



The Second Life of Italian Neo-realism

In 1950 a young commercial artist from a distinguished Bengali intellectual family spent six months in London working for an advertising agency. He was a film enthusiast who a couple of years earlier had founded a film society in Calcutta and had also helped Jean Renoir with location scouting for the French director's film *The River*, shot near Calcutta in 1949. This young man's name, as I am sure you all know, was Satyajit Ray. The part of London in which he and his wife found lodgings was Hampstead and it was at the local art-house cinema, the Hampstead Everyman, that he saw, among other films, Vittorio De Sica and Cesare Zavattini's Italian neo-realist masterpiece, *Bicycle Thieves*. By his own account he saw no fewer than 99 films during his stay in London. Of these it seems to have been *Bicycle Thieves* that made the strongest impression on him, not just as a viewing experience but as a stylistic model that inspired him to bring to fruition his project to make a film of the novel *Pather Panchali* – which he then did, though it took him five years to do it.

Ray was not alone among film-makers of the 1950s and 60s to draw inspiration from watching Italian neo-realist cinema. The list is long and takes

one from Japan to Prague to Paris to Rio de Janeiro to New York, possibly even to Hollywood. But Ray was one of the first not only to draw inspiration but to act on it when neo-realism was still a live movement in its country of origin.

More often action comes later, from about 1960 onwards, by which time neo-realism in Italy has faded away and indeed as far as Italy was concerned was dead and buried. And when it comes it takes different forms, according to the different natures of the individuals who feel the inspiration and the different circumstances in which they find themselves.

I shall start with an account of what neo-realism was and what sort of properties it possessed such that it could act as an inspiration to a future generation even more than to its own.

Neo-realism was a film movement that came into being quite abruptly in 1945 at the end of the Second World War, flourished for five years and in the early 1950s began to break up and then to tail off so that by 1955 it was only a vestige of its former self.

The major film-makers associated with the movement were Roberto Rossellini with *Rome Open City* in 1945 and *Paisà* in 1946, Luchino Visconti with, notably, *The Earth Trembles* in 1948, and the director-scriptwriter team of Vittorio De Sica and Cesare Zavattini with *Shoeshine* (1946) and *Bicycle Thieves* in 1948.

From the outset the movement had two distinct aspects, aesthetic and political. I say distinct but in practice in the early years they were, or were felt to be, inextricable. These aspects were on the one hand aesthetic and on the other hand political. On the aesthetic side the movement aimed to present reality as directly as possible. On the political side this reality was the reality of a country that had been fighting to liberate itself from Nazi occupation and home-grown Fascism and was now setting out to build a new future in circumstances marked by destruction and poverty. Put crudely, a time was bound to come when the problems of destruction and poverty began to lose some of their urgency and it would no longer seem imperative to combine addressing these problems with a realist aesthetic, or vice versa, to combine a realist aesthetic with those particular no longer quite so pressing problems; and it was when that time came that the movement as a movement began to break up.

The next thing to note about neo-realism is that it was unique to Italy. No other country responded in the same way to the experience of war and devastation. The Second World War was a global catastrophe with on the whole a happy ending. It involved almost the entire world but continental Europe

and East Asia most particularly. Countries with vicious regimes overran other countries and occupied them, killing millions. Further devastation ensued when the occupied countries were recaptured. Germany and Japan were bombed to smithereens. Italy was less heavily bombed but was the site of ferocious land battles for the best part of two years.

As well as physical destruction there was moral disorientation. The survivors in Germany and Japan were overcome with resentment and guilt. They had suffered terribly but they had brought it on themselves. And they couldn't talk about it. They were too stunned to even try, and had they wanted to try they were prevented from doing so by the occupying powers who imposed heavy censorship and programmes of re-education which cowed people into silence.

In a funny way the first two years after the end of the war were the least bad in this respect. In both Germany and Japan, as well as in Italy, there was some experiential writing about where people thought they were and how they felt about it. It was a bleeding wound and people could see the blood and talk about it. But when the wound began to heal over, silence fell. It was to be at least ten years before it became possible publicly or privately to come to terms with the past, to think, write or make films about it with any degree of directness or honesty.

Italy escaped much of this. It had been allied to the Germans and it had invaded other countries. But it had not massacred Jewish or Chinese people in their millions. And internal resistance to Fascism and German occupation had played a large part in the country's liberation. Nor was it subject to such heavy censorship or to a so-called re-education which was little better than brainwashing.

