the current situation is like a negative of the former one: people are blocked by the former opening, which has now turned into a glass screen; they have to exit through the former walls of the factory, which have now partly vanished. See photograph at this.

For a more sober description of the generally quite idealized condition of the multitude, see Paolo Virno, A Grammar of the Multitude, trans. Isabella Bertoletti, James Casacalenda, and Andrea Casson (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2004).

As do multiple single screen arrangements.

"Document on Tout va bien (1972)," http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hhm7mnh1kog.

"Photography, filming, or audio recording within paying exhibitions or ticketed events and screenings is not permitted at any time." See "Tate gallery rules," http://www.tate.org.uk/about/whowe-are/policies-and-procedures/gallery-rules. However, filming there is welcomed on a commercial basis, with location fees starting at £200 an hour. See "Location filming and photography," http://www.tate.org.uk/about/media/filming/

Policy at the Centre Pompidou is more confusing: "You may film or photograph works from permanent collections (which you will find on levels 1 and 2 and in the Atelier Brancusi) for your own personal use. You may not, however, photograph or film works that have a red dot, and you may not use a flash or stand." See "FAAC: I. Photos/Video," http://www.centrepompidou.fr/Pompidou/Communication/ref/3930D3A701BD6W0B20C2B0570D96518D416/800025000/110000/800250027/02/24."


Elsaesser, "Cinema in the Museum?"


A good example would be Democraies (2006) by Artur Zmijewski, an unscripted, multi-screen installation with billions of possibilities of screen-content combinations.

The Articulation of Protest
Every articulation is a montage of various elements—voices, images, colors, passions, or dogmas—in time and space. The significance of the articulated moments depends on this. They only make sense within this articulation and depending on their position. So how is protest articulated? What does it articulate and what articulates it?

The articulation of protest has two levels. On one level, the articulation entails finding a language for protest, the vocalization, the verbalization, or the visualization of political protest. On another level, however, the articulation also shapes the structure or internal organization of protest movements. In other words, there are two different kinds of concatenations: one is at the level of symbols, the other at the level of political forces. The dynamic of desire and refusal, attraction and repulsion, the contradiction and the convergence of different elements unfolds on both levels. In relation to protest, the question of articulation concerns the organization of its expression—but also the expression of its organization.

Naturally, protest movements are articulated on many levels: on the level of their programs, demands, self-obligations, manifestos, and actions. This also involves montage—in the form of inclusions and exclusions based on subject matter, priorities, and blind spots. In addition, though, protest movements are articulated as concatenations or conjunctions of different interest groups, NGOs, political parties, associations, individuals, or groups. Alliances, coalitions, factions, feuds, or even indifference are articulated in this structure. There is also a form of montage at the political—combinations of interests, organized in a grammar of the political that reinvents itself again and again. At this level, articulation designates the form of the internal organization of protest movements. By what rules is this montage organized? And what does this mean for articulations that are critical of globalization—both at the level of the organization of their expression and at the level of the expression of their organization? How are global conjunctions represented? How are different protest movements mediated through one another? Are they placed next to one another—in other words, simply added together—or are they related to one another in some other way? What is the image of a protest movement? Is it the sum of the “talking heads” from the individual groups added together? Is it pictures of confrontations and marches? Is it new forms of depiction? Is it the reflection of a protest movement’s forms? Or the invention of new relations between individual elements of political linkages? With these thoughts about articulation, I refer to a very specific field of theory, namely the theory of montage or film cuts. This is also because the relationship between art and politics is usually treated in the field of political theory, and art often appears as its ornament. What happens, though, if we conversely relate a form of artistic production, namely the theory of montage, to the field of politics? In other words, how is the political field edited, and what kinds of political significance could be derived from this form of articulation?

Chains of Production

I would like to discuss these issues on the basis of two film segments, and to address their implicit or explicit political thinking based on the form of their articulation. The films will be compared from a very specific perspective: both contain a sequence in which the conditions of their own articulation are addressed. Both of these sequences
present the chains of production and production procedures through which these films were made. And on the basis of the self-reflexive discussion of their manner of producing political significance, the creation of chains and montages of aesthetic forms and political demands, I would like to explain the political implications of forms of montage.

