

Materiality, Ways of Life and Animality in films by Ignacio Agüero and José Luis Torres Leiva

Materialidad, formas de vida y animalidad en películas de Ignacio Agüero y José Luis Torres Leiva

Materialidade, modos de vida e animalidade nos filmes de Ignacio Agüero e José Luis Torres Leiva

VALERIA DE LOS RÍOS, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile (edelo@uc.cl)

ABSTRACT

This article explores the exchanges between humans and non-humans in two contemporary Chilean films: *El otro día* (2012), by Ignacio Agüero and *El viento sabe que vuelvo a casa* (2016), by José Luis Torres Leiva. These films form an assembly and are connected through the figure of Agüero, who directs one film and stars in the other. Both organize their narratives around a spatial and topographical device that facilitates the contact between human and non-human materialities. These films are built through dialogue and in relationship with others, but also involve an attentive look at the environment, in which organic and inorganic presences emerge. These presences affect the treatment of temporality, editing, and generic distinctions between documentary and film fiction.

Keywords: chilean cinema; materiality; animals in film; slow cinema; Anthropocene.

RESUMEN

Este artículo explora los intercambios entre humanos y no humanos a partir de dos películas chilenas contemporáneas: El otro día (2012), de Ignacio Agüero, y El viento sabe que vuelvo a casa (2016), de José Luis Torres Leiva. Estas películas configuran un ensamblaje en el que se genera una conexión a partir de la figura de Agüero, quien dirige una y protagoniza la otra. Ambos filmes organizan sus narrativas a partir de un dispositivo espacial y topográfico que facilita el contacto entre materialidades humanas y no humanas. Estas películas se construyen a partir del diálogo y de la relación con otros, pero también suponen la mirada atenta del entorno, en el que emergen presencias orgánicas e inorgánicas que afectan el tratamiento de la temporalidad, el montaje y las distinciones genéricas entre documental y ficción.

Palabras clave: cine chileno; materialidad; animales en el cine; cine lento; Antropoceno.

RESUMO

Este artigo explora as trocas entre humanos e não-humanos a partir de dois filmes contemporâneos chilenos: *El otro día* (2012), de Ignacio Agüero e *El viento sabe que vuelvo a casa* (2016), de José Luis Torres Leiva. Estes filmes formam uma montagem em que uma conexão é gerada a partir da figura de Agüero, que dirige um e protagoniza o outro. Ambos os filmes organizam suas narrativas a partir de um dispositivo espacial e topográfico que facilita o contato entre materialidades humanas e não humanas. Esses filmes são construídos a partir do diálogo e do relacionamento com os outros, mas também envolvem o olhar atento do ambiente, no qual surgem presenças orgânicas e inorgânicas que afetam o tratamento da temporalidade, montagem e distinções genéricas entre documentário e ficção.

Palavras-chave: cinema chileno; materialidade; animais em filme; cinema lento; Antropoceno.

How to cite:

De los Ríos, V. (2018). Materialidad, formas de vida y animalidad en películas de Ignacio Agüero y José Luis Torres Leiva. *Cuadernos.info*, (43), 85-92. <https://doi.org/10.7764/cdi.43.1463>

INTRODUCTION

This paper emerges from the conjunction of two Fondecyt research projects; the first, in which I was co-researcher, is entitled *Vida y animalidad en la literatura latinoamericana* [Life and animality in Latin American literature] and the second, *Nuevos materialismos en narraciones literarias y audiovisuales del cono sur* [New materialisms in literary and audiovisual narrations of the Southern Cone]. The first project involved investigating the presence of animals in Latin American literature and cinema, based on the framework of animal studies, biopolitics and Posthumanism, which rejects the centrality of the human and the consequences of what Giorgio Agamben (2006) called the “anthropological machine”. From the premises opened by this approach, I decided to study the material dimension and the non-human agency in contemporary aesthetic productions, based on the framework of new materialisms.

The new materialism has become a term that brings together a variety of perspectives around what has been described as the material turn of contemporary social and human sciences. According to Nick J. Fox and Pam Alldred (2017), this shift assumes (1) that the material world and its contents are not fixed, stable entities, but relational and in constant flux; (2) that nature and culture should not be treated as distinct realms, but as parts of a continuum of materiality, (3) and that agency capacity extends beyond human actors, including the non-human and inanimate.

