

## Films with denomination of origin

### MARGARITA LEDO ANDIÓN

Professor of Audiovisual Communication  
Universidade de Santiago de Compostela  
[margarita.ledo@usc.gal](mailto:margarita.ledo@usc.gal)  
ORCID: [0000-0003-2001-1498](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2001-1498)

#### Abstract

*When assessing the films that were candidates for the Best International Feature Film, the unimpeachable system of the Oscars rejected the film chosen by Portugal because most of the dialogue was in English. It had to be quickly replaced, and a gem was chosen: a film spoken in Cape Verdean crioulo, Vitalina Varela (2020) by Pedro Costa, which premiered in cinemas with subtitles in Galician and Catalan. This is the perfect historical irony of the subaltern language rising above the former colonising language while also representing it. After all, languages are not passive bystanders in the geopolitics within which they are embedded.*

#### Keywords

*Film, minoritised languages, diversity, subtitling, public aid.*

#### Resum

*El gens sospitós sistema dels Oscar, quan va valorar les obres candidates a la millor pel·lícula en llengua estrangera, va rebutjar el film seleccionat per Portugal perquè estava parlat majoritàriament en anglès. La seva substitució precipitada va recaure en una joia, en una pel·lícula en crioulo capverdès, Vitalina Varela, 2020, de Pedro Costa, estrenada en sales amb subtítols en gallec i en català. Ironia històrica perfecta de la llengua subaltern passant per damunt de la del –un dia– colonitzador, al mateix temps que la representa. Perquè les llengües tampoc es poden mantenir al marge de la geopolítica en què s'insereixen.*

#### Paraules clau

*Cinema, llengües minoritzades, diversitat, subtitulat, ajuts públics.*

*Vitalina Varela* hovers over this text, as a symptom of both enjoyment and unease, like a masterpiece that enables us to fit together the two sides of a paradoxical reality which stands out uniquely in the relationship among minoritised languages, or as representation, in films and audiovisuals. The entry we suggest runs through the production of different types of works, but it attempts to reach the shadowy zone of the audience, of those of us who want to see works in our own language and by doing so give it existence. The screen—in all its variations—is the site where this encounter goes from idea to projection; it becomes an event. And if we are concerned with the visibility of the films we produce, it is because of their contribution to acting like a new research variable and social operator to redefine the role of film in minoritised languages in the fields of both film studies and communication policies.<sup>1</sup>

From where we are speaking, albeit with specific situations, minoritised languages in film and audiovisuals are those local languages that are co-official with Spanish, those languages of the nations within the Spanish state: Catalan, Euskara (Basque) and Galician. This is why we draw from an article by Ella Shohat and Robert Stam (1985, p. 35-58), based on a survey—via Russell, Wittgenstein and Derrida; after asserting the equality

of all languages, they note that even though ‘...all languages are created equals, some are made “more equal than others”. Inscribed within the play of power, languages are caught up in artificial hierarchies rooted in cultural hegemonies’. Or simply, because they have mechanisms that discriminate.

#### Eppur si muove...

Some time ago, Philippe Meers, a professor at the University of Antwerp and a touchstone in Flemish film analysis, warned of the need for new clichés, in addition to other approaches to national cinemas, to avoid a kind of standardisation from limiting both the creative freedom of the auteurs and the inclusive power of languages. He mentioned this yet again in the debate at the closing session of the international symposium ‘As linguas e o cinema’ (Santiago de Compostela, 12-13 December 2019). We were discussing what are called ‘small cinematographies’ or, in a more explicit variation, the cinema of small nations, with or without a state, and their different forms of institutionalisation, yet with language as a distinctive feature. Therefore, we were discussing rights and belonging, from the

filming to the showing, to talk about cinema in the original version, in OV. Not hiding the language. We debated the role of OV as a cog in the gears of diversity; its status as 'tangible and intangible heritage'; the right to see and the need for policies that guarantee access to European works in different languages in permanent spaces—beyond the event circuit; and policies that come with the articulation of public networks of cinemas or the design of assistance programmes for independent cinemas, whose goal encompass films 'with an accent' (Naficy: 2001), which are grouped under the label 'Europa Cinemas'.