The first segment is from the film Showdown in Seattle, produced in 1999 by the Seattle Independent Media Center and broadcast by Deep Dish Television. The second segment is from a film by Jean-Luc Godard and Anne-Marie Miéville from 1975 entitled Ici et ailleurs (Here and Elsewhere). Both deal with transnational and international circumstances of political articulation. Showdown in Seattle documents the protests against the WTO negotiations in Seattle and the internal articulation of these protests as a heterogeneous combination of diverse interests. The theme of Ici et ailleurs, on the other hand, is the fluctuations of French solidarity with Palestine, particularly in the 1970s, and a radical critique of the poses, stagings, and counterproductive linkages of emancipation in general. The two films are not really comparable on the surface—the first is a quickly produced utilitarian document that functions in the register of counter-information, while Ici et ailleurs captures a long and even embarrassing process of reflection. The latter film does not place information in the foreground, but rather analyzes its organization and staging. My comparison of the films is therefore not to be read as a statement on the films per se, but rather illuminates only one particular aspect of them, namely their self-reflection on their own forms of articulation.

Showdown in Seattle

The film Showdown in Seattle is an impassioned document of the protests revolving around the WTO meeting in Seattle in 1999. The days of protest and their events are edited in chronological order. At the same time, the developments on the street are grounded with background information about the work of the WTO. Numerous short statements are given by a multitude of speakers from diverse political groups, especially unions, but also indigenous groups and farmers’ organizations. The film (which consists of five half-hour parts) is extraordinarily stirring and employs the style of conventional reportage. Along with this, it demonstrates a specific notion of filmic space-time, which could be described in Walter Benjamin’s terms as “homogenous” and “empty,” organized by chronological sequences and uniform spaces.

Toward the end of the two-and-a-half-hour film there is a segment in which the viewer is taken on a tour through the production site of the film, the studio setup in Seattle. What is seen there is impressive. The entire film was shot and edited over the course of the five-day protests. A half-hour program was broadcast every evening. This requires a considerable logistical effort. Accordingly, the internal organization of the Indymedia office is not very different from a commercial TV studio. We see how footage from countless video cameras comes into the studio, how it is viewed, how useable sections are excerpted, how they are edited into new footage, and so forth. Various media are listed, in which through which publicity is carried out, such as fax, telephone, Internet, satellite, and so forth. We see how the work of organizing information—pictures and sounds—is conducted: there is a video desk, production plans, and so forth. What is portrayed
is a chain of the production of information, or in the terms of the producers, "counter-information," which is negatively defined by its distance from the information circulated by the corporate media. What this involves, then, is a faithful reproduction of the corporate media's manner of production—albeit for a different purpose.

This different purpose is described by many metaphors: "getting the word across," "getting the message across," "getting the truth out." What is to be disseminated is counter-information that is described as truth. It is the "voice of the people," and this voice must be heard. The voice of the people is conceived as the unity of differences, of different political groups, and it reverberates within the resonator of a filmic space-time, the homogeneity of which is never called into question.

Yet we must not only ask ourselves how this voice of the people is articulated and organized, but also what this voice of the people actually consists of. In *Showdown in Seattle*, this expression—"voice of the people"—is used unproblematically: as the sum of the voices of individual speakers from protest groups, NGOs, unions, and so forth. Their demands and positions are articulated across broad segments of the film in the form of talking heads. Because the shots of these talking heads are formally similar, their diverse positions are standardized and thus made comparable. At the level of the standardized language of form, the different statements are thus transformed into a chain of formal equivalencies, which adds the political demands together in the same way that pictures and sounds are strung together in the conventional chain of media montage.

In this way, the form employed by *Showdown in Seattle* is completely analogous to the form used by the corporate media, only the content is different,
namely an additive compilation of voices resulting in the voice of the people—regardless of the fact that the speakers’ different political demands sometimes radically contradict one another, such as those from environmentalists and union members, different minorities, feminist groups, and so forth. It is not clear how these demands can be mediated. What takes the place of this missing mediation is a filmic and political addition—of shots, statements, and positions—and an aesthetic form of concatenation, which unquestioningly adopts the organizational principles of its adversary. In *Ici et ailleurs*, on the other hand, this method of the mere addition of demands resulting in the voice of the people is severely criticized—along with the concept of the voice of the people itself.