My approach to these issues derives from the field of Humanities, in which various disciplines converge, such as philosophy, aesthetics, literature and film studies. There is not a unique methodological matrix to address the material turn, less a specific one for audiovisual narratives. That is why an important part of this work is to review the existing literature on issues related to new materialism, such as the perspective of one of the pioneers of film theory, Béla Balaz, who gives a prominent place to the landscape and the animals in his writings on cinema.

To analyze the audiovisual narratives, I propose an interpretation that respects cinematographic materiality and the procedures used by the cinema as an expressive medium. The analysis will focus on identifying the presence of diverse life forms, not centered on the human and the material environment in which they operate. It is not about imposing the theoretical framework, but about thinking *with* the works, i.e., putting the focus on materiality to later

analyze and describe the way in which these presences generate affections and are aesthetically configured.

ANIMALITY AND MATERIALITIES IN CINEMA

The presence of animals and material objects in cinema has been analyzed by countless thinkers and film theorists. In 1924 the Hungarian film critic Béla Balázs (2013) argued, in a formalistic effort to differentiate the new filmic art from theater, that the real movie stars were not the actors of the stage art, but above all the animals, children and other “natural objects”, such as the landscape (Andrew, 1976, p. 85). In his book *Visible Man, or the Culture of Film*, Balázs affirms that there is no “nature” as a neutral reality, and that the landscape is strictly speaking a “physiognomy, a face that looks at us suddenly somewhere in the environment” (2013, p. 80). Through framing, light effects and editing, the cameraman “paints” a certain atmosphere (2013, pp. 78-79). Balázs states: “Cinema in general has the highly poetic possibility, still little explored, of letting the landscape participate in the drama as a living entity, let us say as a subject of action” (2013, p.79). In the same way, he observes that “the special joy that observing animals in cinema produces lies in the fact that they do not act, but that they live. [...] No actor can equal animals in that, since in them it is not an illusion, but a real thing. It is not an art, it is the nature being spied” (2013, p. 90).

It is easy to detect Eurocentrism and anthropocentrism in the early thought of Balázs, since for him the landscape is first and foremost an auratic projection of the “human soul”¹. However, some of his reflections on the possibilities of landscape as a subject of action and the centrality of these new actors –children, animals and landscape– as living entities are of interest in the contemporary context. These nuances acquire a specific interest in the current biopolitical and Anthropocene scenario. According to Rosi Braidotti (2013), in the Posthumanist context, the interconnection between the self and others, including non-human, implies a rejection of self-centered individualism and anthropocentrism. Braidotti criticizes anthropocentrism from what she defines as “nomadic thought”: a non-unitary view of the subject, which instead of exploring the body as a product of discourses such as law, medicine, science (as Foucault and poststructuralism understood it), is interested in the materiality of the living. Braidotti proposes a non-dualistic understanding of the relationship between

nature and culture, since she considers living matter as intelligent and self-organized (2010, p. 60).

The term materiality can refer –according to Bill Brown (2001)– to different dimensions of experience, which are beyond (or below) experience (2010, p. 49). In *New Materialism. Ontology, Agency, and Politics*, Diana Coole and Samantha Frost (2010) affirm that, although it is undeniable that our existence materially depends on a set of microorganisms, other species, bodily reactions, cosmic movements, material artifacts and natural elements that populate our environment, materialism is still a sporadic and often marginal approach in the field of knowledge.

The ontology of new materialism rejects the divisions between the natural/cultural, human/non-human, base/superstructure, surface/depth, reason/emotion, animate/inanimate. This perspective is post-anthropocentric, since it removes humans from the main focus and facilitates a post-human perspective, which includes non-human animals and things.

