



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Landscape theory: post-68 revolutionary cinema in Japan

Hirasawa, G.

Citation

Hirasawa, G. (2021, September 28). *Landscape theory: post-68 revolutionary cinema in Japan*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3243318>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3243318>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Chapter Four: On Wakamasu Koji, Oshima Nagisa, Jean-Luc Godard and Group Dziga Vertov

This chapter presents analysis of films by Wakamatsu Koji and Oshima Nagisa, who are known for their collaborations with Adachi and Matsuda, focusing on a group of their works that are closely related to landscape theory. The analysis will also be conducted based on a comparison between films by the above mentioned filmmakers and some films by the Dziga Vertov Group—including films by Jean-Luc Godard and Jean-Pierre Gorin—that are thematically relevant to issues of landscape and politics. By so doing, some different approaches to 'landscape' in the context of 'radical cinema'—in Japan as well as abroad—during the period from the late 1960's to the mid 1970's, will be further examined.

1. Wakamatsu Koji

Wakamatsu was born in 1936 in Miyagi Prefecture to a family of farmers. After quitting high school, he went to Tokyo, held various odd jobs—working as pastry maker, delivering newspapers, and engaging in day-labor at yoseba (labor camp). He entered the world of the film and television industry when, as a junior yakuza member, he happened to be in charge of traffic control for a film shoot location in Shinjuku. After having worked as an assistant director and production assistant, he made his directorial debut with the 'pink film' *Amai Wana* (Sweet Trap) in 1963. After that film, he directed a number of films which were controversial due to their explicit depictions of violence and sex, including *Akai Hanko* (Red Crime, 1964), about a falsely accused man expressing his resistance by kidnapping a prosecutor's wife; *Hadaka no Kage* (Naked Shadow, 64), a film about the troubling effects of the atomic bomb; *Namari no Bohyo* (Gravestone of Lead, 1964) about the self-destruction of a thug who pushes his way into becoming a killer; *Joji no Rirekisho* (Resume of Love Affair, 1965), about a poor woman from the Tohoku region who, despite being endlessly exploited, shrewdly tries to survive in Tokyo; and so on. He became the most spotlighted director both commercially and in terms of the uniqueness of] his work within the Pink movie industry. In 1965 Wakamatsu completed *Secret Behind the Wall* (1965), the story of a gloomy and depressed prep-school student who, living in the confined living space of a housing complex built during the housing shortage after the war, lets his unfocused rage explode against a housewife, who meets in

secret with her former lover (from a time when both were activists), as well as against his sister, who enjoys free love and consumer culture. This leads to a sudden rape and stabbing, as a scathing criticism against Japanese society wherein the society is moving towards high economic growth after the defeat of the Anti-Security Treaty struggle in the sixties. This film, which was officially presented as a representative of Japan at the Berlin International Film Festival, caused a big scandal, which remains in the history of Japanese cinema.

At the time, the determination for which films would be selected to represent Japan in international film festivals was made by the Federation of Japanese Cinema. *Secret Behind the Wall*, however, was not selected. It was screened, pushing aside the officially-recommended works, because a German film distribution company, who had seen the film in Japan and liked it, purchased the rights to the film, and contacted the festival to show it there. The existing Japanese film industry condemned as an insult the fact that a vulgar 'pink' genre film would be the representative of Japan, and, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, through the embassy, called for the screening to be cancelled, threatening that Japan would boycott the festival in the future otherwise. The film was also fiercely criticized by various Japanese media—TV, newspaper, magazines etc. In addition, Wakamatsu's response to the criticism after returning to Japan—with people such as Oshima, and Sato Jushin, the editor of *Eiga Hyoron* (Film Review) and film critic acting in full support of him—created a campaign, and thereby the genre 'pink movie', as well as the name Wakamatsu Koji, became well-known to the general public.

While the Japanese film industry, which had peaked in 1958 in terms of box office revenue, was declining, the character of the film industry itself—which had been dominated by major companies—was changing significantly. Many independent production companies were established, diversifying the ways in which films were produced and distributed. Among those was the 'pink film' genre, whereby films of sexually explicit content were mass-produced. The genre was established following the *ero-guro* (erotic grotesque) mode of film that had been begun by Shintohe, one of the major companies, with films produced with actors and staff from major film companies. Pink movies and the major Japanese film industry were therefore closely related, two sides of the same coin. This is evidenced by the fact that

many of the people working in the film industry, who are currently leading Japanese cinema, actually made their debuts in Pink movies. In a sense, the structure of discrimination whereby the existing Japanese cinema required the Pink movie as its exteriority on the one hand, but excluded it on the other hand for its own survival was brought to light by a series of scandalous events surrounding *Secret Behind the Wall*. It should be noted that Wakamatsu started his career as a filmmaker associated with this industry-wise incorporated, but marginalized genre, and later came to be called the 'master of the pink film'. To counter this adverse circumstance, Wakamatsu started his own independent production company. With the participation of Terashima Mikio and Yoshizawa Takao from Shingeki Group, Yamatoya Atsushi and Sone Yoshitada, former assistant directors at Nikkatsu, Adachi Masao and Okishima Isao from Nihon University Film Study Group, as well as Komizu Kazuo and Akiyama Michio from a group of hippies based in Shinjuku, he transformed the pink film into a site of radical experiments, creating Wakamatsu Productions as a body for cinema movement, in which numerous film works as well as his own were produced by proactively promoting young filmmakers for director's posts. The collective dimension of Wakamatsu Production as part of its movement is noteworthy, given the fact that many of the independent productions which boomed in the 1960s depended on the structure of allowing a central auteur to shoot the film, despite proclaiming collective production and screening movement.

The anti-authoritarian inclination in Wakamatsu's films was consistent throughout his career as a director since his debut film. There is a well-known anecdote mentioned in *Ore wa te o yogosu* (I dirty my hands), in which Wakamatsu states that, "I wanted to retaliate against the policemen and prosecutors who put me in jail, but if I actually did, I would get arrested, so I decided to shoot films and kill them through imagination." With the participation of Yamatoya, Sone, Adachi and others, Wakamatsu expressed his animosity further, expanding from the level of personal revenge against police and prosecutors, to that against society, state, capitalism, and even further against the structure of power and control within the Leftist movements. Importantly, it is with radical depictions of anti-authoritarianism in his films that Wakamatsu gained greatest support, especially in the so-called season of politics. For instance, the Left is sharply criticized in *Secret Behind the Wall*, which depicts a former leftist who now

makes profits from stock market fluctuations due to the Vietnam War and lives as part of civil society; *Resume of Love Affair* depicts the degenerated New Left after the Anti-Security Treaty struggle of 1960. In *Violated Angels*, a Sprechchor and the sound of the TV news in addition to newspaper articles on the Vietnam War and anti-war protests are overlaid on a shot of nightsticks being swung by police, who storm into the nurses' dormitory where a beautiful young man, played by Kara Juro, is taking hostages. In *Running Madness*, *Dying in Love* the opening sequence starts with documentary footage from the Haneda Struggle on October 8, 1967, and the Riot in Shinjuku on October 21, 1968, segued into a shot of the protagonist fleeing through the West Exit of Shinjuku Station. In *Teroru no kisetsu* (Season of Terror, 1969) the film starts with still shots of demonstrations and fights with Molotov cocktails, as well as montages of newspaper reports where the trajectory of the protagonist is overlaid, and the film ends with a shot of him going to Haneda Airport to carry out a suicide bombing to stop Prime Minister Sato Eisaku's visit to the U.S. Also, in *Sex Jack* (1970) the film starts with documentary footage of the protest during the Anti-U.S. Security Treaty struggle in 1970, and next to the factional militants engaging in 'rosy alliance,' a young ex-factory worker kills a member of the secret police, bombs the police box and headquarters of the Communist Party, assassinates the Prime Minister, while further suggesting the assassination of the Emperor.

Wakamatsu, who was invited to Director's Week at the Cannes International Film Festival for screenings of *Violated Angels* and *Sex Jack*, on his way back to Japan went to Beirut with Adachi, and joined Shigenobu Fusako from the local Red Army faction and PFLP to create a newsreel film, *Red Army/PFLP: Declaration of World War*, which depicts the 'quotidian life' of the Arab guerillas as the text for world revolution. After returning to Japan, in order to seek an alternative screening method free from the existing system, the Red Bus Film Screening Troop was formed to carry out the screening movement across the country, and as a producer, Wakamatsu supported the basis of its production, as well as the screening movement financially. Also, in *Ecstasy of the Angels*, which turned out to be Wakamatsu's first ATG film, an armed group aiming for a total guerilla warfare attack on Tokyo seizes weapons from the U.S. military base, however, betrayed by the leader of the group (the protagonists) leave the organization

and start blowing up the city to develop their own anarchist battle. This film was called into question due to its connection to the bombing incident of a police box that actually took place in Shinjuku, and furthermore, since the date of the film's release was scheduled after the shooting battle at the Asama-Sanso incident, due to political reasons, many theaters canceled the screenings and the film was released only at Art Theater Shinjuku Bunka.

However, since Wakamatsu was closely connected to the student movement at that time, and due to the fact that the student movement had declined as a result of the defeat in the Anti-U.S. Security Treaty Struggle of 1970, and that Adachi went to Palestine in 1974, he was forced to change direction significantly. This shift of course held true for many of the other filmmakers who were directly tackling the actuality of political issues in the sixties, and were also struggling with pursuing the possibility of expression in the seventies. For instance, Oshima stopped producing films dealing with contemporary issues after his film *Natsu no imoto* (Dear Summer Sister, 1973), and tried to look for an alternative in an alliance with overseas capital instead of ATG, and released *Ai no korida* (In the Realm of the Senses, 1974), with Wakamatsu as its producer. Yoshida Kiju took a long time to produce the next film after *Kaigenrei* (coup d'État, 1973) whereas Suzuki Seijun spent ten years to complete *Hishu monogatari* (A Tale of Sorrow and Sadness, 1977) by way of the Suzuki Seijun Problem Joint Struggle Committee, formed due to his sudden layoff from Nikkatsu. Also, Art Theater Shinjuku Bunka, one of the main theaters known to have supported experimental films released by ATG Films, closed in 1974, and ATG Films was also forced to change its policy. Furthermore, Theater Scorpio under the Shinjuku Bunka helped Wakamatsu establish himself as a filmmaker by promoting him through organizing special screenings of his films. Because of such shifts, Wakamatsu had to make a shift from the guerilla-like, high-mobility production of pink films to a larger framework, based on ordinary commercial films in Japan, as well as ones sponsored by overseas capital, trying to seek out a new means to survive.

2. Catalyst for Landscape Theory

Since the discussion on landscape was developed mainly by Adachi at Wakamatsu Production, Wakamatsu never joined it. However, as mentioned in Chapter Two, in his initial text on landscape theory *Sex as landscape* Matsuda provides analysis of *Go, Go, Second Time Virgin*, commenting that the film "was positioned as catalyst for [the development of] landscape theory."³⁴¹ The script was written by Adachi while the shooting and editing of *A.K.A. Serial Killer* were in progress. Although the theoretical influence from the production of *A.K.A. Serial Killer* is evident, the significance of the ideas and direction Wakamatsu contributed to *Go, Go, Second Time Virgin* is undeniable. This section, therefore, will argue for the role that Wakamatsu's films played in the formation of landscape theory, mainly through a close reading of Matsuda's text on *Go, Go, Second Time Virgin*. The film was based on a script written by Adachi, inspired by the poem, *Mama Boku Dekakeru* (Mom, I'm going out) written by Nakamura Yoshinori, a poet affiliated with VAN Film Science Research Center. Originally however, it was said to have been based on Wakamatsu's idea of exploring the possibility of shooting a film only on the rooftop of his office.

“[We shot] *Go, Go, Second Time Virgin* (1969) just around the time when there was still nothing on the rooftop of the current (Harajuku) Central Apartment. Whenever we had time, we used to be sunbathing or get naked and suntan on the rooftop. Then I had an idea. OK, it would be interesting to shoot a film only here. I was with Adachi, so I said, "Hey Adachi, if we shoot a film only here, it would be great because we wouldn't have to spend much." It began with such silly talk.”³⁴²

In low-budget pink films, since it was difficult to secure a location and shooting site, not to mention a studio, and the production days were limited, Wakamatsu was always searching for various means to reduce production costs. For example, the office of Wakamatsu Production was used as a set for *Embryo Hunts in Secret*; likewise a room at a traditional Japanese inn was used for *Violated Angels*, and for *Shojo geba-geba* (*Violent Virgin*, 1969) only Gotenba, located at the foot of Mt. Fuji, was used as a

³⁴¹ Matsuda Masao, *Fukei no Shimetsu* [Extinction of the landscape] (Tokyo: Tabata Shoten, 1971), 275.

³⁴² Wakamatsu Koji, *Wakamatsu Koji: Orewa teo yogosu* [Wakamatsu Koji: I dirty my hands]. (Tokyo: Dagereo Shuppan, 1982), 112-113

set to shoot this 'locked-room drama' (*misshitsugeki*).³⁴³ In *Go, Go, Second Time Virgin*, only the rooftop of the apartment in Harajuku where the office was situated, was used, and furthermore, Assistant Director Akiyama was used as the film's protagonist, rather than hiring an actor. Rather than trying to fit his work into the framework of low-budget genre films, Wakamatsu thus took advantage of various constraints of the pink film genre, such as limited budget and limited number of shooting days, and constantly explored the entire production method, including creative storylines, directing, shooting, editing, as well as the selection of actors and the staff, in a trial-and-error manner. Though *Go, Go, Second Time Virgin* is basically a strange love drama about a girl and a boy who meet on the rooftop of an apartment building, it depicts the changing city and situation of the time period when 1970 was approaching through the landscape of Tokyo, shot from a locked rooftop. Matsuda argues the relationship between this landscape and the closed room as follows:

This [film] is said to have been based on a poem by a young poet, to which Adachi added a little adjustment, however it is important to note that the closed room where the boy is standing is an artificial space that was constituted by closing the rooftop at the top exit of the flight of stairs. [The space] was open infinitely up to the sky, and beyond the chain link fence, one can see Shinjuku, Shibuya or Tokyo Tower, in other words, the urban landscape that is gorgeously colored with all sorts of accessories. Through the terrifying paradox of the closed room connected to the landscape, Wakamatsu and Adachi vividly expose a tragic relationship between utopia and apocalypse.³⁴⁴

And referencing the scene at the end of the film, in which a young couple throw themselves off the roof, the term 'landscape' was proposed in comparison to the notion of *jokyo* (situations), coined by Yoshimoto Takaaki.

