

Pizza birra faso: Buildings of Hierarchy and Exclusion

Thirteen minutes into *Pizza birra faso* (Caetano and Stagnaro 1997), a group of teenage boys break into the iconic Obelisk in the middle of 9 de Julio Avenue in downtown Buenos Aires. After finding a page torn from a magazine posted on the inside wall showing scantily dressed women, they swig wine from a carton they have also found as they climb the ladder to the top of the building. This activity closes out a day that has included two robberies, one of a businessman in a taxi, the other of a homeless guitar player amputee. When the film's protagonist, Córdoba, peers out the small window at the top of the Obelisk, he sees his pregnant girlfriend, Sandra, being escorted away by police in connection with the robbery of the homeless man. Futilely, Córdoba yells at them to release her, and then hurries down the ladder to attempt to free her from the authorities.

The Obelisk at the center of this scene defines the boys' relationship to the socioeconomic politics of Buenos Aires in the mid-1990s. A downtown site that connotes centrality and power, the Obelisk's representational authority is stripped in this scene as the boys forcibly enter the building, uncover the secrets of its interior—including graffiti and pornography—and drunkenly make their way to the top. The boys then mark this subversion by adopting the position of surveyors of the city by gazing out of the window at the Obelisk's summit. However, instead of giving them authority, this only returns them to “their place” as marginalized inhabitants. Despite achieving the dominant vantage point

through his gaze, Córdoba cannot achieve change and has no voice in releasing Sandra from her arrest.

Youth's marginalization from the neoliberal city of the 1990s emerged in a cluster of films from this era including *Sábado* (Villegas 2001), *Tan de repente* (Lerman 2002), *Picado fino* (Sapir 1996) and *Fuga de cerebros* (Musa 1998). As in *Pizza birra faso*, the city does not become the source of meaningful work or engaged community in these films. Rather, the city represents youth's boredom which leads to delinquent occupations and unfocused relationships. *Pizza birra faso* garnered a host of awards in both Argentine and European film festivals, including Best Film, Best Director and Best Screenplay, for the film's co-directors and screenwriters, Israel Adrián Caetano (born 1969) and Bruno Stagnaro (born 1973), who were in their twenties at the time of the film's release.¹

In the time since this co-production, the Uruguayan-born Caetano has directed the feature films *Bolivia* (2001) and *El oso rojo* (2002), while Stagnaro has turned almost exclusively to writing and directing television miniseries. With university degrees in cinema,² Caetano and Stagnaro knew how to make the best of their low-budget production; they hired nonprofessional actors and filmed in real settings rather than in a studio, both of which are techniques that characterize New Argentine Cinema but also recall the post-World War II cinematic movement of Italian Neorealism to which the film has been compared (Page, *Crisis and Capitalism* 2009, 34–43).³

In *Pizza birra faso*, sociopolitical hierarchies are laid out through the juxtaposition of the protagonists with the architecture of Buenos Aires. From the iconic symbolism of the Obelisk to the entertainment venues of restaurants and nightclubs, to the public spaces of the street, the park and the port, architecture illustrates the complexities of the boys' relationship to the city. The built environment is framed through the camera lens to taunt and exclude the boys; to uphold the status quo, but also to challenge social conventions.

The film follows a group of four unemployed and delinquent post-adolescent boys in their attempts to make a living through thievery. After the principal protagonists, Córdoba (Héctor Anglada) and his closest friend, Pablo (Jorge Sesán), tire of performing heists for a corrupt taxi driver, they attempt increasingly elaborate robberies with their other two friends, Frula (Walter Díaz) and Megabom (Alejandro Pous). The boys scam and pickpocket men waiting in an unemployment line, and they rob an upscale restaurant with the help of an older friend, who in turn

steals much of the looted money. Finally, they raid a nightclub, a job that leads to the slaying of two of the boys by the police. Córdoba's reasons for unlawfulness are shown to be his girlfriend and her pregnancy: he expresses his wish to provide for her and to settle down as a family in Uruguay.⁴ He manages to give her the money from the nightclub robbery, and she leaves by herself on the ferry to Uruguay, while Córdoba dies at the port from a gunshot wound inflicted by the police as the ferry pulls away and the film ends.