In *Vibrant Matter* (2010), Jane Bennett describes the “power of things” as a strange ability of objects of exceeding their status as mere objects and showing traces of independence or vitality (p. xvi). According to Bennett, things have the capacity to prevent or block human will and designs, but they can also act as “almost agents” or forces with their own trajectories, propensities or tendencies (2010, p.vii). In the words of Bruno Latour, things are “actants” (1996). Although modernity made efforts to establish an ontological distinction between inanimate objects and animated subjects, the world continued to be plagued with quasi-objects and quasi-subjects. Walter Benjamin –argues Brown (2001)– thought that the resistance of the avant-gardes to modernity was an effort to deny the distinction between subjects and objects, people and things. For Theodor Adorno, the otherness of things is an ethical issue, since accepting it is a condition for the acceptance of otherness as such (Brown, 2001, p. 12).

In this text, I propose an approach to the materiality, forms of life and animality present in two contemporary Chilean films: *El otro día* (2012), by Ignacio Agüero, and *El viento sabe que vuelvo a casa*, by José Luis Torres Leiva (2016). Although in them animality and non-human materiality are not the central core around which narrative, images and sounds revolve, in this speculative text I will try to give pre-eminence to the presence and figuration of these materialities and bodies to allow the visibility of their relevance and potential.

NEIGHBORHOODS IN IGNACIO AGÜERO'S *EL OTRO DÍA*

The work of Ignacio Agüero is limited but sustained over time. His work as a documentary maker has been widely recognized, both in Chile and abroad. He studied cinema at the School of Communication Arts of the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, from which he graduated in 1979. Since 1982, he has made eight documentaries, including *No olvidar* (1982), *Cien niños esperando un tren* (1988), *Aquí se construye* (2000), *El otro día* (2012) –with which he won his fourth Altazor prize for the national arts– and *Como me da la gana II* (2016), with which he won the first prize of the Official Competition of the FID Marseille Festival, in France. The theme of space has a central place in his films. In his autobiography, published in 2015, Agüero points out that his childhood house marked his relationship with cinema:

With that clarity, I walked back to my house on Bernarda Morin Street. Later in life, I understood that that house in which I lived from 6 to 21 years old was a cinema school for me. Its windows were frames set by the architecture through which people and birds passed as a spectacle made for me (De los Ríos & Donoso, 2015, p. 17).

In his quote, the architectural framework transforms the windows into a space of visibility, which fluctuates between the cinematographic movement and the immobility of photography, an aesthetic feature that will be a trademark in his production. A paradigmatic example of his concern for space is in *El otro día* (2012), a documentary in the first person, filmed in his house, where he observes objects, reflections, animals and plants, while narrating his own story in whispers. This narration is interrupted by anonymous people who knock on his door and who he decides to follow, establishing with them a conversation in which his voice serves as the bridge that connects personal and collective experience. In this structural decision there is an ethical commitment that crosses the director's whole work: the concern, curiosity and genuine interest for others, whom he includes to listen without questioning. In her introduction to the collection of articles *The Cinema of Me. The Self and Subjectivity in First Person Documentary*, Alisa Lebow (2012) takes-up the notion of singular plural of Jean Luc Nancy, in which the individual self never exists alone, but is always a singularity that implies the company of others: the “I” of the first-person singular is always ontologically a

first-person plural, a “we” (Lebow, 2012, p. 3). Hence, the device of the voice, of the naive question used by Agüero (De los Ríos & Donoso, 2015, p. 103), is another of the characteristic features of his work. However, in this paper I will propose that this openness to others has been understood in exclusively anthropocentric terms, leaving out the other non-humans relevant in his work.

Relatives of disappeared-detainees, exploited peasants, homeless workers, children from slums and fellow filmmakers have been subjects in the Agüero documentaries, but also the landscape of the city of Santiago or Villa Alegre, houses about to be destroyed, windows, buildings, gardens and plants, objects, paintings, books, photographs and films; lights and shadows from which he registers the passage and temporality. In *El otro día* there is a turning point regarding the observation of non-human objects and life forms. The structure of the documentary is a starting point that gives the director freedom to improvise. I.e., the idea of determining that the documentary is about his house and about the people who knock at his door allows him to establish a place of enunciation from which to observe. In addition to the material objects that characterize his environment and contribute to the autobiographical tone of the documentary, there is the frame of his window and the garden, which connect him with the exterior. As indicated in the book *El cine de Ignacio Agüero* (De los Ríos & Donoso, 2015, p. 62), the observation structure adopted by this documentary is similar to that of the camera obscura, an “assembly” according to the denomination of Deleuze, where discourse joins material practices and builds a subjectivity as an interiority, as stated by Jonathan Crary (2008) in *Techniques of the Observer. On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century*. However, unlike the historically constructed model, in which vision is placed at the service of the non-sensory faculty of understanding, in *El otro día* the sensory aspect coexists with the understanding, without being surpassed by it.