However, now it is only in the landscape where the boy can go. A boy and a girl jumped lightly over the chain link fence; that is to say, this film ends with the conclusion that they are destined to throw themselves into the landscape and die. In this way we are informed that, for the moment,

³⁴³ Furthermore, the same actors, staff, and filming location for *Violent Virgin* was used to shoot *Female Student Guerrillas* directed by Adachi. This is called 'double shooting,' by which two completely different films are shot in succession to economize labor costs, and two films can be shot with little cost added to the budget for a single film. In this way, Wakamatsu himself often directed two films back-to-back, or had either Adachi or another young director shoot another film in addition to the work directed by himself.

³⁴⁴ Matsuda Masao, "*Fukei toshiteno Sei*" [Sex as landscape], in *Bara to Mumeisha* [A Rose and the Nameless] (Tokyo: Hagashoten, 1970), 122

there is nothing but landscape outside of the <single room>, which is symbolized as a single man, a single woman and a single bed.³⁴⁵

The relationship between the boy and girl begins when the girl, who had been sexually assaulted by a group of vagabonds, salutes "Good morning" to the boy. While they are attracted to each other, the girl pleads with the boy, who is killing all those hippies, to kill her, but he doesn't listen, and even refuses to have sexual relations with her. The girl casually says her last words, "I am going," and goes over the rooftop fence and jumps off. The boy also follows her and does the same. The two of them are shown out on the ground in a long take from a fixed viewpoint on the rooftop. The death is not represented as an outcome of the story, as the body is depicted simply as physical matter, whereas the shot of campaign posters for the prevention of juvenile delinquency presented all over the town is overlaid. As Matsuda points out, they do not have any option other than throwing themselves into the landscape, and even if they kill themselves, the outdoor space is nothing but a part of the landscape. What is revealed by the moment the couple actually jumps over the fence is that the threshold between the rooftop and the outdoors, i.e., the inside and the outside, that was presumed to exist has already dissolved. By creating a paradoxical space—not a locked room in a literal sense, but a space that is closed but at the same time visually open—Wakamatsu represents the structure of power in the urban landscape that encloses all, including that of dominance within the story or within human relationships. The tragic sequence thus anticipates subsequent theoretical developments of landscape theory: the couple aim for the outside from the closed rooftop, and materially fulfill their wish through their bodies, but what lay ahead was not implied as some kind of utopia, but just as a landscape with no distinction of inside or outside.

In the context of landscape theory, attention is mostly paid to the significance of the script by Adachi—who is responsible for the idea of staging the locked room drama on the rooftop—however it should be emphasized that, also combined in this film are Wakamatsu's restrained direction for the lifeless gestures of the protagonists and the minimalist camera work and editing. As much as the analysis that *A.K.A. Serial Killer* propelled Matsuda to propose landscape theory, on an equal level, *Go, Go,*

³⁴⁵ Ibid., 123.

Second Time Virgin functioned as creative and critical input that was crucial in constructing landscape theory.

3. Seeds of landscape theory

In reviewing Wakamatsu's filmography, the initial seeds of landscape theory can be traced back to *Violated Angels*. This film is based on the serial murder of a group of nurses in Chicago. The story is about a young man who holes up in the nurses' dormitory and then kills them one by one, with the exception of one woman who reached out to the young man. Kara Juro, theater director of Jokyō Gekijō (Situation Theater)—one of the representative figures of the underground theater movement, and an actor—was cast as the protagonist, and with only a rough plot prepared in advance, Wakamatsu and Kara attempted to create a unique, tension-filled time and space, based on the use of improvisational direction, while the dialogue was decided upon on the spot, as well as frequent uses of the long take. Wakamatsu commented on the protagonist in an interview in the April 1970 issue of *Film Review* as follows:

People commit crimes on impulse. Kill someone in front of him. That person, I believe is "the young man." The young man points a gun at the sea. The moment he steps out, if someone shows up in front of him, he might kill that person. That is [his] impulse.³⁴⁶

A series of murders is thus not understood on the basis of causality, but as a succession of outbreaks of sudden events. Wakamatsu attempted to fix the moment that the impulse flares up in the protagonist on film. If one traces back Wakamatsu's films, it is possible to point out that the locked-room drama—which starts with *Secrets Behind the Wall* and culminates with *The Embryo Hunts in Secret*—prepared the way for landscape theory. It is through these films that the methodology of disclosing the power structure by depicting human relationships between ruler and ruled, as well as depicting social and political oppression through a man and a woman in a locked room, that extremely restricted subject was created. However, whereas problematics such as these were depicted more scrupulously within the story of the locked-room drama in *The Embryo*, what was attempted in *Violated Angels*, despite its being a

³⁴⁶ Wakamatsu Koji and Sato Jushin (interviewee), "Wakamatsu Koji no kibakuryoku ni tsuite" [Koji Wakamatsu's explosive force], *Eiga Hyoron* [Film Review], vol.27, no.4 (April 1970): 52.

similar locked-room drama, was to connect the time and space within the film to the outside, not only in terms of the narrative, but also through improvisational directions and the use of long takes. This does not mean that time in the film's long takes is identical with time in reality; however, the time and space where the new political movement is on the rise in 1967 is filmed in long takes, so that the contemporaneity of the film beyond its narrative context is compressed. Furthermore, images such as photographs of the Vietnam War and Haneda struggle, and newspaper articles, as well as television sound, etc, abruptly inserted into a static image of a group of police officers storming at the end of the film are used to directly throw cinematic expression itself beyond its narrative context, and into the historical context of the particular time period. Wakamatsu later called this type of work situational film (*Jokyo eiga*),³⁴⁷ which served to re-examine the relationship between the inside and the outside in film, i.e., between films and the times in which those films were made. In addition, a photograph of an anonymous ordinary young man standing in the city is superimposed on political images and sound to articulate the ubiquity of the film's protagonist, as being one of those young men with no particular story or background who would participate in a protest. Retaining the narrative framework of a genre film, by using experimental direction, filming methods and montages, Wakamatsu attempts to indicate emphatically that the film is not a mere object to be consumed as work or entertainment, but exist in the nexus of actual politics and society, or movement. Since *Violated Angels* is literally structured as a locked-room drama, in which, rather than the locked room itself as landscape, the emphasis is on the conversion of the locked room – its interiority, into landscape by external forces, it is possible to discover a precursor to landscape theory. An attempt to depict a locked room as landscape was further pursued in *Violent Virgin*, in which the wilderness at the foot of Mt. Fuji was regarded as a locked room, and then later in *Running in Madness*, *Dying in Love*.

³⁴⁷ "Around that time I was thinking that I could shoot situational films, or I must continue shooting something like that. I thought I had to seriously deal with what was happening in each time period." Wakamatsu, *Orewa teo yogosu*, 104. For the analysis concerning situational films and the actuality of films by Wakamatsu, see below. Furuhashi, Yuriko "Kakkotsuki no hanpuku —Wakamatsu Koji no eiga to akuchuariti" [Repetition in parenthesis —Films of Wakamatsu Koji and actuality] in *Wakamatsu Koji: Hankenryoku no shozo* [Wakamatsu Koji: A Portrait of Counter-Power], ed. Yomota Inuhiko and Hirasawa Go, (Tokyo: Sakuhinsha, 2007), 112-142

This film—whose script was attributed to Deguchi Izuru/De, but was actually written by Adachi—is a story about a younger brother, an activist, who mistakenly shoots his older brother, a police officer, and ventures on a journey of escape with his sister-in-law, with whom he is in love. The protagonists keep fleeing northward, encountering various people and customs in different places, imagining their new life, however when they find out that the older brother survived, the sister-in-law returns to him, with the younger brother opposing this in vain. As similar to *Violated Angels*, the film begins with montages of photographs and newspapers, as well as actual documentary footage and enactments of scenes from it, showing the protagonist fleeing after clashing with riot police during a protest. The scene of the protagonist running through the town of Nishishinjuku before its urban development is shot in continuous long takes. The snowy landscape of the northern provinces against the background of their escape using all forms of transportation such as train, bus, ship, horse carriage, walking etc., is also filmed. Matsuda comments that this film is pioneering because "all the gloomy landscapes of Japan, from Tokyo to the Tohoku region and Hokkaido are assumed as locked room."³⁴⁸

All of these landscapes—despite their varied beauty and undulations—mediated through the depiction of the irrevocable mutual dependency between the three—younger brother, older brother, and his sister-in-law—are revealed to be just variations of the same landscape; in other words, during the course of the protagonists' escape, no matter where it might extend to, the landscape is depicted simply as a part of the power structure of the Japanese state. Since narrative of the film unfolds centering on the love drama of the couple as their internal changes are superimposed on shots of different landscapes, it can be pointed out that the landscape is depicted not as that which exists externally, but rather as if the exclusive locked room of the couple were enclosing the landscape. Wakamatsu commented, emphasizing this aspect of enclosure, as follows:

Both compulsion and desire come out. The story is that as they keep running, they want to enclose the whole world.³⁴⁹

³⁴⁸ Matsuda, *Bara to Mumeisha*, 124-125.

³⁴⁹ Wakamatsu, "Wakamatsu Koji no kibakuryoku ni tsuite," 53.

However, their intimacy and emotional connections within the locked room had to succumb to the older brother, the symbolic figure of ultimate power, who appeared in the bleak snow-covered scenery, and took away the sister-in-law. The protagonist kept on walking dispassionately, not in the landscape-as-locked room, but rather inside the locked room of the 'landscape.' It is of course not intended exclusively in this film to represent the transition from the locked room to landscape thematically, however, if the story is retroactively traced back from the landscape that the protagonists were last staring at, that landscape could also be considered identical with the landscape of Shinjuku, or the beautiful landscape of the northern provinces. As an extension of the analysis of power structures such as this, however, the development of landscape theory can be found in *Go, Go, Second Time Virgin*, filmed immediately after this.

4. *Sex Jack*

In Wakamatsu's filmography after *Go, Go, Second Time Virgin*, it is *Sex Jack* (1970) that should be reconsidered as a new development of landscape theory. The screenplay attributed to Deguchi was written by Adachi, and Assistant Director Akiyama starred in the film, as in *Go, Go, Second Time Virgin*. Many actors from underground theater group *Yakokan* (Night Theatre) participated in the film. It could be said that this film, for which shooting started with the documentation of the Anpo Struggle on June 15, 1970, achieved a political extreme for Wakamatsu's films, as well as marking the end of the movement. The story claims to be based on a series of armed struggles such as the hijacking of the Yodo airplane by the Communist League Red Army faction. It mainly revolves around an armed militant group named *Chiku Hansen* (District-based groups against war), which is hidden away in the apartment of a thief who they encountered by chance during their escape, and the thief, an ordinary looking former factory worker, who turns out to be a lone terrorist providing money for the group's military operations. While militants are calling themselves *barairo no rentai* (rosy solidarity) and repeatedly engaging in sex acts, the young man steps outside, throws Molotov cocktails at the police box, shoots a security officer to death, attempts to blow up the headquarters of the Japan Communist Party, and assassinates the Prime Minister of Japan.

In the film however, 'direct actions' such as this are never depicted, but are only included as headlines on the newspapers delivered by the young man himself. The film only shows the daily life of the young man, who, though beaten and insulted by militants, quietly delivers food for them. However, when the members are arrested due to betrayal by their leader, and security police officers come to arrest him, he kills them all in a gun battle, shoots the collaborator to death, and leaves the hiding place behind.

The apartment is located in a segregated area for resident Koreans, or "over the bridge", and the film ends with a scene of the young man crossing the bridge, in which the screen changes from monochrome to color, with his gaze becoming one with the movement of the camera. A close-up shot of a zipper on a red jacket being zipped up is inserted, and staring ahead, the man crosses the bridge. In the middle of crossing, he stares at a car driving on the right side of the bridge, and a bridge and a river to the left, and then again looks straight ahead and proceeds, and the film ends when he again stares ahead, steps forward, and stares once again at the bridge on the left. In Pink film, due to low budgets and the high cost of print, films were often shot in black and white, and color was only used for the important scenes. This method is called 'part color', and due to requirements of the genre, color was normally used for sex scenes. Wakamatsu however appropriated this method as a form of expression, and adopted it for the ending scene of the film. Interestingly Wakamatsu had a red jacket that he loved and was always wearing, and since the jacket was also used during the actual filming, it could also be said that he overlaid himself on the protagonist.³⁵⁰ However, the crucial point here is that the film comes to an end with the landscapes that the protagonist stares at. Evidently, these landscapes—being quite normal and ordinary, do not allow the action to be taken by the young man to become visualized and be presented as a specific image. What is at play, however is that the young man, with some look of determination, crosses the bridge from this side to the other side, and this indeed is depicted neither through his body or facial expressions, or based on the script, but rather through the landscape that he sees. The use of depicting the landscape through the gaze of the lone terrorist thus helps inscribe his determination in those landscapes, thereby suggesting the

³⁵⁰ Akiyama Michio, "Chi no kayotta mono no chikara," [Power of those with flesh and blood in their body], Sex Jack, booklet included in *DVD-BOX 1: Wakamatsu Koji* (Tokyo: Kinokuniya Shoten, 2005), 7-12.

possibility of the direct action to come. Indeed, because these landscapes are just as normal as any other, the landscape seen by the terrorist is purposefully amplified to redefine the 'ordinary landscape'.

The same methodology was used in *A.K.A. Serial Killer*, in which shots of ordinary banal landscapes that Nagayama may have seen are overlaid one after another. However, the possibility of the concept of landscape was dramatically expanded in a literal sense by introducing the method à la documentary films into a clear narrative structure. It is possible to see this as a new interpretation for landscape theory that was proposed from the side of narrative films. For instance, upon seeing this ending, Matsuda offered an even more in-depth interpretation. He pointed out that the protagonist—who already killed the Prime Minister—had to be led to assassinating the Emperor, the symbol of Japan, at the end.