We were summoned by the RDI project 'Eu\_Vos. Intangible cultural heritage. For a European programme for subtitling in non-hegemonic languages', a research project that continued and incorporated the results of two previous inquiries and ten years of studies and proposals around cinema 'with a denomination of origin' as a topic of interest for public policies, for the field of the creative industries and for intercultural action, a cinema that goes beyond its role as a 'case' to work towards a new model under construction.

Thus, from small cinematographies in minoritised languages as a place of enunciation, beyond some indicators to identify them proposed by Mette Hjort and Duncan Petrie (2007), following qualitative criteria, with the cinema presented by what are called small nations because of their population, geographic size or gross domestic product, we retained the reference to what was once called 'Third Cinema'—with echoes of the seminal text by the Cuban García Escudero, 'Por un cine imperfecto' (For an Imperfect Cinema), of 'Cine Liberación' (Liberation cinema) from Argentina, of Sanjinés and his 'Cine del pueblo' (People's cinema) and of Brazil's 'Cinema Novo' (New Cinema)—which the aforementioned authors conjoin with the cinema of European stateless nations, those nations, they say, which have been subjugated by a dominant nation for such a long time that the power relation turned into a structural issue for both sides. In a previous compilation (Hjort & MacKenzie: 2000), different authors set out to update the definition of 'national cinema' beyond the state apparatus, precisely through the role of cinema in constructing culture, which is not unrelated to what are occasionally called new-new cinemas to distinguish yet connect them to the movements from the 1960s and 1970s.

For this journey, we also include as material the EU's 'Agenda 2020' because it situates us before a pleasant landscape defined by the conjunction between linguistic and audiovisual diversity, just what we set out to observe through cinema as the product which is attributed a substantive role in education—from film literacy programmes to the use of film for learning languages or identities—and especially which is acknowledged to have a transitive role, in the act, not so much as a result of national culture(s) but as an operator so these cultures express themselves, that is, exist. In short, cinema will be a product among other products that creates culture while also being a place that interlinks creativity, economic profitability and social consensus. We are viewing, as a dynamic for imagining

the nation with a purpose similar to other media products, always with echoes of Benedict Anderson (1993) and Martín-Barbero (2014, 15-33), the cinema as a medium yet also as a mediation to leave proof, in the words of the Colombian author, of the long temporality of the cultural in what it means as a permanent contradiction with the increasingly short temporality of the market.

The discursive power of the term *nation*—which is no longer equated with the coercive, conventional state apparatus and has adopted its historical-political meaning as a communal construction, as a social-communicative space—fosters new entries in the classification of films, in addition to stabilising a critical apparatus which we are interested in revisiting.

In terms of the definition of *diversity* as we are applying it in this series of projects between 2009 and 2019, namely 'Cinema, Diversity and Networks', 'Towards the European Digital Space. The role of small cinemas in original version' and 'EU-VOS' encompasses and updates the advice of the Brazilian professor Muniz Sodré when he warned of the need to precisely delineate the term: "Sometimes *diversity* is understood as recognition of the plurality of customs, ways of life and things like that, but to me," he stressed in an interview with *Grupo de Estudos Audiovisuais* of the USC,<sup>2</sup> "it is the occupation of different territories; it is the acknowledgement of one's possession of a place. Diversity is allowing agency; training for action; adopting different communication, economic, financial resources; in short, everything needed to not merely be an object of someone else's gaze". In cinema, for example, it is the capacity for autonomous production, he says.

The cornerstone of this process, the capacity for social intervention with diversity as a reference, is uniquely harnessed through pronouncements and associations, and it can be glimpsed in future programmes that are beginning to bear fruit, as we shall describe below.