The film's architecture emphasizes contrasts and hierarchies in the sociopolitical and economic structures of Argentina during the Menemist era. A critique of the neoliberal power system emerges throughout *Pizza birra faso*. Under the presidency of Carlos Menem (1989–1999), the government welcomed foreign investment and privatized national industries. In a radical move to stop burgeoning inflation, Menem's minister of the economy, Domingo Cavallo, introduced the *Ley de Convertibilidad* in 1991, which pegged the Argentine peso to the United States dollar. These policies created a façade of prosperity marked in the urban landscape by the construction of upscale shopping malls and business tourist investments such as the restaurants in the exclusive district of Puerto Madero that catered to a wealthy clientele. *Pizza birra faso*'s cumbia soundtrack—associated with the *villa miseria*⁵—and the opening scenes of people washing windscreens in the chaos of downtown traffic revealed the perspective of those marginalized by neoliberal policies. The youthful voice of the film is clearly critical of the government: Córdoba reveals that he had held a job with the national railroad before it was privatized, and Pablo is surprised that his hospital stay is not fully covered by the government.⁶

The film represents the possibilities for manipulating architectural symbolism by exploring the relationship between the built environment and marginalized social groups. One way of understanding such groups is to look at the centrality of media in contemporary society. Over the course of the twentieth century to the present day, the media has played an increasingly significant role in assigning meaning to architecture. Lawrence J. Vale (1999), for example, argues that “the twentieth century marks the ascendance of mediated monuments” (391), a shift in the way in which images come to achieve meaning. This change suggests that now:

Business, cultural and governmental élites must cope with a diffusion of control over images and, now more than ever, still need “official” sorts of architectural monuments to demonstrate their ongoing power and

legitimacy. In an image-saturated world, such “petrified memories” cannot “speak for themselves”; in increasingly plural societies there is rarely a commonly understood cultural code. (391)

The media transforms the popular reception of architecture to meanings perhaps unintended by the political and economic authorities that subsidize, sanction and design their construction. With this in mind, the film extrapolates the significance of built environments to then question, subvert and even ridicule them. Indeed, rather than underline the power exuded by downtown sites, *Pizza birra faso* sarcastically challenges their authority by cinematographically framing authoritative architecture in contact with marginalized protagonists. The boys’ circulation through Buenos Aires highlights the underside of the city that is lived in by the unemployed, the homeless, and the delinquent.

DOWNTOWN BUENOS AIRES

Pizza birra faso mediates the built environment of Buenos Aires to reveal a city undercut by socioeconomic oppositions. In addition to the Obelisk on the 9 de Julio Avenue, the film captures images of the neighborhoods of Retiro, Once and la Boca, as well as the Pan-American Highway, the Aeroparque and the Port. Economic contrasts are evident in this visual tour: Retiro’s *villa miseria* beside the luxurious buildings that rise behind it; the wasteland of the River Plate coast along the Pan-American Highway in contrast to the carefully built waterfront by the Aeroparque; the cheap downtown pizza stand, Ubi, frequented by the boys in contrast with the upscale restaurant in the neighborhood, Once, which they rob (Verardi 2009, 2). These disparities serve to unravel the stability of power hierarchies as the boys seek prospects for a meaningful existence from within their environment.

The manipulation of the architectural meanings in the film is nowhere more apparent than in the Obelisk sequence. While its imposing form recalls the Washington Monument on the downtown Mall in Washington DC, the Obelisk’s location, the history of its construction and its incorporation into the political trajectory of Argentina saturate the monument with significant meanings of power and authority—facts that are not overlooked by its portrayal in the film. As Malcolm Miles (1997) has affirmed, “Monuments are produced within a dominant framework of values, as elements in the construction of a national history.... [T]hey suppose at least

a partial consensus of values” (58). Indeed, Miles continues to note that monuments such as the Buenos Aires Obelisk represent a “stability which conceals the internal contradictions of society and survives the day-to-day fluctuations of history ... becoming a device of social control less brutish and costly than armed force” (58).

