THE NEW MORPHOLOGY OF EUROPEAN FILM FESTIVALS
(CASE STUDY: TRANSILVANIA INTERNATIONAL FILM FESTIVAL)

lecturer **Ileana Nicoleta Sălcudean**
Cinematography and Media Department
Faculty of Theater and Television
Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca

Abstract:

The international film festivals are nevertheless "inherently linked to societal and cultural concerns" (Elsaesser 2005, 27). The new morphology of film festivals brings a new light on film festivals and the theory of culture, especially with the new reconfiguration of festivals Europe, the insertion of new technologies and new opportunities to create networks.

The research approach is defined at the intersection of cultural studies, sociology of culture and cultural anthropology, seeking a new vocabulary of film culture in the new socio-political context. In terms of cultural studies I analyze the social and political context of creative industries (mainly film production); an important contribution of cultural studies and sociology of culture refers to the tension between citizenship and consumerism. From the point of view of cultural anthropology, I analyze the new film festival rendering the distinction space/ place; mapping/ tracking (Elsaesser, 2004, pp. 185-188) replacing universal/ particular; local/ global, following contemporary approaches of *convergence* and *network* as more efficient in the globalization context. European film festivals shift away from the stereotyped category of *nation* and *auteur* as connected to Europe towards the global economy and *the city* (Valck, 2007, p. 30). The case study of Transilvania International Film Festival is bringing forth questions regarding the Western European vs. Eastern European film festival models and how are the Eastern and Central European festivals incorporating the traits of the Western European film festival.

Key words: *creative industries, European film festival, Transylvanian Film Festival, convergence and network. .*

Introduction

Studies devoted to film festivals approach them from different perspectives: geopolitical strategies (Acciari, Menarini, 2004), cultural construction (Burgess, 2014), social construction (Dayan, 2002), economics and consumerism (Torche, 2008; Nichols, 1994), management (Fischer, 2013), exchanges and networking (Hagener, Malte, 2014; Elsaesser, 2005, Valck, 2007), creative industries (Iordanova, 2015) activism (Iordanova and van de Peer, 2014; Tascon, 2015), the impact of new technologies (Roddick, 2013), identity (Segal, 2010).

We introduce different approaches to cinema, presenting their socio-political contexts, the dispute between entertainment and economy, and the classical binary: Hollywood film vs. film Europe.

In analyzing European film festivals, we propose an approach starting with the notions of *convergence and network. Convergence*, in terms of Jenkings represents "the content of multiple media channels, the cooperation between multiple media industries and the migratory behavior of media audiences who will go almost anywhere in search of the kinds of entertainment experiences they want", displaying "complex relationships": technological, industrial, cultural, as well as social changes (Jenkins, 2006, p. 2). Considering film festivals as "cinema network" we examine different important agents involved in film festival (sales representatives, film critics, filmmakers etc.) (Valck, 2007, p. 15, p. 34).

Approaches in Cinema. The Socio-Political Context

The confluence between art and politics has been the subject of much research, from the relationship between post-structuralism and leftist orientation, to the specific revolutionary Russian avant-garde in the 20s, or the student movements in the 60s.[1] There was a general enthusiasm in the 70s on the relationship between art, academia and political change (MacCabe, 1999 p. v).[2] Yet, "there was one massive contradiction in film theory of the 70s. On the one hand there was the elaboration of theories, linguistic, psychoanalytical and Marxist, which challenge the primacy of the conscious subject. On the other, the auteur theory (which depended on just such a notion of the primacy of the conscious subject) was unavoidable: in its weak form simply as a necessary descriptive grid for the archive; in its strong form still a crucial evaluative term" (MacCabe, 1999, p. 33).

