We must clearly differentiate between what is simply made to be commercial and what is considered art. Otherwise, “national cinema” will be another tall tale, another limeño fantasy, only one that will undoubtedly be greedy and commercially oriented.

— PERUVIAN FILM CRITIC JULIO ORTEGA, INTERVIEWED IN HABLEMOS DE CINE (AUGUST 1966)¹

South American cinema was especially ripe for the confluence between critic and filmmaker in the mid-1960s, when a growing worldwide trend in cinephilia arrived at the time that filmmaking was becoming possible again (during World War II, cinematic efforts had been halted throughout the continent). In Peru, the emergence of an as yet undefined national cinematic tradition coincided with the coming of age of a group of equally young students at Universidad Católica in Lima. Tired of talking about thematic concerns — such as whether the story was interesting or whether perhaps the film signified something about the filmmaker’s childhood — these young men often called out during postscreening discussions: “hablemos de cine” (let’s talk about cinema!) To “talk about cinema,” particularly in the mid-1960s, meant to privilege the formal structural elements intrinsic to cinema — the mise-en-scène — over all other aspects referenced by a particular film, which the young French critics at Cahiers du Cinéma made fashionable by subsequently making films that received wide international acclaim. In 1965, four limeño² university students, Isaac León Frías, Federico de Cárdenas, Juan Bullitta, and Carlos Rodríguez Larraín, transformed their battle cry into the name of what would become the first and most influential film publication in Peru and the longest-running independent film journal in Latin America: Hablemos de cine.
In addition to writing about the American and European movies that dominated local screens, Peruvian critics paid particular attention to the films produced locally, particularly as feature film production started in earnest in the late 1970s. Reading contemporary critical perspectives alongside the films traces the place of cultural writing within a national discourse, specifically contextualizing the historical trajectory of a developing cinema and the influence of the hablemistas on the aesthetic and narrative choices made by Peruvian filmmakers. Hablemos de cine enjoyed a twenty-year publication run, and the large majority of Peruvian filmmaking fell in quickly with the journal’s overarching ideals of the primacy of traditional mise-en-scène used in genre pictures—even as filmmakers from Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, and Cuba were garnering international attention precisely because of their more militant aesthetic. The journal’s larger, if subtler, role in shaping Peruvian production may also be key to why Peruvian filmmaking remains largely unnoticed internationally even at the beginning of the twenty-first century. By embracing a commercial “Peruvian aesthetic” that was technically proficient and exportable, yet still lacked teeth, Peruvian national cinema remained a still-unrealized “limeño fantasy.”

Film Criticism and National Cinema
Writing about national cinema is not so simple as writing about the films made in a particular country. To do so overlooks who sets the parameters of defining what is “national” and how cinema contributes to this definition; doing so also leaves out the influence debates on canonization have in the development of a national cinematic identity. The relationship between national identity and cinema remains important even in the twenty-first century with the rise of globalized economics and new media (as evidenced by the successful inclusion of terms of cultural exception with specific reference to audiovisual products in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in the 1990s). Ideologically, connecting cinema to constructions of nationhood is relatively simple. Benedict Anderson’s assessment of the nation as “an imagined political community…both inherently limited and sovereign” specifically references the arbitrary notion that “the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion.” Film therefore not only reflects the values, morals, and ideologies of a particular culture but also encourages viewers who share a particular national identity to recognize those values. In providing the images in the first place to be recognized by local viewers, filmmakers also have the power to influence those viewers, as
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Figure 1: Cover of Hablemos de cine 1, originally published as a mimeograph on February 15, 1965. Courtesy of the Filmoteca PUCP Hablemos de cine Archive.
well as the shape of cinema itself. Critics and viewers from outside the culture can then gain the opportunity to observe the arbitrary realities defining “national culture” through tracing nationally produced films over time. Traditionally, most histories of national cinema are written and read primarily through the films.

