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Abstract. This introduction to the Special Issue provides a synthetic overview of scholarly and mainstream discussions about the Portuguese presence in France, while addressing how the different articles collectively and individually expand our understandings of the Portuguese in France as themselves highly reflexive producers of culture. We review common images of the Portuguese presence in France, including how Luso-French participants and cultural producers have responded to and contested such images. In particular, we discuss the following: 1. the relative (in)visibility of Portuguese migrants and their descendants from public life in both Portugal and France, as compared to other migrant and postmigrant groups; 2. how Luso-French cultural producers navigate their families’ transnational lives and intergenerational relations as material for cultural production; 3. the politics surrounding the (i)legitimacy and differential circulation of various forms of Portuguese and Luso-French cultural products. We hope that the issue’s focus on Luso-French cultural productions will allow fresh perspectives, and invite new questions to be asked about the legacies and future directions of Luso-France.
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This special issue brings together scholarship on the underexplored cultural productions by and about those who have participated in the vibrant life of the Portuguese community in France, which we call “Luso-France.” In this introduction, we provide a synthetic overview of previous scholarly and mainstream discussions about the Portuguese presence in France, as background for our exploration of the recurrent themes raised across the articles in this issue.

Despite their presence as one of the largest extra-national groups living in France, the Portuguese have been disproportionately absent from mainstream French political and everyday discussions about immigration. Indeed, the Portuguese have been in France for over a century. Portuguese immigration to
France can be traced back as early as 1916, with an uptick in the twenties and thirties, followed by massive economic and political emigration from rural north and inland Portugal to urban and suburban France during the dictatorship (1928–1974). The number of emigrants reached 750,000 in 1975. Since the economic crisis of the mid 2000s, the Portuguese have again become the largest group of emigrants to France (Volovitch-Tavares).

There is now a substantial bibliography about the Portuguese in France, who have long been the focus of scholarly inquiry across various social science disciplines, such as sociology (e.g., Michel Oriol, Marie-Antoinette Hily, Maria Graça Leandro, Jorge de Portugal Branco, Maria Do Ceu Cunha, Maria Beatriz Rocha Trindade, Albano Cordeiro, Marie-Christine Volovitch-Tavares, Jorge de la Barre, Manuel Antunes da Cunha), cultural anthropology (e.g., Irène dos Santos, Elsa Lechner, Caroline Brettell), history (e.g., Victor Pereira), social psychology (e.g., Felix Neto), and sociolinguistics (e.g., Michèle Koven, Roselyne de Villanova, Maria Helena Araujo Carreira, Christine Deprez, Isabel Vale Ferreira).

However, despite some noteworthy exceptions mentioned below, the cultural productions by members of Luso-France have remained relatively understudied. There is some scholarship on literature (Ana Paula Coutinho, Isabelle Simões Marques, Marie Isabelle Vieira, Martine Fernandes Wagner), immigrant life stories (Elsa Lechner), film and documentary (José Cardoso Marques, João Sousa Cardoso), theater (Graça dos Santos), the graphic novel (Michael Gott, Marie-Christine Volovitch-Tavares, Martine Fernandes Wagner), humor (Michèle Koven and Isabelle Simões Marques), music (Victor Pereira), and social media (Martine Fernandes Wagner, Isabelle Simões Marques and Michèle Koven). This special issue expands on this newly emerging focus, addressing the diversity of cultural productions of “Luso-France,” including literature, music, film, soccer, and online humor.

Our sustained attention to such productions represents a timely response to recent solicitations by the French Luso-descendant association, Cap Magellan, during the celebration of its 25th anniversary, as well as calls by Marie-Christine Volovitch-Tavares (186, Martine Wagner’s translation), to “investigate, preserve and understand the diversity of Portuguese immigrants’ journey and to move beyond stereotypes and commonplaces.” This special issue’s focus on Luso-French cultural productions responds to such invitations to commemorate and take stock of both the legacies and future directions of the Portuguese presence in France.