The Marxist-inspired approaches to popular culture were followed in recent decades by a new epistemological approach related to representation - antiessentialism - writers like Bakhtin, Bhabha, Butler Bauman, Derrida and Deleuze, Lyotard, and Kristeva have transformed the cause-effect thinking, raising questions about the identity and spatiality, methods of research etc. (Cresswell and Dixon, 2002, 3). Feminist studies and recent developments in cultural studies in America, deviate from this Marxist approach, criticizing it for the assumption of a single meaning, shared by all, for any cultural object. Non-Marxist approach suggests that different ways of consuming the cultural product affect its meaning. Some researchers (du Gay, Hall, Janes, Mackay, Negus, 1997) disprove the idea that those who produce culture control culture (the idea of a passive consumer), focusing on the different ways in which individuals receive/ perceive cultural products.

---

[1] "The work was profoundly influenced by the momentary confluence of ideas which could later be described as the union of post-structuralism and leftism but which at the time was experienced more simply as a belief that the development of crucial categories in the humanities could be understood as a fundamental political task. The belief had its roots in the flowering of the 20s Soviet avant-garde, when art seemed indispensable to the revolutionary project. And in a smaller but similar way art and politics were interwoven in the student movements of the late 60s. Many sectors of the international research community which I addressed in the 70s had regained an optimistic view of the relations between art, the academy and political change" (MacCabe, 1999, v).

[2] "This optimism manifested itself most noticeably in the attempt to construe accounts of signification which would link the individual and the social in a general theory of revolutionary transformation. Such a theory was the Holy Grail for many intellectuals in those years. Saussure, Freud and Marx formed the Trinity that would provide everything that the revolution had lacked. It was not simply that scarcity would be abolished but sex would be multiplied; it was not simply that the relations of production would be transformed but we would all become poets; it was not simply that commodity production would come to an end but it would be replaced by perpetual carnival" (MacCabe, 1999, v).

Cinema can be entertainment, industry, propaganda (see during the Nazi regime when it was regarded as the "central cultural device"), but it also communicates the national aesthetics, has a real power of building national identity (Nowell-Smith and Ricci, 1998, p. 21), even if in the first half of the century European cinema has not responded to the challenge posed by the US (which led the economic european market until the Great Depression).

"Film reproduces a reality as its appears in the guise of ideology – an examined surface of life. To be sure, this approach takes a more sophisticated look at the film/ reality connection by claiming that film (1) create reality (albeit an *unformulated* and *untheorized* one) and (2) are produced by reality (the reality of an economic structure)" (Cresswell and Dixon, 2002, p. 3).

Entertainment and Economy. Citizenship and Consumerism

In the film industry, it is not creativity that is lacking, but rather finances, that is why independent films were in decline. In the 90s, the United States was producing around 200 independent films per year and another 200 commercial films (considering that there are thousands of scenarios, only a small fraction of them actually end up being used and transformed into movies). To qualify for the Academy Awards, a film must launch and run in a commercial movie theater in Los Angeles for 7 days in a row. From four hundred movies, only half are going to qualify for Academy Awards (Wiese, 1991, p. 186, interview with Larry Kasanoff, director al Lightning Pictures). On the other hand, Michael Wiese believes that the industry is cyclical and has suffered over time many ups and downs. Lou Greenspan said in the '70s: "As I look back over the past half-century, it seems that there was hardly a time when the motion picture industry was not in *a state of crisis*" (Bluem and Squire, 1972, p. xiii). However it has always survived, though the sound was a threat, then the radio, then the Great Depression took place and the Second World War.

In 1953, Leo A. Handel, former director of the research department of the audience at MGM emphasized that: "... the movie industry is still the only major business in the United States which has never made a serious attempt to study its potential market" (Stokes and Maltby, 1999, p. 1).[3]

To all this the continued pressure from television is added, treated as "public service", a form of public education, an agency of control of information. European governments have included broadcasting ("The linkages provided by a European-based audio-visual industry would appear as central, with communication, culture and information reinforcing identiy across the common territory" - Nowell-Smith and Ricci 1998, p. 29) using 2 models: cinema industry was following a marketing model, while television remained the state monopoly (Nowell-Smith and Ricci, 1998, p. 27).