Designed by the modernist architect, Alberto Prebisch, and built in 1936, the Obelisk commemorated 400 years since the founding of the city of Buenos Aires.⁷ It stands, significantly, in the Plaza de la República at the intersection of three heavily travelled large avenues in the city’s downtown—the 9 de Julio (known as the widest avenue in the world), the four-lane Corrientes Street and the smaller, Diagonal Norte. As if this were not enough to establish its symbolic centrality, during the last year of Isabel Perón’s presidency in 1975, the government placed a ring around the monument’s center that stated “el silencio es salud” [silence is health] (Fig. 2.1). Apparently, this campaign was intended to raise awareness about urban noise, although many residents understood this as a double entendre to silence the people’s voice during the dictatorship that started officially with the coup d’état in 1976 after tensions had already begun mounting significantly.⁸



Fig. 2.1 Screenshot from the short film, “Buenos Aires 1975” (Dir. Enrique Landea)

The film seems to respond directly to Beatriz Sarlo's critique that, in contrast with the Eiffel Tower, the Obelisk has no aerial view:

Tiene un ojo ciego: se planta en Buenos Aires como si estuviera en medio de la llanura desierta, sin hacer cálculos sobre lo que queda allí abajo, a sus pies. El Obelisco no mira a Buenos Aires, por el contrario, es la ciudad la que mira el Obelisco, que es un monumento sin interioridad y, por lo tanto, sin nervio óptico. (162)

[It has a blind eye: it stands in Buenos Aires as if it were in the middle of the deserted plain without calculating what is down below, at its feet. The Obelisk does not look at Buenos Aires, rather it is the city that looks at the Obelisk, a monument without interiority and, therefore, without an optic nerve.]

Before the boys enter the monument, the camera frames them with Sandra in front of the Obelisk in an important shot that accentuates the youths' challenge of the political and economic authority represented by the structure. For 4 seconds, the camera captures the youths' backs as they sit in front of the Obelisk, while the imposing white base of the column begins its rise in the background (Fig. 2.2). Here, the alternating domination of state architecture and marginalized youth is put into play: the camera privileges the protagonists by foregrounding them, but their authority is undermined mediatically by being filmed from behind as well as through their passive, leisurely seated poses. The Obelisk's background location in the frame minimizes its power, but its ominous size and color reestablishes its authority: its height remains undetermined as it extends out of the frame.

This power competition between architectural authority and those marginalized in the society continues in the sequence in which the boys break into the monument. Previous to that point, they have expressed their fascination with the Obelisk; at the pizza stand, Pablo talks about its phallic semblance and, a few scenes later, Córdoba wonders about the windows at the top. Finally, the boys attempt to appropriate the column as a space they can access; their pursuit of the all-seeing authoritarian gaze from the top is thwarted when Córdoba becomes a helpless observer of Sandra's arrest. This shift in the authority of the gaze reveals the distinction in life necessities between the boys and the larger hegemonic society: when they assume the visual power of the bird's-eye view, they find that their needs rest on the ground in the experience of the



Fig. 2.2 Screenshot from the film, *Pizza birra faso*, 9:56

“everyday.” As if in dialogue with Michel de Certeau and his notion of authority linked to the city view from above, the film affirms the different needs of society’s marginalized members. The boys become helpless if their vision gains the authority of distance; their minimal power can only be assumed—again, at a minimal level—on the street.

BUILDINGS OF ENTERTAINMENT

While the environment of buildings downtown allows the film to amplify socioeconomic contrasts, the representation of places of entertainment mediates the spatial exclusion that developed out of economic factors in Buenos Aires during the 1990s. Alongside massive levels of unemployment—figures reached 12.2% in 1994, 13.7% in 1997 (when *Pizza birra faso* was released) and 14.7% in 2000—the greater Buenos Aires urban environment saw an investment equal to approximately two billion dollars in the development of new highways between 1990 and 1998, due in large part to the expansion of gated communities in the outlying regions of the city (Cerruti and Grimson 2004, 27).

In fact, the majority of private investment during this period was dedicated to the construction of buildings that uniquely supported business

professionals: “centros comerciales, comunidades cerradas, hipermercados y hoteles” [commercial centers, gated communities, superstores and hotels] (Cerruti and Grimson, 27). On the other hand, neoliberal policies also involved “un nuevo tipo de exclusión espacial de los pobres urbanos” [a new sort of spatial exclusion for the urban poor] in which the traditional middle- and lower-class neighborhoods experienced a “deterioro generalizado” [generalized deterioration] in their upkeep and maintenance due to the extreme levels of unemployment of their residents (Cerruti and Grimson, 28).

