Novo. Mais tarde reviu sua opinião, chegando a preconizar

5. “Ahora empezamos otra vez con el gran proyecto popular del Cinema Novo y damos un paso más: el pueblo estará en las pantallas y en los cines. Ahora tenemos que hacer películas políticas y populares, películas con sentido del humor, llenas de esperanza y capaces de representar la cultura original del pueblo” (Quoted by Schumann 106).

6. “El fenómeno cultural, en su sentido amplio –antropológico– de efectos más profundos en la vida de América Latina de los años veinte a los años cincuenta es el cine, que elije, perfecciona y destruye por dentro muchas de las tradiciones que se creían inamovibles, implanta modelos de conducta, encumbra ídolos…fija sonidos populares, decreta los idólicos de hablas…y, sobre todo, determina el sentido de la realidad por así decirlo ‘más real’” (Monsiváis, “De las relaciones” 51).

7. Monsiváis’ distinction between parody and satire is worth quoting at length: “Parody is the continuous and wrecked invention of the world as it should be, where satire is ‘the master of ceremonies’ for melodramatic situations, passionate love affairs or incomprehensible plots. Nothing is serious except for death –an that always happens in other movies” (Monsiváis, “Cantinflas” 78).


9. “Yo quise crear un tipo, crear un personaje como los que hay en todas partes del mundo. No hablemos de los grandes, que no es por comparar sino por decir que existen: Chaplin es un prototipo, Cantinflas en México, Sordi, en Italia…Y Chaplin hace de Chaplin, y Sordí el de Sordí, y Cantinflas el de Cantinflas. Yo hacía Cachuso, o sea de Sandrini” (as quoted by Posadas 11–12).

10. “La parodia, ya se sabe, es el arma ambigua del colonizado, una relación intertextual típica de una cultura sometida a matrices que al ser objeto de escarnio confirman al mismo tiempo su universalidad y por lo tanto su superioridad” (“Paranaguá, América Latina”, 265).

Works Cited


A la mala, 203, 213, 218, 220
A los cirujanos se les va la mano, 130, 142, 144, 148
Abolición de la propiedad, 213, 220
absurd, 130, 141, 143, 147, 149, 151
adulterous flings, 133
AG Studios, 204, 206, 210, 218
Aguilar, Luis, 17
Agustín, José, 213
Ahi está el detalle, 22, 60, 64, 65, 172
Alazraki, Gary, 210, 222
Aldama, Julio, 24, 183, 192, 193
Alemán, Julio, 160, 181
Alfonso, Alfredo, 195
Aljaro, Fernanda, 247, 254, 256, 265
Allá en el rancho grande, 16, 17
Allen, Woody, 204, 207, 208, 220, 221
Allende, Fernando, 160, 182
Almodóvar, Pedro, 206, 221, 222
Aló, Aló. Carnaval!, 18
Altman, Rick, 37, 40, 45
Álvarez, Lulú, 194, 201
Álvarez, Manuel José, 159, 181
Amar te duele, 210, 211, 219
Amaral, Milton, 111, 120, 124
Amauta films, 15, 17
Amor a primera visa, 216–18, 220
Amor ciego, 159, 180
Amor de mis amores, 205–7, 213, 215, 220
Amores perros, 151, 153, 196, 198
Angélica María, 190
Argentina Sono Film, 15, 31
Aristotle, 2, 5, 223
Arnolles, Carlos, 33
Arnold, Tom, 217
Arrieta, Luis, 209, 219, 222
art, as propaganda, 95, 100, 125
art, image of, 23
Así del precipicio, 215
Atlantida, 18
Atwood, Margaret, 227
Augusto, Sergio, 9, 10, 26
Aura o las violetas, 158, 159, 179, 180
Avellán, José Carlos, 18
Aymara, 226–7, 232, 238–9, 242, 244–5
Bailey, Peter, 207, 220
Bakhtin, Mikhail, 5–6, 23, 32, 117, 123, 223, 231–2, 244
Bang, Carolina, 214
Bartolo tenía una flauta, 30
Bartra, Roger, 59, 65
Baudelaire, Charles, 5
Bejel, Emilio, 106
Benavides, Osvaldo, 212, 221
Benítez Rojo, Antonio, 98, 107
Benjamin, Walter, 43–5, 46, 48, 64–5
Benjumea, Carlos, 156, 160–3, 171, 177, 180, 181
benjumeísmo, 171
Bergman, Ingmar, 94
Bergson, Henri, 5–6, 23, 41, 44, 46, 101, 106, 146, 223, 225–6, 230–1, 233, 242, 244
INDEX