Below we discuss the key recurrent themes, that crosscut the different articles: (in)visibility of Portuguese migration from public life in both Portugal and France, common understandings of the Portuguese community in France, the latter’s transnational positioning and orientations, how participants have responded to and contested common French and Portuguese “stereotypes” about them, intergenerational and ambivalent relations connected to transnational lives, and the contested (il)legitimacy of different forms of Portuguese and Luso-French cultural products.
(In)visibility and Stigma
As mentioned above, given the large numerical Portuguese presence in France, their relative absence from mainstream French discussions about the legacies of immigration is striking. Indeed, it has become a commonplace to describe the Portuguese in France as either “invisible,” “discrete,” or “well integrated.” As notions of “invisibility,” “discretion,” and “integration” have multiple, ideologically fraught meanings, scholars have tried to complicate them (Boucher; Charbit et al.; Cordeiro “Les Termes du Débat”; Pingault; Wievorka). As shown across the articles, the Portuguese in France have shifted between different types of visibility to invisibility at specific national historical and political moments in France as well as Portugal (as also demonstrated by Volovitch-Tavares). Questions of the relative invisibility of Portuguese migrants in France are also linked to questions of stigma in contemporary France (dos Santos; Noiriel, Immigration) as well as in Portugal (Brettell; Gonçalves; Koven, “Antiracist Modern Selves”; Pereira, La Dictature de Salazar).

How to understand the complex intergroup interactions that produce a sense of a group’s “invisibility”? If a group is invisible/inaudible, does it result from their own silence? Are they speaking, but members of the mainstream are not listening, unable or refusing to see/hear/recognize them, or only seeing/hearing them through a limited set of reductive images? As Françoise Kral argues, visibility/audibility implies that others “think enough of me to listen to me” (57). Who then can speak for the minoritized group, so that they are recognized as fully human by members of the dominant group (Le Blanc)? Why and how are questions of mainstream recognition of minority groups of particular salience now? Who is seeking recognition, from whom, and as whom? Additionally, when the Portuguese in France are visible, one can ask about the nature of the images that are presented, circulated, and/or contested.

Although the relative (in)visibility of Portuguese migrants in France takes on specific contours in French and Portuguese contexts, it also illuminates broader scholarly discussions about the position of minority groups of migrant origin in contemporary national societies marked by transnational circulation of people, images, and goods (Appadurai; Basch et al). These discussions have been formulated under different national and disciplinary rubrics, such as interculturality (Blanchet and Coste), multiculturalism (Taylor), and/or (super)diversity (Faudree and Schulthies; Parekh; Urciuoli; Vertovec). Of particular relevance to questions of (in)visibility and representation, and legitimacy of Luso-French perspectives are discussions about the cultural politics of “public” and “counterpublic” spheres (Warner, Cody, Fraser), associated questions about the culturally variable nature of the public/private distinction (Gal), and issues about possibilities for representing minoritized perspectives (Inoue; Spivak; Vigouroux). We first provide background on the various meanings of notions of (in)visibility in French and Portuguese contexts. We will then discuss the different ways the articles in this issue engage with notions of (in)visibility.
(In)visibility in France
The issue of Portuguese invisibility in France is connected to French proscriptions against “ethnic communities,” particularly as these emerge in debates about the relative hypervisibility of groups with postcolonial links to France. Portuguese (in)visibility must be considered through implicit interethnic comparison.

Unlike discussions of ethnicity, race, and multiculturalism in the United States and Canada, France has historically upheld an official vision of public life that stresses the role of individuals’ allegiance to the nation and the values of the republic. “Integration” in French life has thus been understood in terms of single citizens’ renunciation of claims to group identities, considered to be illegitimate intermediaries between the individual and the republic (Boucher; Brubaker; Favell; Noiriel, Le Creuset Français; Schnapper La France, La République, Wievorka). Contra North American discussions, it has thus often been seen as problematic for social actors in France to make political claims in the name of group-based (ethnic, racial, national) differences or identities. In fact, making such claims has often led to negative charges of “communautarisme,” seen as perilous to the republic (Lévy; Rosello; Taguieff; see Bowen for comparison with the US American context). That said, this official perspective is, of course, complicated by the everyday lived experiences of social actors, who may maintain multiple practices and identifications with groups and places within and beyond the scale of the French nation.

The French ideological rejection of public claims to group, and more specifically, ethnic identities, has most overtly targeted those with North and Sub-Saharan African, rather than Portuguese ties. More specifically, in recent years, the most frequent and contentious debates against public claims to group identity and the “problems” of immigration have surrounded allegedly “hypervisible” displays of religiosity in public spaces and institutions, such as Muslim-identified women’s wearing of the headscarf or veil. Such debates often focus on the importance of secularism (laïcité) in the public sphere, relegating religion and often other group-linked identifications to the “private” sphere (see Jean-Louis Bianco, president of the governmental “Observatory of laïcité”; See Gal for a critique of the naturalness of the public/private distinction). As one can see, questions of (in)visibility of the Portuguese are tightly intertwined with French understandings of community/individual, public/private, (un)integration, all made more salient through intergroup comparisons between groups with connections to histories of French colonialism and those without.