The trajectory of film products that constitute a developing cinema tells a story about the culture whence it comes, but viewers and critics chronicle, nurture and shape that trajectory. Certain films are canonized as emblematic of “national cinema,” while others are not considered in the process at all because local critics and/or audiences undervalue the cinematic or thematic qualities such films reflect. In a country where national identity is developing, critics gain their greatest power when they choose to recognize or not to recognize specific national markers; that is, to allow a particular film to be categorized as a “national film.” Because the cinematic tradition is not yet strong enough to have these values already determined, the very assessment of these cultural values becomes key to generating and maintaining a sense of national cultural agency. Pierre Bourdieu notes that in the process of validating cultural artifacts, critics also validate themselves:

*The production of discourse (critical, historical, etc.) about the work of art is one of the conditions of production of the work. Every critical affirmation contains, on the one hand, a recognition of the value of the work which occasions it, which is thus designated as a worthy object of legitimate discourse (a recognition sometimes extorted by the logic of the field, as when, for example, the polemic of the dominant confers participant status of the challengers), and on the other hand an affirmation of its own legitimacy. All critics declare not only their judgment of the work but also their claim to the right to talk about it and judge it. In short, they take part in a struggle for the monopoly of legitimate discourse about the work of art, and consequently in the production of the value of the work of art.*

Given the primary role critics play in evaluating local filmmaking, it also becomes necessary to analyze how these evaluations materialize. Analyzing criticism as primary textual material along with the films illuminates the interplay between these two forces and the influences of one on the other in articulating a more complete vision of national cinema. In many ways, Núria Triana-Toribio’s *Spanish National Cinema* uses a similar methodology to provide portrait of contemporary issues within film criticism underlying the development Spanish cinema (a more nuanced, convincing portrait than the somewhat simplified title of
the volume implies). Similarly, Anna Everett’s *Returning the Gaze: A Genealogy of Black Film Criticism, 1909–1949* focuses more on the writing, but the period of the work corresponds to the dovetailing of the Harlem Renaissance and the accessibility of film equipment that led to the earliest manifestations of African-American cinema. Following these contexts, *Writing National Cinema* sketches the lasting effects of the twenty-year publication run of *Hablemos de cine* alongside the history of local filmmaking and film culture from the 1960s onward to the beginning of the twenty-first century.

A Representative Peruvian Film: *La boca del lobo*

Francisco Lombardi’s 1988 film *La boca del lobo* (The Lion’s Den; fig. 2), the film that generated one of the largest audience responses to a local film in Peru, serves as a vantage point from which to view the trajectory of Peruvian national cinema and how local film criticism influenced it. The popular response to its release in 1988 speaks to how Peruvian audience tastes as a larger filmgoing society had been shaped to appreciate this kind of film, one that exemplifies a clear, established “Peruvian aesthetic.” The film is set six years earlier in the Andean town of Chuspi, where a small army group arrives to defend against the presence of Sendero Luminoso (the Shining Path) terrorists. The naïve limeño narrator, Vitín Luna (Toño Vega), and the diverse group that make up the troop are at first unnerved when unseen terrorists come in to disrupt their compound. The guerrillas then kill an ineffective army captain as he tries to accompany a suspect’s transport to another vicinity. Rather than be removed from the area, the soldiers soon fall under the command of Lieutenant Roca (Gustavo Bueno), who Luna initially sees as a grounding force in an otherwise confusing environment. The soldiers admire Roca’s stern nature and train under his inflexible eye, but also discuss among themselves the rumor of an unfortunate outcome of a game of Russian roulette that prevented Roca from having advanced further in his career. Situations do not improve and they do not find the terrorists. Luna then witnesses his best friend, Gallardo (José Tejada), rape a young shopgirl named Julia (Bertha Pagaza), who had herself desired Luna. When she goes to Roca to denounce her attacker, Luna says nothing in order not to snitch on his friend. Out looking for more trouble, Gallardo and another soldier are attacked when they try to crash a wedding party; claiming they were injured by terrorists, they convince Roca to raid the party and bring everyone in for questioning. During these proceedings, however, Roca accidentally kills one of the townspeople. In order to cover up his error, the next morning Roca and the soldiers bring the townspeople to
a nearby ravine, where the soldiers shoot them and dispose of the bodies; Luna, however, refuses to discharge his weapon. Following the massacre, Luna returns to the military post where Roca incarcerates him for insubordination. While the other soldiers fret about having knowingly murdered dozens of innocent people, Luna confronts Roca, calling him a coward for murdering the Indians instead of facing consequences. Insulting his superior’s manhood, Luna challenges Roca to a game of Russian roulette. Faced with the final bullet, Roca asks Luna to shoot him; instead, Luna shoots the wall, saying “You’re dead.” Luna then sheds his uniform and leaves the military compound, deserting his post and heading by foot into the mountains.