If we equate the understanding with one of its main aspects, language, we see that this horizontal relationship between the sensory and the linguistic-rational is verified. The voice over of the documentary takes the form of a digression motivated by what the camera records. In this narration, there are elements of personal and family history, and of the Chilean social and political history. But this narrated story is open to interruption, to the contact with others; hence, the device invented by the documentary maker encourages

suspension as a constructive form, which happens every time the doorbell rings. The silent observation of the garden, of the wet plants, of the birds that come to drink or of the cat that silently climbs the twisted branches of the wisteria account for certain slowness in the temporality², which does not follow the logic of the exchange of looks between humans and that differs from the quick and nervous look, subordinated to productivity, in an urban context of the 21st century. This can also be observed in the voice over. On several occasions, the narration becomes whispering, as if that voice were revealing a secret. I want to understand this murmur as the result of a negotiation between human and non-human intensities. In other words, I want to propose that the voice of that subject, which in Agüero’s documentary is built from the observation and narration, is created not only from the conversation with other human beings, but also from the careful observation of other non-human animals, whose appearance in front of the camera obeys to the logic of the interruption.

In *The Animal That Therefore I Am*, Jacques Derrida states that what distinguishes human from non-human animals is language, since animals do not use human language: “Finding oneself deprived of language, one loses the power to name, to name oneself, indeed to respond to one’s name” (Derrida, 2008, p. 35). For the philosopher, “animal” would be a denomination that men have instituted; they have granted themselves with the right and authority to give this name to another living being (Derrida 2008, p. 39), a name which includes “all the living things that man does not recognize as his fellows, his neighbors, or his brothers” (Derrida 2008, p. 50). In *El otro día* the non-human animal appears as an embodied, living agent. The position of the camera moves towards the height of these subjects, propitiating a potential exchange of looks. Unlike the nineteenth-century naturalistic view, here the non-human animal does not appear as a resource or as an object of scientific study. The observation takes place within the framework of the garden, a culturally constructed bourgeois heterotopia, in which the forms of life build a particular form of community that, through the look of a camera, entails a nonproductive contemplation in economic or narrative terms, and the recognition of shared bonds of vulnerability. According to Anat Pick (2018), “vulnerability as a non-power is not the absence of strength, but its suspension. In the apparent paradox of a power without power lies the true radicalism of an ethic of vulnerability” (Pick, 2018, p.

339). That suspension to which Pick refers is precisely the suspension on which *El otro día* is built.

LIFE AND TEMPORALITY BEYOND THE HUMAN IN JOSÉ LUIS TORRES LEIVA'S *EL VIENTO SABE QUE VUELVO A CASA*

José Luis Torres Leiva³ is a director who has premiered many films in different formats: both feature films and medium-length and short films, documentaries and fiction, as well as experimental works.

His filmography shows a careful and affective work, which shows a very broad visual culture and presents witty reflections on audiovisual problems, as well as narrative and of sound, which dialogue with the history of cinema. Although his work has been premiered in theaters, his work is far from commercial cinema.