That said, it is important to consider such mainstream French discussions about public recognition of group-based identities in historical perspective. During the socialist presidency of François Mitterrand in the 1980s, in relation to the rise of the extreme-right National Front and xenophobic acts and public discourses, there was an increase in various group-linked demands for equality and political rights (Hargreaves; Noiriel, Immigration). One key moment involved the 1983 “marche pour l’égalité,” a symbolic marker and contested “site of memory” (Nora) of the beginning of identity politics and struggles for social visibility by
marginalized ethnic groups in France. Labeled by the media as well as by some organizers as “la marche des Beurs,” the focus of the march largely remained on descendants of immigrants from North Africa, overlooking the role of other participants, such as those of Portuguese descent. It is within this larger context, through explicit and implicit intergroup comparison to postcolonial populations, that the Portuguese have often been referred to as “invisible” and/or “integrated,” where their assumed positioning as White, European, and Catholic has led to claims of the Portuguese as a “model minority” (Cordeiro, “Quelques données”; Sole compares them to “Asians”; Tetreault; seen also implicitly in everyday conversation among Luso-descendants in Koven, *Selves in Two Languages*, 188, “Antiracist Modern Selves”).

Through such invidious interethnic comparisons, the problematic notion of integration has frequently been invoked to discuss the Portuguese community in France, both in official and everyday discourse (despite a comeback of the term “assimilation,” see Chemin). As noted by Albano Cordeiro (“Les Termes du Débat”), notions of “integration” disguise the often very developed local and community resources and initiatives that have taken root among the Portuguese in France, from associations, to leisure activities, to sports (see Pereira article in this issue), to mention a few. The absence of overt conflict in French public space need not mean the absence of vibrant community life that is unlikely to disappear in the near future. Leaders and participants in Franco-Portuguese community life have thus implicitly challenged French oppositions between “integration” and “communautarisme” with its questionable, if sometimes tacit interethnic comparison to “Muslim” or “African” [North and Sub-Saharan] youth in the media by conjuring up the images of violent clashes of the “Banlieues crisis” since 2005 (Lucas; Slooter; Willsher).

We see questions of Portuguese (in)visibility in France across the articles in a variety of interconnected ways. For example, as Levéziel aptly notes, the Portuguese have not figured prominently in mainstream French movies, appearing mostly as stock stereotypical figures, such as the “Portuguese concierge.” Although Marie-Isabelle Vieira and Frédéric Levéziel note that Christian de Chalonge’s *O Salto* is still a landmark, the Portuguese appeared for the first time in a mainstream French film in *La Cage dorée* by French-Portuguese director, Ruben Alves. Levéziel describes *La Cage dorée* as a turning point in rendering the Portuguese visible to mainstream French audiences, situating it as a novel example of the new French comedic film genre of the “comédie communautaire.” He argues that through cinematic techniques that play on visibility and invisibility, the film portrays the Portuguese immigrant female domestic worker’s growing awareness of and resistance to social invisibility. Her struggles for recognition comes to represent those of the larger Portuguese community in France. Indeed, Levéziel argues that the film shows an image of the Portuguese as a “well integrated” model minority that is simultaneously focused on its group identity, problematizing simplistic juxtapositions of “communautarisme” and “integration” described above.
We also see questions of (in)visibility in Martine Fernandes Wagner's article about the singer Catherine Ribeiro's autobiography, *L'Enfance*. Using a literary, psychological, and socio-historical framework to analyze individual and social violence (maternal abuse) from the thirties to the fifties, Wagner focused on the darker and often silenced aspects of Luso-descendant, especially female experiences, in the context of the life of a public figure. In opposition to the image of “easy integration,” she shows the diversity and complexity of Portuguese immigrant experiences in France. She thus interrogates fixed reinterpretations of migrant histories, often presented dichotomously as either gloriously linked to positive images of the Portuguese colonial past, or as contemptible, linked to negative images associated with lower-status class, nation, and identity formation (Matozzi). Her article brings unusual attention to an era of Portuguese immigration prior to the sixties, focusing not only on immigrants’ working-class conditions but also on their role during World War II (see also Wagner, *Passages Clandestines*). Far from pathologizing the Portuguese immigrant experience, the singer, Ribeiro, makes visible such experiences of suffering, that are often obfuscated by the model minority discourse. In so doing, Ribeiro calls for concrete sociopolitical changes for a diversity of minority subjects (See parallel to Emmanuel Renault).