However, still, who was this young terrorist, zipping up his red jacket and crossing the river, going to kill next? He essentially killed everyone he could, from the police officer to the Prime Minister. If so, the bridge must be the Niju-bashi Bridge of the imperial palace. It is undeniable that beyond the bridge there is an esteemed personage who is situated at the pinnacle of society's structure of discrimination. The lower-class proletariat's will to divine retribution is thus narrowing in on its target.³⁵¹

Assuming the bridge where the young man is moving forward is the Nijubashi Bridge (built across the moat at the Imperial Palace), Matsuda suggests that the departure from the segregated area "over the river" should inevitably aim for the Emperor system in view of the historical structure of dominance in Japan. It is of course impossible to read the image of the Emperor directly in these landscapes. However, it can be said at least that Matsuda's argument renders salient the invisibility of the Emperor System, and its power structure that is embedded in all landscapes in Japan by identifying the Emperor as the ultimate target of critique in the visible landscape shown in this film in both narrative and cinematographic contexts. The reference to the Emperor system as subject matter in Wakamatsu's films first appears in *Nihon boko ankokushi: Ijoshu no chi* (Abnormal Blood, 1967). Originally titled, *Kuroi chi* (Dark blood), the film aggressively critiques Japanese modernity after the late Edo/Meiji period, superimposing the story of a cursed bloodline revolving around four generations of a family, against the unbroken chain of

³⁵¹ Matsuda, *Fukei no Shimetsu*, 201

the imperial family.³⁵² The film became a big hit and was later turned into a series. His films thereafter also used the theme of the darkness of Japanese modern history brought into focus through the history of sex crimes, and also had a script by Adachi. Interestingly also, a scene of Wakamatsu in his youth himself throwing an explosive device at Nijubashi Bridge is depicted in an early draft of the screenplay for *Ecstasy of the Angels* directed by Wakamatsu and scripted by Adachi, called *Tenshi wa kechi dearu=Dai ikko aruiwa shinario keishiki niyoru Wakamatsu Koji ron* (Angels are stingy=the initial draft, or on Wakamatsu Koji in scenario-format).³⁵³ The final version which the film was based on is significantly different from the initial draft, and this scene was not included, however, since the draft was published in the October, 1972 issue of *Eiga Hiho*, it is possible to imagine this as Adachi's response to Matsuda's essay on *Sex Jack*.

The use of the street landscape to indicate armed struggle can be seen throughout *Ecstasy of the Angels*. The October group affiliated with the Four Seasons party that proclaims an all-out attack on Tokyo turns their back on their policy upon the betrayal of the organization, and indiscriminately attacks the city, with weapons stolen from the U.S. base. The protagonist—who up to the end has many bombs in hands—heads to Shinjuku. While a close-up image of the protagonist walking a landscape of the city shot over his shoulder is seen, when he is finally approaching Shinjuku Street, located in the central district of the city, the camera pans to the right, and shifts to a shot of the intersection in front of the train station that the protagonist would have been seeing, and the film comes to an end. Whether the ending shot is specifically meant to designate the East Exit of Shinjuku Station, a center of street struggle in the late

³⁵² In Oshima's *Nihon shunkako* (*Sing a Song of Sex/A Treatise on Japanese Bawdy Songs*, 1967), the film ends with championing the theory of claiming the Emperor Clan to be the descent of horseback nomads from the Korean Peninsula. It can be pointed out that the Emperor system was a subject of argument simultaneously both at Wakamatsu Productions and at Sozsha.

³⁵³ Adachi Masao, "Tenshi wa kechi dearu=Dai ikko aruiwa shinario keishiki niyoru Wakamatsu Koji ron," [Angels are stingy=the initial draft, or on Wakamatsu Koji in scenario-format], *Eiga Hiho*, no.25 (October 1972): 30-53. The following is described in the scenario for the last scene.

"Young Wakamatsu running on gravel under the Nijubashi Bridge with a grenade raised over his head.

Young Wakamatsu: Uhhh!

Young Wakamatsu throws the grenade like a shot-putter.

With a blast of sound the image of young Wakamatsu freezes in the frame."

sixties, as the target of the attack, or whether it is used as a metaphor for the urban space of Tokyo is unclear, but either way, it is not expressed directly, but is represented by the landscape.

Similarly, the landscape plays a significant role in *Season of Terror*. This film, made slightly before *Sex Jack*, depicts the story of an activist who was monitored by security police. He successfully diverts their attention by spending time unethically and lazily with two women, and then heads for Haneda Airport to stop the Japanese Prime Minister from leaving for the U.S. to negotiate the revision of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty. After a scene of the national flags of Japan and the U.S. overlapping, the 'color-part' continues, and we see a continuous shot of the landscape that would be seen from the car by the protagonist, who has a bomb wrapped around his body. Though the scene is partially divided, the landscapes that the protagonist may be seeing before heading to carry out a suicide bomb attack are shared with the audience for as long as one minute. On the other hand, in the last scene of the film, after the protagonist steps out of the car, walks into the airport gate in a disinterested manner, the camera quickly pans to the control tower, the screen turns white, and sound of an explosion is heard, depicting the airport explosion specifically in the form of a montage. In this scene we can see the development of the method of incorporating the landscape seen by the protagonist—especially this folding in of the landscape he sees on his way to taking action—into the narrative, which is seen later in *Sex Jack*.

5. Oshima Nagisa

Oshima Nagisa participated in the theater movement when he was at Kyoto University, and joined Shochiku in 1954. During his time as an Assistant Director, he published a coterie magazine called *Shichinin* (Seven people) with Takahashi Osamu, Tamura Tsutomu, and Yoshida Kiju. He introduced his own scenarios, while contributing articles to film journals such as *Eiga Hihyo* and *Documentary Film* making statements proactively with respect to new theories of cinema and practice. Oshima made an exceptionally young debut with his *Ai to kibo no machi* (A Town of Love and Hope, 1959) depicting insurmountable class differences through a relationship between a poor boy and a bourgeois girl. Subsequently, *Seishun zankoku monogatari* (Cruel Story of Youth, 1960), the tale of a teenage boy and

girl who encounter a tragic fate while enjoying their aberrant adolescence acquired overwhelming support from a young audience. Through that popularity, the young directors of Shochiku, with Oshima as a central figure, received enormous attention, and were called Shochiku Nouvelle Vague. Oshima and other directors were critical of this name, due to the problem of comparing the young Japanese filmmakers, who were still affiliated with major film companies, with the French Nouvelle Vague, which had been created outside of the existing studio system. On the other hand, contemporaneous to these directors and events, young filmmakers were proactively appointed directors for documentary films as well as for narrative films, and independent productions such as student films and personal films were burgeoning, so in a broad sense, the Japanese new wave in film was created.

Meanwhile, Oshima released *Taiyo no hakaba* (Sun's Burial, 1960), depicting the uprising of the lower-class workers set in Kamagasaki in Osaka, and *Nihon no yoru to kiri* (Night and Fog in Japan, 1960), with the Anti-U.S.-Japan Security Treaty struggle as subject matter. Screenings were cancelled four days after the films' releases due to political suppression. The time of the Anti-Security Treaty Struggle, including discord between the old Left (Communist party) and the New Left (Communist League) is recollected through the wedding ceremony of a couple who met in front of the National Diet, and is depicted in one single, experimentally-long take for each scene. As a form of protest, Oshima left Shochiku the following year and established Sozosha with Tamura, Ishido Toshiro, actors such as Toura Rokko, Komatsu Hosei, and Koyama Akiko; they were later joined by Watanabe Fumio and Sasaki Mamoru. However, Oshima's activities were restricted due to a five-company agreement between the major film companies, and after *Shiiku* (The Catch, 1961), and *Amakusa Shiro Tokisada* (Shiro Amakusa the Christian Rebel, 1962), Oshima moved on to work in other fields such as television, radio, and promotional films. *Wasurerareta kogun* (Forgotten Soldier, 1963) depicted the issue of Japan's imperialism and culpability for the war through the issue of military pensions for resident Korean veterans, showing a new possibility for the television documentary. Together with Ushiyama Junichi, a producer for Nippon Television, he worked on numerous controversial works. Upon shooting the film *Seishun no Ishizue* (Cornerstone of Youth, 1964), the story of a female activist injured during Korea's

democratization struggle, and her subsequent tragedy, Oshima used still images of children that had been shot for later use for a short film, *Yubongi no nikki* (Diary of Yunbogi, 1965) on a self-production basis. The screening of *Diary of Yubongi*, and lecture series by Oshima himself were held as a late program at the Art Theater Shinjuku Bunka. The program proved popular, and there was the thought that, if a film's budget is kept low, and then it gets a longer, late-show run just at Shinjuku Bunka, the production costs can be recovered. This led to the independent production of *Ninja bugeicho* (Band of Ninja, 1967). Though this film ended up being distributed by ATG, the basis of the film production system by the ATG had already been established by Oshima through his continued trial and error for independent film production and screening. This led to *Koshikei* (Death by Hanging, 1968), the first ATG-produced work. Films such as *Shinjuku dorobo nikki* (Diary of a Shinjuku Thief, 1968), *Shonen* (Boy, 1969), *The Man Who Left His Will on Film*, and *Ceremony* were released jointly with ATG, while expanding the opportunities of releases to the U.S. and Europe, and synchronizing themselves with changes of 1968 across the globe. On the other hand, Oshima completed other films commissioned by Shochiku, including *Etsuraku* (Pleasure of the Flesh, 1965), *Hakuchu no torima* (Violence at Noon, 1966), *Nihon shunka-ko* (Sing a Song of Sex, 1967) and *Kaette kita yopparai* (Three Resurrected Drunkards, 1969).

6. ATG and *Death By Hanging*

While Oshima consistently stood at the forefront of Japanese cinema from his debut, it was rare that he diverged from the frameworks established by existing filmmakers, despite his fame in an auteurist context. Of course, none of his films would be what they are without the presence of this exceptionally unique filmmaker himself, however, it can be said that his films' achievements are not attributed exclusively to the singular talent of one man, but rather are the result of a larger, collective movement, created by various people who he gathered around him. This is evident in the sort of collectives Oshima formed around himself, ranging from his involvement in Marxism-based theater against the background of the student movement during his Kyoto University period, to the launching of his own new group immediately after entering university, and joining the already active Sozoza, as well as the publication of

the collected scenarios from his Shochiku period, with the establishment of Sozosha as its culmination, using collective creativity as the basis for his filmmaking. Needless to say, cinema by its nature requires collective work, and in this sense, all aspects of filmmaking can be based on collective production. Oshima however created his films collectively not only in terms of solving technical requirements, but also conceptual issues, including subject matter and content of films, as well as the films' philosophical implications. These were all discussed together with his staff, actors, critics and his friends. It is during his ATG period that his collective production reached its apex.

ATG started working on the production of its own films in 1968, adding on to its work distributing international art films that had begun in 1961. Its initial production was *Death by Hanging* with a production cost of ten million yen, which was split equally between the filmmaker and ATG. As there were less international masterpieces available to purchase, for about the same amount as they would spend for distribution, ATG was able to shift their budget to cost sharing for new works, and the filmmakers could request financing for their work knowing that the costs would be recovered. Furthermore, the low budgets enabled filmmakers to produce work freely and creatively. The advantages and risks on both sides were examined, and the funding method was created as a last resort. Its impact, however, was so enormous that productions of many films—by Oshima, as well as by other filmmakers and artists—became possible, including: Masahiro Shinoda's *Shinju ten no amijima* (Double Suicide, 1969), Yoshishige Kiju's *Erosu purasu gyakusatsu* (Eros + Massacre, 1969), Hani Susumu's *Hatsukoi jigoku-hen* (Inferno of First Love, 1968), Matsumoto Toshio's *Bara no soretsu* (Funeral Parade of Roses, 1969), Kuroki Kazuo's *Ryoma Ansatsu* (The Assassination of Ryoma, 1974), Wakamatsu's *Ecstasy of the Angels*, Jissoji Akio's *Mujo* (This Transient Life, 1970) and Tahara Soichiro's *Arakajime ushinawareta koibitotachi e* (Lost Lovers, 1971) from television industry, and Terayama Shuji's *Sho o suteyo machi e ideyo* (Throw Away Your Books, Go into the Street, 1970), from theater.

The planning of *Death by Hanging* began in 1963, by which time both the initial and the second drafts had already been written by Fukao Michinori. Upon making it into a film, Oshima, Tamura, and Sasaki, wrote the script jointly based on those drafts. The so-called Komatsugawa incident, the murder of

a Japanese high school girl upon which the story is based on, took place in 1958. The incident had become notorious due to the perverse nature of the crime, including the fact that the culprit himself reported the crime to a newspaper, and sent the victim's belongings to her home. Also, the discovery that the man who was arrested for the crime, a hard-working but impoverished young resident Korean named Ri Chin'u, prior to this murder had previously murdered another woman was an enormous shockwave for the public. Despite being a minor he was sentenced to death. Despite some doubts about his guilt and a clemency campaign, his sentence was carried out in 1962.

Oshima depicted the death penalty execution of Ri by the state of Japan by means of theater of the absurd, attempting to pursue the issue of Japan's war responsibility. Issues such as Japanese rule of the Korean Peninsula and resident Koreans had previously been depicted in Oshima's films after *The Forgotten Army*, including *Dairy of Yunbogi*, *Sing a Song of Sex*, and *Three Resurrected Drunkards*. It could be said that Oshima's decision to create *Death By Hanging*, in which Japan and the death penalty in East Asia were central subjects, and an anti-state, anti-Japan stance was highlighted, as his debut film from ATG, clearly determined ATG's subsequent philosophical direction. Taking advantage of the constraint of the low budget, Oshima also proposed an anti-cinematic production format that was different from conventional film making.³⁵⁴ A theatrical methodology was introduced with the use of a single, limited set, and limited number of actors. A flexible production system was created with a small group of staff, including Yoshioka Yasuhiro, a still photographer for film director, as well as script writer Ishido, film director Adachi, film critic Matsuda, and Yun Yundo as protagonists—who were non-professional actors—along with great actors from Sozosha. The participation of Adachi from Wakamatsu Productions known for pink film and Matsuda, an anarchist critic literally represented the joint struggle between Sozosha and the 'underground' cinema and activism at the time. Adachi demonstrated extreme anti-death penalty agitation in the trailer, in which Oshima is depicted with his neck in a noose, asserting to the audience that the act of watching *Death by Hanging* at the ATG theater is equivalent to the political

³⁵⁴ Due to the low budget that Oshima had never worked with before, it is said that he learned much from the production method of pink film at Wakamatsu Production.

movement. ATG's adoption of using artists and performers from media other than film—which was to become more frequent subsequently—owes much to the success of their use in this film. The continuation of experiments in cinematic formats and the questioning of state and power explored here culminated in the film *The Man Who Left His Will on Film*, one of the most representative landscape films.

