

Michał Pabiś-Orzeszyna

Conflict Management: The Camerimage Festival and the Dialectics of Prestige

'We started as a way to turn the spotlight on these great, underappreciated artists whose work reaches across cultural boundaries and reminds us of our common humanity.'

Marek Żydowicz, founder and director of The International Film Festival of the Art of Cinematography Camerimage

'And once the painters of canvases have their national honors, why not the painters of ceramics? Once the makers of short films and sitcoms are eligible for international awards, why not those who make music videos or television commercials? And once that occurs, why should music video makers in the developing world have to look to London, Cannes, or Los Angeles for the laurels of directorial genius instead of to their own, more proximate cultural centers?'

James English, *The Economy of Prestige*

In this essay, I analyze the International Film Festival of the Art of Cinematography Camerimage (hereafter Camerimage) as an example of struggle in the field of film production. The notion of struggle is an *élan vital* to every festival. Films, their creators, and sales agents struggle for awards, struggle to be in competition, and struggle to achieve wide — indeed, sometimes any — distribution. At most festivals, producers participate in pitching sessions and compete for financial support. What is more, journalists compete for interviews with auteurs, while viewers stand in line to see the latest Alfonso Cuarón film. As illustrated by the title of the recent publication *Films Need Festivals/Festivals Need Films*,

- 1) See 2014 conference program at <<http://www.cefs.cz/konference.html>> and reports by Barbora Ligasová (*Illuminace*, vol. 26, no. 4 /2014/, pp. 119–121), and Łukasz Biskupski and Michał Pabiś-Orzeszyna (*Illuminace*, vol. 26, no. 4 /2014/, pp. 114–118).
- 2) See 2015 SIECE V conference program at <<http://www.cefs.cz/konference.html>>; this year's conference takes place in Bratislava, Slovakia.

festivals themselves compete for movies. Their struggles justify global *savoir-vivre* and legitimize the classifications of the International Federation of Film Producers Associations (FIAPF).¹⁾ Also, because of the recent proliferation of festivals,²⁾ their fight for recognition in a field where 'to exist is to be different', as Bourdieu famously put it, results in quantitative domination of specialized thematic events, and fosters distinct entry strategies.³⁾ The very logic of this field — or, as James F. English argues, 'the logic of proliferation' — requires festival founders 'find their niche'.⁴⁾ According to English, this dialectical process never ends

[b]ecause the cultural field is a relational one, the logic of furious propagation does not tend, as practically all commentators have imagined it must, toward saturation. It is in fact completely wrong to suggest that the field must by now be crowded with redundant awards to the point of their mutual suffocation. On the contrary, each new prize that fills a gap or void in the system of awards defines at the same time a lack that will justify and indeed produce another prize.⁵⁾

At first glance, Camerimage would seem a prime example of how effective this strategy can be. Founded in 1993 by the art historian Marek Żydowicz, this festival outlined its objectives from the get go. Its intention was to honor the best cinematographers and promote the value of their hitherto underappreciated work, which meant contributing 'to the growth of cinematographers' prestige' irrespective of the genres or formats in which they worked. The first seven editions of Camerimage took place in Toruń, Poland, where Żydowicz hosted ceremonies bestowing awards upon influential filmmakers and industry-insiders, from Sven Nykvist and Vittorio Storaro to Victor Kemper of the American Society of Cinematographers, and Bobby Arnold of the film equipment manufacturing

- 1) See Steven Gaydos, 'Battle behind the Scenes'. *Variety*, <<http://variety.com/2003/scene/markets-festivals/battle-behind-the-scenes-1117891416/>> [accessed 10 August 2015].
- 2) The rapid proliferation of film festivals is acknowledged in most scholarship on this subject. See Dina Iordanova, 'Introduction', in: Dina Iordanova with Ragan Rhyne (eds.), *Film Festival Yearbook 1: The Festival Circuit* (St Andrews, Scotland: St Andrews Film Studies, 2009), pp. 1–2. Also see chart depicting 'the rise of the prize in cinema: number of film awards per 1,000 films produced, worldwide, 1900–2000' in James F. English, *The Economy of Prestige: Prizes, Awards, and the Circulation of Cultural Value* (London: Harvard University Press, 2008), p. 324. According to English 'There are now more film prizes awarded each year than there are feature films produced'. Ibid.
- 3) For an analysis of the emergence of the themed film festival format see Marijcke de Valck, 'Rotterdam and the Rise of Thematic Festivals. From Cinephile Initiatives to Popular Events', in: *Film Festivals. From European Geopolitics to Global Cinephilia* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007), pp. 163–202. Today it seems obvious that the proliferation of film festivals intersects with the development of academic research. See Skadi Loist and Marijke de Valck, *Film Festivals / Film Festival Research: Thematic, Annotated Bibliography Compiled for the Film Festival Research Network*, <<http://www.filmfestivalresearch.org/index.php/ffrn-bibliography/>> [accessed 10 August 2015]. This impressive database is constantly updated. Listed articles and books are not organized by publication date, and the database's very purpose seems to stem from practicality — to facilitate the exchange of ideas and support research — rather than bibliometrical; yet most articles listed were written in the last ten years.
- 4) See English, 'The Logic of Proliferation', in *The Economy of Prestige*, pp. 50–67.
- 5) See English, *The Economy of Prestige*, p. 67. On the other hand the 'process can at times devolve to the specification of almost laughably narrow cultural niches — 'Nobels' of such minor and eccentric domains as to seem artistic equivalents of the 'Miss Congeniality' award'. Ibid. p. 65.

company Arri. In 2000, the festival moved to Łódź, a city known internationally as the birthplace of the 'Polish Film School'. However, despite rapid growth both in both prestige and popularity, it found itself in conflict with the local government, which saw it relocate to Bydgoszcz — a medium-sized city of 350,000 inhabitants located in the North of the country. According to agreements between Camerimage and this city's municipal council, the festival is set to stay in Bydgoszcz until 2017. There have, however, been no attempts to change its non-generic, cinematography-centered profile or to replace Żydowicz. The stability of the festival's brand identity, coupled with the fact that Camerimage occupies a stable position in the local film production field, may help to support its differentiation strategy.