As a reflection of these changes to the urban landscape, the youth in the film are excluded from both the restaurant and the nightclub. The boys’ knowledge of the norms related to a sit-down restaurant is minimal.⁹ When Sandra wants to eat at a table, the boys explain that they do not have the money for a proper restaurant. Later they express surprise when they learn that the restaurant client pays a service charge merely to sit at a table. Although a more possible venue for the boys’ entertainment, the nightclub also restricts access to them. They need to pay to enter, and the manager denies his acquaintance with them when they try to bypass the monetary requirement for entry. Instead of accepting their marginalization and exclusion from these locales, the boys choose to enter illegally through armed robbery.

Before attempting the restaurant robbery, the boys consider the architectural layout of this upscale site in the commercial neighborhood of Once. It is an easy task for Rubén, an older friend of Frula’s who is leading the job, to convince the boys that the restaurant is popular with the rich and famous. The youth both observe the characteristics of the restaurant from the outside and also discuss its interior design to plan their moves. They gaze nervously at the entrance on the street corner, and discuss possible pitfalls—the place does not look busy; how will they carry out the theft?; can the childish Megabom really serve as lookout? To the question of the interior layout of the restaurant to plan the trajectory to the cash register, Rubén describes the interior design as long and thin, “tipo chorizo” [sausage-like].

The camera underscores the youths’ exclusion from the site when they finally enter the front door. In a shot from the restaurant’s interior, the camera captures the boys behind the glass doors of the vestibule for 3 seconds as they anxiously peer inside (Fig. 2.3). The viewer is struck by the visual interaction between representatives of different social classes when a pair of diners appears to note that the boys gazing through the



Fig. 2.3 Screenshot from the film, *Pizza birra faso*, 38:19

doors do not belong in a restaurant of this caliber. The duration of the shot at the vestibule creates a moment of hesitation before the rapid action of the robbery. Although excluded from recording the actual theft, the camera focuses on Megabom waiting at the car, and then the sudden thrust of the boys running from the restaurant, yelling orders in a race to the getaway car. Adrenaline mounts as the boys feel discomfort at their escapade. While the previous thefts—the taxi client, the legless busker, the unemployment line—were performed without high levels of anxiety, this restaurant robbery has placed the boys in an unfamiliar environment.

The mise-en-scène of the nightclub robbery also illustrates the youth's marginalization underlined by spatial exclusion. In this case, it involves the play of eyeline matches and reverse shots between the boys and the authority figures who guard the entrance to the nightclub. An establishing shot from the night before the robbery (Fig. 2.4) notes the club's advertisement for the performance of Los Charros, a cumbia group from the Chaco region of Argentina,¹⁰ before the political dynamics of the locale are revealed to the viewer. Large and heavy-built, the club's bouncer covers the entrance to the nightclub to defend it from those who are undesired. Frequently catching the bouncer's eye, the boys attempt to access the establishment but are turned away. On the night of the robbery, when Córdoba, Pablo and Frula manage to enter the ticket booths to steal, the camera captures the glass screens of the booths that both divide and exclude.



Fig. 2.4 Screenshot from the film, *Pizza birra faso*, 45:20

The restrictions on the boys develop from their lack of economic power: social exclusion stems from their unviable choices for making money. Their desire to acquire wealth through delinquency pushes them down in all areas and finally destroys their futures by bringing on the premature deaths of Córdoba, Frula and, probably, Megabom.

OUTDOOR DESIGNS

While exclusionary politics reflect an era of privatization, the spaces that offer the most access, freedom and intimacy are public ones such as the street, the park and the port. The street becomes the site for the enactment of private intimacies. It returns the boys to animalistic hierarchies based on bodily strength, and it reflects the temporal understanding of society for those removed from the status quo. That intimacy is attained most frequently in the public sphere in the film demonstrates the inversion of conventional meanings of public and private for the boys. The neoliberal era that saw fences and walls erected around previously public spaces—for example, the neighborhood or village transformed into a

gated community; the restriction of public access to parks—limited the possibilities for public spaces:

In the Buenos Aires of the 1990s, not only were more and more of the upscale residential areas becoming enclosed and gated, but even public areas such as parks, beaches, and historical sites were increasingly privatized: either bought by individuals for their personal use or, more often, acquired by corporations that converted them into shopping malls and commercial real estate, the enjoyment of which was limited to specific social groups. (Guano 2002, 186)

Ironically, or sadly, it is precisely in these spaces that were diminishing during the 1990s where the boys find a level of respite from the restrictions imposed on them. The *mise-en-scène* frames these moments of respite as interrupted by an illustration of power from the built environment or through human interaction.