### About diversity, distortion and formal declarations

On 17 December 2016, warning that no approved instrument fully recognised or protected language rights in Europe as a whole, civil society organisations like ELEN (European Language Equality Network), UNPO (Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organisation) and others signed the 'Protocol to Ensure Language Rights' (henceforth, the Protocol) in Donosti, Euskadi (the Spanish Basque Country), an action that links up with the state of need in which a reflection like this one is situated by establishing ties between language and identity, and language and reality (society), while attempting to relate it to other realities and distinguish the application of which and what type of measures proposed in each context.

With echoes of UNESCO's position (2009, p. 37) and its decision to go beyond considering languages a mere means of communication to instead think of them in plural as the fabric of cultural expressions and the vehicle of identities,

value systems and worldviews, and drawing from the 2003 report 'Language Vitality and Endangerment', which provides the analysis indicators applied by the Protocol, the idea of 'democratic management of diversity' as an asset of 'a fairer and more equality-based Europe', its introduction is based on considerations like the following:

'All languages are the expression of a collective identity and of a distinct way of perceiving and describing reality and must therefore be able to enjoy the conditions required for their development in all functions. [...] For that reason the signatories of this document think that all language communities have the right to organise and manage their own resources so as to ensure the use of their language in all functions within society, and that they are also entitled to have at their disposal whatever means are necessary to ensure the transmission and continuity of their language.'

However, it would also have to grapple with a political scenario which is also what we detected in an earlier study (Ledo-Andión, López-Gómez & Pérez-Pereiro: 2016, p. 309-331), when we concluded that:

"Between 1996 and 2016 it is possible to discern a certain drift away from the model of a network of interconnected peripheral systems, a model of economic development underwritten by the EU authorities at the beginning of this period, towards a new model of tributaries twenty years later feeding a central European artery of a commercial nature. It is in this variant of the model –and the consequent change of perspective from reconciliation of interests of economic development with interests of sociocultural development to the implementation of a purely economic perspective– that we can find a response to the commercial dysfunctionality (as expressed in EU terms) of the films distributed and exhibited in original version originating in small- and medium-sized countries."

Thus, one of the questions that requires an answer is concealed in the effective sense of what Tristan Mattelart (2013, p. 755-772) calls 'the deconstruction of the notions of national culture and identity which were at the core of the theoretical edifice of the critical political economics of communication' to present them as 'asphyxiators of cultural diversity' by positions which range, according to this author, from the drift of a certain interpretative apparatus from Cultural Studies (CS) to neoliberal think tanks. This which entails a theoretical turn from 'the defence [in the 1970s] of national cultures as the guarantee of cultural diversity', which is precisely where we are situated in the cinema, and role of institutions, to guaranteeing this and countering the utter dominance of the transnational flows which, in short, are captured in the unequal exchange binomial.

Without delving into the dilemmas with regard to certain texts from CS since the 1980s that the text points out, we cannot fail to mention something that is wholly relevant in the sphere of our research and in the sense and urgency of calling

for political measures—ensuring and guaranteeing a subtitling programme—for cinema in non-hegemonic languages like the two dissimilar cases we present here. In line with the Protocol (article 3.2), we believe that the only way to promote linguistic diversity is by facilitating social, political and economic conditions that are favourable to the development of languages.

### A few theoretical notes

With the goal of locating certain contradictions in the latent state pollinating academic thinking, our reference-source on the meaning of the national is the phase that Anderson provides in *Imagined Communities* (1993, p. 25), the critical essay that hovers over the thinking about the construction of the nation in the historical process and in different geopolitical spaces: regardless of the inequality and exploitation that may actually prevail in each case, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal community. And we take up a wish that the Quebecois ethnographer, poet and filmmaker Pierre Perrault made when he said that nations are born from memory, but memory is not lacking in imagination. We thus activate the value of this new fragment for a loving discourse which crosses the experience of cinema in minoritised languages to set our attention on what we call the 'State of the Art', in all its intimacy and essential variations, which we capture in this snapshot anchored in the conclusions of the aforementioned research projects, the indicators of a new discourse which does not exclude the political from the analysis of cinematography or, if you will, institutional responsibility in cultural production, access and consumption.