What needs stressing here is precisely how the history of this festival has been told by its organizers: a story of the success of an 'unconventional' and 'unique' 'alternative to traditional film festivals'.⁶⁾ This bottom-up self-narrative is not entirely untrue. Differentiation based on traditional distinctions such as film genre does indeed differ substantially from the emphasis Camerimage places on cinematography, a profession often dismissed as 'technical'. Accordingly, in this essay, I argue that, although the very character of this festival may be intuitively understood as a challenge to the 'autonomous' field of art — to a logic based on the strategic depreciation of 'technical' and 'technological' aspects of filmmaking — Camerimage has nevertheless earned a strong position in the local film production field.

Camerimage's self-narrative of a revolutionary strategy of 'otherness' reminds us of the neoliberal concepts of 'one simple idea', 'find your niche', or 'take a leap'. These buzzwords and phrases of cognitive capitalism and the so-called new economy largely undermine the complexities, temporal dimensions, and material conditions of the struggle for recognition in a given field. For this reason, this essay draws from Bourdieu's understandings of 'strategy' and of 'habitus' as a 'principle enabling agents to cope with unforeseen and ever-changing situations'.⁷⁾ Accordingly, in the final part of the essay I suggest that the case of Camerimage shows how competition for legitimacy hinges on a 'practical sense' of how to exploit external — historically and geographically rooted — resources of capital, to convert different types of capital, and to capitalize on various conflicts.

Estimating legitimacy: bureaucracy as a tool for understanding the field

In order to appreciate how its distinct strategy of acquiring legitimacy by differentiation emerges from Camerimage's conduct, we need to recognize that this festival occupied the role of a struggling albeit ultimately successful agent, the principal objective of which was to contribute 'to the growth of cinematographers' prestige'. At the same time, we should note that its actions were somewhat risky given that within their cultural field cinematographers are routinely dismissed as 'technical' workers whose contributions are subordinat-

6) For phrases including 'unconventional', 'unique', and 'an alternative for traditional film festivals' see 'About us' description on the festival website <<http://www.camerimage.pl/en/miedzynarodowy-festiwal-sztuki-audiotow-zdjec-filmowych-camerimage.html>> [accessed 15 August 2015].

7) Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), p. 72.

ed to the 'creative' labor of directors and actors. Under these conditions, we might ask whether Camerimage really holds the status of a prestigious film event; whether it truly is legitimized.

To answer this question we must consider how cultural events such as Camerimage are evaluated culturally. Cultural economists largely agree that market value measurement tools are poorly suited to estimating the value of festivals.⁸⁾ For this reason, research into such events is enriched by Bourdieu's work, particularly its highlighting of the various different forms of capital which imbue agents with value. In this sense, Bourdieu is correct when he suggests that 'Creative economy — as the former Polish Minister of Finance Jerzy Hausner put it — is much more focused on brand value than on annual profits (a key indicator in the industrial economy).'⁹⁾

In 2009, the brand management consultancy Millward Brown estimated the annual market value of the Camerimage brand to be around PLN 7,117, 000 or about US\$1.8 million.¹⁰⁾ This sum may seem impressive; however, it is a poor indicator of the event's position in the local field of production, not only because economic capital is not the most reliable gage of value in this case, but also because of the absence of a means of comparison. While fields are always relational, no estimates of other polish festivals' brand values are available.¹¹⁾ What is more, the advertising value equivalency of Camerimage also fails fully to capture its value.¹²⁾ A more fruitful measure may therefore be to consider the individual and institutional players in this field.

Admissions provide an obvious indicator of an event's public recognition. Each year, during eight days of screenings, Camerimage typically attracts about 70,000 festival-goers.¹³⁾

-
- 8) See Dominic Power and Allen J. Scott, 'A Prelude to Cultural Industries and the Production of Culture', in Dominic Power and Allen J. Scott (eds.), *Cultural Industries and the Production of Culture* (London and New York: Routledge: 2004), pp. 3–15; W. Douglass Shaw, Judy Rogers, 'Review of Non-market Value Estimation for Festivals and Events. A Discussion Paper, Draft report submitted to the Ontario Tourism Board by Research Resolutions Ltd. Inc. Toronto, Canada Shaw', <<http://tourism.tamu.edu/impacts/Review%20of%20Non-market%20Value%20Festivals%20and%20Events%20Final.pdf>> [accessed 10 August 2015].
- 9) Jerzy Hausner, 'Kultura i polityka rozwoju', in Jerzy Hausner, Anna Karwińska, Jacek Purchla (eds.), *Kultura a rozwój* (Warszawa: Narodowe Centrum Kultury, 2013), p. 93.
- 10) 'Oświadczenie Włodzimierza Tomaszewskiego', *Dziennik Łódzki*, 15 August 2012. In 2009, Camerimage was hosted by the City of Łódź. Millward Brown estimates the market value of 'non-financial contributions' from the festival organizers to the Camerimage Łódź Center Company (launched to coordinate the construction of the conference center building).
- 11) A comparison with overseas festivals would not be especially useful in this instance because of changing exchange rates and differences in purchasing power between countries. Research into the estimated market value of the Sundance Film Festival has focused on the expenditure of visitors and the profits from distribution agreements signed there. Both of these indicators fail to provide adequate tools for estimating levels of legitimacy within the cultural field however. See Jan Elise Stambro, 'The Economic Impacts of the 2014 Sundance Film Festival', <http://www.sundance.org/pdf/press-releases/Economic_Activity_Report_Sundance_Film_Festival_2014.pdf>; 'Sundance Infographic 2015: Dollars and Distribution', <<http://www.cultural-weekly.com/sundance-infographic-2015-dollars-and-distribution/>>.
- 12) According to festival organizers, the annual advertising value equivalency stands at PLN 7,000.000 (US\$1.7 million). See Marta Leszczyńska, 'Żydowicz o Camerimage: "Dobrze czuję się w Bydgoszczy, ale..."', *Gazeta Wyborcza. Dodatek Bydgoski* 22 March 2015.
- 13) For precise data see <<http://www.camerimage.pl/pl/Camerimage-2014-6.html>> [accessed 10 August]. It is worth mentioning that since 2010 Camerimage takes place in Bydgoszcz, medium-size town without significant numbers of students which is not a popular tourist destination.