According to Jonathan Burt (2002), the animal presence on the screen can be covered by multiple metaphorical meanings, which both the filmmaker and the audience project. In spite of this, the animal presence constitutes a place in which these symbolic associations collapse, because—as indicated by Bálázs in his early film texts—the animal's recording (and by contiguity, of children and landscape) erodes, from the beginnings of the technique, the limits between reality and fiction (Burt, 2002, p. 30). In other words, the animal image entails a form of rupture in the field of representation (Burt, 2002, p. 11). The animal on the screen presents kinetic, morphological and expressive dimensions (Bellour, 2014, p. 14) and the confrontation between human and non-human animals provides a series of emotions and affections. As Burt points out in a markedly materialist or Spinozian sense, animal agency is not an innate or static entity that an organism has always possessed, but a relational sense, which emerges as an effect of that same relationship. According to Burt, any entity has the potential power to act, be it human or non-human (Burt, 2002, p. 31), i.e., both non-human animals and things are "agents". The phrase that gives title to this Torres Leiva film—*El viento sabe que vuelvo a casa* [The wind knows that I am coming home], taken from the epigraph of a poem by Jorge Teillier—is, from the beginning, a materialist affirmation, which grants agency to that inorganic entity: the wind. In the context of the Anthropocene, i.e., the era in which the exceptionalism of the human leaves its marks on all kind of matter, be it organic or inorganic, Torres Leiva situates in Chiloé a space in which the contiguity of life forms is made visible in its own temporality. Dogs

waiting for the boat that connects the villages, horses used as means of transport that decide, suddenly, to bathe and drink water in a lagoon, cows that go through the fences of a rural school and look at the camera, lambs that graze in fenced fields, a pig punished for eating the potatoes of a neighbor garden... These sequences frame the visit of Ignacio Agüero—the protagonist of the film—to the islands, with the purpose of filming a story about an impossible love.

The director conducts a casting for the students of an Achao boarding school and interviews the inhabitants of Meulin Island. While students do artistic performances facing the camera and tell about their affections, work and daily life on the island, Agüero inquires about the love story of a couple that disappears due to the opposition of their families to their relationship. One of the young women interviewed recognizes the story and tells that, in the past, families used to oppose couples formed by people of different origins.

In Meulin, Agüero continues to listen to the story of division for ethnic reasons, which is topographically inscribed in the territory: in the middle of the island, there is a bridge that divides two sectors, one where the mestizos live and another where the natives live. But he also finds mixed couples, of different generations, who tell him how those relationships have become increasingly common, which gives this investigation a development over time, in the same way as technical changes—for example, the appearance of motorboats and cars on the island—reported by other witnesses, show the transformations in the way of life in that locality.

In that context, the animals could be seen as a projection of the otherness, of the most radical division among the species, which in the case of the pig is verified in the hierarchy between humans and animals, and in a corporal punishment inflicted on the animal because it exceeded the limits between territories. However, at the same time, that presence unfolds spatially and temporarily before the camera, underlining that division between documentary and fiction pointed out by Burt. Thus, animals emerge as "companion species" (Haraway, 2003), i.e., as species that have co-evolved since remote times and that, in the rural case of Chiloé shown by Torres Leiva, continue to have direct productive relationships with humans, i.e., not mediated by the industry.

Little by little, the fictitious love story investigated is revealed as an excuse or a mere starting point for conversation. The purpose of this self-reflective documentary is to investigate the everyday and affective

life of the island, so the interviews begin to revolve more around life and death, family, daily occupations, parties, children and the deceased. The visual record pauses in the animals that inhabit the landscape, but also in the displacements, either by car on rural roads, in a ferry, in a boat or on foot. It also pauses in the casting, in which the adolescents dance, sing, play instruments or act, deploying corporal and affective dimensions during the time the camera records them. Hence, in this film the question of generic classification is presented as a problem, since it has fictional and documentary premises. From the point of view of the documentary, we find both observational and reflexive, participatory and performative elements in the film (Nichols, 1991). The cinema technical procedures are made visible through the direct recognition of the interviewees to the camera, in the transitions between the spatial displacements, pointing out the inorganic and machine character of the camera, and in the editing of audio and image, since the delayed acoustic splicing or the camera going black are often used, generating a suture on the ellipsis between image and sound.