1. **New notations in the field of thinking** which, with the nation-state as the sole territory of analysis, separates itself from this dominant institutional framework and works its way towards other notions, like stateless nations, to consider it a social-communicative space that, if needed, will use language as the hallmark of a millenary identity. Worth citing in this regard is the work of Schlesinger (2000) and the opening of a logic that contemplates the use of a local language in film and the right to maintain it in all the places where films are exhibited and circulated, a logic which leads us directly to subtitling policies, which have been avoided in European programmes until quite recently.
2. **Changes in scholarly production**, which give rise to classifications like the one by Stephen Crofts (2006, p. 44-58), which is sometimes contested from conservative positions because it includes a section for 'regional or national cinemas whose culture and/or language distance themselves from the nation-states which enclose them', and which points towards a qualitative methodological change by highlighting small nations (with or without a state) in a situation of conflict and summons the (ideological and political) reasons for their denial or concealment.

3. **Stabilisation of a critical apparatus** which, as Philippe Meers comments regarding the book *The Cinema of Small Nations* (2007), a summary of the first two decades since this position was taken, calls for a more nuanced analysis of a series of small national cinematographies. The emergence of what Meers calls 'sub-national', alongside standard adjectives like *international*, *regional* or *global*, is complemented with visions-sources such as those of Higson (1989) and his paper 'The Concept of National Cinema' to Elsaesser (2015), who calls for national cinema to be part of the political-cultural process, and Christie (2013), who points out that cinema can become national 'in the sense of speaking by and for the nation at times of political crisis and liberation'.
4. **The audience as subject** in the assemblage between formation, production, distribution and exhibition. And thus emerges what in the short term has to do with the construction—at home and abroad—of an audience, an aspect that Andrew Higson questions in the aforementioned article. When examining the parameters for national cinema he focuses 'on the activity of national audiences and the conditions under which they make sense of and use the films they watch' and concludes with this question: 'For what is a national cinema if it doesn't have a national audience?'

### Declarations and mediation framework

Obviously, all of the above runs parallel to, if not intertwined with, changes in mediation institutions mentioned above, such as UNESCO, which we choose as a manifestation of the power relations between different interests, which translates into both progress and regression. Thus, Jacques Guyot, a professor at the University of Paris 8 and a contributor to the Grupo de Estudos Audiovisuais (GEA), presents a diachronic interpretation of UNESCO's position in an article published in *Quaderns del CAC* by comparing the content of the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (2001) and the Convention on the Promotion and Protection of Diversity with Cultural Expressions (2005). He cautions about a regression in the latter compared to the text from the dawn of the millennium, in addition to the (self-interested) omission of communication policies or explicit references to the hegemony of certain languages in the media system, including the social media.

'The preamble to the 2005 UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions states that "linguistic diversity is a fundamental element of cultural diversity" and emphasises the vital role of education in promoting the languages of the world. This reminder is surely beneficial and would be even more so if the recommendation in question (which on the whole seems rather laconic, since it is never once repeated in the 100-page document) was on the one hand explicitly defined (what is meant by "linguistic

diversity"?) and, on the other hand, led to concrete measures.' (Guyot: 2017, p. 29-35)

We shall now focus on the guiding principles and vicissitudes of the consequent measures to be implemented which are contained in certain European documents. After all, in order to become a programme with an official implementation date, significant progress is needed on visibilisation, possibilities of exchange and recognition of the cinematographies which we are spotlighting.