Such numbers are comparable with Poland's other major film festivals. The Warsaw Film Festival, categorized by FIAPF as a Competitive Feature Film Festival, draws an average of about 100,000 people.¹⁴⁾ A similar number attend the T-Mobile New Horizons International Film Festival in Wrocław, categorized as a Competitive Specialized Feature Film Festival.¹⁵⁾ By contrast, the Krakow Film Festival, categorized as a Documentary and Short Film Festival, secures an audience of about 25,000.¹⁶⁾ The prominent position Camerimage occupies in the field relative to these other internationally 'legitimized' festivals therefore clearly derives from factors other than admissions or differences in profile.¹⁷⁾

In 2012, visitors to the 28th Warsaw Film Festival could attend a panel discussion on 'Polish Festival Majors', an elite group the organizers suggested comprised the four aforementioned events.¹⁸⁾ In the trade press, Anna Wróblewska emphasized that the establishment of this alliance of 'festival giants' was intended not only to promote good practices in this industry but also to protect the field's existing hierarchy from up and coming events such as Warsaw's Planete+ Doc Film Festival and Kraków's TVN Off Plus Camera.¹⁹⁾ Wróblewska's description of these developments calls to mind the dialectic of consecrated players and newcomers Bourdieu outlines in *The Rules of Art*.

A comparison of annual budgets of the four 'consecrated' Polish film festivals reveals that Camerimage surpasses the 'FIAPF three'. It is the main recipient of grant programs established by the most powerful player in the Polish field of film production, the Polish Film Institute (PISF) (see Table 1 and Table 2).²⁰⁾ Camerimage's profile is also underwritten by consistently generous financial support of a level not afforded either Warsaw or New Horizons, in spite of their comparable operation expenses.²¹⁾ While levels of such sponsorship might depend largely on the quality of grant applications and financial reports, they also represent a mark of recognition within the field; an indicator of the collective faith in their suitability as investees. In this case, investment risk is seen not simply in economic terms, but symbolic terms as well. By officially supporting a given project, PISF effectively allocates economic and symbolic capital.

It is also imperative we recognize that, even though it is a prominent player in the Polish field of film production, PISF operates independent of the bureaucratic field of power. Financial decisions are made by PISF's director and 'expert commissions' consist-

14) For precise data see <<http://www.wff.pl/en/historia/>> [accessed 10 August 2015].

15) Data provided by Marcin Pieńkowski, T-Mobile New Horizons International Film Festival press spokesman.

16) Data provided by Anna E. Dziedzic, Krakow Film Festival press spokeswoman.

17) Except for Camerimage, these events are the only Polish festivals accredited by FIAPF; and partly because of this they articulate a traditional film festival discourse focused on art cinema, centralizing directors, and linking with popular tourists destinations.

18) Panelists included Stefan Laudyn (WFF founder and director), Krzysztof Gierat (KFF director), and Marek Żydowicz (Camerimage founder and director). Roman Gutek (NH director) did not participate.

19) Anna Wróblewska, 'CentEast. Sojusz wielkich festiwali', <<http://www.sfp.org.pl/wydarzenia,48,11592,1,1,CentEast-Sojusz-wielkich-festiwali.html>> [accessed 17 August 2015].

20) On the role of the PISF in Polish cinema see Anna Wróblewska, 'Polska produkcja filmowa po roku 2005 w perspektywie badań ilościowych', *Images*, vol. XIII, no. 22 (2013).

21) In making this comparison I do not include the Gdynia Film Festival. PISF supports Gdynia with the largest amount of money (a total of PLN 4 700 000 from 2012 to 2015). The 'national' specificity of this event is the main reason for its special treatment. One might say that GFF plays in its own league, and this is why we should be careful when including it in comparisons like the one made above.