Besos de azúcar, 206, 221
Bichir, Demián, 212, 220, 222
Bissner, Joaquín, 211, 221–2
Blazing Saddles, 90
Blockbuster, 17, 167, 174, 205–7, 209, 219
Botta, Antonio, 30
Bourdieu, Pierre, 8, 185, 200, 202
Brando, Roberto, 195
Briggs, Lucy, 227, 232, 244
Brooks, Mel, 89–90, 105
Brown, Lyle C, 65
Brown, Michel, 210, 221
Buarque de Holanda, Sérgio, 111, 113, 119, 127
Buena Vista-Disney, 206
Bueno, Eva Paulino, 11, 26, 117, 127
buffoon, 93, 150
bureaucracy, 23, 88, 94, 96–7, 103, 176
bureaucrats, 64, 97, 193
Bustillo Oro, Juan, 61–3, 65
Caballero Calderón, Eduardo, 160
Cabeza de Vaca (film), 226, 241
Cabrera, Sergio, 22, 169, 179, 180
Cahen Salaberry, Enrique, 23, 129–53
capirra, 11, 23, 109–25, 127
Calderón, Felipe, 193
Calle, Marta Stella, 158, 180
Camargo, Jairo, 170
Cambio de ruta, 213–14, 216–17, 221
Camil, Jaime, 216–17, 220, 222
Cándida, 69ff
Cándida, la mujer del año, 69, 73–4, 81, 82
Cándida millonaria, 15, 69, 72–4, 82
Cansa de besar sapos, 203, 208, 215, 221
Cantinflas (Mario Moreno), 6, 12, 16–22, 26, 27, 47ff, 82, 125,
127, 128, 163–4, 171–2, 181, 187, 251, 255
capitalism, 52–3, 98, 110, 114, 121, 191, 197, 222, 256–9, 268
capital-labor relation, 60
Capulina (Gaspar Henain), 24, 183, 187ff, 201
Caracol Televisión, 155, 166–7, 174, 180, 181
Cárdenas, Lázaro, 49, 51, 63–5
Cárdenas, Marcelina, 236, 237
Carelli, Vincent, 234, 243
Caro, Manolo, 205, 212, 220, 222
Carriazo, Enrique, 166, 169, 181
Cartas del Parque, 85
Casamiento en Buenos Aires, 15, 75, 77, 82
Casán, Moria, 144
Cásese quien pueda, 204, 210–13, 220, 221
castas, 162
Castro, Noemí, 208
Catholic Church, 135, 157, 178
Catita, 15, 20, 68, 75ff, 82
Catita es una dama, 75, 82
CDI Centro de Desarrollo Indígena, 228, 241, 242
CEFREC-CAIB, 24, 236, 240–1, 244
centaurom Producciones, 155, 180–2
Cha cha chá Films, 196, 201
Chaflán (Carlos López), 17
Chagoyán, Rosa Gloria, 179
Chanan, Michael, 90, 106
chanchadas, 9–10, 18, 19, 22, 110, 112, 115, 126
Chaplin, Charlie, 7, 16, 26, 30, 32, 43, 46, 48–9, 64, 65, 85, 94, 105, 151, 163, 251, 255
charro, 17, 24, 183, 192
Chion, Michel, 42, 46
Choteo, 23, 87–8, 92, 102, 108
Chupamirto, 189–91
Cinema da Retomada, 8