Production costs have increased. In 1985, a studio film would cost around $ 17 million, and costs related to marketing came to $ 6.5 million. In the early 90s costs reached 24 million dollars and 10 million for film production to marketing. Meanwhile, revenues are increasing: in 1985 only 13 films have grossed over 20 million dollars, in 1986 there were 17, in 1987 reached 20, in 1988-18, and in 1989 were 30 films grossed over 20 million dollars (Wiese, 1991, pp. 3-11). Except the United States, other countries that have a significant production are subsidizing film production costs (Gilbert, Stokes, Maltby, 1999, p. 69). However, to keep the proportions, according to a 1993 study (Standard & Poor's Industry Surveys) sales of electronics and computers amounted to over 287 billion dollars in 1991. In the film industry, the box-office of the same year was around $ 4.8 billion (Wasko, 1994, pp. 2-3).

Hollywood is more than film production and distribution, it also means promotion, marketing, television, cable, video etc. Besides film industry there are also transindustrial activities; when it comes to Hollywood, change and continuity can be understood within the general economic and political contexts, but also considering the global market (cable, privatization, commercialization); Hollywood's relationship with new technologies must be seen in light of all these contexts (Wasko, 1994, p. 6).

The Classical Binary: Hollywood vs. Europe

---

[3] "Two things are certain, however: both cinema and television will continue to fail to learn from their own and each other s histories; and, as with all revolutions, the outcome may change rather less than was expected either by participants or by observers" (Ellis, 1992, p. 284).

"The Film Europe movement, though short-lived, had some significant effects. For one thing, it made many film-makers known outside their own countries who might otherwise have remained primarily national figures. One result of this was probably to pave the way for the assimilation of European émigrés into the Hollywood industry during the 1930s and 1940s. In addition, the circulation of films provided many influences that enhanced styles of film-making throughout the world. (Teinosule Kinagusa`s *Page of Madness* [1926] and Carl Dreyer`s *La Passion de Jeanne d`Arc* [1928] are only two of the more obvious examples.) Ultimately Film Europe contributed institutions which have been far more thoroughly developed in the subsequent decades. Today international film festivals, co-productions, and multinational casts and crews are common strategies. All of them either originated during the 1920s or at least received their first widespread and systematic use then" (Smith-Shank, 2004, p. 78).[4]

Hollywood is a big exporter of film; the film was always determined economically, although after 1945 one could notice the European cinema strive to remove aspects of totalitarian doctrine. Applied to industry policies, this well-intentioned fascist direction had other implications in the obstruction of national culture of film industry (e.g. the Italian one).[5] Admiral Stone, president of the Film Commission argued that there should not be a film industry, his reaction was countered by the British (Nowell-Smith and Ricci, 1998, pp. 5-6).

After WWII, the search for unity in Europe was essentially defined on economic criteria, the notions of "national" markets were redefined, but the search for a common cultural identity become secondary (the Treaty of Maastrict has references to the common European culture 1992). In the 50s there was an idealistic vision of spiritual unity. In the European Community foundation agreements from 1957 nothing is said about the establishment of a unity in the European culture, nor about any support for cinema or film industry; only in 1963 there is a reference to the film industry (Nowell-Smith and Ricci, 1998, p. 20). Cinema exploded in the '60s, the nine member countries of that time had an audience and a capacity greater than the one in the US (Nowell-Smith and Ricci, 1998, p. 28).

Yet, when we analyze film festivals, we conclude that they have a capacity for self-preservation. "In the 1970s, they responded to youthful rebellions worldwide and supported young film talent and political struggles. In the 21st century, they close professional sponsorship deals and seek industrial partnerships in order to continue to grow and to remain competitive" (Valck, 2007, p. 207).

The year 1993 was a turning point in terms of GATT negotiations (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) highlighting concerns about culture, on the one hand and economic and free trade policies, on the other. There were conferences related to European cinema and Hollywood, organized by the British Film Institute, UCLA, Film and Television Archive (first in 1993 in London, hosted by the British Film Institute, the second a year later in Los Angeles, UCLA Film, Television Archive and the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences) (Nowell-Smith and Ricci, 1998, pp. viii-ix).