*Ici et ailleurs*

Godard and Miéville, the directors (or rather the editors) of *Ici et ailleurs* take a radically critical position with respect to the terms of the popular. Their film consists of a self-critique of a self-produced film fragment. The Dziga Vertov Group (Godard/Jean-Pierre Gorin) shot a commissioned film on the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in 1970. This heroizing propaganda film that blusters about the people’s battle was called *Until Victory* and was never finished. It consisted of several parts with titles such as “The Armed Battle,” “Political Work,” “The Will of the People,” and “The Extended War—Until Victory.” It showed battle training, scenes of exercise and shooting, and scenes of PLO agitation, in a formally almost senseless chain of equivalencies in which every image is forced to express an anti-imperialistic fantasy. Four years later in *Ici et ailleurs*, Godard and Miéville inspect the material more closely. They note that parts of the statements of PLO adherents were never translated or were staged to begin with. They reflect on the staging and the blatant lies of the material—but most of all on their own participation in this, in the way they organized the pictures and sounds. They ask: How did the adjuring formula of the “voice of the people” function here as populist noise to eliminate contradictions? What does it mean to edit “The Internationale” into any and every picture, rather like the way butter is smeared on bread? What political and aesthetic notions are added together under the pretext of the voice of the people? Why did this equation not work? Godard and Miéville arrive at an important conclusion: the additive and of the montage is far from innocent and unproblematic.

Today the film is shockingly up to date, but not in the sense of offering a position on the Middle East conflict. On the contrary, what makes it so topical is the problematizing of the concepts and patterns in which conflicts and solidarity are reduced to binary oppositions of betrayal or loyalty and reduced to unproblematic additions and pseudo-causality. For what if the model of addition is wrong? Or if the additive *and* does not represent an addition, but rather grounds a subtraction, a division, or no relation at all? Specifically, what if the *and* in *Here and Elsewhere*, in this France and Palestine, does not represent an addition but rather a subtraction? What if two political movements not only do not join, but actually hinder, contradict, ignore, or even mutually exclude one another? What if the *and* should really be *or*, *because*, or even *instead of*? And what does an empty phrase like “the will of the people” mean?

Transposed to a political level, the questions are thus: On what basis can we draw a political comparison between different positions or establish
equivalencies or even alliances? What exactly is made comparable? What is added together, edited together, and which differences and opposites are leveled for the sake of establishing a chain of equivalencies? What if this and of political montage is functionalized specifically for the sake of a populist mobilization? And what does this question mean for the articulation of protest today, if nationalists, protectionists, anti-Semites, conspiracy theorists, Nazis, religious groups, and reactionaries all line up together at antiglobalization demos, in a dispiriting chain of equivalencies? Is this a simple case of the principle of unproblematic addition, a blind and that presumes that if sufficient numbers of different interests are added up, at some point the sum will constitute “the people”?

Godard and Miéville do not relate their critique solely to the level of political articulation—in other words, the expression of internal organization—but also to the organization of expression. Both are closely connected. An essential component of this problematic issue is how pictures and sounds are organized, edited, and arranged. A Fordist articulation organized according to the principles of mass culture will blindly reproduce the templates of its masters, according to their thesis, so it has to be broken up and problematized. This is also the reason why Godard and Miéville are concerned with the chain of production of pictures and sounds, although they choose an entirely different kind of scene than Indymedia—they show a crowd of people holding pictures, wandering past a camera as though on a conveyor belt and pushing each other aside at the same time. A row of people carrying pictures of the “battle” is linked together by a machine, following the logic of the assembly line and camera mechanics. Here, Godard and Miéville translate the temporal arrangement of the film images into a spatial arrangement. It becomes evident that chains of pictures do not run one after the other, but rather are shown at the same time. They place the pictures next to one another and shift the focus of attention onto their framing. What is revealed is the principle of their concatenation. What appears in the montage as an often invisible addition is problematized in this way and set in relation to the logic of machine production. This reflection on the chain of production of pictures and sounds in this sequence makes it possible to think about the conditions of representation in film in general. The montage is the result of an industrial system of pictures and sounds, whose concatenation is organized from the start—just as the principle of the production sequence from Showdown in Seattle is marked by its adoption of conventional schemata of production.