Cinema Novo, 9–14, 25, 26
Claudia de Colombia (Gladys Caldas), 160, 181, 182
Cleopatra era Cándida, 69, 83
Colombianness, 24, 156
Colón, Jorge, 203, 221
comedia ranchera, 13, 16, 17, 26, 28, 160
Comedy duos, 169
Como era gostoso o meu francés, 226, 227
Constandze, Marco Polo, 204
consumption, 10, 100, 119, 123, 139, 165, 174, 185, 248, 257, 260, 261, 264–5
Contigo en la distancia, 85
Contreras, Mar, 215, 222
Coquimbo Films, 256, 265
Coral, Ricardo, 156, 167, 169, 172, 181
Corazón marchito, 208, 209
Corkidi, Rafael, 228
Corrèa, Mari, 234, 243
Craig, Linda, 94, 96–7, 106
Critchley, Simon, 2–4, 26, 140, 147, 153, 249, 266
Crowdus, Gary, 106
Crudo de petróleo, 190, 201
Cuarón, Alfonso, 180, 196, 202, 203, 214, 218, 222
Cuarón, Carlos, 24, 185, 186, 197, 199, 201
Cuban Revolution, 159
cumbia, 194, 267
Dago Producciones, 155, 156, 166–7, 170, 172f, 180, 181
Dardenne, Luc & Jean-Pierre, 209, 210, 221
Daries, Catherine, 106
de Fuentes, Fernando, 16
de la Reguera, Ana, 212, 220, 221
de la Rosa, Érika, 215, 222
de León, Osvaldo, 214
De Niro, Robert, 170, 181
de Palma, Rossy, 206
decolonization, 24, 223, 227, 237, 245, 268
del Río, Felipe, 247, 254–6, 265, 266
del Toro, Guillermo, 196, 216
Dennison, Stephanie, 10, 17–19
Derbez, Aislinn, 213, 220
Derbez, Eugenio, 210, 216, 217, 219, 220, 221, 222
Diegues, Carlos, 10
Discépolo, Enrique Santos, 73, 81, 82
Divorcio en Montevideo, 15, 75, 77, 83
documentary films, 105, 157, 180, 234–5, 243, 244, 250, 258, 267
documentary footage, 91, 92, 95
Don Chinche, 163, 180
Don Quijote del altillo, 19, 35
Downing, John D. H., 106
dramedy, 209, 220
drug cartel, 193, 194
Duarte Duarte, Rosa, 228
Duchovnay, Gerald, 106
Dzul, Jorge Agustín, 229, 230
Dzul, Matilde, 229, 230
Echeverría, Sandra, 205, 213, 215, 220, 221
Eichorn, Franz, 90, 108
Eisenstein, Sergei, 97
El Chacotero Sentimental, 248, 263
El Chan Comandante Chico, 229, 230
El charro más naco del ejido, 24, 183, 192
El Chavo del 8 (Roberto Gómez Bolaños), 22
El cielo en tu mirada, 213, 221
El coraje de un pueblo, 226
El inmigrante latino, 160, 180
El mundo es ancho y ajeno, 226
El naco más naco, 24, 183, 187–8, 191, 201
INDEX