Table 1: Annual expenses of the Polish 'festival Majors'²²⁾

	Camerimage	New Horizons	Warsaw Film Festival	Krakow Film Festival
2012	No Data Available	No Data Available	No Data Available	No Data Available
2013	No Data Available	No Data Available	No Data Available	No Data Available
2014	PLN 6,000,000 (US\$ 1,500,000)	PLN 5,155,000 (US\$ 1,288,000)	PLN 6,500,000 (US\$ 1,625,000)	PLN 2,347,100 (US\$ 586,000)
2015	PLN 6,000, 000 (US\$ 1,500,000)	PLN 5,073, 000 (US\$ 1,268,000)	PLN 5,650,000 (US\$ 1,412,000)	PLN 2,405,000 (US\$ 601,000)
	PLN 12,000,000 (US\$ 3,000,000)	PLN 10,228,000 (US\$ 2,557,000)	PLN 12,150,000 (US\$ 3,037,000)	PLN 4,752,000 (US\$ 1,187,000)

Table 2: Financial support granted by PIFS as a part of Grant Program for Education and Culture Popularization²³⁾

	Camerimage	New Horizons	Warsaw Film Festival	Krakow Film Festival
2012	PLN 640,000 (US\$ 160,000)	PLN 640,000 (US\$ 160,000)	PLN 640,000 (US\$ 160,000)	PLN 360,000 (US\$ 90,000)
2013	PLN 640,000 (US\$160,000)	PLN 640,000 (US\$ 160,000)	PLN 640,000 (US\$ 160,000)	PLN 500,000 (US\$ 125,000)
2014	PLN 700,000 (US\$ 185, 000)	PLN 640,000 (US\$ 160, 000)	PLN 640,000 (US\$ 160,000)	PLN 400,000 (US\$ 100,000)
2015	PLN 700,000 (US\$ 185,000)	PLN 640,000 (US\$ 160,000)	PLN 640,000 (US\$ 160,000)	PLN 500,000 (US\$ 125,000)
	PLN 2, 680,000 (US\$ 670,000)	PLN 2,560,000 (US\$ 640,000)	PLN 2,560,000 (US\$ 640,000)	PLN 1,760,000 (US\$ 440,000)

ing of representatives from the local cultural field. According to the Polish Act on Cinematography — a foundational act in contemporary Polish film production field ratified in 2005 — each commission includes experts from a list drawn up annually by the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage,²⁴⁾ comprising representatives of the film community and 'leaders of opinion'. In 2015, this list named some 314 individuals, including directors, cinematographers, writers, film critics, and scholars.²⁵⁾ The choices these players make tend to mirror the general perceptions of the dynamics and relations characterizing the field. The institution represented by individual players acts in a 'reasonable' manner, profiting from the fact that its habitus and position in the power field enable it to perform

22) Source: <<https://www.pisf.pl/dotacje/dofinansowane-projekty>> [accessed 10 August 2015].

23) Ibid.

24) See 'Ustawa z dnia 30 czerwca 2005 r. o kinematografii', Dz.U. 2005 nr 132 poz. 1111, p. 12.

25) See <https://www.pisf.pl/files/dokumenty/po_2015/po_produkcja_filmowa/lista_ekspertow_pisf_2015.pdf> [accessed 12 August 2015].

what Bourdieu calls 'practical anticipations' — performative acts at once reflecting and re-producing the field's internal dynamics.²⁶⁾

Specific institutional trust placed in Camerimage finds expression in the support it is provided by the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage and the City of Bydgoszcz (see Table 3). Applications for ministerial grants are also evaluated by the field's representatives. In 2015, the steering committee of its 'Artistic events — Priority no. 4 — Film Grant Program' consisted of the screenwriter Michał Zabłocki, the director of the National Film Archive Andrzej Goleniewski, and the Head of the PISF's Department of Film Culture Dissemination and Promotion Anna Sienkiewicz-Rogowska.

Table 3: Financial support from Ministry of Culture and National Heritage (Grant Program for 'Artistic events — priority no. 4 — film') and City of Bydgoszcz

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Ministry of Culture and National Heritage	PLN 600,000	PLN 600,000	PLN 600,000	PLN 600,000	PLN 600,000	PLN 600,000
The City of Bydgoszcz	PLN 2,500,000	PLN 2,500,000	PLN 2,500,000	PLN 2,500,000	PLN 2,500,000	PLN 2,500,000

The strong presence of film professionals in the bureaucratic system exemplifies the modern 'culture of experts' paradigm. The influence they exert on mechanisms of financial support also reflects what Tomasz Zarycki and Tomasz Warczok have described as the 'intelligentsia hegemony'.²⁷⁾ Drawing on the work of the sociologists Gil Eyal, Ivan Szelenyi, and Eleanor Townsley, Zarycki and Warczok argue that, in the semi-peripheral sphere of Central Europe, a substantial amount of cultural capital lies within the power field. Their findings contrast to the preeminent role Bourdieu assigns economic capital in France, and to the case of Russia where huge amounts of power sit with political capital owners (the post-communist bureaucracy). These scholars' findings help us to explain why the mechanism of financial support is very much an 'internal affair' in the Polish field of film production, with support from the municipal council even reflecting internal industrial trust. The financial support Camerimage has recently received was mandated by three-year agreements signed respectively with the City of Bydgoszcz in 2011 and the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage in 2015.

In all of these cases we see in operation a form of faith institutional and individual players share in an investment opportunity. As noted above, what at first sight appear to be purely bureaucratic decisions are in reality the products of a strategy-generating habitus

26) A more accurate measure of the festival within the local film industry should include an analysis of 'big data' pertaining to the presence of community members at the Camerimage event, as well as the future of awarded — or simply screened — movies (their distribution, reception etc.) and their creators (their prospective employment etc.). Juxtaposing knowledge of funding mechanisms with data on industry representative practices and their careers is beyond the scope of this essay.

27) See Tomasz Zarycki and Tomasz Warczok, 'Hegemonia inteligencji: Kapitał kulturowy we współczesnym polskim polu władzy — perspektywa 'długiego trwania'', *Kultura i Społeczeństwo*, no. 3 (2014).

derived in part from a 'feel for the game'.²⁸⁾ Decision-makers holding strong positions within the field make 'suitable' decisions; their choices are at once representative, inasmuch as they represent an effect of field recognition, and performative-reproductive, insofar as they represent a form of support epitomized by investments of economic and symbolic capital.