Discussions of feelings, emotions, relationships, and revenge, as well as family routines such as dining, all occur on the street, creating a contrasting marker for the site: while the environment calls for fleeting and ephemeral conversations and relationships, the boys redefine normative behaviors for these transitory places. Córdoba and Sandra argue on the street outside his apartment, he gives a reconciliatory gift to his girlfriend,¹¹ and then he makes significant promises about their future to her during a walk at the port. After the bungle of the restaurant robbery, the boys reassert their friendship while walking through a residential area. When Córdoba and Pablo are denied entry into the nightclub, they sit on the curb to plot their “revenge.” They eat dinner on the curb facing the Obelisk instead of at a table.

The street environment is also infused with particular social hierarchies that relate most clearly to an attitude of pure survival. As Gonzalo Aguilar has demonstrated, this drive to survive, represented by the boys’ nomadic displacement through transitory places such as the taxi, also challenges the conventions of modern society (Aguilar 2006, 45). On the street, the youths’ agile bodies permit them control over certain figures who are more direly outcast. In the opening scenes of the film, Córdoba and Pablo first appear energetically hanging from trucks to meet the taxi driver and stage their robbery while beggars (including a woman with a baby, and a man in a wheelchair) circulate among the cars asking for money.¹² The indigent man who eats the boys’ pizza leftovers,

and the theft from the legless busker, also point to this survivalist hierarchy. In another shockingly brazen sequence, the youths steal from those waiting in an unemployment line and manage to outrun the men who chase them furiously through a city park.

For Joanna Page, the opening close-up scenes of dense traffic and circulating people that intersperse with the opening credits—all pulled together through the extradiegetic cumbia soundtrack—illustrate ways in which “the film as a whole attempts to carve a hole in the frenzied time of the city, through which we may glimpse the lives of those who are not integrated into the space-time of global capitalism” (*Crisis and Capitalism*, 37). As Sarlo (2009) has observed in reference to the urban poor: “En los tiempos cortos no hay posibilidad de acumular nada, porque toda previsión necesita de un tiempo extenso y de un aprendizaje que enseñe a navegar ese tiempo, difiriendo las necesidades, eligiendo a cuál se responde primero” [In short lapses of time, there is no possibility for accumulating anything because all forecasting needs extensive time and the learnt knowledge of how to navigate that time, differentiate necessities and choose which to respond to first] (67). In the film’s contemplation of its construction, Page identifies an “alternative filmic temporality” that draws it in as a “sociological tool” (*Crisis and Capitalism*, 37). Indeed, two different temporalities are underscored in the experience of the city: that of the constant circulation of traffic and working people (reflected in the shakiness of the handheld camera) and that of the discouraged youth who merely sit and wait on the street (Page, *Crisis and Capitalism*, 38).

An extension of this is the *mise-en-scène* of the city park as a site infused with the contradictory notions of acceptance and exclusion. After their scam in the unemployment line, Córdoba, Pablo and Megabom race through the park to the main street with the victims hot on their tails. An upscale apartment building looms in the background as the camera captures them with a low-angle shot running down a grassy incline in the park (Fig. 2.5). The lens frames the boys during the moments in which they seem to be losing the men who are pursuing them; they run freely down the slope as if carefree. During this short sequence, the condominium in the background serves as an indication of the boys’ continued socioeconomic difficulties: the viewer is reminded that their poverty and lawlessness excludes them from belonging to this space.



Fig. 2.5 Screenshot from the film, *Pizza birra faso*, 24:41

While the film reiterates tensions in socioeconomic hierarchies through its portrayal of the street and the park, the final sequence at the port of Buenos Aires definitively fuses the narrative and the characters with the city. As the ferry departs from the port, the camera on the ship looks back to reveal Buenos Aires in a sequence that lasts a full 1 minute and 40 seconds (Fig. 2.6). That the youths' full identities have been subsumed by the city becomes even clearer when the police radios announce the results of the night-time violence—coldly requesting two hearses for the boys killed in the shooting. Carolina Rocha has commented that Buenos Aires is equated metaphorically with a “tomb” in this final scene (“The Many Faces of Buenos Aires” 2008, 119).