The tone of the documentary is not solemn, but materially vital, insofar as it includes both the organic and the inorganic. There are many sequences in which the sun, the moon and the clouds are directly recorded, including these entities in a temporality that is not exclusively human. Towards the end of the documentary, there is a remarkable sequence in which Agüero, sitting in the courtyard of a house facing the sea, is interrupted by a child playing around him. The dialogue they establish revolves around the sighting of an octopus, of a shark, but also about the observation of two volcanoes, a snowy mountain, and the alleged existence of some dinosaur bones and a museum on the island. These elements make up a constellation that includes both human and non-human life, organic and inorganic matter, the remains and two different temporalities: that of the museum and that of the earth. In that sense, in the documentary, different forms of life and community coexist, presenting the possibilities of animal future, the evolution of the earth and the future of the machine, shaped by the metaphors constructed from the narrative (the use of the parallelism between the animal and the human), the editing (the inclusion of long sequences in which there is a displacement of the centrality of the human) and the camera (where we visualize the presence of technical devices, among others, cameras).

Facing the horizon of our extinction and that of other species, the documentary shows a materialist

affirmation of life and, at the same time, a displacement of anthropocentrism.

CONCLUSIONS

In this article I analyzed two contemporary Chilean films from the framework proposed by new materialism. By adopting this perspective, the material figurations within these films are made visible. In the case of *El otro día*, by Ignacio Agüero, the centrality of the garden space in the director's house is revealed, in which there is an exchange of views between the human and the non-human. The sound of the film is modified in these sequences and this transformation is transferred to other sequences of the movie. In that regard, the emphasis placed on the social world, on relationships with others, also extends to other forms of community, which include the human, the non-human and the inanimate. At the same time, this exchange of views generates a change in temporality, which slows down to allow careful observation, thus skipping the requirements of economic productivity and its temporal corollary, which requires the creation of narratives centered on a central conflict, marked by anthropocentrism.

In the case of *El viento sabe que vuelvo a casa*, the fictional premise of the film allows us to explore the creative and unveiling possibilities of fiction within a documentary register. The record of sequences of human and non-human life points, as in Agüero's film, to generate a different temporality that modifies the rhythm of the film and opens the possibility of a coexistence of different temporalities within modernity. The sequences that record animal life on the island generate a counterpoint to the daily life of its inhabitants and point to the possibility of generating a community in which agents that are not exclusively human, such as animals, nature and landscape, participate. The film, filmed on the island of Chiloé, located in the south of Chile and far from the metropolitan centers, shows without romanticizing the daily life in this periphery, in which young people live both inside and outside modernity, such as demonstrated by their daily experiences, which they tell the camera. The final dialogue of the film condenses several of its themes, which account for a particular type of temporality and community that has historically been built from different types of negotiations with otherness, whether human or non-human.

To conclude, I would like to point out that these productions, in spite of their obvious differences,

are twinned from the presence of Agüero as director or protagonist, by the choice of a plot opened to interruption or inquiry, and by being circumscribed to a space –a house or an island– from which it is possible to glimpse an outside world and build a possible community. Although these documentaries

are not focused exclusively on visualizing the material and the animal, the relationship they show between the organic and the inorganic, between human and non-human animals, allows us to imagine other forms of life and community, starting from a particular mix between registration and invention.

NOTES

1. For Bálázs, close-up is “the most specific territory of cinema” (2013, p. 57). For the Hungarian theorist, in the mid-1920s the expressive surface was reduced to the face (2013, p. 18). In *The Visible Man* he writes: “The soul of a landscape or of a social environment is not immediately revealed in each place. Thus, in a person the eyes are more expressive than the neck or shoulders, and a close-up to the eyes shows more soul than the long takes of the body. It is the director’s task to find the eyes of a landscape. Only in close-ups of these details will he capture the soul of the whole: the climate” (2013, p. 67).

2. In their introduction to the book *Slow Cinema*, Tiago de Luca and Nuno Barradas Jorge (2015, p. 19) state that one of the first to coin the concept of cinema of slowness was the French film critic Michel Ciment in 2003, citing examples of directors such as Béla Tarr (Hungary), Tsai Ming-liang (Taiwan) and Abbas Kiarostami (Iran). In 2008, taking-up the expression of Ciment, Matthew Flanagan (2008) expanded the theoretical applications of the concept in his paper *Towards an Aesthetic of Slow in Contemporary Cinema*, in which he describes as characteristics of this cinema the use of long takes, de-centred and understated modes of storytelling, and a pronounced emphasis on quietude and the everyday. In the Latin American context, the editors of *Slow Cinema* (De Luca & Barradas Jorge, 2015) talk about directors such as Carlos Reygadas (Mexico) and Lisandro Alonso (Argentina).