Furthermore, when people did start writing or, more ambitiously, making films, about recent experience, there was the makings of an aesthetic already in waiting in the form of a rebellion against the literature and film-making of Fascism. This aesthetic, which came to be called neo-realism, involved a return to the literary models of the late 19th century school known as "verismo" which sought to describe popular experience with the simplest of means and as close to the thing itself as possible. It had already a cinematic exemplar in the form of a film by Visconti called *Ossessione* ("Obsession"), made in 1943 and promptly banned by the government.

All over the world the war functioned as a reality check, even in Hollywood. Looking at the first-hand photographic records of the war, the great cinematographer John Alton wondered why he and his peers spent so

much time crafting fictional effects with lights, filters and gauzes when war photographers could bring back such powerful images with nothing but a seen reality and a camera through which to see it.

Post-war film audiences, meanwhile, were divided in what they wanted from the cinema. Against a desire for an echo of the reality they had gone through there was a strong wish just to go back to the world before the war. In most film industries it was that wish that won through but there was also, in the phrase of the Italian neo-realist Cesare Zavattini, a “hunger for reality” which remained for the most part unsatisfied.

Italy produced; other countries consumed. In countries where, for whatever reason, no similar cinema arose, Italian neo-realist films were regularly imported, generally reaching Paris within six months and New York and London not long after. They reached into Soviet-dominated Eastern Europe and even into American-occupied Japan. They were seen in art house cinemas and film society screenings and were widely looked upon as an – *the* – alternative to mainstream cinema. Among the audiences for these films were young men and women who in due course were to be film-makers in their turn.

At the beginning all sorts of films were lumped together under a single heading, mainly on the basis of their subject matter. If a film was Italian and about the war, resistance or post-war reconstruction it was held to belong to something called neo-realism, regardless of style. While there was a lot of talk about low budgets, simple understated plots and undemonstrative acting by non-professional actors, a film did not have to have those attributes to be called neo-realist. Take, for example, Giuseppe De Santis’s 1949 film *Bitter Rice*, which had two established star actors, Vittorio Gassman and Raf Vallone, and an aspirant starlet called Silvana Mangano whose thighs and cleavage were a major part of its appeal. It had a crime-film plot told as a melodrama. But it was set against a background of the struggle of casual workers for a decent wage and for that reason was put into the general category of neo-realism. It was also hugely popular at the box office, unlike the films with non-professional actors and minimal plots.

In fact round about 1950 neo-realism had very fuzzy borders, both recognized and unrecognized. *Bitter Rice* qualified as neo-realist because of its left-wing politics. But popular genre films including melodramas tinged with a backward-looking Catholic ideology tended to adopt certain features of social realism without the fact being remarked on, either favourably or unfavourably. In brief, the situation was confused and nobody cared.

This confused situation could not last for ever. In 1949, the year of *Bitter*

Rice, Rossellini made a decisive move in the opposite direction from De Santis. Rossellini was always interested in the idea of breaking into the American market and persuaded an American studio, RKO, to back a film he intended to make with the Swedish-born Hollywood star Ingrid Bergman. Over the next few years he made three films with her, in all of which she plays a northern European suffering in an alien Mediterranean culture. Whereas most of the neo-realists wanted to show Italy to the Italian public, Rossellini wanted to show it to the rest of the world, especially the USA. The gamble misfired. None of those films – *Stromboli* in 1950, *Europe '51* in 1952, and *Journey to Italy* in 1954 – was popular anywhere, except in one place.

This place was Paris. Here, unbeknownst to the rest of the world, a small cult of Rossellini began to develop. Its spearheads were the critic André Bazin and the future film-makers Eric Rohmer, Jacques Rivette and Jean-Luc Godard, future film-makers of the French New Wave then writing in small film magazines which in 1951 coalesced into a larger one called *Les Cahiers du cinéma*. Suddenly the critical consensus around neo-realism broke up. While critics in Italy and Britain continued to admire neo-realist films pretty indiscriminately while writing off Rossellini as a renegade, the *Cahiers* writers lost interest in neo-realism in general and praised Rossellini to the skies for doing things with cinema that none of the others could envisage, let alone achieve.