El paseo, 167, 172, 173
El Rumpy (Ricardo Artiagoitía), 22
El Santo, 185, 200
El taxista millonario, 161, 162, 173, 176–7, 180
El violín, 226
Eltit, Diamela, 104, 106
Esposos en vacaciones, 159, 180
Entrecáscar, 155, 160, 164–5, 179, 180
Espinoza Domínguez, Carlos, 104, 106
Fagan, Kristina, 223, 231, 232, 240, 242, 244
ficheras, 194
film festivals, 11, 167, 206
FOCINE, 158, 180, 181
Franco, Luis Ernesto, 205, 222
Fresa y chocolate, 85, 99, 103, 106, 107
Freud, Sigmund, 3, 5, 223, 225, 244
Freyre, Gilberto, 111
Galán, Luis Carlos, 157
Galindo, Rubén, 194, 201
García, Alex, 206, 220, 221
García, Dago (García, Darío Armando; Dago), 23, 155ff
García, Víctor, 215
García Bernal, Gacl, 183, 196–9, 201, 202, 212, 221, 222
García Borrero, Juan Antonio, 86, 87, 89, 106
García Canclini, Néstor
Consumidores y ciudadanos, 186, 201
Hybrid Cultures, 186, 201
García Jr., Raúl, 181
Garzón, Gustavo, 215, 222
gender performativity, 67, 68, 81
gender roles, 79, 96, 100, 162
gender stereotypes, 68, 78, 100, 136, 140, 213
Gilly, Adolfo, 64, 65
Giménez, Susana, 132, 133, 139–41, 144, 152, 153
Giménez Cacho, Daniel, 209, 212, 222
globalization, 24, 185, 247–9
Gnatalli, Radamés, 119
Golden Age of Mexican Cinema, 1, 12, 13, 21, 22, 31, 192, 219
Golpe de estadio, 22, 169, 179, 180
Gómez, Beto, 206, 222
González Iñárritu, Alejandro, 151, 153, 196, 218
Grande Otelo (Sebastião Bernardes de Souza Prata), 19, 105, 112, 115, 126
Guantanamera, 85, 103, 107
guido, 189
Guizar, Tito, 16, 17
Gutiérrez Alea, Tomás
“Confesiones de un cineasta,” 86, 107
“La dialéctica del espectador,” 86, 106, 107
Guzmán, Enrique, 190
Hable con ella, 206, 219, 221
Hannah and Her Sisters, 207, 221
Hansen, Miriam, 43, 44, 46
Hasta cierto punto, 85, 86, 93, 102–3, 107, 108
Hay que romper la rutina, 130, 133–4, 138–40, 152
Hayek, Salma, 198, 201
Henaine, Antonio, 191, 201
Henaine, Gaspar (Capulina), 187, 188, 191
Higareda, Martha, 204, 210, 211, 213, 215, 219, 221, 222
Hobbes, Thomas, 2, 223
Hokeson, Jan Walsh, 4–6, 27
homophobic, 140, 152, 162, 168
Hool, Christopher, 213–15, 221
Huasipungo, 226
humor blanco (white humor), 187, 191
Ibarra, Pedro Pablo (Pitipol Ibarra), 203, 213, 216, 220, 221
ICAIC (Instituto Cubano de Artes e Industria Cinematográfica), 89, 107
ICODES (Instituto Colombiano de Desarrollo Social), 157, 178
Ilf and Petrov, 88–90, 104, 108
IMCINE (Instituto Mexicano de Cinematografía), 107, 208, 218, 221
Infante, Pedro, 17
Infante Jr., Pedro, 192, 194, 201
Irony, 58, 77, 85, 103, 174
Ítaca Films, 204, 206, 209, 210
Italian-Americans, 189
Janitzio, 226
Jeca Tatu, 23, 110, 111, 114, 116–17, 120, 122–5, 127
Jersey Shore, 189
Jiménez Hernández, Rafael, 208
Juan Gabriel, 204, 215–16
Junta de Calidad Cinematográfica (Colombia), 158
Kant, Immanuel, 3, 223
Karané and Kumaré Txicão, 236
Karush, Matthew, 16, 20, 27, 31, 32, 41, 45, 46
Keaton, Buster, 7, 94, 95, 151
King, Geoff, 14, 27, 162, 163, 180, 243, 245
Knight, Alan, 64, 65
Kny, Lenka, 213, 221
Kotero, Apollonia (Patty), 159
Krakauer, Sigfried, 43–6
Kraniauskas, John, 64, 65
Krauze, Enrique, 64, 65
La banda del carro rojo, 194, 201
La captura, 166, 181
La casa de Quirós, 33, 34
La esquina, 169, 170, 181
La India María (María Elena Velasco), 20, 21
La muerte de un burócrata, 23, 85, 86, 91, 93–102, 104–8
La nación clandestina, 226
Ladies’ Night, 213, 221
Lamarque, Libertad, 36
Las cartas del gordo, 166, 181
Las mujeres son cosas de guapos, 131, 142, 144, 147–8
Latam Pictures, 206, 209, 210, 220, 221, 222
Laurel and Hardy, 94, 104, 169
Law 814/Law on Filmmaking (Colombia), 155, 178
Leguizamo, John, 172
Lewis, Jerry, 151, 161, 170, 181
Lionsgate, 204, 208, 216, 221
Llanque Chana, Domingo, 227, 232, 244
Llanthupi, Munakuy, 236, 237
Lloyd, Harold, 94
Lloyd, Phyllida, 215
Lombardo Toledano, Vicente, 51, 52, 53, 54, 57, 64, 65
López, Esteban, 230
López, Issa, 207, 213
Los celos de Cándida, 15, 69, 72, 83
Los Güeros Films, 209
Los hombres solo piensan en eso, 139, 152
Los ríos profundos, 226
Los sobrevivientes, 23, 85, 86, 91, 97, 98, 99, 100–4, 106, 107
Los Tigres del Norte, 194
Los tres berretines, 16, 41
Los turistas quieren guerra, 130
INDEX