In the EU almost 1,300 films were produced in 2012. In the same year, 17 of the 20 most popular films were produced in Europe by the US. While the US still dominates ticket sales in the European cinemas, the European films are gaining more territory on the market. In 2009, European films have attracted 26% of all films in Europe, and by 2012, the proportion increased to 33.6%. Meanwhile, the share of films in the US fell from 67.1% to 62.8% of total admissions. French films represent 13.6% of the seats in European cinemas, followed by the UK with 8%, while Italy is in third place with 2.9% (*Creating Growth. Measuring Cultural and Creative Markets in the EU* EY, December 2014, p. 65).

---

[4] "The decline of the Film Europe movement paralleled that of the general European idea and the effort to create a federation of European states. After much discussion during the 1920s, this effort came to a head at the Tenth Session of the League of Nations Assembly in September 1929 in Geneva. There Aristide Briand, France`s Foreign Minister and one of the central supporters of the European idea, proposed a European federation; he was backed by Stresemann and Herriot. There was much debate over the next few years, but it soon became clear that the project was doomed. The rising right-wing parties in Germany condemned the move as an *enslavement* of their nation. Stresemann`s death on 7 March 1929 and Briand`s on 7 March 1932 were severe blows. By the autumn of 1931, the European idea was waning quickly, and it was soon largely eclipsed. It never died out completely, however, and after the Second World War it helped form the basis for the formation of the Council of Europe, the Common Market and the developing of European Union" (Smith-Shank 2004, pp. 77-78).

[5] The Frenchmen fighting for national attribute under the leadership of de Gaule, under André Malraux as Minister of Culture were promoting the European civilization, a different concept than the racist, fascist *Kulturnation*; the left wing was also Eurocentric (Nowell-Smith and Ricci, 1998, p. 28).

The future of Europe will also be shaped by the digital transformation. Within the creative industries new business models have developed, integrating new technologies adapted to aesthetics, functionality and content (*Creating growth. Measuring Cultural and Creative Markets in the EU,* EY, December 2014, p. 16).

European Film Festivals

Film festivals have European roots (before the WWII), but became global phenomenon. Yet, they were inevitably influenced by Hollywood in a high-culture vs. popular-culture dispute; state-model (subsidized cinema) in Europe vs. studio-system (box-office cinema) in Hollywood; work or art of an auteur vs. entertainment involving stars; festival circuit in Europe vs. Academy Awards (Oscar night) of Hollywood (Valck, 2007, pp. 14-15). Elsaesser will render the difference between Hollywood film - film Europe in terms of the effects of globalization: "space/ place, mobility/ ubiquity, mapping/ tracking" (Elsaesser, 2004, pp. 185-188). "However, where structuralism concentrates on binary oppositions and their relationship to social structures, ideo-morphology deals with social values that are embedded in stylistic elements generally overlooked in Western art, but which are very important in understanding and attributing meaning to works on non-Western art" (Smith-Shank, 2004, 90). It is nevertheless important to inquire whether in globalization, or even despite globalization we could consider the binary: Western European cinema and film festival vs. Eastern European cinema and film festival.

Valck is transcending the approaches based on semiotic, structuralism or psychoanalysis and concentrates on the network approach that is more suitable in the globalization era and promotes the *actor-network theory* (in the lineage to Bruno Latour) also diminishing the distinction micro/ macro and local/ global (Valck, 2007, p. 39) and including different agents involved in film festival that are important for the network (sales representatives, film critics, filmmakers etc.) (Valck, 2007, p. 34). This view seems similar to that of "convergence as both a top-down corporate-driven process and a bottom-up consumer-driven process." (Jenkins, 2006, p. 18V). Also, it shifts away from the too worn category of *nation* and *auteur* as connected to Europe towards the global economy and *the city* (Valck, 2007, p. 30).

Though 44 countries in Europe have different film festivals, the oldest and most famous European festivals are the ones from Venice and Cannes or Berlin, considered A-class festivals.