3. He studied film at the Universidad de Artes, Ciencias y Comunicación (UNIACC) (UNIACC). In 2003 he received the Fundación Andes scholarship for the realization of his first documentary work *Ningún lugar en ninguna parte* (2004), filmed after a year of visits to the neighborhood La Matriz of Valparaíso. The film was premiered in more than twenty-five international festivals. He then shot the short film *Obreras saliendo de la fábrica* (2005), selected in more than 50 festivals and which has received, among others, the award for the best short film at ZINEBI Bilbao and the Drama Short Film Festival. His documentary *El tiempo que se queda* (2007) was premiered at the Rotterdam 2007 festival and won the Best Film of the Cinema of the Future Award at BAFICI, in Buenos Aires, that same year. In addition to directing that film, he was its producer, cameraman, sound engineer and editor. His first fiction feature film was *El Cielo, la tierra y la lluvia* (2008), premiered at the 2008 Rotterdam Film Festival, where he was honored, as well as at festivals in Mexico and Korea. In 2011 he premiered his second feature film, *Verano* (2011) at the Venice Film Festival and in 2016, again in Rotterdam, *El viento sabe que vuelvo a casa*.

REFERENCES

- Agamben, G. (2006). *Lo abierto. El hombre y el animal* [The open. The man and the animal]. Buenos Aires: Adriana Hidalgo Editora.
- Andrew, D. (1976). *The major film theories. An introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bálázs, B. (2013). *El hombre visible o la cultura del cine* [Visible man or the culture of cinema]. Buenos Aires: El Cuenco de Plata.
- Bellour, R. (2014). *From Hypnosis to Animals*. *Cinema Journal*, 53(3), 1-8. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/43653617.pdf>

- Bennett, J. (2010). *Vibrant Matter. A Political Economy of Things*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Braidotti, R. (2013). *The Posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Brown, B. (2001). Thing Theory. *Critical Inquiry*, 28(1), 1-22. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1344258>
- Burt, J. (2002). *Animals in film*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Cole, D. & Frost, S. (2010). *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Crary, J. (2008). *Técnicas del observador. Visión y modernidad en el siglo XIX* [Techniques of the Observer. On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century]. Murcia: Cendeac.
- De los Ríos, V. & Donoso, C. (2015). *El cine de Ignacio Agüero. El documental como la lectura de un espacio* [The cinema of Ignacio Agüero. Documentary as the vision of a space]. Santiago: Cuarto Propio.
- De Luca, T. & Barradas Jorge, N. (2015). *Slow Cinema*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Derrida, J. (2008). *El animal que luego estoy si(gui)endo* [The Animal That Therefore I Am]. Madrid: Editorial Trotta.
- Flanagan, M. (2008). Towards an Aesthetic of Slow in Contemporary Cinema. 16:9, (29). Retrieved from http://www.16-9.dk/2008-11/side11_inenglish.htm
- Fox, N. J. & Alldred, P. (2017). *Sociology and the New Materialism. Theory, Research, Action*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Haraway, D. (2003). *The Companion Species Manifesto: Dogs, people, and significant otherness (vol.1)*. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.
- Latour, B. (1996). On Actor-Network Theory: A Few Clarifications. *Soziale Welt*, 47(4), 369-81. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/40878163.pdf>
- Lebow, A. (2012). *The Cinema of Me: The Self and Subjectivity in First Person Documentary*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Nichols, B. (1991). *La representación de la realidad* [Representing reality]. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Pick, A. (2018). Vulnerability. In Lori Gruen (Ed.), *Critical Terms for Animal Studies* (pp. 337-348). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Valeria de los Ríos, associate professor at the Aesthetics Institute of the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. She is a researcher in the field of visual culture and Chilean cinema. She is the author of *Fantasma Artificial. Cine y fotografía en Enrique Lihn and Espectros de luz*; co-author of *El cine de Ignacio Agüero* and coeditor of *El cine de Raúl Ruiz*. Her papers have been published in national and international books and magazines. Currently preparing the book *Raúl Ruiz, metamorfosis*.