7. *The Man Who Left His Will on Film*

Originally titled *Tokyo Fukei Senso* (Tokyo landscape war) with the subtitle, *Eiga de isho o nokoshite shinda otoko no monogatari* (the story of a man who left his will on film), *The Man Who Left His Will on Film* is one of Oshima's most complex and experimental films. The film, based on the idea described above, conceived by Oshima and Tamura, was scripted by Hara Masato and Sasaki. Landscape became a central subject of the film, because Hara—through his critique of the previous generation's notion of subjectivity, including Oshima and other filmmakers, as well as the notion of that generation's auteurist subject as was discussed in Chapter Two—recognized it as subject matter. Meanwhile Sasaki's interest in the notion of landscape derives from his participation in the filming of *A.K.A. Serial Killer* along with Matsuda and Adachi. Former members of Group *Posiposi*, a high school film study group, also appeared as actors in this film.

Structurally, the film takes the form of a film within a film, in which shots of a film that a man had left as his 'will' are inserted throughout, while the protagonist tries to film the same landscape as is seen in that film. The protagonist Motoki, a member of a high school film study group has his camera confiscated by the security police while filming a protest. While trying to get it back, he becomes obsessed with the illusion that one of his friends filmed something using a camera he had borrowed from Motoki, left it as his will, and committed suicide. Based on the film left, Motoki, together with Yasuko whom he believes was a girlfriend of the dead man tries to trace his footsteps. Motoki attempts to overlay himself onto the man in order to overcome him by filming the same landscape, but the attempt leads to Motoki's own death. What dominates a substantial part of the film is shots of banal landscapes.

The All-Campus Joint Struggle League, which culminated between '68 and '69, was gradually suppressed by an unstoppable police force, and to counter that force, a new course of action for armed struggle was to be created. The Tokyo War was a policy for struggle that the Communist League Red Army faction proposed during its initial formation. They laid out the theory of preliminary armed insurrection (*zen dankai buso hoki ron*), and attacked police boxes in Osaka and Tokyo. However, a large number of Red Army faction members were arrested at a training camp in the mountains, and they thereby suffered heavily. Meanwhile the movement as a whole also tapered off after International Anti-War Day on October 21, 1969, along with the Struggle to stop Prime Minister Sato's visit to the U.S. in November. The history of these struggles, according to Oshima, was collectively referred to as *sengo* (the post-war) of the Tokyo War.

During the Tokyo War (as proclaimed by the Red Army) that culminated with [struggle] to stop Prime Minister Sato's visit to the U.S, each sect proclaimed that they would fight to the death, but ultimately with not one death, I was deeply affected by the fact that the struggle in the sixties came to an end in the form of defeat. I was also roaming around the Haneda area with camera in hand, but of course I was also unable to die. For me, how one can die in the seventies is the answer to the question of how one can live.³⁵⁵

The accomplishment of this work thus was not to depict the movement and struggle directly, but rather to film the war's end in defeat, or to film the impossibility of filming the war that had already ended. To put it differently, Oshima attempted to re-examine cinema as visual medium by having the cinema movement for which Sozosha had been responsible question itself. What is filmed through the landscape, therefore, is not the movement but its aftermath, not the war but 'post-war,' not the Tokyo War but the post-Tokyo War as phantasmagoria; the film thus depicts shots of ordinary landscape rather than those selected thematically according to narratives of struggle or politics. The shooting of the film itself started on April 28, 1970, the first annual Okinawa humiliation day. The protest demonstration starting from Meiji Park is depicted as the film begins, with a scene in which a high school film study group who was filming it had their camera confiscated by the police. However, with the voiceover of the film study group

³⁵⁵ Oshima Nagisa, "Nanajunendai o do shinuka," [How can one die in the seventies] in *Kaitai to Funshutsu* [Deconstruction and eruption] (Tokyo: Hagashoten, 1970), 189

members critiquing the protest demonstration or the movement itself, along with the landscape that they are to see daily, even the politically-charged signs in the film are pushed into the background. It is thus only through the landscape, which is different from that which is produced based on political or narrative causality, that the aftermath of the movement in the seventies can be representable. It could be said that the present or the 'post-war' was presented as that which can only depict landscape in and of itself.

As was argued in Chapter Two, Oshima himself was not engaged in a discussion of landscape theory. However, since Matsuda developed landscape theory in the essay he contributed to the official pamphlet for *The Man Who Left His Will on Film*, comparing it with *A.K.A. Serial Killer*, beyond Oshima's intention, the film had become representative of the landscape films. This further complicated the situation. Though there are aspects that make it difficult to include this film clearly in the genealogy of landscape theory, it is evident that a completely new theory of the state and power in 1970's were sought by Oshima through landscape. It can also be said that the importance of historically reexamining this film is enormous, in consideration of matters such as Sasaki's involvement with the film as script writer, as well as the subsequent development of discussions about landscape by Hara, who also filmed a landscape movie called *Hatsukuni Shirasu Sumera Mikoto* (The First Emperor, 1973), in which the notion of landscape was more autonomously understood as a critical reply to *The Man Who Left His Will on Film*.

8. *Boy* and Landscape

Out of all of Oshima's films, *The Man Who Left His Will on Film* is considered most relevant to landscape theory. However *Boy* shot a year before *The Man Who Left His Will on Film*, should be mentioned as well. The film depicts daily life from the perspective of a boy in a family making their living by staging fake accidents for money, as they drift across Japan. Inspired by a true story, Tamura wrote the script in 1966, but the film remained unrealized for the next three years until it was completed as an ATG film. As an ATG work, the film retains a more narrative structure compared to Oshima's

experimental works filmed around the same period. The filming was conducted entirely on location; Oshima himself looks back on his demanding travel schedule:

On October 13th, I left for Kochi, and the film shoot began on the 15th, after traveling to Kochi, Niihama, Onomichi, Kurashiki, Kitakyushu, Matsue, Kinohara, Tangokanno, and Fukui; I returned to home to Tokyo briefly on November 26th, and went to Takasaki for three days on December 10th, 11th, and 12th, and left for Yamagata on the 14th, and after that, traveled to Akita, Wakkanai, Otaru, and Sapporo, and returned to Tokyo, and then went to Osaka on January 18th. Shooting finished on the 26th, and re-shooting minor parts completed on February 4th. The total excursion was 7,400 kilometers by railway, the equivalent of traveling round-trip between Kagoshima and Aomori three and a half times.³⁵⁶

Though the film revolves around a boy and his family as protagonists, the other subject that plays a central role in the film is images of landscapes, shot while the family are traveling across Japan freely. Due to local jurisdictions of police in Japan, which are separated by administrative districts called prefectures, the boy and his family do their business from one prefecture to another, continuing their journey of living precariously day by day, without a destination. They are arrested in Osaka, and all their bad deeds are revealed. What matters here, however, is not the characteristics and differences of the regions to which they escaped, or where they were caught. It is rather that the images of landscape depicted in the film indicate that everything, everywhere in Japan is subsumed by the state. This not only means that the entire land of Japan is controlled administratively from above by a repressive police governance. It rather means that all forms of power in everyday life are embedded as apparatus in landscape. This is evident in the images of the Japanese flag that are seen everywhere the family goes, regardless of whether metropolitan area or remote region. The family migrate silently in a landscape enclosed by such apparatuses. Despite the individual beauty of those landscapes, signs of violent interventions by the state are filmed in them. What is depicted here is the story of the family's flight, but also the process of bringing the structures of state and power to the surface through the landscape they had to see in their daily lives. Whether they leave towns to escape the hands of the police, or slip into the crowd of the city, or even if they remain nearly inhumane as a family engaging in extortion, they cannot exist outside of Japan. In the discussion of Oshima's films and the landscape, Sasaki states as follows:

³⁵⁶ Oshima, "Shonen Oboegaki," [Memorandum for *Boy*] in *Kaitai to Funshutsu*, 164.

I think that *Boy* is more of a film about the "boy." But, during the course of following the boy, or that family of four centering on the boy, the camera inexorably continues filming the landscape behind [them].³⁵⁷

The incident of a boy staging a fake accident itself is astounding and may be even emotionally appealing content-wise, however, Sasaki's statement points out that what is depicted in this film is not just the relationship between people, but also their relationship to the landscape in the background. These images of landscape, rather than being shot subjectively, as representation of the state, are something that has to be shot on film. Except for Sasaki's statement above, this film was almost never discussed in the context of landscape theory, however in light of Oshima's theoretical engagement with the issues of the state and power that were being rigorously developed starting with *Death By Hanging*, detecting similar themes in this film is not difficult. For instance, near the end of *Death by Hanging*, when the protagonist R claims his innocence and is about to open the door to step out of the execution site, and is drawn back by the bright light emanating from the outside, he is unable to go outside. The prosecutor tells R the following:

Do you understand why you came to a standstill? The place you are about to step out to now is the state. Where you are standing still now is also the state. You said that the state was invisible. But now you know the state. The state exists inside your heart. As long as the state exists in your heart, you feel guilty. You are guilty. Now you think that you should be executed.³⁵⁸

R, who then returns to the gallows, feels convinced by the prosecutor's statement that, as long as the state existed, he was innocent, accepts his fate as R for all people, and chooses to be executed. While *Death by Hanging* precedes discussions of landscape theory, this scene—in which the state is represented by a white light behind the door, by which the protagonist has to stand still, and furthermore, where he comes to stand still is referred to as part of the state, and the reference to the invisibility of the state and its internalization are all indicated—can be read as a step in the theoretical development of landscape theory. In this context, the family's state of drifting is what the "prosecutor" referred to as being inside the

³⁵⁷ Sasaki Mamoru, "Zadankai——Oshima sinpojiumu" [Discussion: Oshima symposium] in *Sekai no Eigasakka 6 Oshima Nagisa* [Filmmakers of the world 6 Oshima Nagisa], (Tokyo: Kinemajunposha, 1970), 214.

³⁵⁸ *Koshikei: Oshima Nagisa Sakuhinshu* [Death by Hanging: Collected Works of Oshima Nagisa], (Tokyo: Shiseido, 1968), 174.

"state." It is also interesting that Oshima met Wakamatsu in Tohoku and Hokkaido for filming locations for *Boy*, while Wakamatsu was then shooting *Running in Madness*, *Dying in Love*, in which the protagonist's journey of flight was similarly depicted as melodrama, and a film which also serves as a precursor for landscape films.³⁵⁹ Furthermore Toura from Sozoshu, who did not act in *Boy*, appears in *Running in Madness*, *Dying in Love*. Hence, in the context of the landscape in films by Oshima, the relationship between *Running in Madness*, *Dying in Love* and *Go, Go, Second Time Virgin* can similarly be seen in the relationship between *Boy* and *The Man Who Left His Will on Film*.

9. Cinema of Premonition

Subject matter such as state, power, and landscape were thoroughly developed by Oshima during his ATG period, however two of his films, *Sing a Song of Sex* and *Muri shinju: Nihon no natsu* (Japanese Summer: Double Suicide, 1967) can be listed as a precursor to these, which built a new basis for experimentation. *Sing a Song of Sex* is a teen drama about the daily life of a group of high school teenagers who came to Tokyo for college entrance exams. They spend time engaging in reckless acts, such as ditching their former teacher and raping his fiancée, and searching for a female high school student they met at the site of entrance examination to rape her as they fantasized.

This time we are going to begin shooting without making what is in the normal filmmaking process called a script. When we start shooting, we will have only a brief description that simply sketches the basic images of the characters and their actions. This should be called a script of images, because it consists of the conclusions reached about the images of the work that were agreed upon among the director, the script writer, the art director, and the producer, who had discussed the work up to now. We believe that this will meet our needs as we begin shooting. Accordingly, the concrete creation of each scene will be done during the process of preparation for shooting or during shooting itself, not only by the director and the script writer, but by the entire crew and the actors as well.³⁶⁰

³⁵⁹ Wakamatsu, *Orewa teo yogosu*, 109.

³⁶⁰ "Nihon shunka-ko" ni sanku suru shokun e [To the friends and Collaborators on "Sing a Song of Sex"], (Tokyo: Sozoshu, 1967), 1. Reprinted in Oshima Nagisa, *Koshikei: Oshima Nagisa Chosakushu* [Death by Hanging: Collected Writings of Oshima Nagisa] (Tokyo: Shiseido, 1968), 179. For English translation see "To the Friends and Collaborators on A Study of Japanese Bawdy Songs" in Oshima, *Cinema, Censorship, and the State: The Writings of Nagisa Oshima*, ed. Annette Michelson, trans. Lawson Dawn (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992), 125. A minor change was made for this translation.

In a three-page brochure, a reprint that is separate from the scenario titled, *Nihon shunka-ko ni sanku suru shokun e* (To the friends and Collaborators on *Sing a Song of Sex*) Oshima proposed a collective concept and experimental methodology for the film production. Through various unorthodox attempts, including collaborations with thinkers and students from Zengakuren on scripts and direction by Oshima and Ishido, or those by Matsumoto Toshio and Tomatsu Shomei on a script for *The Catch* that had been made in the past, an approach to newly theorize a collective, group-based creation, beyond the framework of the independent film productions was worked on in this film. A plot-only scenario was written by four people including young script writers, and based on that, directions were provided improvisationally.

For these reasons, we are confident that by applying this formula, we will be able to bring off a freer, richer film production; at an even deeper level, however, there is the fact that we have great confidence in our abilities. We are confident that we are Japan's best film crew at this point in time. It is because we are Japan's best film crew that we are able to embark on an adventure that has never before been attempted in Japanese film.³⁶¹

Through these new attempts at collective and collaborative creation, protagonists' chaotic sex and violence are depicted not only as cinematic narrative, but also as a series of shots—including distinct bodies, monotonous urban landscapes with the use of long takes and long shots, anti-Emperor system demonstrations by anarchists who are raising black Japanese flags against the re-establishment of National Foundation Day, and the last scene where the theory of claiming the Emperor Clan as the descent of horseback-riding nomads is abruptly championed—to successfully create a chain of events filled with tension. It is important to note that this was not meant for the sake of the avant-garde novelty of the improvisation-based story or cinematic techniques, but rather as the result of a philosophical endeavor. This horizon was to be further pursued in *Japanese Summer: Double Suicide*. The story is that a suicidal man meets a vagabond girl, and while wandering together in the city in search of a place to die, they encounter a mysterious group: killers, a random sniper, etc. As was written for *Sing a Song of Sex*, Oshima similarly describes the following in his declaration for the production of this film:

³⁶¹ Ibid., 179. For English translation, see "To the Friends and Collaborators on A Study of Japanese Bawdy Songs" in Oshima, *Cinema, Censorship, and the State*, 124.