It is becoming increasingly clear that institutionally rooted decision-makers and members of award panels are quite similar. The 'reasonable', albeit on occasion seemingly irrational, decisions of festival juries are prefaced by a collection of 'suitable' decisions made by 'experts' to support the festival. And it is with this in mind we might better recognize the paradox of how a profoundly revisionist project — one with a strong heterogeneous energy — may be consecrated within the autonomous cultural field.

Achieving legitimacy: conflict management, currency exchanges, and the founding myth

'Cinematographers are given the rock star treatment at Camerimage.'

Variety, '50 unmissable film festivals.'

These are the ones who are also the most deprived of specific capital, and who (in a universe where to exist is to be different, meaning to occupy a distinct and distinctive position) only exist in so far as — without needing to want to — they manage to assert their identity (that is, their difference) and get it known and recognized ('make a name for oneself') by imposing new modes of thought and expression which break with current modes of thought and hence are destined to disconcert by their 'obscurity' and their 'gratuitousness'.

Pierre Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art.
Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*

Unless we ourselves take a hand now, they'll foist a republic on us. If we want things to stay as they are, things will have to change. D'you understand?

Tancredi in *The Leopard*

The strong position Camerimage occupies in the Polish field of film production is in many ways surprising. As noted above, this festival can be seen to pose a challenge to the field's logic in terms of both its focus on 'non-commoditized art' and its creative spirit. Bringing attention to a particular occupational group — to a profession generally rather than exceptional individuals — significantly differs from the collection of legitimized strategies

28) Bourdieu explains the notion of strategy that governs the nominal opposition between 'the conscious or unconscious character of strategies': 'Habitus is what you have to posit to account for the fact that, without being rational, social agents are *reasonable* — and this is what makes sociology possible. People are not fools;

English dubs 'differentiated imitation', which undergird those festivals devoted to a particular genre, theme, style, aesthetic or format. Those festivals built around a specific profession are few and far between,²⁹⁾ with institutions geared to supporting art cinema typically drawing hierarchical distinctions between awards for 'creative' and 'technical' talent. This internal division of awards for professionals such as cinematographers, makeup artists, special effects artists, and editors engenders a struggle over the sanctity of the art of creative practitioners like directors and actors, with awards for technical personnel bordering on the abjective. Such awards are perfunctory within the context of the other awards granted at festivals; although in principle this situation may change if 'subordinate' professions are afforded the opportunity to determine their relative status within the award-giving hierarchy. We might ask if this is indeed happening at Camerimage, where cinematography is approached in three interlocking ways: in terms of technological support, craftsmanship, and teamwork.

Technological support highlights the non-human dimensions of film practice. At Camerimage the heterogeneity of cinematography manifests in a somewhat fetishistic display of technical devices including cameras, rigs, tripods, trolleys, and cranes. This parade of practical objects approximates the industrial zones and markets run at most traditional film festivals.³⁰⁾ Yet, where festivals typically underplay such events as if a little embarrassed by their mere presence, Camerimage showcases the value of technological devices by for example showcasing the newest model of Arri lenses in an oft-frequented festival hall.

The notion of craftsmanship in film practice is centralized during workshops and seminars at which practical knowledge is exchanged. Yet the importance of craftsmanship also extends to the festival program and to competition rules. Positing practical skill as a key criterion to evaluate film blurs the boundaries between high-end Hollywood fare and more marginal 'independent' cinema, along with the structuring contrasts of Hollywood and Europe, commerce and artistry, auteurs and artisans, and so on.³¹⁾ For example, the main competition of Camerimage 2013 included *Rush* and *Shirley — Visions of Reality* (both 2013). In the same year, the 3D Film Competition jury considered *Avatar* (2009) and *Pina* (2011); one year later, *Fury* (2014), Godard's *Goodbye to Language 3D* (2013), *Mr. Turner*, and *Dawn of the Planet of the Apes* (both 2014).³²⁾

they are much less bizarre or deluded than we would spontaneously believe precisely because they have internalized, through a protracted and multisided process of conditioning, the objective chances they face. They know how to 'read' the future that fits them, which is made for them and for which they are made (by opposition to everything that the expression 'this is not for the likes of us' designates), through practical anticipations that grasp, at the very surface of the present, what unquestionably imposes itself as that which 'has' to be done or said (and which will retrospectively appear as the 'only' thing to do or say). See Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc J. D. Wacquant, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), pp. 129–130.

29) This short list consists of Macedonia's Intl. Cinematographers' Film Festival Manaki Brothers (Bitola), the International Festival of Cameramen 'Golden Eye' (Tbilisi), the London Festival of Screenwriters, and EdiFest LA.

30) See Dina Iordanova, 'The Film Festival as an Industry Node', *Media Industries Journal*, vol. 1, no. 3 (2015).

31) On film festivals as spheres of film practice alternative to the Hollywood mode of film practice see Thomas Elsaesser, 'Film Festival Networks: The New Topographies of Cinema in Europe', in *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press 2005), pp. 82–107.