Lübbert, Orlando, 2, 7, 14, 22
Lubezki, Emmanuel, 207
Lucatero, Eduardo, 208–12, 222
Lucha libre, 184, 200
Lukács, Gyorgy, 44, 46
Lumiton, 15, 31
Luna, Diego, 183, 196, 198, 199, 201, 202, 212, 222
Luna de miel en Río, 15, 75, 77, 78, 79, 83
Macbean, James Roy, 102, 103, 108
Macedo, Watson, 112
machismo, 92, 96, 101, 168
Mackin, Jonna, 223, 226, 232, 233, 245
Madeinusa, 226
Magaña, Jaime, 228
Mamma Mia!, 215, 221
Mañach, Jorge, 108
Manero, Tony (John Travolta), 162, 189
Manríquez, Silvia, 188, 201
Mar, Marcela, 214
María Candelaria, 226
mariánismo, 101
Mariátegui, José Carlos, 48, 65
Maridos en vacaciones, 130, 133, 134, 135, 139
market-society, 247, 248, 255, 257
Marshall, Niní, 15, 16, 19, 20, 23, 28, 267
Martín-Barbero, Jesús, 11, 15, 19, 27, 77, 84, 140, 143, 154
Martínez, Karen, 172
Marx, Karl, Capital, 49, 50, 65
Marx, Karl, Grundrisse, 57, 65
Maya(s), 14, 224
Mazzaropi, Amáicio, 6, 10, 11, 20, 21, 22, 26, 109ff
Me late chocolate, 211, 212, 213, 220, 221
Medina, Juan, 205, 210
Medina de la Serna, Rafael, 17, 27
Medusa, myth, 67, 81
melodrama, 8, 11, 12, 13, 16, 29, 46, 63, 68, 77, 79, 83, 126, 204, 213, 219, 236, 263, 267
Memorias del subdesarrollo, 85, 93, 102
Méndez, Luis Gerardo, 210, 222
Mexican Revolution, 65, 217
Mi abuelo, mi papá y yo, 166, 170, 171, 176, 181
Milagro en Praga, 213, 221
military coup (Argentina), 23, 43
Miracle, Andrew, 245
Miranda, Carmen, 18, 104, 111, 128
Miravalles, Reynaldo, 89, 92, 99, 107
Miravista, 206
mockumentary, 199
Modern Times, 32, 49, 94
modernization, 20, 30, 110, 112, 114, 120, 122, 123, 124, 249, 252
Moglia Barth, Luis, 33, 34, 41, 42
Monroe, Marilyn, 94, 96
Monsiváis, Carlos, 11, 12, 13, 17, 19, 20, 25, 26, 27, 29, 46, 49, 50, 55, 59, 64, 65
Monteiro, Lobato, 23, 110, 114, 120, 125, 127
Montsé, Nuri, 36
Mora, Karina, 161, 164, 180
Moreno, Jorge Luis, 211
Moreno, Marlon, 161, 164, 180
Morones, Luis Napoleón, 51, 52, 53, 56, 64
Morreall, John, 2, 3, 27, 150
Mosquita muerta, 212, 222
Moulián, Tomás, 257, 266
Moyngó, the Dream of
Maragareum, 236
Mraz, John, 63, 65
MTV, 189, 198, 200
Mubi, 206
Mujeres que bailan, 75, 84
Mujeres que trabajan, 84
Mulvey, Laura, 165
Murúa, Alfredo, 36
Murúa, Fernando, 36
música norteña, 185, 194, 198, 201
musical, 9, 13, 15, 16, 17, 26