Our films are usually films of premonition. We take a lot of our material from the past and present: however, we don't use it to explain the past or present. We take material from the past and present only when it gives rise to our images of the future. At such times, the material already transcends its significance as material, becoming our images and projecting certain premonitions about the future to those who see the film. Thus, we are now trying to make exclusively premonitory films, and we consider all other films meaningless.³⁶²

"Films of premonition" is one of the well-known statements made by Oshima. It does not mean that *Japanese Summer: Double Suicide* is predicting that something new is about to happen. More specifically, it does not mean that, as of the spring – summer of 1967, Oshima and his crew immediately had a gut instinct about, and prepared a way towards the turbulent political and cultural period that was to fully unfold in 1968. It could be certainly pointed out that - when retroactively tracing history, the work was pioneering in depicting the turbulence characteristic of '68, with a plot in which mysterious characters, neither on the right nor on the left, without stating their nationalities, appear one after another, while introducing a wild girl as an agent to create mayhem estrangement. "Premonition" here is not meant for the talented avant-garde subject—whether an auteur, a thinker or an activist—to create a new form of practice or theory. Oshima discusses the notion of premonition through the relationships between characters as follows:

It's correct for one to have a premonition that they are being made by someone to commit suicide. But that someone isn't us. We are not on the side saying, "Let us commit double suicide." We ourselves have the premonition that someone is making us commit double suicide.³⁶³

Oshima is trying to present the fact that he has a premonition not that one forces others to commit suicide, but rather one is going to be driven to double suicide as a demand of the times. It is through the notion of premonition that he tried to express the situation in which one would become galvanized by something new, rather than that in which either specific individuals or a group would lead pioneering thoughts or practice. It goes without saying that Oshima, who had been responsible for the most

³⁶² "Satsujin hyakka matawa Muri Shinju Nihon no Natsu ni sankasuru shokun ni," [To the Friends and Collaborators on *Encyclopedia of Murder* and *Japanese Summer: Double Suicide*], 1967, 1. Reprinted in Oshima, *Koshikei, Oshima Nagisa chosakushu*, 181. For English translation see "To the Friends and Collaborators on Japanese Summer: *Double Suicide*" in Oshima, *Cinema, Censorship, and the State*, 128-9.

³⁶³ Oshima, *Koshikei: Oshima Nagisa Chosakushu*, 183.

experimental cinema movement both historically and contemporaneously, developed new horizons of cinema and thoughts through his works and statements. In this sense, what is referred to as 'premonition' can be generally understood as a new concept proposal by Oshima. In actuality however, Oshima contrarily tried to indicate the recognition that new thoughts and practice in the new era should not be created unilaterally by avant-garde individuals or groups, rather that he and his colleagues are simply existing to witness that something new is rising. Paradoxically however, it was most radical for him to be able to take notice of that new thing, and recognize that he simply existed inside it. Through the presentation of the notion of premonition and its impossibility, Oshima attempted to negate the auteurist subject in terms of cinema and art on one hand, and the leftist or new leftist subjects on the other. This negation however does not mean passivity. While clarifying the limits of the existing 'Avant-garde' subject, or subject on the basis of Politics with a capital 'P', an entirely different form of new subject was sought simultaneously through collective filmmaking. In the context of such attempts, the issue of subject in film is to be argued.

How can we go far beyond naturalism and still permit each existence to stand on its own? To what extent can time pass subjectively, or stop? Can our premonition, expressed clearly as a framework in our script, take root as a film? Our work from now on, which will decide this can be boiled down to these two points.³⁶⁴

In previous filmmaking, the emphasis was on the subjectivity of each division, however this work, in addition to respect for each subjectivity, requires scrupulous mutual interaction between divisions, even in the smallest details. Oshima aimed to bring out the potential of each individual maximally, not through a group of individual subjects, but by generating a collective subject of autonomous individuals. As a specific example of this type of organization theory, Oshima references that the victory at the Struggle at Haneda on October 8th, 1967 was due tactics in which each activist group fought autonomously and sporadically, rather than under a unified chain of command. Oshima further discusses the relationship between individual and group, and art movement and everyday life:

³⁶⁴ Oshima, *Koshukei: Oshima Nagisa Chosakushu*, 185. For English translation see Oshima, *Cinema, Censorship, and the State*, 132.

That a small number of people who can talk about creation directly on a daily basis do something together is art movement. Since art is based on each and every minute symptom of our daily life, art movement can be established only based on the personal relationship. And [the only way] is that those various bodies of art movements which are scattered, respectively create superb work (including criticism), [and there is no other way].³⁶⁵

Developing his unique theorization of subjectivity and cinema movement, with reference to problematics such as everyday rather than those of avant-garde art and politics exclusively, Oshima created collective forms of expression that differed entirely from auteuristic works; though still under his own name or his production *Sozosha* with members of extremely individual originality, going beyond the 'names,' he pursued the possibility of cinema as anonymous creation, which is also linked to the uprising of 1968 negating all forms of representation. In *Diary of a Shinjuku Thief* in which the chaotic situations of Shinjuku ranging from political movement, culture, entertainment and everyday circumstances from spring to summer of 1968 are actually filmed, the film ends with the documentation of the actual police box attack. Oshima explains this incident in relation to his concept of films of 'premonition':

Later, from October 8th to October 21st, the 'riot' of the crowd in Shinjuku escalated, but the first stir was actually created on June 29th, and that was an attack on the police box in Shinjuku, done for the first time in sixteen years after the [incident] on the 27th year of Showa. I always want to make films that stir things up like that.³⁶⁶

While in 1967 premonition and the subject were defined as synonymous with revolutionary direct action in the midst of the season of politics of '68 and '69, in *The Man Who Left His Will on Film*, they were to be re-questioned in the new stage of post-'68, through the notion of landscape.

10. Jean-Luc Godard and Dziga Vertov Group in Japan

Though the Dziga Vertov Group, formed in 1969 by Godard and Jean-Pierre Gorin, had no direct relationship with landscape theory that was developed in Japan, in this section a comparative investigation on works and theory that examined the relationship between cinema and politics through

³⁶⁵ Oshima Nagisa, "Hoho dake o ronzu mono wa taihai suru," [Those who only discuss methods will degenerate] in *Kaitai to Funshutsu*, 56.

³⁶⁶ Oshima Nagisa "Shinjuku Dorobo Nikki no shinario ni tsuite," [On the script of Diary of Shinjuku Thief] in *Kaitai to Funshutsu*, 153.

landscape will be attempted, mediated by discussions on the works of Godard in Japan. Godard's work and theories since the Nouvelle Vague period have had an enormous impact on Japan, however, it was during the time just before and during the period of the Dziga Vertov Group when various transnational, mutual exchanges were conducted. Sozosha, together with Kawakita Kazuko and Shibata Hayao from France Eigasha (Shibata organization: distribution company in Japan), organized a movement to screen the works of Godard and the Dziga Vertov Group in Japan called Godard Manifesto. The movement consisted of a total of four series, lasting from October 1970 to November 1971. This screening movement intended to re-contextualize earlier works such as *Breathless* (1959) and *A Woman Is a Woman* (1961) that were previously imported by either distribution company, as well as to screen unreleased works including *Le Carabiniers* (1963), *Made in U.S.A.* (1966), and *Two or Three Things I Know About Her* (67), along with work from the same period by the Dziga Vertov Group such as *Pravda* (1969), *British Sounds* (1969), and *Lotte in Italia* (1969). As requested by Godard, versions with voice-over instead of subtitles were created for *Pravda*, *British Sounds*, and *Lotte in Italia*, and actors from Sozosha and Adachi as voice actors, and Matsuda and Tsumura for translation of political terminology participated under the supervision of Shibata. Also *Eiga Hihyo* by Matsuda and Adachi cooperated by reprinting the script, as well as publishing translations of texts by and interviews with Godard.³⁶⁷ Since screening and televising the works of the *Dziga Vertov Group* had been banned in Europe, it can be imagined that the role played by these advanced releases of the works in Japan was, for Godard, not marginal. Also, since France Eigasha was also handling the overseas distribution of Oshima's films, there was an exchange of screening rights between *Death By Hanging* and *Two or Three Things I Know About Her*. Texts by Godard and the Dziga Vertov Group, as well as those written about them by Matsuda,

³⁶⁷ For the published booklet, see ed. Fukami Koichiro, *Godard Manifesto* [Godard Manifesto] (Tokyo: Furansu Eigasha and Sozosha, 1970). Featured texts include the translation of Godard's "What is to be done?" and Matsuda's essay on *Lotte in Italia*. For detailed background for the screening, see Matsuda Masao, "'Godard Manifesto' no koro – dojidaisha no monorogu funi," [Around the time of "Godard Manifesto" – in the manner of monologue by a contemporary], ed. Hirasawa Go, *Bungei Bessatsu Godard* [Literary and Art Extra issue Godard], (Tokyo: Kawadeshoboshinsha, 2002), 129-135. Also in the similar context of cinema movement, *La Chinoise* and *Wind from the East* were released by Firumu atosha (Film Art Company) —a company related to Sogetsu Art Center—, which published *Kikan Firumu* [Film Quarterly] with Matsumoto Toshio, Teshigahara Hiroshi and others as editorial board members.

Adachi and Oshima became central to the theorization of cinema movement in Japan. Additionally, the voice-over system for the Dziga Vertov Group was also to be used for Red Army/PFLP. And last but not least, both the Dziga Vertov Group and Adachi made films about Palestine: *Until Victory/Palestine Will Win* and *Red Army/PFLP* respectively. More importantly, however, practical and theoretical relationships between the group and filmmakers in Japan was established, was based on various historical events and background as described above.

11. Landscape in Films by Godard

Although neither the term nor the notion of landscape was directly referenced in films by Godard, it can be said that problematics similar to those of 'landscape' are brought to the fore in Godard's film *Two or Three Things I Know About Her*.³⁶⁸ The film fragmentally depicts the life of the female protagonist living in a large apartment complex in the suburbs who is involved in prostitution, while hiding it from her husband. However the film's other subject matter is the landscape that is being homogenized by high economic growth. The film can be considered as extension of *A Married Woman* (1964) in terms of a methodology based fragments of a woman's everyday life, and *Masculine-Féminine* (1966) in terms of its sociological analysis of youth lifestyle and fashion, and also *A Married Woman* in its depiction of poverty and prostitution in the modern city. However, the narrative structure centered on characters is pushed into the background through the decentralizing of the narrative, by depicting the protagonist, the newly-born middle class with multiple women simultaneously, and furthermore, the overlaying of the landscape of the new city, represented by the apartment complex where they live. The pronoun 'she' included in the title denotes both the character of the film and Île-de-France, a new administrative district which was established in 1961 and later renamed in 1976, and thus, both the character and the redeveloped district were considered to be the protagonists of the film. The new poverty, in which female characters are driven to prostitution by a desire for consumption is explained as a political and economic issue in light of

³⁶⁸ For instance, Jean-Henri Roger points out the connection of this work with works from *Dziga Vertov Group*. Jean-Henri Roger, Interview by Stephan Bouquet, Thierry Lounas, "Défense du cinéma", *Cahiers du cinéma: cinéma 68, hors-série*, (1998): 38-41.

class theory, either inside the story or by Godard's off screen narration. More importantly, the sheer objectiveness of the landscape is represented by images such as enormous buildings towering in the redeveloped suburban areas, the everyday living carried on in each room of the apartment complex, the shopping at clothing stores or the supermarket, commercial ads filling the street, and construction sites; hence the film depicts the structure where, rather than engaging in business or daily living subjectively, the protagonists living in the new urban space are subsumed into the landscape and forced to do so. From this transitional work, Godard was to proceed further with an attempt to discuss landscape as representation, as well as cinema as a form of media, while referencing himself as auteur, thereby making clear the dynamics of the state and capitalism that are at work in filmmaking.

In *Camera Eye*, part of an omnibus film titled *Far From Vietnam* (1967), while shooting himself sitting in front of the camera in Paris, Godard keeps talking in a disinterested manner on whether one can or cannot shoot a film for the liberation of Vietnam. The impossibility of filling the distance, no matter how extensively one talks about the Vietnam War in Europe, as well as the fact that Godard, who is feeling conflicted himself, is part of the landscape, is self-referentially depicted. It could be said that *Camera Eye* is not a film about Vietnam, but rather about the distance to Vietnam. In *La Chinoise* (1967) the story revolves around a group of university students studying Mao Zedong during summer vacation. Against the background of a discussion between one of the protagonists and Francis Jeanson, a philosopher who was involved in the Algeria national liberation struggle on a train ride from Nanterre La Folie station, shots of banal suburban city landscapes are continuously overlaid, highlighting the contrast to the discussion on armed struggle. The majority of the film takes place inside an apartment depicting the 'landscape' where the students are learning intently. In contrast to the vivid colors of images such as scattered red quotations from Chairman Mao and others, the clash of the aggressive sounds of political language with an impoverished use of images is articulated. In *Weekend* (1967), a peaceful country landscape is depicted—filled with urban symbols such as colorful cars and a Shell truck, due to a heavy traffic jam caused by car accidents—by a continuously moving camera.

Meanwhile, in February 1968, upon the sudden dismissal of Henri Langlois, the director of Cinémathèque Française, protest demonstrations were called for by Godard and François Truffaut, and during the decisive events of May 1968, this fight further developed into a struggle to crush the Cannes International Film Festival. Godard himself participated in demonstrations and rallies in the streets of Paris, and jointly with *Cinétracts* (1968), the independent film production movement for political agitation formed by directors including Chris Marker, he released short films consisting of montages of documentary images of the protest movement, his own films from the past, and political slogans. After the May revolution, Godard launched the editing of *Le Gai Savoir* (Joy of Learning, 1968), for which filming was completed in January. This marks the transition from the period of his early commercial narrative films to the era of the *Dziga Vertov Group*. The story is set in a film studio where the protagonists, a student activist and a worker, are engaged in discussions on images, films, photographs, arts, science, media, politics, etc. The film is shot with extremely unadorned and spare lighting, straightforward and devoid of frills. While the presence of the protagonists is evident, the film articulates the importance of the impersonal 'landscape', which is unconventional in comparison to cinematography in character-based narrative film. In short, whereas Godard's films from *Two or Three Things I Know about Her* to *Weekend* indicate the structure of power inexorably filmed in banal scenes and landscape within the framework of fiction films, it could be said that starting in Godard's films starting from *Joy of Learning*, mediated by quite limited images of landscape, the political analysis of the structure of cinema as an audio-visual medium of representation itself is strengthened. Also, the sound and voice are clearly articulated against images of visually empty scenes of discussions, in an attempt to make sound and image break free from their relationship of subordination, and establish their own autonomy.