In his article about the role of soccer in the Portuguese community in France, Pereira also touches on questions of (in)visibility in his discussion of the different venues where soccer is played: in in-group associations, without outsiders’ scrutiny, and in venues more “visible” to French and international observers. As such, soccer allows both in-group affirmation and displays of legitimate pride in being Portuguese, making the Portuguese and Portugal visible in a positive light on a French and an international stage.

Similarly, questions of Portuguese (in)visibility in France emerge for Koven and Marques. Specifically, with the video having been seen over 5,000,000 times, many French Luso-descendants have embraced Ro et Cut’s emergence and success as a sign that the Portuguese have finally become visible in widely available, online popular culture. That said, although anyone with an internet connection can view Ro et Cut’s clip, it seems to have mostly reached a Luso-descendant audience, as indicated by the ways that the majority of commenters explicitly and implicitly signal their own Luso-French backgrounds. Ro et Cut then allow these insider Luso-descendant viewers to watch and recognize themselves in particular forms of heteroglossic, transnational, and intergenerationally rich scenarios. However, it remains unclear whether and how the emergence of Ro et Cut on YouTube makes the Portuguese visible to wider France-based audiences. This question of in-group versus mainstream visibility and audience emerged when Ro et Cut produced two brief miniseries for broader audiences, i.e., *Les Gardiens* through *Canal Plus* and *Le Bled est dans le Pré*. From Koven and Marques’s preliminary (unpublished) analyses of these two miniseries and their reception, it seems that Ro et Cut altered their performances, in order to appeal to audiences beyond the diaspora. Ro et Cut may have had to forsake some of their clever allusions to shared in-group experience, in order to be legible to audiences without a Portuguese migrant background. Some commenters complained that these miniseries depended more
heavily on dominant French images of immigrants as laughable and uncouth, in comparison to Ro et Cut’s earlier materials, such as *Vamos a Portugal*, discussed here. Indeed, although these mini-series may allow for greater apparent visibility for Portuguese to mainstream audiences, there may be a tradeoff. In order to be more widely recognizable and appeal to a mainstream audience, they may have had to recirculate rather than challenge mainstream stereotypes.

As such, the struggle against Portuguese invisibility in France is connected to struggles against stigma. If a group is invisible, it is less likely to be the target of overt stigma. Indeed, a number of the authors describe cases where Luso-French participants fight not only against being ignored, but also against being disdained. For example, Levéziel notes how *La Cage dorée* addresses and challenges mainstream stigmatizing images of the Portuguese as being of lower social status. Pereira mentions that soccer allowed Portuguese migrants and their descendants to compete on equal or better footing with so-called “French” teams. As Pereira notes, soccer’s role as a source of Portuguese ethnonational pride in France became particularly poignant, during the 2016 World Cup, when Portugal beat France. Many in the Luso-French community perceived Portuguese victory to be a “symbolic revenge,” challenging stereotypical and xenophobic visions of the Portuguese in France. For instance, the director of the RTP (*Radio Televisão Portuguesa*), ex-correspondent in Paris, dedicated the Portuguese victory to “all those who know what it means to suffer small daily humiliations, always expressed with a condescending, smiling tone, with the superiority of those who feel they can reduce us to the clichés of janitors, taxi drivers, construction worker and cleaning ladies” (Martine Wagner’s translation).

Across the articles, we can see the various ways that Luso-French cultural productions complicate mainstream French views of their model minority status, as well as received ideas about the status of “ethnic community” life and activity in France.

**(In)visibility Relative to Portuguese Contexts**

As noted in Oriol et al., and more recently (Charbit et al.; Koven, “Transnational Perspectives,” “Speaking French in Portugal”), the Portuguese in France are known for their bipolar and/or transnational orientations to both France and Portugal. The meanings of (in)visibility can thus also be understood relative to migrants’ relationships to Portugal. For families who emigrated during the Salazar regime, there may be a general ambivalence about, and/or inexperience with engagement in national political and public life in Portugal, with higher investment in more locally based activities.