32) Although big-budget Hollywood products occupy important places at Europe's major film festivals, programmers tend to isolate them from other showings by way of a 'special screening' format. The intermingling

The notion of teamwork in cultural production is inherently imbued with something of a revisionist critique inasmuch as it counters the Romantic notion of creative autonomy many traditional festivals promote. Whether conscious of it or not, Camerimage founder and director Żydowicz effectively invoked a famous Erwin Panofsky metaphor when he suggested

[a] film is like a gothic cathedral. It is brought into being as a result of a creative co-operation of artists of various professions — all directed by [a] 'magister operis', the director. It is mainly directors and actors (who are like sculptures and paintings decorating the cathedral) who attract attention at festivals, competitions or film reviews. The role of cinematographers and their importance as contributors to the visual effect of the whole construction — the final shape of the film picture — is usually underappreciated.³³⁾

Żydowicz's statement captures something of Camerimage's 'no red carpet' ethos, a characteristic of the festival routinely mentioned by visiting journalists. In 2006, for instance, Nick Holdsworth of the American trade paper *The Hollywood Reporter* described the exceptionality of Camerimage thusly: 'The chance to spend time in the company of like-minded professionals and filmmaking aficionados in an atmosphere that is both intimate and relaxed — there are no red carpets here — is a more likely explanation.'³⁴⁾ A year later, another US trade paper *Variety* suggested '[t]he event's intimacy allows attendees to mix with talent in a highly accessible atmosphere where there are no velvet ropes and VIP lounges.'³⁵⁾ This conspicuous absence of markers of prestige was also noted by Chris Patmore of the magazine *MovieScope*, who wrote:

Because the festival's remit is to showcase the best in cinematography, there is no clamour for premieres and red carpet events, instead they are great films with fantastic images followed by Q&As that have intelligent questions from people who both understand the work and want to know more about how it was achieved.³⁶⁾

of Hollywood and independent films at festivals sometimes provokes outrage, as evinced by an anecdote told by the actor Tim Robbins: 'Cannes is a very strange mixture of the art of film and total prostitution of film (...) One of the things I remember from my first year here in 1992 is walking into a room and meeting a great actor like Gérard Depardieu and then walking out and seeing this poster of a woman with large breasts holding a machine gun. The film wasn't made yet, but they already had a title and an ad concept'. Quoted by Kenneth Turan, *Sundance to Sarajevo. Film Festivals and the World They Made* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002), p. 21.

33) See <<http://www.camerimage.pl/en/miedzynarodowy-festiwal-sztuki-autorow-zdjec-filmowych-camerimage.html>> [accessed 12 August 2015].

34) Nick Holdsworth, 'Crafting an image', *Variety*, <<http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/news/crafting-an-image-143130>> [accessed 12 August 2015].

35) '50 unmissable film festivals', *Variety*, <<http://variety.com/2007/film/markets-festivals/50-unmissable-film-festivals-1117971644/>> [accessed 12 August 2015].

36) Chris Patmore, '21st Camerimage Festival report', *MovieScope*, <<http://www.moviescopemag.com/market-news/featured-editorial/21st-camerimage-festival-report/>> [15 August 2015].

While networking plays a key element role in the film festival field, as the press coverage cited immediately above demonstrates, it is also important we acknowledge the dominant discursive construction of traditional film festivals. Camerimage is depicted as offering an alternative to their 'general practices', including the great man theories of cinema they tend to propagate. This apparently proved too much for the director Wim Wenders who received Camerimage's Award to the Director with Unique Visual Sensitivity in 2006. 'It is not a festival for those who behave like a diva,' recalled Żydowicz about Wenders, adding: 'When he stayed on the stage for like half an hour talking about himself before steeling the limelight from awarded lenser Robbie Miller, I said to him that I would not accept it. I know it was not diplomatic but here at Camerimage no one gets respect for free.'³⁷⁾ It is clear that this emphasis on a combination of technology and craftsmanship, paired with a rejection of the notion of individual vision, poses something of a challenge to the autonomous logic of the field in which Camerimage finds itself. That this discursive struggle for legitimacy translates into a material struggle would seem to support film director Andrzej Wajda's 1993 proclamation that this festival was a 'risky initiative with dubious evaluation criteria.'³⁸⁾

However, if we are indeed better to understand the dialectics of this particular struggle, it is also necessary we recognize that Camerimage's strategies have never been quite as unambiguously critical of the film festival status quo as they may initially appear. The ambivalence characterizing Camerimage's philosophy toward cinematographers as elite artists is recognized by the cinematographer Phedon Papamichael, who suggested 'it's such a terrific, warm event, and cinematographers love it because they are truly appreciated and treated like artists'³⁹⁾. The profession of cinematography, one might argue, is in reality apt to pair a revisionist perspective with notions of high art. Even the emphasis on collectivity conveyed by Żydowicz through his aforementioned cathedral metaphor ultimately imbues creative practice with a sense of the spiritual. What is more, it needs stressing that the majority of the awards Camerimage bestows include in the titles they carry the rather grandiose phrase 'unique visual sensitivity' instead of something more down-to-earth such as 'taught manual proficiency'. One can trace the hidden spirit of conservatism in Camerimage's invocation of cultural capital back to the 'Polish film school', to its contemporary the Łódź Film School, and to the city of Łódź itself.

The notion of pre-1990s Polish cinema as an art cinema has been propagated internationally by a range of influential tastemakers including the Hollywood auteur Martin Scorsese — care of his Masterpieces of Polish Cinema project — and the directors of photography Jerzy Wójcik, Mieczysław Jachoda, Jerzy Lipman, and Witold Sobociński. Moreover, the promotion and reception of directors like Andrzej Wajda, Roman Polański, Wojciech Jerzy Has, and Krzysztof Kieślowski as aesthetically sophisticated Polish filmmakers has helped to build a modernist reputation for the output of the country. This cultural capital has in turn been transformed into social currency. As far as Camerimage is concerned, this phenomenon gathered momentum since the year 2000 when the festival

37) Quoted by Jakub Wiewiórski, 'Camerimage Gang', *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 12 February 2010.

38) Ibid.