In *One Plus One* (1968), the rehearsal sessions for *Sympathy For the Devil* by the Rolling Stones, each scene is filmed as one shot, a series of uninterrupted takes. Along with this sequence, shots of militants from Black Panthers' performing a revolution play in a junkyard are included. In *Un film comme les autres* (A Film Like Any Other, 1968) a discussion of the events of May to June 1968 is filmed, endlessly, with extraordinary framing and in long shots, between students from Nanterre, and workers

from the Renault factory, with their faces hidden in the shade of tall grass in a field near an apartment complex outside Paris. Meanwhile, various black and white documentary footage shot during protests is inserted into those color sequences. The soundtrack consists of the off screen reading of texts on revolution in France and abroad, from the French Revolution leading up to the May revolution. The structure of power in the suburbs is thus highlighted by the landscape of the field spread with the high-rise apartment complex and highway bridge in the background. In addition, documentary shots of intense protests on the street, university, and factory are meticulously montaged with the monotonous landscape, thereby evading the interpretation of those images exclusively on an ideological basis. In addition to the use of images such as these, another noteworthy aspect of this film is the political aspect in sound=words. Godard himself recalls that this work "can be mechanically decomposed into three elements — two visual images and one auditory image".³⁶⁹ Here, based on Godard's defining sound=words as auditory-image, it is clear that the possibility of autonomy of sound in cinema was intended. At the same time however, words, as well as sound and image, have a prominent role in this film. In a conversation with Solanas, Godard looks back on this film as follows:

I made a film with students talking to workers and it was very clear: the students talked all the time and the workers never... The workers among themselves talked at lot... But where are their words? Not in the newspapers, not in the films.³⁷⁰

In an interview in the January 23rd, 1969 issue of *Tribune socialiste* Godard states more succinctly:

That was a film about words. Those words that are often sealed between them, when students and workers get together, and those words that were released there, I needed to present them.³⁷¹

Clearly, in a sense of articulating a political argument versus images, Godard's statement testifies to the fact that workers do not have their own words, and thus the film is about the absence of words. In the film it is not that workers are not talking at all, however, it can be pointed out that their voice is not

³⁶⁹ Ed., Alain Bergala, *Jean-Luc Godard par Jean-Luc Godard: Tome 1 1950-1984* (Paris: Cahiers du Cinema, 1998), 364.

³⁷⁰ Godard on Solanas/Solanas on Godard, in *Selections from New Latin American Cinema*, ed., Coco Fusco, (New York: Hallwalls Contemporary Art Center, 1987), 89.

³⁷¹ Ed., Bergala, *Jean-Luc Godard par Jean-Luc Godard: Tome 1 1950-1984*, 335.

heard as the discussions by the students. In short, the film depicts the impossibility of representation or representing in words=sound, as well as in images, and hence, in order to respond to the events of May, 1968 an approach that Godard took in this film was to seek content and form in which the anonymity of discussion can be secured, and the structure of power in image and sound into light should be brought to light, and finally, the negation of representation by such image and sound should be expressed.

Films about 'May' were created based on a viewpoint which was separate from the commercial films as a starting point. They were also created as part of personal political activities. These films are not seen as spectacles, therefore it is not possible to consider them as spectacle. As a matter of fact, films about May have to be well made to the extent possible. However, that which was created well to the extent possible still remains to be seen, and may gradually become clear going forward.³⁷²

Based on this context, it can be said that it is in *A Film Like Any Other* that, as a turning point, the experiments in image and sound initially introduced in *Two or Three Things I Know About Her* were radically developed, and that even based on its negation, a new cinematic horizon can be opened up. The depiction of class struggle by means of words was made possible by disclosing the structures of power by sound, as well as by images in the form of landscape. In the same interview however, as self-critique, Godard refers to it as being nothing but a revisionist film that was thought of by himself, even though the film is more revolutionary in comparison to *Joy of Learning*. Despite the fact that the director's name is actually absent in the credits, and the script, filming, and editing are attributed to both Godard and ARC Group, he strongly critiques it as auteurist, and as created individually, and this was to lead him to the formation of Dziga Vertov Group, for the purpose of carrying out movement-based, collective and anonymous film production.

12. Landscape during the Period of Dziga Vertov Group

In December 1968 Godard filmed *British Sound*, a documentary about Britain, jointly with Jean-Henri Roger, a young Maoist and editor of the journal, *Action*. Though the film's credits show that the film was co-directed and scripted by Godard and Roger, this practically marks the beginning of Dziga

³⁷² Ibid, 332.

Vertov Group. The finished film, which had been scheduled to be aired on London Weekend Television, resulted in the rejection of screening. The film consists of six sequences on the basis of the subjects: 'workers', 'struggle', 'capital', 'workers' again, 'students' and 'revolutionary sound', and the operations in image and sound executed in *A Film Like Any Other* were developed further, politically and analytically, with an emphasis on the aspect of 'sound film'. As is evident in the opening shots with word 'images' crossed out, the film is clearly intended as a critique of images. In the September-October, 1969 issue of *Cinéthique*, on behalf of Dziga Vertov Group, quoting a narration used in the film, Godard issued a manifesto called, *Premiers 'sons anglais'* (First "British Sounds").

The bourgeoisie created a world in its image. However, it also created an image in its world. The bourgeoisie creates an image of its world that it calls a reflection of reality. <Photography is not a reflection of reality but reality as reflection of reality.>³⁷³

Godard further points out that photographic media was nothing but an invention designed to camouflage reality as an ideology of new communication for the masses. In this work, 'sound' was juxtaposed against 'bourgeois' images, and then further 'revolutionary' sound against 'imperialist' sounds.

This film pertains to a sound that is placed in opposition to some other sound. It is about a revolutionary sound that is placed in opposition to some imperialistic sound. But this is to be expressed in this film itself, on the film strip, through something dialectical (Eisenstein) which is none other than a struggle for image and sound.³⁷⁴

Godard then proposes a critique of image as representation using the Marxist concept of surplus value.

Is there an opportunity for surplus value to have an effect on representation? Is surplus value not created when reality is reproduced (or represented)? Is the Marxist notion of surplus value not a useful weapon in the struggle against the bourgeois concept of representation?³⁷⁵

Representation in image and sound is understood precisely as exploitation from filmed reality, and through dialectical methodology, by colliding image against image, image against sound, or sound against sound, Godard aimed to point out and dismantle fundamental structural problems of cinema as a

³⁷³ Ibid., 337.

³⁷⁴ Ibid., 338.

³⁷⁵ Ibid.

medium of representation. Therefore, in this work, the images of the landscapes at the factory, university, or in everyday life as elements of representation, become objects to be analyzed and criticized through other images or sounds. If films up to the Dziga Vertov Group were assumed to visualize the violence of the state and Capitalism or Communism through the representation of landscape, it could be said that after the Dziga Vertov Group, emphasis was placed rather on the politics of representation in image and sound itself, including landscape. These attempts were to be fully unfolded in the Group's second film, *Pravda*.

Pravda was edited by Godard, based on material shot by Godard and Roger, and cinematographer Paul Burron in Prague, Czechoslovakia in April 1969. The film consists of four parts, in which a couple named Vladimir and Rosa, who are off screen, analyze and critique documentary footage shot during the Prague Spring when the democratization movement was suppressed by the Soviet Union's military interventions: a presentation with respect to the specific situation of Czechoslovakia is delivered in Part one, that presentation is then diagnosed as revisionism in part two, and in part three, as prescriptions against those false images, a Marxist-Leninist discourse is presented as correct sound, and finally, in part four, after a short evaluation, Mao Zedong's struggle based on three kinds of social practice is addressed. As Godard himself pointed out, that "<political> shooting, but in reality it is shooting based on <political tourism>, nothing more, nothing less." or "hasty, opportunist, petit-bourgeois shooting,"³⁷⁶ documentary footage—that was originally difficult to make into work—was reincarnated as a political film through Marxist-Leninist-based self-critical re-examination and editing after returning to France. With a technique based on Dziga Vertov's Kino-Eye theory, with an emphasis on the editing process, those images came together as one material, and a new relationship between image and sound was sought. As an affirmative aspect of this film, Godard lists the fact that cuts and scenes where working-class or productions are captured were able to be rescued at the end by organizing editing, without abandoning filmmaking.

And to pick up simple images is to refuse to create excessively perfect images about the world. Also, it is not even that the same image (or sound) remains to be the image (or sound) of struggle;

³⁷⁶ Ibid., 340

it is to make them become an image (or a sound) about struggle, about critique, and about change, and to make them become an image (or a sound) to struggle, to critique, and to change.³⁷⁷

Experiments to politically reconstruct images and sounds taken by themselves through editing culminated in *Le vent d'est* (Wind from the East, 1969) and *Lotte in Italia*, and also after the Vertov Group era, they bore fruit methodologically in *Ici et ailleurs* (Here and Elsewhere, 1975). For instance, the editing of *Pravda* was actually conducted after filming and editing *Wind from the East*. Faced with the limitation of the shooting method, Godard stalled. The work was however made possible by innovative editing methodology by Gorin. Godard states as follows:

His work was to try to overturn the traditional notion of editing. Rather than considering editing as simply combining and collaging cuts, he tried to consider it as a way to systematize cuts. Thanks to his work, we were able to break free from the impasse. Gorin's work was something that made me try to ask myself politically about images and sounds, and the relationship between images and sounds.³⁷⁸

Wind from the East was shot in Italy in May-June 1969 by Godard, Gorin, and Gérard Martin, with activist Daniel Cohn-Bendit and Italian script writer Sergio Bazzini, who co-wrote the screenplay. Also, in this film, the name Dziga Vertov Group first appeared for the directing credit. In the film, while a revolutionary western is performed in the field by caricatured characters such as 'Union soldier,' 'Indian,' 'bourgeois girl,' 'union delegate,' and 'fighter,' shots of the cast and crew discussing the film, images of landscape such as factories, a rural village, and apartment complex, as well as black and red screens are inserted intermittently, along with an off-screen voice-over continuously critiquing the film's images. Godard speaks about his approach to a spaghetti western film as follows:

The intention was not to say that this is a correct image, but the intention was rather to say that this is just an image. It was not like trying to say that this is an image of a Union officer riding a horse. It was rather intended to say that this is an image of a horse and a Union office. And an attempt to say that in *Wind from the East* was quite an aggressive thing to do. Because in that film we were taking the major position of the enemy called western as <an image> that the West has been imposing on other countries—by using any means.³⁷⁹

³⁷⁷ Ibid., 340

³⁷⁸ Ibid., 366

³⁷⁹ Ibid., 366.

By creating a Western film—which symbolizes Hollywood—in light of Marxism, the aim was to deconstruct the Hollywood cinema as an institution centered on 'stars' and story-based spectacles. Structurally, a quasi-spaghetti western drama unfolds in landscape, or 'nature' discovered in the process of modernization, while being interrupted by the screen turning to black or red, scratched-up images a la experimental films, discussions as self-critique, and so forth. In the second half of the film, when a landscape of workers working in rural village or a factory, a suburban ghetto, and a housing complex are overlaid, the film criticizes cinema vérité by stating that the masses cannot be filmed by simply turning the camera towards them. The film contends that images and sounds are those of the ruling class, which are dependent on the Hollywood-Mos Film industry, and also points out structural issues to do with photography being an institutional and bourgeoisie medium at its origin, and finally, armed struggle is called for, while practical images of bomb- and weapons-making relevant to direct action, landscapes of blown-up buildings, a market, and children waiting for after-school pickup are montaged along with the sounds of explosion. Furthermore, workers on duty early in the morning at the Citroën plant are shot in long takes with a fixed camera, while a civil war between capital and labor, as well as rebellion against the bourgeoisie and revisionists are called for. During the events of May 1968, collective film production in order to put thoughts into praxis was vastly significant in terms of cinema movement. In fact, the most important contribution production turned out to be participation of Gorin. Godard, along with Gorin, recalls the film's production process as follows:

Gorin: Let's take a film like *East Wind*, which was very involved in the spirit of the May-June events, because all sorts of people were gathered together there. There were the people who were around Danny Cohn-Bendit, there were Marxist-Leninist people like me and Jean-Luc—it was some sort of liberal gathering of people. And it failed because there was no real political discussion. What happened was that the two Marxists really willing to do the film took power, and ...

Godard: All the anarchists went to the beach. (laughter)³⁸⁰

³⁸⁰ The Dziga Vertov film group in America: An interview with Jean-Luc Godard and Jean-Pierre Gorin, by Michael Goodwin, Tom Luddy and Naomi Wise, *Take One*, vol.2, no.10 (1970): 17.

Initially the script started to be written collectively by twenty-nine people, however, it is suggested that, as the production went on, there were difficulties in the end. It could be said that the tumultuous aspects of the movement inherited from '68 took root in this film as well. *Lotte in Italia*, directed by Godard and Gorin, was filmed in December 1969. RAI in Italy produced the film, but it was again denied screening. Consisting of four parts, the film depicts a young female student involved in revolutionary movement in Italy, and her rigorous self-critique of bourgeois ideology that permeates her daily life. In the first one, themes such as 'political activism', 'university', 'society', 'family', 'housing', 'sex', and 'identification' are presented visually, however at the end of the sequence the protagonist herself points out that images such as these are none other than fragments of her own self, or 'reflection rather than reality'. The second part is constructed primarily based on the depiction of the protagonist's reflection on her daily living and how contradictions therein can be overcome through Marxist theory and praxis. It concludes that what is asked for is the ideological struggle between bourgeoisie and revolutionary movement. The third part provides structural analysis concerning what sort of ideological function was at play in the first and second parts; for instance, while specific relations of production at places like a factory that are concealed behind the day-to-day living indicated in the first part are found out, the intellectual reproduction of teaching workers knowledge acquired at university as an ideological state apparatus is also referenced. Criticism is further aimed at the fact that only relations of capitalistic production are mentioned in the second part, and it is decided that the struggle should be expanded to the legal and political domains. In the fourth part, the question as to how the protagonist must actually develop the struggle is posed.