This mise-en-scène breaks from filmic conventions concerning endings and closure. Instead of a sharp image of an urban skyline, in this sequence the city retains the haze of the early morning, a brown-gray color that matches the dirtiness of the river. While the camera will usually film from the front of the ferry towards the future, this camera films back into the past in a way that elicits concern for the protagonists and for the city's future. Does this gray city hold the possibility of optimism for the youth of Buenos Aires? How can this environment be made to protect and embrace those marginalized from the socioeconomic and political



Fig. 2.6 Screenshot from the film, *Pizza birra faso*, 1:12:09

system? Can they be welcomed into the city's buildings, and can the iconic symbols come to represent them as well? Viewers consider these questions in this final scene as they recall the boys' inability to connect with the symbolic significance of iconic architecture such as the Obelisk, their exclusion from places of entertainment and their intimacy with the habitation and use of public spaces. Architecture in the film underscores the boys' marginalization from the mainstream as well as their defiance against social norms.

NOTES

1. *Pizza birra faso* was subsidized by the local production company, Palo y la Bolsa Cine, the Instituto Nacional de Cine y Artes Audiovisuales, and the Film Festival Rotterdam's financial assistance to projects from developing countries, the Hubert Bals Fund.
2. Stagnaro studied at the Universidad de Cine in Buenos Aires and Caetano studied at a film school in Barcelona, Spain (Falicov 2003, 52).
3. Analyses of *Pizza birra faso* place the film in a postmodern cinematic and historical context; scholars have observed its effective representation

of the globalized economy (Kantaris, “Last Snapshots/Take 2” 2010; Rocha, “The Many Faces of Buenos Aires”); the protagonists’ nomadic tendencies that isolate them from the mainstream (Aguilar, 43–47); and the film’s *mise-en-scène* that privileges discontinuity and observation (Page, *Crisis and Capitalism*, 37).

4. Elisa Vidal (2004) astutely has affirmed that it is difficult to read the character of Sandra without thinking about the important political role of women during the past few decades in Argentina. Sandra’s determination to leave the life of delinquency and violence recalls the strength of the Madres de Plaza de Mayo and the neighborhood women organizers who, in recent years, have pulled communities forward in the face of great hardship (162).
5. Although beyond the scope of this analysis, and worthy of an in-depth study of its own, the film’s use of cumbia villera is significant. The music genre expresses resistance to the dominant culture, as Eloísa Martín (2012) has underscored: “On the one hand, it expresses dissidence with the ideals that linked work and family with notions of masculinity. And on the other hand, as a form of disagreement with the social exclusion these *pibes* suffer (from the networks of the dominant order of the state, the market, the law, and hegemonic values), expressed in two different ways: (1) that of recklessness and (2) that of a desire for inclusion, yet not in the terms promoted by the dominant order” (60).
6. Remarking on the relationship between the protagonists and the city, Elisa Vidal has noted that: “La ciudad, con su entramado violento, está lista para ‘vigilar y castigar’ a quienes hayan sido apartados del ‘orden’ establecido. Por eso son arrojados a su suerte, sin tener posibilidad de inserción, de trabajo, de progreso; están condenados de antemano” [The city, with its violent framework, is ready to “surveil and punish” those outside the established “order.” That is why they are thrown to their fate, without the possibility of integration, of working, of progress; they are condemned in advance] (163).
7. See Ernesto Katzenstein for a description of modernist architecture of Buenos Aires in the 1930s.
8. See Enrique Landea’s short film, “Buenos Aires 1975” (<http://www.mapsofsilence.com/CASTELLANO/videos/enrique.html>) for a filmic interpretation of the reception of this sign in Buenos Aires during this time period (Landea 2012).
9. The boys’ resistance to norms of conduct in restaurants begins when Córdoba sits on the counter at the pizza stand and the manager gestures for him to get down, to which Pablo comments wryly, “la ley” [the law]. This infraction against the norms of dining foreshadows the later larger-scale thefts of the restaurant and the nightclub.

10. In another moment that is supposed to represent the same evening, the sign on the nightclub advertises another cumbia band, Los Sheriff—obviously a consistency error in filming.
11. Córdoba offers her cotton to help her in her pregnancy, a gift that is tenderly received by Sandra.
12. Their dominant physical status has certain clear limitations. Pablo's asthma and Rubén's false tooth point to the decadence of Argentine society portrayed in *Pizza birra faso*.