Ever since the Council of Europe member states ratified the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (ECRML) in Strasbourg in 1992, an array of international, state and local initiatives have all highlighted the structural role played by non-hegemonic languages in the development and preservation of cultural diversity. One example is the aforementioned 2009 UNESCO World Report, which associates plurilingualism and translation with fostering intercultural dialogue, and it calls for the formation of national policies on the functional use of all the languages in a given society. Another example is the Opinion of the European Committee of the Regions on protecting and developing historical linguistic minorities under the Lisbon Treaty.

On a practical level, in 2013 the European Parliament added a provision to the Erasmus+ and Creative Europe programmes that includes financial assistance for subtitling as a way of facilitating the accessibility and circulation of European works. In September of that same year, the Parliament approved a Resolution on endangered European languages and linguistic diversity in the European Union. Likewise, in a qualitative turn in the sphere of political responsibilities, this document suggests considering linguistic diversity a fundamental right.

However, in its implementation in certain areas which only complete the process with their circulation and exhibition, like cinematography, this cumulus of position-taking tends to become mere routine, if not mere description. This is attested by the EU itself in the recent 'Conference on Language Technologies and Digital Equality in a Multilingual Europe' (27/09/2018). Sponsored by the Greens and the European Free Alliance, with the Euro MP Ana Miranda from the Bloque Nacionalista Galego (BNG) as one of the organisers, the participants on the digital equality panel criticised the lack of a regulatory framework and specifically the non-binding nature of the Charter for Regional and Minority Languages for the member states. In this sense, the constant calls for attention directed to Spain—and the regional government (Xunta) of Galicia—were outlined in the reports on noncompliance with the commitments stemming from this charter written by the Council of Europe expert committees.

### A bedevilled decade of regression

Convinced that the interstices of the official structure always offer a more open playing field, to provide an overview of the issue we will look back at an initiative—we believe it is the only

one—that enlisted the support of a president of the government, Rodríguez Zapatero. We shall do so via the press:

‘...yesterday, Wednesday, was a historic day in the Senate. After two intense hours of debate, the plenary of the upper chamber definitively approved the expansion of the use of the co-official languages with 134 votes in favour, 115 against and no abstentions. Starting 1 January 2011, Catalan, Galician and Basque—and Spanish, of course—may be used when discussion motions in the Parliamentary chamber.

‘The cornerstone was laid on 28 April when PSOE agreed to take the proposal signed by 34 nationalist senators into consideration.’

Juanma Romero, *Público*, 22/07/2010

One year later, the regional chamber approved a motion to promote cultural diversity and guarantee citizens’ right to access film and audiovisual contents in their original version, with an explicit reference underscoring the promotion of measures to develop the range of products available in their original version in the official languages of the autonomous communities, in addition to an emphasis on incorporating these contents into education in order to improve language learning, once again specifically mentioning the official languages of the autonomous communities.

One decade later it is paradoxical—and a paradox cannot be solved; instead, an alternative must be offered, as Walter Benjamin said—that the practical indicators turned into a dead letter of the declarations of this—shall we say touching—motion.

Once again in a public context, in early April 2021, an array of organisations— A Mesa pola Normalización Lingüística (Galicia), Kontseilua (Basque Country), Ciemen and Plataforma per la Llengua (Catalonia), Escola Valenciana and Acció Cultural del País Valencià (Valencia) and Iniciativa pel Asturianu (Asturias)—managed to get the Congress of Deputies to approve a resolution on the multilingual reality and linguistic equality.

Comings and goings, precarity and urgency... instability is still the term that defines the fond yearnings of language, cinema and audiovisuals, fond yearnings which, to differing degrees, afflict specific language, cultural and communication policies of the governments of Catalonia, the Basque Country and Galicia, which are qualitatively very different. They take advantage of the juncture of elections and reappear through social entities, in the case of the Plataforma per la Llengua in 2021, which is calling for the law on cinema approved by the Parliament to be fulfilled, while also looking at other platforms to demand that the government ‘promote the supply of TV series and films dubbed and subtitled in Catalan on online platforms, while condemning the fact that in late 2019 there were only four titles in Catalan on Netflix’.<sup>3</sup>