With the intervention of the *Cahiers* group there were now three critical doctrines as to what neo-realism was – or, increasingly, had been, since it was now visibly breaking up. These doctrines each fixed on a particular film-maker

There was a central doctrine, of which the spokesman was Zavattini, a tireless propagandist as well as the scriptwriter of *Bicycle Thieves*. This saw neo-realism as a bundle of approaches united only by the focus on ordinary life and the “hunger for reality” mentioned above. The film-maker who best exemplified this was, of course, De Sica.

Then there was a Marxist tendency, which criticized neo-realism precisely for its ordinariness and its obsession with the surface of reality and lack of critical analysis of underlying social and economic forces. The spokesman of this tendency was a certain Guido Aristarco and its preferred film-maker was Visconti.

And then there was the new kid on the block, Bazin, who championed Rossellini precisely for the qualities Aristarco deplored, his lack of pre-given structuring assumptions about what to film and his openness to what he saw immediately in front of him.

Aristarco and Bazin clashed in print over Rossellini’s trilogy of films with

Ingrid Bergman. Aristarco wrote a hostile review of *Europe '51* in his magazine *Cinema nuovo*, criticising its vague spirituality and sopiness towards its heroine. Three years later Bazin penned a reply, also published in *Cinema nuovo*, in which he compared conventional realism, the sort of neo-realism that Aristarco liked and didn't find enough of in neo-realism, to what he, Bazin, regarded as the innovation of neo-realism in the hands of Rossellini notably in *Journey to Italy*. He did this by means of a metaphor. Conventional realism (*le réalisme classique*), he said, is like a bridge made of bricks, purpose-built to enable the traveller to cross a river. Rossellinian neo-realism, by contrast is more like stepping stones in the river bed. The stones are just there, they have no pre-given purpose, but they take you across the river none the less. And a cinema of stepping stones is truer to the genius of cinema.

By the time Bazin's response to Aristarco appeared, there was not much left in the way of neo-realist production. De Sica and Zavattini had made *Umberto D* (1953), the most low-key and deliberately "ordinary" of their films, and a worse box-office flop even than *Europe '51*, and Visconti had made *Senso* (1954), a historical spectacular which was realist in Aristarco's terms but not neo-realist in either Zavattini's or Bazin's sense.

Meanwhile the films that had so inspired the young people who saw them in the late 1940s and early 1950s – *Bicycle Thieves*, *Rome Open City*, *Paisà* – were no longer in circulation. So in the place of inspiration acquired by film viewing, neo-realism became increasingly mediated through critical doctrine. By the time young people got round to seeing the films they would already have read and been influenced by the doctrine.

Of the three doctrines, that preached by Aristarco had the least direct purchase, except to the extent that its parent doctrine, Marxism, did have purchase, increasingly so in the 1960s.

Of the other two, Zavattini's continued to be influential, but more through his writing and teaching than through his activity as a scriptwriter. From 1954 onwards, Zavattini was writing fewer scripts but teaching more, mainly abroad. He travelled to Communist Eastern Europe and spoke to film students, tactfully encouraging them to cast off the shackles of the official Socialist Realist doctrine and embrace neo-realism instead. He travelled to Latin America and was invited to Cuba in 1959, soon after the Revolution, to help set up Cuba's new Institute of Film Art and Industry. And if he couldn't always get a visa to go to a country in Latin America, the Latin Americans came to him, or if not to him in person then to the Centro Sperimentale di Cinema in Rome, which had been the centre of diffusion of neo-realist doctrine ever since the

early 1940s .

Meanwhile Bazin and *Cahiers du cinéma* were getting less interested in neo-realism. Bazin had always been interested in both the politics of neo-realism – what he called the “École italienne de la libération”, liberation meaning 1945 and its aftermath – and in its aesthetic. His young acolytes, on the other hand, were not interested in the leftist politics of 1945, or indeed left-wing politics at all. But they continued to hold to an aesthetic inspired by neo-realism and Rossellini in particular. *Cahiers* is mostly remembered today for its championing of Hollywood directors such as Alfred Hitchcock and Howard Hawks, but its other idols in the 1950s were Rossellini and Jean Renoir, two great realist film-makers, and when they began to make films themselves it was the close-at-hand examples of Renoir and Rossellini rather than distant Hollywood studio directors who inspired them the most.

Thus François Truffaut, reviewing Roger Vadim’s *And God Created Woman* in 1957 – a film which like *Bitter Rice* was popular largely because of the physical display of its female star Brigitte Bardot – congratulated the film-maker on achieving qualities of “realism and life” and in his own first film *The 400 Blows* (*Les Quatre*



Bitter Rice

cent coups, 1959) kept very close to a neo-realist model of understated acting (most of the time) and straightforward location film-making.