REFERENCES

- Aguilar, Gonzalo. 2006. *Otros mundos: un ensayo sobre el nuevo cine argentino*. Buenos Aires: Santiago Arcos Editor.
- Caetano, Adrian and Bruno Stagnaro, Dir. 1997. *Pizza birra faso*. Argentina: Hubert Bals Fund, Instituto Nacional de Cine y Artes Audiovisuales (INCAA) and Palo y a la Bolsa Cine Palo y a la Bolsa Cine.
- Caetano, Adrián, Dir. 2001. *Bolivia*. Argentina and The Netherlands: Fundación PROA, Hubert Bals Fund, Iacam, Instituto Nacional de Cine y Artes Audiovisuales (INCAA) and La Expresión del Deseo.
- Caetano, Adrián, Dir. 2002. *El oso rojo*. Argentina, Spain and France: Lita Stantic Producciones, TS Productions and Wanda Visión S.A.
- Cerruti, Marcela, and Alejandro Grimson. 2004. *Buenos Aires, neoliberalismo y después. Cambios socioeconómicos y respuestas populares*. Buenos Aires: Instituto de Desarrollo Económico y Social. http://www.plataformademocratica.org/Publicacoes/2358_Cached.pdf.
- Falicov, Tamara L. 2003. Los hijos de Menem: The New Independent Argentine Cinema, 1995–1999. *Framework: The Journal of Cinema and Media* 44 (1): 49–63.
- Guano, Emanuela. 2002. Spectacles of Modernity: Transnational Imagination and Local Hegemonies in Neoliberal Buenos Aires. *Cultural Anthropology* 17 (2): 181–209.
- Kantaris, Geoffrey. 2010. Last Snapshots/Take 2: Personal and Collective Shipwrecks in Buenos Aires. In *Cultures of the City: Mediating Identities in Urban Latin/o America*, ed. Richard Young and Amanda Holmes, 31–45. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Landea, Enrique, Dir. 2012. Buenos Aires 1975. Buenos Aires, Mapas del silencio. Produced by the San Francisco Art Commission.
- Lerman, Diego, Dir. 2002. *Tan de repente*. Argentina and The Netherlands: Hubert Bals Fund, Lita Stantic Producciones and Nylon Cine.
- Martin, Eloisa. 2012. Cumbia Villera and the End of the Culture of Work in Argentina in the 90s. In *Youth Identities and Argentine Popular Music*, ed. Pablo Semán and Pablo Vila, 59–82. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Miles, Malcolm. 1997. *Art, Space and the City: Public Art and Urban Futures*. New York: Routledge.
- Musa, Fernando, Dir. 1998. *Fuga de cerebros*. Argentina.
- Page, Joanna. 2009. *Crisis and Capitalism in Contemporary Argentine Cinema*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Rocha, Carolina. 2008. The Many Faces of Buenos Aires: Migrants, Foreigners and Immigrants in Contemporary Argentine Cinema (1996–2008). *Visual Communication: Urban Representations in Latin America*. Organized by David William Foster and Denise Correa Araujo, 110–138. Porto Alegre: editora.plus.org. <http://www.siuue.edu/~crocha/files/visual.pdf#page=110>.
- Sapir, Esteban, Dir. 1996. *Picado fino*. Buenos Aires: 5600 Film.
- Sarlo, Beatriz. 2009. *La ciudad vista: mercancías y cultura urbana*. Buenos Aires: Siglo Veintiuno Editores.
- Vale, Lawrence J. 1999. Mediated Monuments and National Identity. *The Journal of Architecture* 4: 391–408.
- Verardi, Malena. 2009. *Pizza, birra, faso: la ciudad y el margen*. *Bifurcaciones: Revista de Estudios Culturales Urbanas* 9: 1–8. http://www.bifurcaciones.cl/009/pdf/bifurcaciones_009_pizzabirrafaso.pdf.
- Vidal, Elisa. 2004. *Pizza birra faso*. In *Plano secuencia. 20 películas argentinas para reafirmar la democracia*, ed. Mónica Satarain, 159–164. Buenos Aires: La Crujía Ediciones.
- Villegas, Juan, Dir. 2001. *Sábado*. Argentina: Tresplanos Cine.

Politics of Architecture in Contemporary Argentine
Cinema

Holmes, A.

2017, X, 162 p. 54 illus., 30 illus. in color., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-55190-6