At that time Italy was experiencing so-called *L'autunno caldo* (hot autumn), a period in which an aggressive struggle centering around the labor movement was underway, however, as is different from what one can expect from the title, even though discussion of such movement is depicted, actual documentary footage never appears in the film. Except for several shots that were taken at factories in the suburbs of Milan or near Lille, almost all filming was conducted in the apartment of Godard and Anne Wiazemsky. Gorin expresses the reason straightforwardly as follows:

We were not involved in the revolutionary movement in Italy, so we decided to make the film mainly in Paris, and then to add a few shots of the Italian situation—very well-chosen, important shots.³⁸¹

With an Italian student militant as protagonist, Godard and Gorin poses a question not about politics with a capital 'P', but rather politics in everyday life. Godard was at first skeptical of the methodology of militant documentation. In the same interview he criticizes the American Newsreel group as follows:

They are just trying to spread other information than the Establishment. It's not enough just to show students on strike or people rioting—the task of the militant filmmaker is much more difficult. How can you build an image of a riot, how can you build an image of a striker, when you don't belong to the working class?³⁸²

It can be pointed out that many of the Newsreel group filmmakers were in fact rolling the camera while directly participating in the movement, however, Godard contends that, instead of filmmakers filming from the outside, those who are actually participating in the movement themselves should shoot films and images regardless of their experience or skills, and if filmmakers themselves are going to shoot a film, production should be made jointly with those participants. As an extension of the proposal, since he was not participating in the worker's movement in Italy, Godard decided to take a different approach in terms of content and form to shoot a film about the political situation in Italy. It is therefore important to note that rather than movement-related images, shots of a black screen like those that started to appear after *Wind From the East* were to be frequently employed; the black screen in the first part serves to indicate the protagonist's lack of political consciousness, for which the attention was evoked in the second part. In the third part, instead of the black screen, images of factory labor are shown in an attempt to visualize the relations of production that are rendered invisible by daily bourgeois life. Problems of visibility and invisibility in images are thus to be challenged in the context of class struggle. Concerning this black screen and its technique, in discussing *Lotte in Italia*, Matsuda argues as follows:

³⁸¹ Ibid., 13.

³⁸² Ibid., 23.

I would rather like to see a truly sincere sense of arrangement in order where his agony in method—like colorful paints that were thrown too casually on the canvas in *Wind From the East*—inevitably has to pass when it is aiming for a single direction, and is beginning to be crystalized within Godard himself. I or Adachi Masao or Sasaki Mamoru would propose rather a <landscape> than a <black screen>. However, the problem is not within a simple dichotomy between <black screen> and <landscape>. Indeed, the problem lies in [the question] of what should mediate both [of us], who shared the same agony in method in a global simultaneity.³⁸³

In comparison to landscape theory, Matsuda discusses a black screen in this film based on the notion of global simultaneity surpassing theoretical and methodological differences, as well as individual-based relation of influence. On the other hand, Adachi summarizes what transpired before Godard reached the black screen as follows:

Godard was trying to film the fact that his own gaze trying to film images, even though it is aiming at everything in the situation, is none other than an image to be looked at by filming objects to film and persons filming and offset them. And finally, it has become <a black screen> as something to be looked at synergistically consisting of objects to film, objects to be filmed.³⁸⁴

In response to the black screen as a method, Adachi criticizes that it is simply "part of Godard's method, which digested 'the old scheme of politics and art,'" and "when duty unique to <work>, duty unique to <auteur> are turned into methodology introspectively, it only becomes <work>. Furthermore, quoting the above writing by Matsuda, Adachi launched a declaration titled, *What should not be done?* as a critical response to the black screen, Dziga Vertov Group, and Godard.

When Matsuda Masao thus points out, the contrast between Godard, who has used <the black screen> in *Lotte in Italia*, and auteurs (including myself) who have used landscape theory by holding it in private as the so-called "Serial Killer" first has to be viewed objectively.³⁸⁵

As the comparison between the film theory of Dziga Vertov and the landscape theory of Adachi and Matsuda attests, both are significantly different politically and methodologically. The Vertov Group, with a strong belief in Marxist-Leninist philosophy, aimed to dismantle the political structure of power in images and sounds through a process of editing, and to reorganize their relations. Therefore, a landscape

³⁸³ Matsuda Masao, "Itaria ni okeru toso' Oboegaki" [Memorandum for *Lotte in Italia*] in *Godaru Manifesuto*, 21.

³⁸⁴ Adachi, *Eiga eno senryaku*, 138.

³⁸⁵ Adachi, *Eiga eno senryaku*, 146.

such as a city, factory or rural village is just one of the aspects in the film newly consisting of new images and sound. In contrast, Adachi and his colleagues, by overlaying one image of banal landscape over another, tried to articulate the structure of power implied in those landscapes in an attempt to generate new meanings by representing landscape. Neither revolutionary messages nor signs are contained either directly or indirectly in individual landscapes. Instead, through closely examining them, they strove to evoke the possibility of new events arising; in other words, rather than being the author unilaterally documenting the object to be filmed and editing the image, they eliminated the relations of dependency between the seer and the seen, or filming and being filmed, thereby trying to bring out new subjectivity and autonomy on the side of the spectator. Despite the shared denial of auteurism, the Marxist-Leninist dialectics of the Vertov Group and the anarchism-based methodologies of Adachi and Matsuda were in contrast with each other in terms of understanding subjectivity and its conceptualization. It is evident, for instance, in the comparison between a shot in *Wind From the East*, in which the call for action is specifically indicated through a montage of the daily landscape, with the scene of an explosion on the one hand, and shots of monotonous daily landscape (despite its being the object to be destroyed) in *A.K.A. Serial Killer*—which suggests the potentiality to leap into action for armed struggle—on the other. Of course the Vertov Group is not straightforwardly proposing praxis only, and not everything about the group can be understood based on schematically-informed ideology. Rather, it could also be said paradoxically that it is within the discrepancies between politics and cinema, or the gaps between images and sounds that are created due to their thorough adherence to dialectics that characteristics unique to the Vertov Group reside; indeed, it is due to their attempt to carry out the theory as film that the political movement supported by the theory and its praxis can be critically understood as well. Importantly however, despite their differences, there was also a similarity in terms of the way the problem was raised; i.e., rather than by directly documenting the existing movement itself, by calling into question possibility or impossibility of representation through landscape, as well as images and sounds, and thereby fundamentally exposing the structure of governmental power based upon which they are constituted. On the other hand, it can also be pointed out that the methodologies by which revolutionary agitation and

intertitles are overlaid against ordinary landscapes, and images and sounds are juxtaposed or distanced from each other through editing in *Red Army/PFLP* bears more similarities to the Dziga Vertov Group than to *A.K.A. Serial Killer*.

The Dziga Vertov Group was virtually dissolved with their last film, *Tout va bien* (1972), co-directed by Godard and Gorin, featuring Yves Montand and Jane Fonda as protagonists. It depicts a wildcat strike at a meat factory, via Vladimir and Rosa, a political comedy based on the Chicago Eight Trial. In a broader sense however, *Here and Elsewhere*, for which Godard and his new partner Anne-Marie Miéville re-edited footage from *Until Victory* shot during the Vertov Group period, was to be their last film.

13. *Here and Elsewhere*

In February 1970, Godard, Gorin, and Armand Marco, in cooperation with Fatah, began shooting the film *Until Victory* in Jordan, Lebanon and Syria.³⁸⁶ The filming continued intermittently, wrapping up in July. Two months later, an operation under the leadership of the Jordanian King Hussein to wipe out armed Palestinian insurgents known as "Black September" was implemented, and many of the guerrillas shown in the film lost their lives. Due to that, and drastic changes in the situation surrounding Palestine, filming was interrupted for a long time. Later, when Godard was checking the footage shot with Miéville, he noticed that the voices of guerrilla soldiers criticizing the higher-ups were not interpreted. With the task of correctly conveying that voice as a major theme, *Until Victory* was restructured as a film not about

³⁸⁶ For production cost, it states in the film, "6,000 dollars from League of Arab States." Also, at the press conference at the Cannes Film Festival in '75, Godard made the following statement: "As for the film about Palestine, three of us —Anne-Marie, I, and Jean-Pierre Gorin, who left two years ago, started creating it four years ago, and recently it was finally completed. In those days, based on millions francs provided from Jacques Perrin and League of Arab States, the production was moved forward jointly with the PLO, and the film was finally completed two weeks ago. "*Kannu eigasai deno kashakaiken '75 • 5 • 16 'Jinsei no rimeiku'*," ["Remaking life" at a press conference at the Cannes Film Festival on May 16, '75"], Godard no zentaizo [A Comprehensive Picture of Godard], ed. and trans. Okumura Akio (Tokyo: Sanichishobo, 1979), 492. League of Arab States is an organization of Arab states, established in 1945. With the approval of the League in '64, the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) was founded. Fatah practically plays a central role in the PLO. Also, upon visiting the U.S., Godard answered that the reason "We came here for money reasons, to get a little money for the living expenses of the three or four people who are working on the movie we made in Palestine two months ago." Godard, "The Dziga Vertov film group in America: An interview with Jean-Luc Godard and Jean-Pierre Gorin," 16, therefore presumably the production cost provided from the Arab side may not have been sufficient.

the Palestinian Revolution, but concerning the relationship between the idea of here=France and elsewhere=Palestine. Materials that had been shot during the Vertov period and had yet to be made into a film were re-compiled by Godard and Miéville, and, revising the title to *Here and Elsewhere*, the film was completed in 1975.

Before examining *Here and Elsewhere*, a brief summary concerning the circumstances surrounding *Until Victory* may be worthwhile. The reference was made by Godard in his proposal to Fatah: first, in response to the question as to why Palestine and Fatah were chosen, Godard stated that, as French militants, paying a visit to Palestine, which, among the former British and French colonies in the Middle East is the most trouble with contradictions is rather appropriate. Also, as a result of reading their programs and having discussions repeatedly, they decided that, because Fatah differed from other Marxist-Leninist factions like DFLP, and refused to call themselves a party or front, and was trying to organize an even broader movement in practice, they would like to shoot the film jointly with the group.³⁸⁷

It is very difficult to talk to the higher officials about *the image* that has to be constructed of the Palestinian revolution, and about *the sound* that has to accompany (or contradict) this image. But it is exactly this difficulty that is positive. It poses in concrete terms the contradiction between theory and practice: between political front and artistic one. When we arrived in Amman, we were told, “what do you want to see?” We answered, “everything!” We have seen the Ashbals, the training of the militia, the bases in the South, the North and the Centre. We have seen the school of war orphans. We have seen the school of higher-ups, the medical centers. Then they told us “what do you want to film now?”. We said “we don’t know” – “How come you don’t know?” – “No, we would like to talk, and learn with you. You don’t have a lot of munition for the Kalachnikovs and RGB’s. We don’t have many images and sounds. The Imperialists (Hollywood) have ruined and destroyed them. So we can’t waste them.”³⁸⁸

It is said that the text above was published in July, 1970, however the intention was to communicate the outline of the film prior to the start of full-blown shooting. Thus, in terms of content, because of the assumed joint production with Fatah, the text goes beyond the context of simply

³⁸⁷ The DFLP (Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine) criticized the PFLP's policy for the armed struggle, and became a separate organization to develop more grass-roots-based movement. It is unclear whether the Dziga Vertov Group contacted organizations other than Fatah and DFLP or not.

³⁸⁸ Jean-Luc Godard, "1969-1976— A propos de *Ici et ailleurs* de Jean-Luc Godard: un Manifeste inédit" in *La Palestine et le Cinema*, ed. Guy Hennebelle and Khemais Khayati (Paris: E.100, 1977), 207. The present English translation by Stoffel Debuysere slightly modified version of the one available online: <http://www.diagonalthoughts.com/?p=1728> [Accessed 31 August, 2020]

distributing political propaganda, indicating the characteristics of the Vertov Group which were pursuing revolutionary expression politically and cinematically. Rather than having cinema unilaterally subordinate to politics, political relations between images and sounds were called into question through problems concerning Palestine, and likewise, it is through cinema that questions about Palestinian Revolution were addressed.

We say: cinema is the secondary task of the revolution for us currently in France. However, we make this secondary task our primary activity. Understand thoroughly this contradiction between this secondary task and the primary task of the revolution, which is armed struggle against Israel. Understand also the other contradictions between cinema and the other secondary tasks of the Palestinian revolution. See also that at a certain moment, at a certain place, the secondary transforms into the primary. That is what we call politically posing the fact of shooting a film politically.³⁸⁹

Based on the dynamics between cinema and revolution, in which cinema is not the primary task for revolutionary movement, and for those on the side of cinema, who understand that cinema and revolution are synonymous, Godard attempts to propose a new relationship between politics and cinema. He further argues on the political relationship between image and sound in cinema:

[We] present not only interviews with Habash or Arafat or Hawatmeh, or spectacular images of the “young lion” wading through flames, but relations between images, relations between sounds, between images and sounds that point out the relations between armed struggle and praxis in the Palestinian revolution. Each image and each sound, each combination of image and sound, is a moment of relations between forces.³⁹⁰

Those forces, in order to counter imperialism, are presented specifically as three images, for example: Fedayeen crossing the river, a female soldier teaching reading and writing at the refugee camp, and young guerillas training. Each scene is emotionally or aesthetically inviting, and although each has its own role, what makes them politically important is the order in which they are arranged.

In order to have them carry political value, any of these three images has to be connected to the other two. At that moment, what becomes important is the order in which they will be shown. Because they are parts of an overall politics, and the order in which we arrange them represents the political line. We are on the line of Fatah. So we arrange the images in the following order: 1)

³⁸⁹ Ibid.

³⁹⁰ Ibid., 208.

Fedayeen in operation; 2) Militia woman working in a school; 3) children training. Which means: 1) armed struggle; 2) political work; 3) prolonged popular war.³⁹¹

It is not by filming the revolutionary subject itself, nor by the methodology of how to film them, but rather it is by correctly combining those images and sounds that political value can be generated for the first time. Since images such as the militancy of Palestinian guerillas, or women and children doing military training have the danger of being consumed as spectacles, it is pointed out that the crucial matter is how they should be combined and arranged. Hence, while shooting a film about the Palestinian revolutionary movement—an extremely militant subject to film—rather than relying on its political aspect, what mattered more was the relationship between images and sounds, or the politics within cinema as a medium. As will be described later, it could be said that an attempt such as this may already involve the problematics of the conjunction 'and,' as seen in *Here and Elsewhere*. In other words, it was presented as self-criticism against movement-based cinema in which political identification with the movement is strived for through filming the revolutionary movement on one hand; a critical proposal to the side of the movement based upon which the cinema simply becomes subordinate to the movement as a medium for propaganda. In an interview conducted in the U.S. in April 1970, regarding the tension on both sides throughout film production, Godard and Gorin make clear-cut comments, as follows:

Godard: So when we arrived, they asked us, "Where do you want to go? Do you want to shoot a training camp? An operation? A hospital? Where do you want to go?" I said, "Yes, we want to see a training camp, we want to see an operation, but for the moment we don't know if we are going to build our picture from them. To know, we have to discuss it with you." And it took us three weeks before we could start shooting.