39) Quoted by David Heuring, 'D.P. Showcase Camerimage Benefits From Razor-Sharp Focus', *Variety*, 4 November 2014.

relocated from Toruń to Łódź — a visually arresting city replete with striking post-industrial ruins; one of the birthplaces of Polish art cinema; alma mater to the bulk of the aforementioned filmmakers. This decidedly un-touristy anesthetic charm, in conjunction with the modernist reputation of Polish cinema, has helped the organizers of Camerimage to convince prominent players in the international cinematic field to invest cultural capital into this otherwise semi-peripheral initiative.

The exploitation of resources rich in cultural capital, along with its conversion to social capital, are fundamental to understanding Camerimage's strategy as one rooted in the accumulation of cultural capital. The number of 'special awards' given to festival attendees exceeds that given to those actually competing there. This practice started at the very first edition of Camerimage in 1993, since which time the 90 competition awards were easily surpassed by 157 special awards. The latter includes standards such as the 'Lifetime Achievement Award', but crucially others appear specifically tailored to accumulate social capital. These have included a 'Special Award from Cinematographers to an Actor for Visual Valor' bestowed upon John Malkovich in 2001, and an Award for 'Taking Care of Artistic Vision and Helping Transfer it to Film Stock' given to Kodak three years later. Camerimage has also doled out awards under its 'friends of the festival' banner, including the 'Special Medal for Immense Contribution to the Development of Camerimage Festival' given to the director Arthur Hiller in 1994 and the cinematographer Victor J. Kemper in 2000, the 'Award for the Idea Inspiring the Creation of Camerimage' given to German filmmaker Volker Schlöndorff in 2002, and the 'Friend Of The Festival' Badges awarded annually from 2012. This strategy connects Camerimage to collective authorship. Indeed, in a number of interviews, Żydowicz has bestowed the 'guiding spirit' title upon prominent figures from the international production field, including the Italian cinematographer Vittorio Storaro, his Swedish counterpart Sven Nykvist, and the American Conrad Hall. The rhetoric of collective authorship also builds social and cultural capital by developing a network of associates whose symbolic capital can be appropriated as a consequence of a fairly standard strategy-generating habitus.⁴⁰⁾

The threshold between social and cultural capital is exemplified by the case of David Lynch. By his own admission, Lynch fell in love with both the city of Łódź and the Camerimage festival upon his first visit in 2000:

When I first came to Łódź, I was astonished', explained the American director, 'Winter sunlight, heavy grey clouds, factories, old houses with devastated walls, trees without leaves — this all conjuncted. (...) I felt in love with Łódź because this is one of the few places where poverty does not deprive people from their energy. (...) if you want to experience something shockingly authentic, visit Łódź.'⁴¹⁾

40) I concur with Bourdieu when he writes 'The problem of the conscious or unconscious character of strategies, thus of the good faith or cynicism of agents which is of such great interest to petty-bourgeois moralism becomes nonsensical'. Quoted by Bourdieu and Wacquant, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, p. 129, note 83.

41) 'Tu się zdarzy cud. Z Davidem Lynchem rozmawia Krzysztof Kwiatkowski', *Newsweek*, no. 53 (2009).

While perhaps a little trite, Lynch stresses how the anesthetic city ruins of Łódź draw cultural capital by way of invoking discourses associated with high art. Lynch would film his short *The Green Room in Lodz* (2005) and parts of the feature-length *Inland Empire* (2006), both co-produced by Camerimage organizer the Tumult Foundation, in this city. In 2000, he also received two special awards: the Golden Frog for Visual Valour in Direction, and The Golden Frog for a Duo, shared with director and cinematographer Frederick Elmes. Having been awarded the Order for the Contribution to Polish Culture in 2003, Lynch would also receive the Lifetime Achievement Award for Directing in 2012. The partnership between Lynch and Camerimage arguably reached an apotheosis however in 2005 with their plan to build a film studio and a conference center in Łódź for an estimated PLN 500,000,000 (US\$125,000,000).⁴²⁾ The Lynch Studio would include a set, a music hall, postproduction facilities, and workshops for crafts including sculpture, pottery, upholstery, and jewelry. Designed by the esteemed architect Frank Gehry, the 37,000 m² Camerimage Łódź Center was set to boast screening rooms, conference facilities, a television studio, and exhibition space. Billed as a 'second Guggenheim' — and said to be bankrolled by the City of Łódź, the Ministry of Culture and Heritage, and the European Union — it soon became clear that this project, which had received international attention, would never happen.⁴³⁾

Łódź city council ultimately withdrew its financial support for Camerimage Łódź Center in 2010, leading the Lynch Studio to be put on ice and to the festival relocating to Bydgoszcz.

While the limited scope of this essay prevents a thorough account of this saga, its most significant development — 150 mainly student supporters of the project occupying council chambers for six days in protest at the council's decision — is worth stressing because

42) For a detailed account of the project's history see Konrad Klejsa, 'Surrealne sny o łódzkim Bilbao. Camerimage i architektura' in Ewa Ciszewska and Konrad Klejsa (eds.) *Kultura filmowa współczesnej Łodzi*, (Łódź: Wydawnictwo Państwowej Wyższej Szkoły Filmowej, Telewizyjnej i Teatralnej im. L. Schillera w Łodzi, 2015).