Founded in 1933, the International Federation of Film Producers Association (FIAPF) regulates the categories for film festivals. According to FIAPF there are three festival categories: 1. Competitive Specialized Feature Film Festivals; 2. Non-Competitive Feature Film Festivals and 3. Documentary And Short Film Festivals.

Venice Film Festival (the oldest festival in the world, founded in 1932), part now of the Venice Biennale is a "construction of a media spectacle", built on the accreditation hierarchic privileges and able to create an added value to the notion of festival (Valck, 2007, p. 159). Some very important films had their première in Venice during the time, that being a special feature of this festival (interview with Chiara Sgarbi, involved with management of Cinema in North Italy).

Jean Monnet, rather than Leon Blum formulated what is known as the Blum-Byrnes Agreement related to managing competition between the French and the US industry after the war, consisting of a certain protection for the European industry and European cooperation (for example for France and Italy) (Nowell-Smith and Ricci, 1998, pp. 7-8). It must be the reason and the platform for launching several European film festivals in 1946: Locarno Film Festival (Switzerland), Karlovy Vary International Film Festival (Czech Republic), Cannes Film Festival (named until 2002 International Film Festival), or in 1951: Berlin International Film Festival (Berlinale).

Cannes Film Festival (founded in 1946), the mirror of Hollywood in Europe, built as an American, French and British effort to fight against the Venice Film Festival of fascist dominance (McGrath, 2011, p. 1, p. 5) is the European festival that owns most to Hollywood in terms of the economic model it promotes, the glamour and image, at the same time trying to stand against Hollywood`s power.

Much entangled in the geopolitical power of the cold war, Berlin International Film Festival is moving from a national to a network focus (Wong, 2011, p. 2).

After the 1968, there was a shift visible in film festivals, towards independent programming, new alternative sessions, and adapting to the needs of the audience. Such a festival is International Film Festival Rotterdam, with its focus on independent cinema and on thematic sections, and as the same time fighting the "glamour that dominates the festivals in Cannes, Berlin, and Venice", managed to develop

more and more in the "direction of professional cultural entrepreneurship" (Valck, 2007, pp. 200-201), being "the first festival to promote coproduction" (Wong, 2011, p. 12). After the 90s, film festivals proved that art cinema can be "economically viable" (Valck, 2007, p. 209).

The Eastern/ Central European film festivals began to exhibit their taste after the fall of Communism and are drawing much from the Western models. Yet, an analysis of the common traits with their predecessors and the unique traits regarding their morphology (keeping the proportions, of course) is needed. The case study I chose will answer more the first part of the question, trying to identify to what extend *convergence* and *networking*, as the proposed notions for approach are visible and functional in an International film Festival from Eastern Europe.

Transilvania International Film Festival

In Romania, the creative/cultural industries were not visible in traditional cultural policies based on arts and heritage (Romania falling into this category with the attempt for a strategy for culture in 1998 that emphasized the patrimony, but at the expense of other cultural sectors - aspect that was criticized by the Council of Europe in 1999). The need for self-financing cultural institutions highlighted the relevance of creative industries. Yet, Nicholas Garnham (Garnham, 1990) believes that under the creative industries terminology hides exploitation of private property, and for others it is actually an umbrella to separate policies of film and television.

The developments of the Romanian creative/ cultural industries started to be relevant in the last decades, after the communist censorship.[6] In the performing arts, namely film industry, a new generation of film makers became important in extracting key elements of the Romanian identity and illustrating them in their movies (cultural representations of the national identity), but also encouraging a local platform for cinematic competitons and events, an international dialogue.