naco, 24, 183ff
NAFTA, 198
Não adianta chorar, 18, 112
narco, 194, 201
Native North American Literature, 75
Navidad de los pobres, 84
Negrete, Jorge, 17
neoliberalism, 22, 24, 186, 203, 204, 222, 247, 268, 269
Neo-Realism, 91
Netflix, 167, 220, 233
New Latin American Cinema, 8, 13, 29, 159
(New) New Latin American Cinema, 8
Ni te cases ni te embarques, 172
Nieto Roa, Gustavo, 23, 155ff
Nieto Roa, Luis Guillermo, 158
nietorismo, 171
Nietzsche, Friedrich, 1, 5, 6
Niñas mal, 210, 211, 212, 213, 219, 222
No se aceptan devoluciones, 210, 216, 219
No sé si cortarme las venas o dejarlas largas, 205, 206, 207, 222
Noriega, Fez, 210, 222
Nosotros los nobles, 210, 211, 212, 213, 219, 222
Novo, Salvador, 51, 52, 65
Nueva Ola (mexicana), 190

O ébrio, 119, 126
Ochmann, Mauricio, 208, 209, 220
Olmuedo, Alberto, 129ff
Once upon a time in Mexico, 198, 201

Operación Ja Ja, 131, 162
Orejuela, Héctor, 156
Oropeza, Roger, 195
Ortíz, Renato, 11

Palela, Ludwika, 205, 222
PAM Films, 111
Paranaguá, Paulo Antonio, 15, 17, 19, 26, 27, 46
 parody, 14, 15, 19, 25, 26, 28, 58, 82, 88, 95, 98, 110, 112, 123, 139, 197, 199, 226, 227, 229, 240, 242, 253, 255, 265
Paz, Octavio, 25, 64, 65
pelado, peladito, 19, 20, 49, 50–3, 55–9, 61, 64, 125, 149, 171, 172
Pereira Dos Santos, Nelson, 226, 227
Pérez Gavilán, Fido, 209
Peronism, 31, 74, 83
picarese, 93, 94, 133, 240
Pilcher, Jeffrey M., 20, 21, 27, 48, 49, 51, 53, 63, 64, 65
Piquer, Estela, 191, 201
populism, 16, 20, 127, 216
Porcel, Jorge, 22, 23, 129ff, 263
pornochanchadas, 18, 19, 22
Porteña de corazón, 15, 75, 78, 84
Posición viciada, 167, 169, 181
Preludio, 209, 219, 222
primitive accumulation, 49, 51, 58
¿Qué le dijiste a Dios?, 204, 215, 216, 222
Quercia, Boris, 247, 265
“Quiero que me quieras” (song), 185, 197, 198, 201