43) See R. B. Doyle, 'The Hollywood of Poland Reclaims Its Industrial Past', *The New York Times*, 8 January 2012; Michał Chaciński, 'Lynch Rallies Lodz for Art Center', *Variety*, <<http://variety.com/2008/film/markets-festivals/lynch-rallies-lodz-for-art-center-1117980530/>> [accessed 15 August 2015]. This project has even been discussed by Slavoj Žižek. Considering my earlier account of Łódź and its anesthetic charm, the style of Žižek's account is worth quoting at length: 'In November 2003, after a visit to Poland, where he participated in the Camerimage festival and opened an exhibition of his own paintings and sculptures in Łódź, David Lynch was completely fascinated by this truly 'post-industrial' city: the big industrial centre with most of the steel works and other factories in decay, full of crumbling grey concrete housing developments, with extremely polluted air and water. Lynch wants to invest money there to create his own cinema studio, and help to transform Łódź into a thriving centre of cultural creativity (Peter Weir and Roland Joffe are also linked to this project). Lynch has emphasized that he 'feels very much at home in Poland' — not in the Romantic Poland of Chopin and Solidarnosc, but precisely in this ecologically ruined Poland of industrial wastelands. This news once more confirms Lynch's extraordinary sensitivity, on account of which we should be ready to forget his reactionary political statements, as well as his ridiculous support for a New Age megalomaniac project of a mega-centre for meditation. The post-industrial wasteland of the Second World is in effect the privileged 'eventual site', the symptom point from which we can undermine the totality of today's global capitalism. We should love this world, up to and including its grey decaying buildings and sulphurous smell — all this stands for history, threatened with erasure between the post-historical First World and the prehistorical Third World.' See Slavoj Žižek, 'Burned by the Sun', in Slavoj Žižek (ed) *Lacan: The Silent Partners*, (London: Verso, 2006).

it reflected and allowed stakeholders to rearticulate the ideological standard of a conflict between autonomous art and heterogeneous political structures. Thus, Żydowicz publically announced that, in addition to pursuing legal action, local scholars should join the sit-in and discuss art and culture with the young campaigners.⁴⁴⁾ That their protest proved unsuccessful was — and is — largely beside the point. After all, it was primarily a performative gesture designed to accumulate symbolic capital by staging a confrontation between radical artistic autonomy and municipal bureaucracy, thereby linking Camerimage to notions of art.

The act of overwriting the heterogeneity of cinematography with discourses of autonomous art is writ large in a DVD blurb for *Tumult Over Łódź* (2013), a documentary co-produced by Camerimage organizers.⁴⁵⁾ It reads:

A distinctly unusual film edited almost entirely using archival footage collected over twenty years of Camerimage film festival, television news, amateur photos posted online by anonymous authors, official recordings from Łódź city council sessions, as well as eye-catching animations and hip-hop music videos. Everything shot in a variety of formats and techniques, from analog to digital. This unusual conglomeration provides a perfect backdrop for a dramatic and emotional story about the fate that has befallen the New Center of Łódź and the wonderful artistic plans destroyed by political intrigue, shortsightedness of decision makers and, finally, by simple greed and avarice. It is also a film about a struggle in defense of honor and dignity, about gradual accumulation of hatred and the great strength that lies in high art. The film features the greatest contemporary filmmakers from all over the world, while the story, narrated by former mayor of Łódź Jerzy Kropiwnicki, revolves around David Lynch, Frank Gehry and Marek Żydowicz. We also witness young local students who go on strike in defense of culture by occupying municipal building for a week.

Conclusion

In *The Economy of Prestige* James English rightly suggests that '[i]deologically, the prize offers particularly rich opportunities to test and affirm the notion of art as a separate and superior domain, a domain of disinterested activity which gives rise to a special, nontemporal, noneconomic, but scarce and thus highly desirable form of value'.⁴⁶⁾ This essay has examined the Camerimage festival's struggle for legitimacy, arguing that the very specificity of this event may appear to pose a challenge to the field of film production and the ideology of autonomous art. Where I suggested that at least some revisionist elements are constantly present in this festival's own discourse, its prominent and stable position in the local field hinges on its long-term accumulation of both cultural and social capital.

44) Quoted in 'Marek Żydowicz okupuje Urząd Miasta!', *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 6 January 2010.

45) Tumult Foundation is the Camerimage organizer. The word 'tumult' means the same in Polish as it does in English.

46) English, *The Economy of Prestige*, p. 52.

Moreover, within the logic of 'differentiated imitation', Camerimage maintains its status by neutralizing any heterogeneous dimensions of cinematography and by spotlighting the autonomous spirit of this profession.

Michał Pabiś-Orzeszyna teaches at the School of Media and Audiovisual Culture, University of Lodz, Poland. His Ph.D. thesis examined methodological change in cinema historiography since the 1980s, including the influence of media archeology. He is currently researching the social history of the Polish media industries.

Film Cited: *Avatar* (James Cameron 2009), *Dawn of the Planet of the Apes* (Matt Reeves, 2014); *Fury* (David Ayer, 2014); *Goodbye to Language 3D* (Jean Luc Godard, 2013); *Inland Empire* (David Lynch, 2006)); *Mr. Turner* (Mike Leigh, 2014); *Pina* (Wim Wenders, 2011); *Rush* (Ron Howard, 2013); *Shirley — Visions of Reality* (Gustav Deutsch, 2013); *The Green Room in Lodz* (David Lynch, 2005); *Tumult Over Łódź* (Leszek Cichoński, 2013)

SUMMARY

Conflict Management. The Camerimage Festival and Dialectics of Prestige

Michał Pabiś-Orzeszyna

This article is a case study of The International Film Festival of the Art of Cinematography Camerimage (hosted by Polish cities of Toruń /1993–1999/, Łódź /2000–2009/, and Bydgoszcz /2010–/). The festival's main goal is to contribute 'to the growth of cinematographers' prestige'. My attempt is to picture wider significance of this specificity. What interests me most is the struggle for legitimacy in the local film production field. I will argue that despite the fact it can be seen to pose a challenge to the field's logic, Camerimage holds a strong position in the local film production field.