These fond yearnings are also what can be heard in those thumps behind the door when the Galician writer and translator María Reimóndez and the musician Éric Dopazo, based on the

experience of audiovisual consumption during the pandemic, wondered: ‘why do some people do it in their own language and others don’t? (*por que algunas [persoas] poden facelo na súa lingua e outras non?*)’ They said this in a Change.org campaign for the catalogues of HBO, Netflix, Movistar+, etc. to include contents in the Galician language. In addition to highlighting the passiveness of the Galician regional government, the petition described having these services in Galician as vital and lists reasons like job creation, the international community’s familiarisation with Galician and the contribution to global linguistic diversity.

### The profession and academia are in cahoots

And in this diffuse map, a new temporality emerges which comes to occupy specific spaces through well-defined practices and objectives called to embed the pieces that remain institutionally separated, either purposefully or randomly. We are referring to the appearance of associations like Próxima Cine, established on 15 May 2000, which brings together more than 100 distributors, and Promio, a network of independent cinemas whose founding act dates from 29/09/2020.

In its bylaws—articles 4.1 and 4.2— Próxima Cine states one of its objectives is ‘to strengthen the visibility and trajectory [of independent cinema] nationally and internationally, as well as to defend cinema in the co-official languages of the state in original version subtitled in Spanish’. It also points to the audience as the common task of each and every sector, both creation and exhibition, which are called to collaborate to ‘increase the number of film spectators we defend, with the clear intention of integrating and working together with all parties involved in the film industry to project quality cinema that defends cinema as culture’.

In a similar vein, objectives 1, 2 and 3 in Promio’s approach mention screen quotes for the sake of ‘promoting diversity in films shown’, of ‘facilitating access to a cinema showcase for films that represent our cultural richness and the different realities and languages of the state’ and of promoting original version and/or subtitling. Thus, in the public presentation that this association made as part of the European Film Festival of Seville in November 2020, when comparing the situation with other nearby countries, in which we are included by number of screens, revenues and attendance (France, United Kingdom, Germany and Italy), after underscoring their work in favour of cultural diversity, they drew attention to the lack of any protective measure similar ‘to what our European colleagues enjoy’.

Similarly, just a few days later, Promio took a series of steps in this regard towards the institutions with responsibilities for cinema policies, beginning with the Institute of Cinematography and the Audiovisual Arts (Instituto de la Cinematografía y de las Artes Audiovisuales, ICAA), to which it applied for a specific assistance programme for cinemas. Its arguments describe

the specificity and general state of independent cinemas and the difficulty of the situation because of the pandemic, while recalling its efforts to distribute that other cinema. Finally, it calls for 'recognition by the Administration on par with our European peers' and formulates three specific proposals. The first refers to the timeliness of a call for funding for diversity in programming, which would not only increase the number of cinemas in the Europa Cinemas network, Promio explained, but would be 'designed so that those cinemas that already receive some type of regional aid [Basque Country, Catalonia] can also consider slightly increasing the diversification of the programming in order to reach the European standards, and for those autonomous communities that do not have stimulus measures to be able to design them based on the existing models'. The second proposal cites the urgency of completing the digitalisation of the cinemas, and the third one looks towards the figure of a mediator to 'regulate and settle potential conflicts among the different cinematographic activities'.

Finally, distribution and exhibition, the most forgotten links in the chain, are revealed to be fundamental in everything related to cinema.

In order for the potential audiences for the films in veiled languages, that audience long subjected to modes of spatial distribution and a temporal sequencing based on 'day and date' which define the industry and the constant appearance of new titles that quickly become obsolescent (Verhoeven: 2011); that public which was segregated in hierarchical circles which classified the zones from the centre to the outskirts, from the home countries to the diasporas and peripheries, from the places inhabited towards the spaces of consumption—large shopping centres, captive in circles that did not break with digital distribution—simultaneously—which are accentuated with the selection of works and languages by the hegemonic platforms; in order for that public to also have the opportunity to be one with the same rights as any other audience, but to do so the institutions acting on their behalf need to support both original and subtitled versions as the step from participation in festival circuits to independent cinemas, to places of encounter and a substantive part of the resources and functions that give body to the cinema. Because we cannot forget that the distribution and exhibition are what make the screens light up.

