

*'Aesthetics of Hunger'*, written by *Glauber Rocha* was presented in *Genoa in 1965, as part of a retrospective survey of Latin American cinema*. Discontent, with the way Europeans saw Latin America through the lens of exoticism, Rocha analysed the cause and effect on political and social grounds.

Filmmakers in Latin America at the time, employed the use of cinema as a weapon for the revolutionary struggle. Cinema Novo, a Brazilian film movement, was the truest depiction of the Latin America as it was—terrible. However, Rocha took great pride in the originality Cinema Novo had to offer. According to Rocha, the greatest misery of the Latin America is their hunger, that is rarely understood as it should be—without eliminating the ugly truth that it bears.

Coining the formula 'aesthetics of hunger', Rocha further pushes progressive filmmakers in the Latin America to not be influenced by World Cinema, certainly out of their reach, but work on their own identity—hunger. He encourages them to build their own aesthetic of hunger, through the lack of resources, and not only as a theme, but a fundamental. He further taps upon the semantics of hunger, a track which filmmakers could take; for they could benefit not only as a nation, but professionally in the field of cinematography too.

Rocha proposes the possibility of 'aesthetic of violence', once the colonizer becomes aware of the colonized. Fighting the violence of images for so long, Cinema Novo being more than just a film movement—perhaps, a revolution. This is where the demand for a third cinema resides. It is not seen in the light primitivism anymore—an aesthetic idealization of the lesser part of the America, in an eye of the European observer.

Once the victim confronts the colonizer, an act of revolution begins. The juxtaposition between the two aesthetics—‘hunger’ and ‘violence’, both being the result of Cinema Novo is what makes Rocha believe in the power of it.

This conversation certainly reminds oneself of the term coined by Edward Said—Orientalism. *Orientalism* is a product of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century, when the West romanticized the idea of East being backward, yet exotic in its own manner. He suggests that the relationship between the West and *Orient* is a play of power and domination, in its finest form; a *hegemony*.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps, Europe has known to be the vilest of all colonies, since ages. Defining the “others” to eventually define itself, The Great West.

Cinema Novo’s spirit resides in its truth, and the ability of it to unveil even the things that ought to be considered ‘national shame’. Henceforth, Rocha emphasizes on the importance for it to develop efficiently; it *has* to outgrow its marginal outreach—culturally and economically, in terms of geographical limitations.

To conclude, cinema has always responded to conflicting class conflicts. Geopolitical axis of confrontation may have differed, nonetheless they stand in the face of brutality. Be it *Pathar Panchali* (Ray, India, 1955), *Zindagi Tamasha* (Khoosat, Pakistan, 2019), or *Now!* (Alvarez, Cuba, 1965). As put forth by Rocha, “*Wherever there is a filmmaker prepared to film the truth and oppose the hypocrisy and repression of censorship, there will the living spirit of Cinema Novo*”, and it certainly lives up to it.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hegemony is the political, economic, or military predominance or control of one state over others.