Rama, Ángel, 12, 29, 46
Ramos, Samuel, 64, 66
Ramsey, Laura, 217, 220
ranchera comedy, films, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 26, 28, 160, 192
ranchera music, 225  
*Rancho Alegre*, 109  
realia, 103  
Revolledo, Carlos, 16, 21  
Revueltas, José, 57, 66  
*Riachuelo*, 16, 41, 42, 44  
Ríos, María Eugenia, 183  
Rocha, Glauber, 9, 11, 25  
Rodríguez, Robert, 198, 201  
Romero, Manuel, 35, 75, 82, 83,  
84, 267  
Rubiano, Fabio, 166, 169  
*Rudo y cursi*, 24, 183ff  
Ruffinelli, Jorge, 88, 108  
*Sábados felices*, 162, 181  
*Sai da frente*, 109  
sainete, 33, 41, 74, 82, 83  
*Salvando al Soldado Pérez*, 206,  
222  
Sánchez, Chalino, 195  
Sandrini, Eduardo, 36  
Sandrini, Luis, 6, 15, 16, 19, 21,  
26, 29ff  
Sanjínés, Jorge, 226  
*Santa Cándida*, 69, 72, 74, 84  
Santiesteban, Enrique, 89, 92, 99,  
107  
Saraceni, Julio, 75, 82, 83, 131  
Sariñana, Fernando, 210  
satire, 14, 22, 25, 26, 63, 67, 77,  
85, 87, 88, 97, 101, 104, 204,  
223, 227, 240, 242, 255, 265  
*Saturday Night Fever*, 162, 189,  
191, 202  
*Saturday Night Live*, 162  
Schumann, Peter B., 8, 9, 10, 25,  
26, 28  
Scorsese, Martin, 170–81  
*Se permuta*, 103  
Serradilla, Ana, 208, 209, 213, 221,  
222  
Serrano, Antonio, 203, 206, 208,  
222  
Serrano, Enrique, 77, 78, 82, 83  
Sexo, pudor y lágrimas, 203, 206,  
212, 222  
*Sexo con amor*, 22, 24, 247, 249,  
262ff  
Shaw, Lisa, 10, 17, 18, 19, 27, 28  
Shohat, Ella, 175, 181, 227, 241,  
245  
SIDE (Sociedad Impresora de  
Discos Electrofónicos), 36  
Soap opera(s), 155, 159, 160, 161,  
166, 167  
*Sobre ella*, 213, 222  
Sobrecosto (Surcharge Law), 157,  
158, 179  
Sofovich, Hugo, 23, 130ff  
Solís, Marco Antonio, 216  
*Sólo con tu pareja*, 203, 204, 207,  
222  
Souza, Karla, 211, 212, 213, 215,  
220, 221, 222  
sovereignty, 52, 245, 269  
Spence, Louise, 227, 246  
Stam, Robert, 175, 181, 227, 241,  
245  
Stevens, Ilan, 171, 181  
*Stefan v/s Kramer*, 1, 262  
Stott, Andrew, 14, 28  
*Strike*, 97  
Suárez, Cecilia, 212, 222  
Suárez, Teresa, 215, 222  
*Super, Todo Chile adentro*, 25, 247,  
249, 254ff  
Susini, Enrique, 41  
Szifron, Damián, 22  
Tabío, Juan Carlos, 94, 103, 107  
Talancón, Claudia, 207, 221  
tango, 9, 15, 21, 41, 79, 81  
*Tango!, 41  
Taracena, Alfonso, 51, 52, 53, 64,  
66  
*Taxi para tres*, 2, 7, 14, 22, 24, 25,  
247, 249, 250ff  
*Te presento a Laura*, 210, 211, 213,  
215, 219, 222
Teatro de revista, 18, 19
telenovela(s), 217
Televisa, 65, 159, 204, 206, 208, 210, 216, 219, 221
The Battle of the Century (Laurel and Hardy), 94
The Colombian Connection, 159, 161, 181
The King of Comedy, 170, 181
The Producers, 90
The Seventh Seal, 97
The Village People, 190
Third Cinema, 8, 13, 14, 229
Tiempo para amar, 159, 181
Tierra Colombiana (T.V. Show), 158
Tin Tan (Germán Valdés), 17, 19, 22, 27, 82, 163
Tironi, Eugenio, 248, 249, 266
TMA Programa de Transferencia de Medios Audiovisuales, 228, 241
Todas mías, 212, 222
Torres, Camilo, 157, 178
Travolta, John, 181, 189, 191
Treze cadeiras, 89, 108
Trompetero, Harold, 156, 173
Turix video, 24, 228, 233, 239, 241, 242
Ukamau, 226
Ukamau Group, 226, 244
Una bici en carrerita, 224, 227, 228, 229, 242
Una mujer con suerte, 160, 182
Una pelea cubana contra los demonios, 100
Univisión, 216
Valdés Rodríguez, José Manuel, 89
Valdivia, Juan Carlos, 217, 220
Valle, Mauricio T., 213, 222
Vallejo, Virginia, 159
Vargas, Getúlio, 10, 111, 115, 125
Vargas, Gina, 215
Vargas Vila, José María, 158, 178, 179
Vásquez, Juan Carlos, 166, 181
Vega, Marimar, 205, 220
Velázquez, Olinka, 215
Vera Cruz Company, 115, 116, 124, 125
Verdú, Maribel, 196, 202
Video in the Villages, 24, 234, 235, 241, 243
Videocine, 206, 207, 210, 211, 215, 216, 218, 219, 221, 222
Virno, Paolo, 60, 66
Volverte a ver, 215, 222
Weber, Wammack, 228, 229, 233, 239, 241, 243, 246
White Humor, 187
Williams, Linda, 29, 40, 46, 84
Wood, Andrés, 91, 250
Y tu mamá también, 180, 196, 202
Yawar mallku, 226
Yo quiero ser bataclana, 15, 75, 76, 84
Yucatán Peninsula, 213, 225, 228
Zacarías, Alfredo, 187, 201
Zayas, Alfonso, 194, 201
Zizek, Slavoj, 232
Zuluaga, Pedro Adrián, 164, 172, 182
Zurita, Sebastián, 205, 220