And we've saved for last an extract of the results of the EU-VOS project as a pleasant symptom. The standard portrait of experts who contributed to these results from academic (34.7%), professional (57.1%) and institutional (8.2%) fields is a person aged 48.16 years, most of them male (67.3% versus 32.7% women), 79.3% of whom live in Spain (Catalonia:14.3%; Basque Country: 24.5%; Galicia: 24.5%, other: 16.3%) and 20.4% in the rest of Europe.

We have extracted the themes with the most consensus—over 90%—in the responses to the 49-item Delphi questionnaire organised around five main thematic areas: 1) Demand for film productions in non-hegemonic languages and programmes to support creation and dissemination; 2) Dubbing, subtitling and

preservation of European linguistic diversity; 3) Subtitling from/to non-hegemonic languages; 4) Other forms of audiovisual content distribution in non-hegemonic languages, and 5) Status of translating and subtitling in non-hegemonic languages in Spain.

Of the opinions worth highlighting as both recommendations and possibilities, we chose five that condense factors examined in this article and solely depend on political will:

1. The promotion and support of film productions in non-hegemonic languages should be addressed at a state, not regional, level.
2. The EU should guarantee funds for the development of programmes to stimulate the subtitling of films from/to non-hegemonic languages.
3. The public financing of subtitling in non-hegemonic languages should include transferring the operating rights in order to foster their distribution/exploitation on multiple platforms (cinemas, festivals, TV stations, etc.).
4. The subtitles financed or created under the aegis of public financing should be done and evaluated according to quality criteria agreed upon by expert committees made up of experts in linguistics and audiovisual translation. And it is worthwhile highlighting the dominant opinion that subtitles should be a public responsibility (departments of cultures in the administration, cinemateques and libraries, public television, etc.).
5. The distribution of subtitled contents in non-hegemonic languages by OVD platforms might improve the status and/or use of those languages.

## Coda

We began this text with *Vitalina Varela* as a pleasant symptom and yet a kind of ailment afflicting the film-language binomial. Why, we ask? Because in its two sides, as a repressed meaning (symptom), as a problem, or as a pleasure (*sinthom*), as *jouissance*, to maintain the term with what Lacan explains and which I know through the application of the realist Slavoj Žižek (2006) in 'Alfred Hitchcock, or is there a right way to remake a film?', I presage that only by revealing what has been rendered invisible, in our case, cinema in minoritised languages, will we be able to work on the diversity-cinema relation like that Lacanian 'enjoyment that becomes real, like that story which we tell ourselves which, adapting the lyrics and music of Reimóndez and Dopazo, is in our way of speaking, thinking, feeling, deciding.

## Notes

1. With this common thread, in [www.estudiosaudiovisuais.org](http://www.estudiosaudiovisuais.org) you can see our three latest projects: *Cine, diversidad y redes* (Cinema, diversity and networks). (2009-PN119); *eDCINEMA: Hacia el Espacio Digital Europeo. El papel de las cinematografías pequeñas en versión original* (eDCINEMA: Towards the European Digital Space. The role of small cinematographies in original version). (2012- PN071) and *EU-VOS: Patrimonio Cultural Inmaterial. Para un programa de subtítulo en lenguas no hegemónicas* (EU-VOS: Intangible cultural heritage. For a European programme for subtitling in non-hegemonic languages). (CSO2016-76014-R).
2. Held on 30 May 2013 at the conference Ibercom: Comunicación, cultura e esferas de poder. Santiago de Compostela, 29-31 May 2013.
3. See *Ara. Cultura*, 21 January 2021, Xavi Serra, "El cinema entra en campanya".