Up until the bloodbath, inspired by a well-known 1983 massacre from the region around Ayacucho called Soccos, La boca del lobo appears to be a socially conscious film where the innocent city-dweller learns about corruption among the powerful by being placed out in a fish-out-of-water situation in the countryside. Similar scenes from other films evoke outrage by placing the viewer on the side of the victims. This aligning is most memorably accomplished in the 1971
Bolivian film *El coraje del pueblo* (The Courage of the People) by Jorge Sanjinés; the film documents a massacre in the mining town of Siglo XX by incorporating semi-documentary footage of actual survivors and employing the same people to assist with development of the script. In *La boca del lobo*, however, the mass execution is not the climax of the film: instead, Luna’s conflicted feelings about this event take narrative primacy over the plight of the murdered. Lombardi assures us of this by allowing the soldiers—and the viewers—to sympathize with only one member of the large group of natives who are about to be slaughtered: their guide from an earlier expedition (who actually did not get many lines or much character development prior to his being incarcerated). Throughout the film, Lombardi employs numerous long shots to keep the native population from the town at a distance, while also largely denying them an actual voice; the exception is Julia, notably the sole woman in the film, whose words must speak for the rest of the subjugated town. Any dramatic tension from the massacre is superseded by the Russian roulette sequence, filmed with sharp angles and close-ups of the participants’ strained faces. Contrast this with Sanjinés’s film, which opens the movie with a scene of the army machine-gunning a demonstration of native workers marching across an open field: immediately before the massacre, the camera shows many close-ups and medium close-ups within the groups of the striking workers, giving them equal standing with similar, albeit isolated, soldiers on the hill preparing to shoot.

*La boca del lobo* often earns the sole Peruvian entry in several international retrospectives of Latin American cinema. Alberto Elena and Marina Díaz López’s 2004 collection *The Cinema of Latin America* features the film as one of only twenty-four “representative” films from the region from more than a century of filmmaking in Latin America.7 Mikel Luis concludes his summary of the film for the Spanish collection *Tierra en trance: El cine latinoamericano en 100 películas* by calling the film emblematic of “a trajectory of realistic continuity that seeks to forge the most compact and representative career in all of Peruvian cinema.”8 And in a survey of the best Latin American films, conducted in the 1990s by the film journal *La gran ilusión*, *La boca del lobo* was the highest-placing Peruvian film. The principal idea throughout these reflections is that a particular film can “represent” a national cinematic tradition. To some extent, each critic discusses why *La boca del lobo* is ideally situated within the Peruvian cinematic tradition and articulates specific elements of the mise-en-scène that justify its placement there. Elided in this discussion, however, is the protagonist role that the critics themselves—and specifically, the Peruvian critics associated with *Hablemos de*
— play in establishing the criteria for national representation. La boca del lobo is representative not only because it fits within certain narrative and aesthetic parameters established by other films, but also—and primarily—because it matches those that privileged the value of the auteur and venerated forms reminiscent of American genre films. The assumption of the critic’s objectivity masks the cultural and critical biases that are crucial to understanding how criticism influences the shaping of a particular cultural perspective like national cinema.

At the time of its release, the local critical response to La boca del lobo was overwhelmingly positive; given that this was his fifth feature film, the film also succeeded in confirming an auteurial trajectory for Lombardi, as exemplified in Isaac León’s review for the general newsweekly Caretas:

> While the bonds of domination and aggression remind me of some of his previous work, the prison scene demonstrates some uniquely new qualities in this case since La boca del lobo is Lombardi’s first feature set in an Andean [mountain] town and the surrounding countryside, the first of his films that really features sun and open space. Despite this, the film reproduces familiar claustrophobic conditions (where the persecuted soldiers are as trapped as the people living in the occupied town), but adds a foreboding sentiment through images of the countryside, thus redefining the limits of how to bring out the sense of claustrophobic spaces.⁹