Gorin: It was the political fight with them, because they were still on "go and fetch images", while we were on "try to analyze and build images," which are completely different.³⁹²

The above testifies to the fact that filming was still going on in April, however, it is noticeable that there were significant disparities between the Vertov Group and Fatah.³⁹³ As Godard himself

³⁹¹ Ibid., 209.

³⁹² Godard and Gorin, "The Dziga Vertov film group in America: An interview with Jean-Luc Godard and Jean-Pierre Gorin," 19

³⁹³ For the film shoot by the Vertov Group at the time, see Elias Sanbar, "Vingt et un ans après," *Trafic* (Winter 1991): 108-119. Sanbar, Palestinian historian, who worked as translator, refers to an episode where Godard was told

references in the film's summary, their initial question was how contradictions between cinema and politics can be overcome within cinema, and how that process can be depicted. An attempt to continue this questioning through collaboration with the body of the movement—unlike previous work by the Vertov Group, who had been commissioned by European television stations to make revolutionary films, which were then denied broadcast—was genuinely pursued.

However, while editing continued after the filming was completed, it was discovered that, despite documenting fedayee, who had lost his comrade during reconnaissance, and strongly criticized his higher-ups, the content of his actual statement had been left out, and because of this, Godard was faced with a long interruption, and a reconsideration of the work itself. Subsequently, significant restructuring was conducted to complete a film about the distance between France ('here') where Godard exists, and Palestine ('elsewhere') articulated through narration by Godard and Miéville, in which previously shot images were self-critically reviewed, as well as through the introduction of a historical examination of Palestine and Europe, with additional scenes that were shot in Paris, and footage of the Munich Olympics incident by Black September that occurred after shooting.

In 1970 this film had been called *Until the Victory*. In 1974, however, this film was called *Here and Elsewhere*. Here—it means a French family watching TV. Elsewhere—it is an image about Palestinian revolution. Here, it means today. It is also about today's sound and the image about that sound. Elsewhere—firstly, it is yesterday, it is abroad, and next, tomorrow.³⁹⁴

And at the end of the film, the footage of fedayeen having a discussion, shot in a long take, vis-à-vis other sequences using detailed editing, quotations, and insertions are introduced. While their voices—which were previously unheard—are translated and conveyed anew, discussions between Godard and Miéville about this event continue.

Yes, I remember well when I shot this. It was in June 1970, three months before the massacre. Members of this small troop would all be dead three months later. In fact tragically enough, they are talking about their own death like that.³⁹⁵

by the person responsible for the Information Bureau to film the Palestinian folk dance group, but since he refused, he was left alone at a hotel in Amman.

³⁹⁴ From *Here and Elsewhere*.

³⁹⁵ Ibid.

Also, with a strong feeling of remorse he had as translator, Sanbar recalls in detail the circumstances of those days.

Two years later, on the first floor of the main building of Maine, Godard was in front of the editing bench to work on the montage. With the usual intuition that became his habit, suddenly, reducing the voice of a man who is talking about self-criticism, and raising the volume of the conversation of the fighters sitting cross-legged behind him, Godard asks me to translate it. Young fedayeen said to the person responsible. "You do not understand, enemies do not have mercy. They don't think about things in the easy way. The reconnaissance team had us cross the Jordan river three times at the same time, and we were ambushed all three times, and we lost our comrades ... "Then the angry outburst continued. We were stunned. Godard was shocked at that time that he had not asked [me] to interpret the words of fedayeen. And speaking of myself, after all it is my native language. I felt a deep sense of guilt that I did not hear anything accurately at that scene. The unshakable theory and conviction had deafened my ears that far.³⁹⁶

The untranslated sound literally represents the voices of protest from the guerillas, for whom trivial mistakes or false information can mean life or death. The failure to hear their sound=voice, despite his critical engagement in political relations between images and sounds, became a crucial factor for Godard, to turn to filmmaking that self-reflexively examines the distance between Palestine and himself, rather than films about Palestinian revolution or films for revolution. The methodology of recomposing filmed materials through editing remained the same as in the times of Dziga Vertov Group. However, whereas previously an attempt was made to engage in both cinematic revolution and revolutionary cinema in Palestine relying on Marxist-Leninist theory, here in contrast, such politics with a capital 'P' was also called into question in order to investigate the distance and the relationship between 'here' and 'there,' or France/Europe and Palestine; in other words, Godard, rather than seeking identification with the revolutionary movement, gave way to self-reflexive analysis of the distance, and thereby determined to accept cinema rather than politics.

Godard: "Evidently, we did not even try to hear the silence within silence. Immediately, and on top of that, on behalf of them, we wanted to shout out for victory."

Miéville: "If we think that we want to make a revolution on behalf of them, perhaps that means that in the present times, we don't think that we want to make a revolution where we are now; we rather think that we want to make a revolution where we are not."³⁹⁷

³⁹⁶ Elias Sanbar, "Vingt et un ans après", *Ibid.*, 110.

³⁹⁷ From *Here and Elsewhere*

After the dissolution of the Dziga Vertov Group, Godard's rigorous investigation of image and sound using those from that era continued further, and along with the critical interventions of Miéville, a new theory and practice in cinema after '68 were to be pursued. In this sense, it is possible to say that *Here and Elsewhere*'s position is crucial as an intermediary film, which—via video works such as *Numéro deux* (Number Two, 1975) and *Comment ça va?* (How Is It Going?, 1975) — connects the works of the Dziga Vertov Group period to Godard's grand experiments in *Histoire(s) du cinéma* (1998).

14. Restitution of Images

Film critic Serge Daney discusses *Here and Elsewhere* in his thesis, which was published in *Cahiers du Cinéma* in 1976 in conjunction with the release of *Numéro deux*. While discussing Godard based on the logic of education, he argues that the movie theater in all respects is a dangerous place, a place of crime and illusion where they exploit images and sounds, exploited from living people, and release them and entertain the spectators to make a profit. The film industry makes profits by navigating from one venue to another, and it is for these reasons that he argues how seriously Godard confronts these cinematic tasks.

This type of symbolic debt is also something that cannot be returned. What is posed by the way Godard walked is the problem that is fundamental for cinema, the problem with respect to the crisis of cinema, or what we could call the <filmic contract> between the one who films and the one who is filmed. Such an issue seems to be related exclusively to radical films or ethnographic films, however, Godard tells us that it is something to do with the act of filming in itself.³⁹⁸

He then describes the problem concerning voices in *Here and Elsewhere*, in discussing the task for new participants in the film industry, after the collapse of the given relations between the person filming, the person filmed, and the spectator:

³⁹⁸ Serge Daney, "Le Therrorise: Pédagogie godardienne," [The T(h)errorized: Godardian Pedagogy], *Cahiers du cinéma*, no. 262/63 (January 1976): 32-39. Partial translation by Bill Krohn and Charles Cameron Ball, available at <http://kinoslang.blogspot.com/2009/01/preface-to-here-and-elsewhere-by-serge.html> [Accessed 31 August, 2020] The present translation is slightly modified by the author.

The impossibility of obtaining a new type of filmic contract has thus led him to keep/retain/preserve images and sounds, without finding anyone to whom he can return them, restore them. Godard's cinema is a painful meditation on the theme of restitution, or better, of reparations. Reparations would mean returning images and sounds to those from whom they were taken. It is a phantasm that is difficult to eliminate, however, this also commits them to produce their own images and sounds. And all the better if that production obliges the filmmaker to change his own way of working. There is a film in which this restitution-reparation takes place, ideally at least: *Here and Elsewhere*.³⁹⁹

Daney assesses that, at least in a theoretical sense, the restitution of images is realized in this film. However, the destination to which they are returned is neither a casual audience nor a political audience nor the PLO who worked jointly on the film—but rather it is to the Fedayeen, who were already massacred during Black September.

To make the film is then, quite simply, to translate the soundtrack, so that one hears what is being said, so that one listens to it. What was retained has been freed, what was kept has been restored, even if it's too late. Images and sounds, as well as honor, are returned to those to whom they belong: the dead.⁴⁰⁰

On the other hand, upon the release of *Here and Elsewhere* in 1978 in Japan, comparing the work with Adachi's, Matsuda discusses it to the extent that it touches upon Daney's theory of morality in cinema as follows:

Indeed, it is based on his genuineness of never being able to fly lightly like Adachi Masao and others between <*Here and elsewhere*> that he has endured [this] six-year period. That is to say, this means that Godard himself closed the way to sublimate the well-known binary opposition of <cinema and politics> by somewhat easily surrendering himself to the side of <politics>. Precisely under the name of <factionality in cinema>, Godard has no choice but to go back and forth ascetically between <*Here and elsewhere*>, through repeated introspections.⁴⁰¹

Matsuda praises Godard's ethical decision to remain in the domain of cinema, while self-critically moving back and forth between here and elsewhere, in contrast to Adachi, who crossed from cinema to politics. Originally Matsuda was skeptical of Adachi's joining the Japanese Red Army, and furthermore,

³⁹⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰⁰ Ibid.

⁴⁰¹ Matsuda Masao, "Godard no shinsaku 'Hear & There' ga saguru tohasei no konkyo," [The basis of sectarianism explored in Godard's new film *Here and Elsewhere*], *Gendai no me* [Contemporary eye] 19, no. 8 (August 1978): 215.

upon being deported from Paris due to a charge of conspiring in a military operation, which he was not informed of in '75, and since he was condemning the bureaucratism of the Red Army in the latter half of the '70s, using the unique concept of 'factionality in cinema' (*eiga no tohasei*), Matsuda was taking a position to support Godard's 'genuineness,' while criticizing 'lightness' of Adachi who threw himself into revolutionary movement from cinema.

On the other hand, interesting similarities and differences in terms of complex analysis and investigation in sound and cinema—especially concerning the restitution of images mentioned earlier—can be observed if one compares *Red Army/PFLP*, which Matsuda also held responsible for its theorization and screening movement overseas, with *Here and Elsewhere*. As for the itinerary for the production of *Red Army/PFLP*, the production crew joined the PFLP troop in June, 1971, filming was completed in July, and in August and September filming of the Red Army faction in Japan, as well as editing was to be conducted. While editing the film, the battle in Jerash Mountains broke out, and many of those guerrillas who had been filmed were killed. The fact that the guerrilla soldiers in Godard's film were massacred during Black September is similar. However, upon receiving their deaths and the problem of the sound earlier, Godard then took five years to complete the film; whereas in contrast, Adachi, after returning to Japan and filming additional footage, immediately proceeded with editing, and then launched the nation-wide, red-bus film screening movement with the initial screening in Tokyo on September 30th. In the following month, the screening with English subtitles was held at the Palestinian camp. Matsuda, who brought the film to the site, looks back on the circumstances at the time as follows:

“Mainly with the local Japanese journalists, we completed the film in a rush, and when the film was screened at the Palestinian camp in the suburbs of Beirut, the venue resounded with loud applause, and everybody cried. Because the guerrilla soldiers on the front line who were filmed in *Red Army/PFLP* were all killed during the battle with Israel in September. Apparently, the survivors—parents, brothers and sisters, young sons and daughters—watched Red Army/PFLP, and cried their eyes out because their immediate family who should have been dead were alive and moving. At that moment I felt extremely embarrassed about the fact that up until then I had just been talking about something like the Palestinian revolution as a concept, or an agenda of the movement; I realized for the first time that I had to spend my whole life with those Palestinian people of flesh and blood. Perhaps Wakamatsu Koji and Adachi Masao may have had a similar awareness as well, and also everyone—including the fighters who died at the Lydda Airport or

their friends, and of course Shigenobu Fusako—at some point may have had the definitive process of conversion.”⁴⁰²

In *Red Army/PFLP* what was aimed for through the screening movement in Japan was to realize simultaneous world revolutions, as well as to engage with the restitution of images both ideally and in practice. On the other hand, in *Here and Elsewhere* the 'restitution' was carried out as a form of self-critical investigation in images and sounds, while theoretically and ethically remaining in the domain of cinema. It could also be said that the restitution continues taking place, as the work in the subsequent history of cinema beyond differences in time and place significantly influenced many filmmakers in Palestine and Arab countries. Since Adachi went to Palestine in 1974, he did not see this work at the time of release in France and Japan. He did however, publish a text about the film in 2002 after his return to Japan.

“We used a straightforward idea of '=' rather than 'and' as method. [The idea is] not [based upon] 'front' and 'rear,' and of course not 'here' and 'elsewhere'. We have been experimenting with the stance of 'front=rear' or 'here=elsewhere' as our method. Did Godard and others want to say that it is precisely the '=' that allows the infinite accumulation of '0's [zeros] where new American cinema and Soviet cinema are forming a single chain?’”⁴⁰³

In response to Godard's "and", Adachi examined his own attempt with "=", which, despite assumed differences between 'front' and 'rear' or 'here' and 'elsewhere', daringly aimed to make the two synonymous. Significant differences lie in theory and practice between Adachi, who became committed to Palestinian revolution not as a shift from cinema to revolution, but rather as cinema synonymous with revolution, but was unable to make a film in the Arab world, and Godard, who remained in Europe, accepted its history as his own, and continued investigating the distance between France and Palestine through cinema. This difference may also be attributed in part to the simple fact that Japan, which is located 'elsewhere' on the margins, like Arab countries, viewed from the standpoint of Europe or France, which had played a central role in the world history, was initially off the track in terms of historical and

⁴⁰² Matsuda Masao, “<To> toiu akuryo wo koete,”[Transcending demons called <parties>] in *Bungei bessatsu: Sekigun* [Literary and Art Extra Issue: Red Army] (Tokyo: Kawadeshoboshinsha, 2001), 178.

⁴⁰³ Adachi Masao "Godaru ga kakanakatta yuigon 'koko to yoso' o miru" [Watch *Here and Elsewhere*, a will that Godard did not write] in *Bungei bessatsu Godard*, 93.

geopolitical recognition. However, the fact that these two radical filmmakers and two film collectives, beyond their differences, were both led to a meditation on the logic of conjunctions '=' and 'and' respectively through Palestine as a common subject should at least be pointed out.

Lastly, in light of landscape, the fragmentation of images in *Here and Elsewhere* in comparison to the work during the period of Vertov Group is further accelerated by even more complex editing through insertions of narrations, texts and slides, as well as television images, each of which are further divided into smaller sections. Hence, the attributes of power in the relations between images, or images and sounds, rather than the images of landscape themselves, are further brought to foreground. In contrast, landscape theory aimed to make the global power structure, constituted by the accumulation of such relations, visible through the depiction of ordinary, banal landscape. Godard and Adachi can be seen as opposites in terms of their methodological approach to images. Hence, simultaneous analysis of both cinematic and philosophical similarities and differences is required.