In contrast, Godard and Miéville ask: How do the pictures hang on the chain? How are they chained together? What organizes their articulation and what kinds of political significance are generated in this way? Here we see an experimental situation of concatenation, in which pictures are relationally organized. Pictures and sounds from Nazi Germany, Palestine, Latin America, Vietnam, and other places are mixed together wildly—and combined with a number of folk songs or songs that invoke “the people” from both right-wing and left-wing contexts. This produces the impression that the pictures naturally attain their significance through their concatenation. But more importantly, we see that incongruous concatenations occur: pictures from concentration camps and Venceremos songs, Hitler’s voice and a picture of My Lai, Hitler’s voice and a picture of Golda Meir, My Lai and Lenin.
It becomes clear that the voice of the people, which we hear in its wildly diverse articulations, is not in fact a basis for creating equivalencies. Instead, this sequence exposes the radical political contradictions that the voice of the people strives to cover up. It generates sharp discrepancies within the silent coercion—as Theodor W. Adorno would say—of the identity relationship. It produces contraries instead of equations, and even provokes sheer dread—everything except an unproblematic addition of political desire. For what this populist chain of equivalencies displays is the void that it is structured around, the empty inclusivist and that keeps blindly adding and adding, outside the realm of any political criteria.

In summary, we can say that the principle of the voice of the people assumes an entirely different role in the two films. Although it is the organizing principle in Seattle, the principle that constitutes the gaze, it is never problematized. The voice of the people functions here like a blind spot, a lacuna, which, according to Jacques Lacan, constitutes the entire field of the visible but only becomes visible itself as a kind of cover. The voice of the people organizes the chain of equivalencies without allowing breaks; it conceals the fact that its political objective does not go beyond an unquestioned notion of inclusivity. The voice of the people is thus simultaneously the organizing principle of both a concatenation and a suppression. Yet what does it suppress? The empty topos of the voice of the people covers up a lacuna, specifically the lacuna of the question of the political measures and goals that are supposed to be legitimized by invoking the people.

So what are the prospects for the articulation of a protest movement based on the model of an and—as though inclusion at any cost were its
primary goal? Why and for whom is the political concatenation organized? What goals and criteria have to be formulated—even if they might not be very popular? And does there not have to be a much more radical critique of the articulation of ideology using pictures and sounds? Does not a conventional form mean a mimetic clinging to the conditions that are to be critiqued, a populist form of blind faith in the power of the addition of arbitrary desires? Is it not therefore sometimes better to break the chains than to organize everyone into a network at all costs?

**Addition or Exponentiation**

So what turns a movement into an oppositional one? For there are many movements that call themselves protest movements but should rightly be called reactionary, if not outright fascist. Such movements are those in which existing conditions are radicalized in breathless transgression, scattering fragmented identities like bone splinters along the way. The energy of the movement glides seamlessly from one element to the next—traversing the homogeneous empty time like a wave moving through the crowd. Images, sounds, and positions are linked without reflection in a movement of blind inclusion. A tremendous dynamic unfolds in these figures—only to leave everything as it was before.

What kind of movement of political montage would result in oppositional articulations, instead of a mere addition of elements for the sake of reproducing the status quo? Or to phrase the question differently, what kind of montage of two images/elements would produce something beyond and outside these two images/elements, something that would not represent a compromise, but would instead belong to a different order—roughly the way someone might tenaciously pound two dull stones together to create a spark in the darkness? Whether this spark, which one could also call the spark of the political, can be created at all is a question of this articulation.

---


2. This is not intended to imply that there is any film that could take on this work of mediation. However, a film could exist that this cannot be replaced by simple adjurations.


4. And what does Hara and Elsewhere mean now, in 2002, when synagogues are burning in France?