León’s emphasis on Lombardi’s use of the image of the countryside is not accidental. The thrust of the review centers around Lombardi’s careful attention to mise-en-scène: literally, how images are arranged on the screen in service of the larger narrative. What might be taken in another film as a pastoral image of freedom (in a Hollywood context, one might think of the opening and closing shots of Robert Wise’s 1965 film The Sound of Music) instead becomes “foreboding” and “claustrophobic,” and León appropriately credits the fresh use of this image to Lombardi. This kind of criticism—examining the mise-en-scène as a way of venerating a director as an auteur—became popular in Europe in the early part of the 1960s as the primary mode of critique employed by the French film journal Cahiers du cinéma, which had become influential when writers affiliated with the publication (such as Jean-Luc Godard and François Truffaut) became internationally recognized filmmakers themselves. Note that León uses language that also affirms (or reaffirms) Lombardi as an auteur by referencing “his previous work.”
I am privileging the actual wording of the review here because, as Bourdieu notes, the articulation tells us as much about the critics as the film itself. The reference to Cahiers and the auteurs it engendered is even more appropriate in this Peruvian example: as it happens, director Lombardi had also been a critic— schooled in criticism, for the most part, by none other than León, the editor-in-chief at Hablemos de cine for the entire publication run. Particularly because the film was a box-office success in Peru, this critique is mutually beneficial: the favorable review confirms Lombardi as an auteur while the film’s success elevates Lombardi’s former status as a critic and, by association, others affiliated with that publication.

Other than this use of mise-en-scène and the thematic use of the contemporary topic of Sendero Luminoso, the vantage point distanced in time and location exposes the lack of novelty in the film. If it is a “representative” text, its quality has therefore been couched in terms of narrative clarity and comprehension, not innovation. For example, the Russian roulette sequence refers explicitly to Michael Cimino’s 1978 film The Deer Hunter, which reminds viewers that, despite the specific nature of the massacre, the film fits into the tradition of the war film, specifically those expressing the futility of the Vietnam era, whose expressive, expansive shots of the Asian countryside invoke a similarly haunting atmosphere for the American soldiers. Lombardi’s film is unique in being the first to dare confront the contemporary threat involving Sendero Luminoso, which by 1988 was waging a strong campaign in Peru, even disrupting and bombing locations within the capital. Nevertheless the film presents this threat to viewers using familiar—one might say “safe,” unencumbered—narrative techniques based on American examples of the war film genre. The homage to The Deer Hunter actually brings into focus how the Peruvian film mimics a Hollywood war film instead of establishing a unique aesthetic presentation for the local situation. The nationalist terms of that homage are also complicated: the linearity of the film’s narrative structure leads us to sympathize with the young military squad instead of the innocent Andean villagers who were massacred immediately before. León does not comment on this, instead praising the more comprehensible narrative structure being served by the mise-en-scène.

I would like to emphasize two converging elements concerning both La boca del lobo and León’s review. For one, Lombardi’s film is not anomalous as a sample Peruvian film from the 1980s: indeed, this genre-oriented, linear narrative placed in a local setting with careful use of mise-en-scène characterized many Peruvian productions of this time, from José Carlos Huyhuaca’s Profesión:
Detective (1985) to Alberto Durant’s Alias: La Gringa (1991). The most interesting example of this period is actually one that has been rejected by more recent histories of Peruvian cinema: Luis Llosa’s Hour of the Assassin (1987). This film explicitly embraces its status as a simple genre picture, with numerous car chases and shootout scenes characteristic of the American action film. Made in English for the direct-to-video market and produced by Roger Corman’s Concorde–New Horizons Films, the film was released commercially to theaters in Peru as Misión en los Andes (Mission in the Andes), where in recognizing locations audiences could provide an alternate, familiar reading over the otherwise overtly American genre.10 The large box-office returns achieved by each of these films coordinates with positive reviews from Peruvian critics. As the most consistently successful director and the most decorated at film festivals outside of Peru, Lombardi has become emblematic of Peruvian cinema as a whole—so much so that in the early twenty-first century, young critics now refer to all directors from this period as the “Lombardi generation.”

The canonization of Lombardi as a “representative,” “iconic” Peruvian filmmaker, however, can also be seen as the natural outcome from nearly twenty years of debate among film critics at Hablemos de cine. Lombardi’s film in fact embodies the ideal elements critics were looking for in a Peruvian film. Such would be only an interesting side-note if León were writing for a specialized cinephilic audience; we should remember, however, at this point that his review appears for a general readership in a news magazine, evidence that the specialized, analytical language of European film criticism had by the 1980s entered into the Peruvian mainstream.