Portuguese emigrants’ and Luso-descendants’ relative (in)visibility in Portugal can also be understood in terms of local norms of comportment, where showing off or drawing attention to oneself in public (“*dar nas vistas*”) is frowned upon. Levéziel recalls the complex and conflictual interpretations of the Portuguese emigrants’ relationship with invisibility, with “silence” being considered as a negative heritage of the Portuguese dictatorship. Proscriptions against excessive
visibility and emigrants’ reticence relative to migrants’ origins in rural, Salazar’s Portugal may also be self-protective, as Levéziel notes.

Similarly, Koven and Marques’s discussion of YouTube performances and comments on Portuguese migrant figures shows how Portuguese emigrants may be criticized for their imagined hypervisibility and ostentation (see also Gonçalves). Visibility quickly turns to stigma in such nonmigrant Portuguese anti-emigrant discourse, paralleling earlier xenophobia against the scorned returned Portuguese emigrants from Brazil (Cabral).

We also see issues of invisibility in Portugal in the work of Marie-Isabelle Vieira, who shows how narratives of clandestine emigration to France were rare and taboo before the revolution of April 25, 1974. Censorship in the Salazar regime attempted to control images of the massive exodus in the sixties, as poor reflections on the regime and the state of the country. This censorship limited such discourse, only allowing negative accounts of migration, notably in literary works such as *A Salto* by Nita Clímaco and *Fronteiras* by Assis Esperança. Despite these limitations, these literary works provide readers with a detailed socio-historical portrayal of the Portuguese experience of “o salto,” the clandestine crossing of borders, and contribute to the memorial recovery of Portuguese emigration experiences to France (Volovitch-Tavares).

In these ways, one can see how articles in this issue also evoke questions of (in)visibility and stigma in Portugal, ultimately informing contested ideas over “legitimate” displays of national belonging for different audiences, at different historical moments.

As noted above, visibility/audibility depend not only on those who (fail to) speak or show themselves, but also on those who listen and/or watch. The role of reception and uptake of different audiences is also clear across the articles. Wagner discusses Catherine Ribeiro’s relentless quest for recognition and her denunciation of how she was rejected by the French music industry (“the shitty show business”) due to her positioning as a radical political activist and artist. Ribeiro linked her own lack of individual and social esteem to the general lack of social recognition and political rights of her parents. With their attention to commenters’ interpretations of Ro et Cut’s skit, Koven and Marques also address the role of audience. France-based Luso-descendant commenters and young Portugal-based nonmigrant commenters apprehend the displayed figures and scenes through different images of space, time, and person, i.e., “chronotopes” (Bakhtin). Luso-descendants, as the primary audience, view the video as an opportunity to create a community based on nostalgia about shared experiences. Nonmigrant Portuguese, however, interpret the video through a historically situated lens of anti-emigrant discourse. In this way, any discussion of Portuguese (in)visibility must take seriously into account the positionality of the listening other (Inoue), who can only see the Portuguese in France through particular, often limited, sets of socio-historically situated images.
Old and New Media

Questions of “in-group” versus “mainstream” visibility and reception are also linked to questions of platform or medium. Following Benedict Anderson’s discussion of the role of books and newspapers in allowing unacquainted readers to view themselves as part of the same “imagined community,” we can ask about the role of different media in forging participants’ sense of shared identity positions in France and/or Portugal. What affordances do different media offer Luso-French and mainstream French viewers to allow new identity positions for Portuguese and Luso-descendants in France? Indeed, one can compare the roles of “traditional” and “new” media (radio, television, newspapers, books versus Blogs, Facebook, YouTube, etc.) in allowing different cultural productions by and about the Portuguese in France to circulate (Fernandes; Kral):

[…] the recent changes inherent in the development of new information technologies, […] new information technologies like the internet have started to generate a form of visibility which is renewed and constantly reinvented and which sharply contrasts with the type of visibility which more strictly codified arenas of visuality, for example museums and the world of art or films, used to produce. […] one of the key questions at the turn of the twenty-first century is probably whether the larger impact achieved through some of these channels is of the same nature and is as durable as the visibility that existed in a pre-World Wide Web era. (Kral, 1–2)