But in two significant respects Truffaut and his group departed from the standard neo-realist model.

Firstly, they preferred to make films based on their own life experience which was that of the bohemian middle class, avoiding working-class subject matters with which they could have sympathy but not in the same way empathy. This had its advantages but it also wiped out the crucial social dimension possessed by neo-realism.

Secondly, they broke the realist illusion by engaging in in-jokes and metacinema, thus reminding the audience that what they were watching was not real life but a film.

The French New Wave was the first in time of a number of new cinemas which sprang into existence between 1959 and 1964. There was a Japanese New Wave which also started in 1959 and borrowed its Japanese title “nuberu bagu”



Francoise Truffaut, *Shoot the Pianist*

forward did not last long and the new cinema either lost its novelty and was absorbed into the mainstream or it was terminated by political repression, as for example in Czechoslovakia with the Soviet invasion in 1968 or in Brazil with a military coup in the same year.

In researching my book *Making Waves: New Cinemas of the 1960s* I noticed an interesting fact and that was the constant reference made by film-makers of the new cinemas to the experience of neo-realism. Time and again, in interviews or other statements by film-makers from France to Czechoslovakia to Japan to Brazil, film-makers then in their 30s or 40s would refer back to an experience they had in their youth of watching neo-realist films, in particular Rossellini's *Paisà* or De Sica and Zavattini's *Bicycle Thieves*. All these young or youngish film-makers were setting out to do something that was not standard practice in the cinema of their country and the newness and difference they were trying to promote did not always push in the same direction but the original source of inspiration was often the same.

How do we trace the lines of inspiration?

In the case of the France the history is not difficult. There was a generalized politico-aesthetic enthusiasm for neo-realism in the immediate post-war years. This narrowed down a purely aesthetic enthusiasm centred on Rossellini, and

from the French name *Nouvelle Vague*. There was the so-called *New American Cinema*, which was never really any such thing but acted as a catch-all phrase for a number of exciting developments outside the mainstream beginning with John Cassavetes' *Shadows*—also in 1959. There was a German “*Junges deutsches Kino*”, launched with a manifesto in 1962. There was a Czech *New Wave*, starting in 1963. There was Yugoslav “*novi film*”, maybe a year or two later. There was Brazil's “*cinema novo*”, 1964, and a brand new cinema in Cuba that started in a small way as early as 1960. In many cases the wave that carried the new cinema

promoted by Rohmer and Bazin in the pages of *Cahiers du cinéma* and elsewhere, leading to the New Wave.

One important feature of the criticism in *Cahiers du cinéma* by the future film-makers of the New Wave was its distaste for French “quality” cinema, compared unfavourably to Hollywood (including cheap Hollywood B-pictures) and to Italian neo-realism.

Curiously, the same phenomenon crops up in Japan, most notably with Nagisa Oshima. Oshima was born in 1932, the same year as Truffaut, and made his first feature, *A Town of Love and Hope*, in 1959, again the same as Truffaut. They therefore had only childhood memories of life before and during the war. They both entered adulthood disliking the quality cinema of their own country. In Oshima’s case, however, this was complicated by a strong sense of betrayal. The country he grew up had been guilty of monstrous crimes, which on the whole it refused to acknowledge. The democratization of Japan promoted by the American occupiers was at best a well-meaning sham. Japanese cinema – the great Japanese cinema of the likes of Kenji Mizoguchi and Yasujiro Ozu – was a sham too, full of aged stereotypes and totally irrelevant to the problems facing the country. Oshima wanted a cinema drawn directly from life and it was his political as well as his aesthetic impulses that drew him towards the neo-realist films that he was able to see when he was a student and later when he went to work in a lowly capacity in the Japanese film industry.

Oshima may also have seen, besides the masterworks of Italian cinema such *Paisà* and *Bicycle Thieves*, some of the minor post-neo-realist Italian films of the late 1950s with settings in the criminal underworld. Certainly criminality is a major theme with Oshima and his early crime films have a similar look to these post-neorealist Italian films. So too do some of the films of his Japanese contemporaries. I would love to know if this is the case or not, but it’s not easy to find out without knowing Japanese and having access to hard to find sources.