## References

- ANDERSON, B. *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Londres: Verso, 1983. Spanish edition: *Comunidades imaginadas*. Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1993. ISBN: 98789681638672.
- BERGFELDER, T. "National, transnational or supranational cinema? Rethinking European film studies". *Media, Culture & Society*, 2005, maig. Vol. 27, 3, 315-331.
- CHRISTIE, I. "Where is National Cinema Today (and We still need it?)". *Film History*, 2013. Vol. 25. 1-2, 19-30.
- CROFTS, S. "Reconceptualising National Cinema/s". In: VITALI, V.; WILLEMEN, P. (eds.) *Theorising national cinema*. London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006. ISBN: 978183902841.
- ELSAESSER, T. "Cine transnacional, el sistema de festivales y la transformación digital". *Fonseca, Journal of Communication*, 2015, 11, July-December, 175-196.
- GUYOT, J. "The 2005 UNESCO Convention or the lack of thought concerning linguistic diversity". *Quaderns del CAC*, 2017, 43, vol. XX- July, 29-35. [https://www.cac.cat/sites/default/files/2019-01/Q43\\_Guyot\\_EN.pdf](https://www.cac.cat/sites/default/files/2019-01/Q43_Guyot_EN.pdf)
- HIGSON, A. "The concept of national cinema" *Screen*, 1989, 30 (4), 36-47.
- HJORT, M.; PETRIE, D. *The cinema of small nations*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007. ISBN: 9780253220103.
- KONTSEILUA. *Protocol to Ensure Language Rights*. Donosti: Kontseilua, 2015. [http://protokoloa.eus/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/protokoloa\\_en.pdf](http://protokoloa.eus/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/protokoloa_en.pdf)
- LEDO ANDIÓN, M.; LÓPEZ GÓMEZ, A.; PÉREZ PEREIRO, M. "Cine europeo en lenguas de naciones sin estado y pequeñas naciones". *Revista Latina de Comunicación social*, 2016, 71, 309-331. <http://www.revistalatinacs.org/071/paper/1097/17es.html>
- MATTELART, T. «Sobre la deconstrucción de la "diversidad cultural"». *Denken Pensée Thought Myśl, e-zine de Pensamiento Cultural Europeo*, 2013, 44, 755-772.
- MARTIN BARBERO, J. "Diversidade em convergencia". *Matrizes*, 2014, 8 (2), 15-33. <https://www.revistas.usp.br/matrizes/article/view/90445/93216>
- MEERS, P. "The cinema of small nations". *Historical Journal of Film, Radio & TV*, 2011, March. Vol. 31, 1, 147-149.
- NAFICY, H. *An accented cinema. Exilic and Diasporic Filmmaking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001. ISBN: 9780691043914.
- SCHLESINGER, P. "The sociological scope of nacional cinema". In: HJORT, M.; MACKENZIE, S. (ed.). *Cinema and nation*. London and New York: Routledge, 2000. ISBN: 9780415208635.
- SHOHAT, E.; STAM, R. "The cinema after Babel: language, difference, power". *Screen*, 1985, 26, 3-4, pàg. 35-58.
- UNESCO. *Language Vitality and endangerment*. UNESCO: Paris, 2003. [http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/pdf/Language\\_vitality\\_and\\_endangerment\\_EN.pdf](http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/pdf/Language_vitality_and_endangerment_EN.pdf)
- UNESCO. *Investing in Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue*. UNESCO: Paris, 2009. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000184755>
- VERHOEVEN, D. "Film Distribution in the Diaspora. Temporality, Community and National Cinema". In: MALTBY, R.; BILTEREYST, D; MEERS, P. (ed.). *Exploration in New Cinema History*. Malden and Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011. ISBN: 9781405199490.
- ZIZEK, S. *Lacrimae rerum. Ensayos sobre cine moderno y ciberespacio*. Madrid: Debate, 2006. ISBN: 8483066599.