With 18 listed film festivals in Romania (4 in Cluj-Napoca), Transilvania International Film Festival (TIFF - founded in 2002), presented by Romanian Film Promotion, is the first and the largest international feature film festival in Romania and it is a member of the Alliance of Central and Eastern European Film Festivals (CENTEAST), supported by the Creative Europe - MEDIA Programme. In 2011, Transilvania IFF was accredited by the FIAPF, which places it among the 40 most important festivals in the world.[7]

Festivals depend on the glamour as well as on "the cutting-edge art" (Wong, 2011, p. 29). Over the years, Transilvania IFF's Lifetime Achievement Award has been presented to important figures of European and worldwide cinema, including Sophia Loren, Nastassja Kinski, Jiří Menzel, Debra Winger, Claude Lelouch, Geraldine Chaplin, Wim Wenders, Marin Karmitz, Jacqueline Bisset, Michael York, Catherine Deneuve, Claudia Cardinale, Annie Girardot, Udo Kier, Vanessa Redgrave, Nicolas Roeg and Franco Nero.

TIFF`s main goal is the promotion of cinematic art by presenting some of the most innovative and spectacular films of the moment that feature both originality and independence of expression, that reflect unusual cinematic language forms or focus on current trends in youth culture (http://tiff.ro/en/about-festival).

If we consider the main three historical phases of film festivals depicted by Valk, from being "showcases of national cinemas… to operate both as protectors of the cinematic art and as facilitators of the film industries…to becoming professionalized and institutionalized" (Valck, 2007, pp. 19-20), then we can definitely affirm that Transilvania International Film Festival has comprised all these stages in its 15 editions.

---

[6] From a sociological point of view, see the study of University of Bucharest – "Atractivitatea profesiilor creative și orientări antreprenoriale ale tinerilor în domenii creative", [Attractiveness of creative professions and entrepreneurial orientation for the young people in creative fields], Raluca Moise (ed.), http://indcreative.postprivatizare.ro/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Atractivitatea-profesiilor-creative-si-orientari-antreprenoriale-ale-tinerilor-in-domeniul-ind.creative-Universitatea-Bucuresti.pdf, retrieved in February 2012.

[7] TIFF is rapidly growing, becoming a facilitator for film industry, but also showing efficient management. The 2016 edition was a record: 79 000 tickets sold; 248 selected films from 64 countries; 400 screenings; 1100 attending filmmakers, actors, distributors, sales agents, producers, and festival programmers; 250 attending journalists; 330 volunteers.

After years of continuous work in promoting Romanian cinema and welcoming international guests to meet national productions and their filmmakers, in 2015, the festival rounded up its industry activities under one umbrella. TIFF industry is open for talents from Romania and Moldova and is gathering Transilvania Talent Lab (TTL) - the hands-on programme dedicated to emerging talents, and Transilvania Pitch Stop (TPS) - a tailor made workshop for feature fiction films wrapping up with a public presentation and one to one meetings. TIFF - Industry hosts a series of masterclasses, lining-up experts in audience development, and script writing, film directors, documentarist and personalities. TIFF Industry also means closed screenings for industry members and special screenings of the newest Romanian films, in the presence of their filmmakers (http://tiff.ro/en/about-festival). In 2015, Transilvania IFF hosted the launch of the new platform #FEEDback (Film Eastern Europe Dialogue) and in 2016 organized a regional edition of The Pitch, in partnership with ShortsTV. The festival also developed a strong educational platform for children, through EducaTIFF (awarded Best Educational Project in Romania at Education Awards Gala, 2011 edition), and teenagers, through Let's Go Digital! The intensive workshop gives teenagers the opportunity to cover all the steps of film-making under the supervision of film professionals and using modern equipment. TIFF has also editions in other Romanian cities: Sibiu, București, Tg-Mureș, Miercurea-Ciuc.