Whether it is the case or not, however, Oshima must be put in the category of film-makers who drew what they wanted from neo-realism of the basis of film viewing and maybe discussions with friends over a drink after the cinema, rather than alongside cases where, as with Truffaut, there is an organized line of descent – in Truffaut’s case *Cahiers* and Bazin.

Also to be placed in the Oshima category are American independent film-makers such as Cassavetes and Shirley Clarke. With Cassavetes I don’t in fact know whether neo-realism was a direct inspiration for him. All I can say from a viewing of his first feature, *Shadows*, shot over an 18-month period in 1957 to 1959, is that it looks as if it might be the case and it is also the case that

neo-realism as a model of non-Hollywood film-making was very much “in the air” at the relevant period.

With Clarke however there is no doubt. Clarke was a dancer turned avant-



Shirley Clarke, *The Connection*

garde film-maker who in 1961 shot a feature-length film called *The Connection* about some heroin addicts in New York hanging out waiting for their “connection” (i.e. supplier) to arrive. The film was taken from a play and there are traces of its theatrical origin in the way it was staged. But it is shot in a quasi-documentary style, almost

like *cinéma vérité*. In at least two interviews I have read she refers to the impact on her of seeing neo-realist films and Rossellini’s *Rome Open City* in particular and in one of those interviews she says she had wanted to shoot it in the streets like Rossellini but was afraid of the technical difficulty of doing so with the equipment at her disposal. Mainly what she aimed to do and succeeded in doing was invent a style that would capture the world of her drug-addicted characters and express what she felt to be the truth about their condition, with minimum recourse to the conventions of ordinary film-making, as she thought Rossellini had done with his characters in *Open City*.

So much for France, Japan and the USA. What about Eastern Europe and Latin America?

The first thing to understand about East Central Europe in the post-war period is that most intellectuals in the region, Communist and non-or anti-Communist alike, took their cue from the West. By the West I mean, not America, but Western Europe, from which they felt they had been unjustly cut off by the Cold War and the Iron Curtain. The film industries in those countries were heavily controlled by the government and the Communist Party, which in turn were in thrall to the Soviet Union. There was an official aesthetic doctrine called Socialist Realism which was neither socialist nor realist. Artists of whatever stripe chafed under these restrictions and looked enviously at the West where such restrictions did not apply. In the late 1950s and early 60s there were various thaws and refreezes and film-makers got a bit more freedom and then found it snatched away again. In Poland there was a thaw in 1957 and a freeze again in 1962. In Czechoslovakia there was a freeze in 1959 and a slow thaw from 1962 onwards. Zavattini on his visits understood

the delicacy of the situation and urged film-makers to escape the straitjacket of Socialist Realism and do things differently but without provoking a fight which they were likely to lose. The flexibility of his idea of neo-realism even enabled him to suggest that it was compatible with Socialist Realism although he knew it wasn't. In particular he encouraged students in the film schools to express their "hunger for reality", eschew as far as possible the formulaic construction of socialist heroes and look at the ordinary world of ordinary people around them and build from there. In Czechoslovakia this bore fruit in the form of films like Věra Chytilová's *Something Else* and Milos Forman's *Konkurs* in 1963 and Ivan Passer's *Intimate Lighting* two years later.

But by the time these films were made another western model presented itself for imitation, in the form of the films of the French New Wave, many of which had entered the country to be seen by film students and members of film clubs, if not the general public. New Wave films, notably Truffaut's *400 Blows* but also Alain Resnais' *Hiroshima mon amour*, were much admired and sometimes quoted or imitated – especially the freeze frame at the end of *400 Blows*. So the new cinemas in Eastern Europe were children of neo-realism but also of the New Wave and therefore, you might say, grandchildren of neo-realism as well.



Ivan Passer, *Intimate Lighting*

In Eastern Europe, the transmission of neo-realist influence was mainly informal. In Latin America it was explicit and argued about in print. In Cuba, Julio García Espinosa had received help from Zavattini in making his first feature, *Cuba Dances*. Later he was to argue for what he called "imperfect cinema", a form of film-making far more radical than anything Zavattini had envisaged: film-making that took ordinary stories as neo-realism did and that was unpolished, as neo-realism was, but made a virtue of its imperfection and was metacinematically explicit about the fact of its making (as the New Wave was and neo-realism wasn't). It went further still in seeing formal imperfection

as a political act, making the content of the film provisional, a hypothesis about reality rather than an assertion that this was what reality was. This, it should be said, is something Espinosa said he wanted to do and which would have been possible in 1967 when revolutionary Cuba was still relatively open-minded. But he never really put his idea into practice and had he tried in the 1970s he would not have been allowed to.