Indeed, the articles discuss materials across a range of older and newer media, from books (Vieira, Fernandes Wagner); to mainstream movies (Levéziel); to heavily mediatized soccer games that can be viewed live, on satellite television, and online (Pereira); musical performances that can be live, sold on CD, and watched online (Fernandes Wagner); as well as YouTube performances that largely appear online (Koven and Marques). As such, part of the ways that these cultural products can circulate and potentially challenge Portuguese invisibility is thus not only through one-off performances, publications, etc., but through the ways that social actors can spread them, by recontextualizing and reperforming them for new contexts and audiences (Bauman and Briggs). On the one hand, the internet facilitates the circulation of images and voices of the Luso-French, allowing new audiences to discover and recirculate cultural products, such as in the case of singer Catherine Ribeiro’s (re)discovery and re-issue of CDs. On the other hand, the internet can also keep particular types of performers and performances in “underground,” “alternative,” or “counterpublic,” rather than more “legitimate” mainstream spaces. As Pereira reminds us in his discussion of soccer, certain types of cultural products and platforms may still confer more value and mainstream recognition (Bourdieu), especially in France, with its long tradition of privileging of “high” cultural products, such as literature. Indeed, it is probably no accident that cultural studies, and its attention to popular cultural products, first emerged and spread outside the French context.

Second-Generation Spokespersons

With regard to issues such as how the platform confers more or less legitimacy on Luso-French cultural products, there is the related question of who can
legitimately “represent” and speak for and about the Portuguese community. Most of the articles in this issue involve cases where members of the “second generation,” raised primarily in France, are in a position to represent “Portuguese culture” as both legitimate and authentic. For example, Ro et Cut draw from their personal experiences to perform legitimate and “authentic” Portuguese immigrant experiences. That said, their skits involve members of the “second generation” performing first-generation characters. Additionally, it appears that most France-based YouTube commenters are not themselves members of the first generation, but those of subsequent generations who can “hear” and then affectionately parody the first generation through several simultaneous “filters.” Similarly, Levéziel mentions Ruben Alves’s ambivalent positioning in his creation of La Cage dorée. On the one hand, he is a Luso-descendant with an insider’s perspective that entitles him to present a vision of the Portuguese community. On the other hand, he refuses to claim his experience as universal, and presents his film as fiction. Further, it is noteworthy that the main Portuguese immigrant characters in the film were played by famous professional actors, rather than actual Portuguese migrants.

Across a number of the articles, the second-generation “spokesperson” then often represents and evaluates Portuguese culture by highlighting differences between the first and second generations, that is, between people like their parents and themselves. Focus on intergenerational differences then becomes a key site for presenting and evaluating images of “French” and “Portuguese” culture. For example, Catherine Ribeiro, as Wagner writes, places her difficult experiences with her Portuguese immigrant family as a central motor for her creative work and examines transgenerational trauma. Pereira also examines the positive role of soccer in the generational transmission of Portuguese identity and pride. Families and intergenerational relationships are thus key foci across the articles, with members of the second generation speaking for and about the first—from whom we do not actually hear directly.

In addressing these complex interconnected questions of (in)visibility, stigma, and legitimacy of Luso-French cultural productions and producers, relative to French, Portuguese, and Luso-French contexts and audiences, it is our hope that the work showcased in this special issue will allow fresh perspectives, and invite new questions to be asked about the legacies and future directions of Luso-France.

Notes

1 Volovitch-Tavares notes that the Portuguese went from being visible in the sixties and seventies due to their poor living conditions (clandestinity and shantytowns) to being forgotten in the eighties, as Algerian immigrants and descendants took center stage. Then they were back in the limelight again in the nineties during the issue of the sans-papiers (undocumented immigrants especially from Sub-Saharan Africa), which brought back a recollection of their clandestine past and the creation of sites of memory (official monuments in Champigny, etc.), to be forgotten again in the 2000s until the comedy La Cage dorée (2013) put them back on the national map.

2 The topic of films as a medium of large-scale visibility thus needs to reposition the discussion in terms of the scope and impact of the different subcategories of the film industry. The film industry cannot be envisaged as one large arena of hypervisibility which largely draws on popular culture,
but more as an archipelago which brings together various arenas with different degrees of visibility. At one end of the spectrum are independent, low-budget films or even short films, and at the other end one finds the global blockbusters. (103)

There are other noteworthy documentaries about the Portuguese community over the years (see Cardoso).
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