Trying to investigating the capacity of TIFF to create network, as well as its social role, I conducted 16 interviews with different actors involved in TIFF: managers, volunteers, participants in the competitions (age ranging from 22 to 46 years old). The analysis of the interviews conveyed that TIFF is an experience, similar to the *convergence* notion introduced by Jenkins[8], creating communities of cinephilia that mingle people from the film industry with others from different fields, and creating common memories. The films chosen for the competition or for other sections of the festival also address different social dilemmas and that is an added value to the social involvement of the festival. The network is understood in the festival (mainly by the participants in competition) more as a platform, not necessarily as an attempt for commission or agency. Yet, others consider that TIFF is the number one film festival in Romania especially for that opportunity, as it creates the interactions between producers, film makers, agents involved in film distribution. Also, the network is more geared towards Europe. The specially crafted events of TIFF: Transilvania Talent Lab, Transilvania Pitch Stop, First Film First and Less is More (that represent European collaboration), TIFFashion (in collaboration with the Art and Design University of Cluj Napoca), as well as celebration of Hungarian Days (Cluj Napoca being a multicultural city) represent good examples of network. It is also considered that TIFF equals films, awards and networking. Networking gives credibility to TIFF and is efficient to professionalize the festival. Also some interviewed persons referred to the way the city transforms during the festival, revealing a certain convergence that became specific for that period of time.

There are also different opinions regarding the social role of TIFF. Persons from the management consider TIFF as an important voice for the community, involved in social projects (*Safe the Big Screen Campaign* 2014, fundraising campaign for Film Warehouse as its first mission, the project for the children in Pata Rat 2013 etc.). Yet, others believe that TIFF does not have a social role, understood as an activist/ cultural role, which is considered to be more the attribute of A-category festivals, or that a social role for a film festival can be overrated.

We consider that there are different views on what a social role of a festival or even network might mean, and there are also different views depending on the role the person who answered had related to the festival.

As a conclusion of the interviews, we could summarize that regarding the two notions proposed for approach for the European film festival (*convergence* and *network)*, they are quite applicable to TIFF, yet they might be defined and measured partly different than indicated in the case of Western film festivals. That has to do with the understanding of the vocabulary of film festivals, the novelty of such a tradition in Romania (as compared to other European festivals), the specificity of TIFF, or with the urge of Romanian artists to first search their validation outside Romania (as shown in a previous research, Sălcudean, 2016).

General conclusions

There are different approaches to cinema as it can be viewed as entertainment, industry, or propaganda; the social and political context, as well as the economic factor play decisive roles for these prospects.

---

[8] "Our lives, relationships, memories, fatasies, desires, also flow across media channels" (Jenkins, 2006, p. 17).

Hollywood dominates the European market ("US export balances to Europe from movies are second in value only to aerospace technologies and agricultural products" (Nowell-Smith and Ricci 1998, p. 30), but the European movie is visible only to a niche in the American public. The cliches comprised in the binary Hollywood film – film Europe are still functional to a certain degree. Yet, within the creative industries new business models have developed, integrating new technologies adapted to aesthetics, functionality and content (*Creating growth. Measuring Cultural and Creative Markets in the EU,* EY, December 2014, p. 16). With concern to the European festivals, there is a shift away from the too worn category of *nation* and *auteur* as connected to Europe towards the global economy and *the city* (Valck, 2007, p. 30).

It is nevertheless important to inquire whether due to globalization, or even despite globalization we could consider the binary: Western European cinema and film festival vs. Eastern European cinema and film festival.

The case study was trying to investigating the capacity of Transilvania International Film Festival to create network, as well as its social role, I conducted 16 interviews with different actors involved in TIFF: managers, volunteers, participants in the competitions. As a conclusion of the interviews, we could summarize that regarding the two notions proposed for approach for the European film festival (*convergence* and *network)*, they are quite applicable to TIFF, yet they might be defined and measured partly different than indicated in the case of Western film festivals.

Bibliography:

Articles:

1. Elsaesser, Thomas (5/ 2013). "ImpersoNations: National Cinema, Historical Imaginaries and New Cinema Europe", *Mise au Point*, *Le cinéma européen et les langues*.
2. Roderick, Conway Morris, (September 2003). "Venice Film Fest Living Up to Projections", *International Herald Tribune* 3:7.