How did Peruvian cinema get to La boca del lobo? Why has this become the “representative” vision of Peruvian cinema instead of a film from the indigenous perspective? This question is particularly cogent within a Peruvian context, considering that after the 1920s, Latin American cultural identity—and particularly the Peruvian—was caught somewhere between indigenismo, raised largely by socialist intellectual José Carlos Mariátegui and bringing attention to the ethnocentrism that resulted in the subjugation of native cultures, and the call for “civilization over barbarism” emblematized by Argentine Domingo Faustino Sarmiento.11 Moreover, Peruvian filmmaking had existed in the Andean region since the early 1960s when members of the Cine-Club de Cuzco released the feature-length Kukuli in 1961. However, both cinematic production equipment and spectator culture was centered in the capital of Lima, making it as much a “filmic city” as cultural critic Ángel Rama’s “lettered city.”12 Lombardi’s privileging of the soldiers’ perspective in La boca del lobo establishes an outsider’s perspective
that may be read as limeño in the characters’ uneasiness and fear of both the "claustrophobic” Andean countryside and the silent, unfamiliar, and visibly “othered” Andean population. The seeming rejection of indigenismo by critics and the primary Peruvian filmmakers is not surprising given the relatively young age of the primary cinephilic audience, who preferred to look outside for influences. Peruvian critics and filmmakers largely did not look within their own cultural contexts for inspiration but rather confronted representations from Europe and the United States, concerning themselves with aesthetics as a seemingly “neutral” political concern. Within the context of Latin American cinema in general, however, the stalwart political and aesthetic positions of Hablemos de cine—and, by extension, of Peruvian filmmaking in general—are somewhat conservative, which meant that neither attracted the same kind of international attention that was lavished on the cinematic productions and writings from other Latin American countries. Focusing entirely on aesthetic concerns throughout its publication run, the journal avoided the polemic issues that occupied other film journals during the period, such as Cine Cubano or even the French Cahiers du Cinéma. While this unassuming position made Hablemos de cine highly distinctive and assured continued publication and discussions of all kinds of films (long after many other journals closed from lack of interest or were shut down by governmental powers), the Peruvian cinema it helped mold by the end of the 1980s stagnated, resulting in a standard type of genre feature that often, like Llosa’s Misión en los Andes, flirted with the possibility of not even being considered a “national production.” The far-reaching effects of the hablemistas continue into the twenty-first century: as late as 2008, the section on Peru in the International Film Guide (which calls itself “the most authoritative and trusted source of information on world cinema”) was written by Isaac León, even as other, younger critics were available who were more in touch with newer filmmaking trends. These latter-day critics positioned themselves against what they considered the dominant critical mode.

Overview
This book is not so much a strict history of Peruvian national cinema as an examination of how and why that concept was formed and molded by local film critics. As this examination involves tracing the history of Peruvian filmmaking and culture, the book follows a rough chronological trajectory beginning with the period immediately before the founding of Hablemos de cine in 1965. Nonetheless, as there is very little written in English on Peruvian cinema, the primary histories in
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Spanish may be inaccessible for most readers. To aid in the navigation of what might be an unfamiliar cinematic history, chapter 1 offers a brief history of Peruvian cinema from its inception through the early 2000s.

Each subsequent chapter focuses on a particular issue relating to the influence of film criticism on the developing nature of Peruvian cinema. Chapter 2, “Publication, Authority, Identity: Constructing the Film Journal,” begins by tracing the role of cinephilia in film criticism and how this cultish “love of film” in Peru brought together the editors that established the journal. The chapter then explores specifically how film writing—that is, writing about film—nurtured this trajectory of cinephilic identity, how adjustments in the journal’s ideology were reflected through both the writing and physical changes in the publication itself and how the ideology reflected in *Hablemos de cine* became the dominant critical perspective in Peru through a series of coincidental political events in the mid-1970s. Chapter 3, “Shaping Peruvian Taste: ‘Good’ and ‘Bad’ Peruvian Movies” addresses how the *hablemistas* assessed the “quality” of a film with regard to the national, specifically by concentrating on the myriad “unworthy” or problematic Peruvian films released during the first few years of the journal’s run.