Other countries in Latin America picked up on the Zavattinian message. In Argentina Fernando Birri, who had returned home after studying at the Centro Sperimentale in Rome, took the neo-realist path in his *Tire die* (“Throw us a dime”) in 1958. Nelson Pereira dos Santos did the same in Brazil with *Rio North Zone* in 1957 and *Vidas secas* (“Barren Lives”) in 1964 and Glauber Rocha with *Barravento*, also in 1964. These and other films were cheap to make, loosely thrown together, focused on the world of the poor (who in Brazil at least were much poorer than the poor anywhere in Europe) and exemplified a general Zavattinian ethos adapted to local conditions.

But again the New Wave intervenes. The year after making *Barravento* Rocha abruptly declares himself a devotee of Truffaut whom he quotes in order to proclaim the right, indeed duty, of the artist to follow his own individual path in order to express what he believed to be the truth. In Eastern Europe, too, while some kind of neo-realist influenced film-making became the norm, there were also artists like the Hungarian Miklós Jancsó who opted for a distinct and distinctly non-realist personal style. Rocha too moved decisively away from neo-realism or realism of any kind, most spectacularly with *Antonio das Mortes* in 1969, his last Brazilian film before being driven into exile.

I think I have said enough to give a picture of the way Italian neo-realism, having died at home, had a second life across the globe in the 1960s. I think too that I have shown there was no one way in which it enjoyed this global afterlife. The impact could be direct and immediate as with Ray; it could be direct but delayed as with Oshima or Clarke; or mediated by intellectual gurus as with those cinemas influenced by the ideas and teaching of Bazin or Zavattini.

There will, I also think, always be aspirant film-makers discontented with the cinema they see around them who want to go back to basics: a camera, maybe a few lights, a simple story, some friends who can act out the story, a surrounding reality that calls out to be shown to the world.

So long as such aspirant film-makers exist, Italian neo-realism will continue to cast a spell. But neo-realism was more than half a century ago and there are by now other models to follow. The world has changed too. It was, I hope to have shown, uniquely in the 1960s that the cinema and the world were

especially receptive to what films like *Bicycle Thieves*, *Rome Open City* and *Paisà* had to offer.

Filmography:

- 1943 *Ossessione* (Luchino Visconti, Italy)
- 1945 *Rome Open City* (*Roma città aperta*, Roberto Rossellini, Italy)
- 1946 *Paisà* (Rossellini, Italy)
Shoeshine (*Sciusià*, Vittorio De Sica / Cesare Zavattini, Italy)
- 1948 *Bicycle Thieves* (*Ladri di biciclette*, De Sica / Zavattini, Italy)
The Earth Trembles (*La terra trema*, Visconti, Italy)
- 1949 *Bitter Rice* (*Riso amaro*, Giuseppe De Santis, Italy)
- 1950 *Stromboli* (Rossellini, Italy)
The River (Jean Renoir, USA)
- 1952 *Europe '51* (*Europa '51*, Rossellini, Italy)
- 1953 *Umberto D* (De Sica / Zavattini, Italy)
- 1954 *Journey to Italy* (*Viaggio in Italia*, Rossellini, Italy)
- 1955 *Pather Panchali* (Satyajit Ray, India)
- 1958 *Tire die* (Fernando Birri, Argentina)
- 1959 *The 400 Blows* (*Les Quatre cent coups*, François Truffaut, France)
Hiroshima mon amour (Alain Resnais, France)
A Town of Love and Hope (Nagisa Oshima, Japan)
Shadows (John Cassavetes, USA)
- 1960 *Shoot the Pianist* (*Tirez sur le pianiste*, Truffaut, France)
Cuba Dances (*Cuba baila*, Julio García Espinosa, Cuba)
- 1962 *The Connection* (Shirley Clarke, USA)
- 1963 *Something Else* (Věra Chytilová, Czechoslovakia)
Konkurs (Miloš Forman, Czechoslovakia)
- 1964 *Barravento* (Glauber Rocha, Brazil)
Vidas secas (Nelson Pereira Dos Santos, Brazil)
- 1965 *Intimate Lighting* (Ivan Passer, Czechoslovakia)
- 1969 *Antonio das Mortes* (Rocha, Brazil)