Books:

1. Cresswell, Tim and Dixon, Deborah (eds.) (2002). *Engaging Film. Geographies of Mobility and Identity*, USA: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, USA.
2. De Valck, Marijke (2007). *Film Festivals: From European Geopolitics to Global Cinephilia*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
3. Elsaesser, Thomas (2005). "Film Festival Networks: The New Topographies of Cinema in Europe." *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam Univ. Press.
4. Fischer, Alex (2013). *Sustainable Projections: Concepts in Film Festival Management*. St Andrews: St Andrews Film Studies.
5. Garnham, N. (1990). *Capitalism and Communication*, London: Sage.
6. Gay, Paul du; Hall, Stuart; Janes, Linda; Mackay, Hugh and Negus, Keith, (1997). *Doing Cultural Studies: The Case of the Sony Walkman*, The Open University, Londra, California, New Delphi: Sage Publications.
7. Gaydos, Steven (1998). *The Variety Guide to Film Festivals*, USA: Berkley Publication.
8. Gunther R. Kress, Theo van Leeuwen (1996). *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design*, London and New York: Psychology Press.
9. Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as a Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
10. Hing-Yuk Wong, Cindy (2011). *Film Festivals: People, Culture, and Power on the Global Screen*, USA: Rutgers University Press.
11. Jenkins, Henry (2006). Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide, New York and London: New York University Press.
12. MacCabe, Colin (1999). *The Eloquence of the Vulgar. Language, Cinema and the Politics of Culture*, London, UK: British Film Institute.
13. McGrath, John (2011). *Cannes Confidential: A Gatecrasher's Guide to the World's Most Famous Film Festival*, UK: AuthorHouse.

14. Nowell-Smith, Ricci, S. (eds) (1998). *Hollywood and Europe: Economics, Culture, National Identity 1945-95*, London: BFI.
15. Rose, Gillian (2012). *Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to Researching with Visual Materials,* London: Sage Publications.
16. Sălcudean, Ileana-Nicoleta (2016). *Cultural Policies: from Bucharest to Brussels*, Cluj-Napoca: Risoprint.
17. Smith-Shank, Deborah L., (ed.) (2004). *Semiotics and Visual Culture: Sights, Signs, and Significance*, , Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
18. Stokes, Melvyn and Maltby, Richard, (eds.) (1999(. *Hollywood`s Audiences. Cultural identity and the Movies*, London: British Film Institute, London.
19. Wayne, Mike (2002). *The Politics of Contemporary European Cinema: Histories, Borders and Diasporas*, Bristols and Portland: Intellect Books.
20. Wiese, Michael (1991). *Film and Video Finacing*, USA: Michael Wiese Productions and Focal Press.

Short Bio

Ileana Nicoleta Sălcudean is curently a lecturer at Babeș-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, in the Department of Cinema and Media Studies, Theatre and Television Faculty. She holds a PhD in sociology with the thesis *Cultural Policies and Identiy Constructions in the European Context.*

Her spheres of interest are: cultural studies, sociology of culture, creative industries.

Recent Publications: ”Outrunning the Past: European Influences in Building Cultural Policies in Romania and the Role of the Romanian Cultural Institute”, *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 2016, 46:5, pp. 255-273; ”The Convergent Motions of the Social Dimension and the Cultural Dimension. National and European Blueprints”, *Studia Europaea*, 60/ 2015, pp. 109-134; *″*Sexuality in Comedy. Controversy and Clichés”, *Ekphrasis* 14, 2015, pp 136-150; *″*Creative Industries – Art and Commerce ; Entrepreneurship and Creativity”, *Ekphrasis* 13, 2015, pp. 10-25; “New Aesthetics and New Technologies: Global Challenges to the Future of Cultural Organizations and Management”, *Ekphrasis* 11, 1/, 2014, pp. 225.233; "Art and Vandalism. Crossbreeding of Street Art: (re) Interpretation of Street Art from Sociological, Aesthetical and Interactivity Perspectives ", *Journal of Media Research*, Volume 5, Issue 1 (12)/ 2012, pp. 45-60" etc.

Books: *Cultural Policies: from Bucharest to Brussels*, Risoprint, 2016; and *Handbook of Creative Writing*, co-author, PUC, 2014; *`Social` and `Cultural` in the European Context*, Risoprint, 2013.