Chapter 4, “Latin American Dis/Connections: Peru versus The New Latin American Cinema,” locates the Viña del Mar Film Festivals of 1967 and 1969 in Chile as defining moments for the critics—and for Peruvian cinema itself—within the context of the New Latin American Cinema in the late 1960s. Filmmakers from throughout the continent came together at Viña to discover that many concerns they had thought unique to their situations were common throughout the region. As the Peruvian representatives to both festivals, however, the editors of *Hablemos de cine* also realized how their own national cinema was—or, more precisely, was not—developing within the context of what Zuzana Pick has called a continental project. That *Hablemos de cine* happens to have been published during the rise to international prominence of the much-studied New Latin American Cinema movement forces a consideration of (a) how Peru and this journal fit into such a paradigm, and (b) whether Peruvian critics and/or filmmakers chose deliberately not to be pigeonholed into this movement as it gained momentum through the early 1970s.

Chapter 5, “For a Few Minutes: Considering the Peruvian Short Film Industry,” explores defining national cinema not through feature films, but through the development of a short-film industry through the mid-1970s. Joint efforts by the government of General Juan Velasco to promote Peruvian identity and by the film community (filmmakers and critics alike) to establish a more viable film industry
led to the creation of the Film Law of 1972. Through a tariff levied on all foreign films and an established exhibition circuit established for all locally produced films, the law intended to generate funds for feature filmmaking. While features would be made some five years later, making *short* films that were run in front of all other features in Peru yielded more immediate returns and a profitable short-film industry. *Hablemos de cine* pointedly ignored this format during much of its infancy, but a grudging acceptance led to an eventual realization that the short films were a way to establish *auteurist* trajectories for filmmakers even before they turned to feature filmmaking.

Although four feature films debuted in 1977, which marks a banner year for the rebirth of feature filmmaking in Peru, only Francisco Lombardi emerged into the 1980s anointed as the chosen Peruvian auteur. Chapter 6, “Creating the ‘Lombardi Generation’: The Rise of an Urban Cinematic Aesthetic,” first follows how the critique of Lombardi’s filmmaking career in tandem with that of an equally prolific contemporary feature director, Federico García, was viewed in terms of geographic setting, with the former’s films associated with metropolitan Lima and the latter with the Andean city of Cuzco. These two primary locations colored how both directors’ bodies of work were viewed by *Hablemos de cine* as well as other critics and viewers. This division reflects not only the racial and socioeconomic boundaries that limited both cinemas but also the preferential treatment the Lima-based film journal gave toward situations and ideas with which it was more familiar. The chapter then reflects on how the politics of aesthetics simultaneously grounded the journal’s ideology, enabled it to continue publication for twenty years, and help shape the resultant genre-oriented output of the late 1980s and beyond.

This work of the “Lombardi generation” progressed slowly but steadily until 1994 when, during the first administration of President Alberto Fujimori, the Film Law of 1972 was repealed, sharply ending the short-film industry that had proved a substantial training ground for national filmmakers. This action served to inspire the *hablemistas* to regroup with a new publication entitled *La gran ilusión* with financing from the Universidad de Lima, where many of them now serve as faculty members. The changes in content, structure, and even financing of the new publication make an interesting counterpoint for this “second coming” of *Hablemos*, which published eleven issues before morphing in 2004 into yet another title, *Tren de sombras*, this time published by Universidad Católica.

By the beginning of the twenty-first century, the so-called young boys of Peruvian film criticism are now the establishment. But they are also not the only
Peruvians writing film criticism: weaned on *Hablemos*, writers at three additional film publications—*Butaca sanmarquina* (now *Butaca*), *Godard*, and *Abre los ojos*—provide diverse reflections on the contemporary state of Peruvian cinema. Filmmaking has shifted considerably from the “Lombardi generation,” with product largely developed by a new generation of filmmakers who did not cut their teeth on the short-film industry of the 1970s and 1980s. Likewise, Peruvian film criticism no longer holds the *hablemista* viewing position as sacred, often confronting these progenitors in much the same way that their elders challenged their own contemporaries forty years earlier. One might also question the relevance of local film writing in print during the Internet-heavy beginning of the twenty-first century. Chapter 7, “The Changing of the Guard: Peruvian Cinema in the Twenty-First Century,” looks specifically at the contemporary intersections of Peruvian filmmaking, film culture, and film criticism—and the lingering effects of the *hablemistas* on all three.