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OTHERNESS, NEW MARGINALITY AND OTHER TROPES

As far as we can currently see, the 21st century has been significantly marked by uprisings, producing powerful swarms of protest pictures. Already the globally circulated images of the anti-WGO demonstrations in Seattle (1999) and Genoa (2001) at the turn of the century were most influential in coining the new millennium’s imagination of participative and globally connected upheavals and politics. This was even more evident in the so-called Arab Spring and the 15-M Movement in Madrid in 2011. These uprisings indicated the dawn of a new media ecosystem of protests around digital media and online platforms (Hartle and White 2021). Since then, current images and forms of protest have continued to be deeply embedded into digital media environments (cf. Rovisco and Veneti 2017; Mortensen et al. 2019) shaping the technical (re)producibility, the effectiveness and even the very possibility of political action (Rovisco 2017; Snowdon 2020).

Throughout the last decades, such protests have produced an increasing volume of photographs and memes, but also a broad range of online videos. Video documentation, in particular, is spread all over the world in real time, enabling new protest practices and professionalisms to emerge (cf. Ristovska 2021) and creating layered ecologies in the media/movement dynamic (Neumayer and Rossi 2018; Trerè 2019). In light of these changes, Hartle and White (2022) recognize a new paradigm of “visual activism” that aims to subvert reigning visual and discursive regimes in the digital sphere and create contentious, imaginary spaces of political action. Despite their heterogeneous claims, a key feature shared by online-activists across very different places is the effort to create digital counter-publics that confront mass media coverage with their own images and narratives (Anden-Papadopoulos 2013). Accordingly,
video production has become a constitutive element in acts of revolt (Della Ratta 2018). The continuous dialectic between the actions performed by the “singular-plural” body (Nancy 1996) and their audiovisual remediation (Mirzoeff 2017) seems to disclose a potentiality that is both political and aesthetic.

Obviously, investigating protest today demands a multifocal point of view. On the one hand, it requires a consideration of the specificity of the revolts, situated in a certain historical context and in concrete local situations, as in the emblematic case of Gezi Park in Turkey. On the other hand, it is necessary to identify the globally shared digital environments and the common features of audiovisual protest practices that are manifest in activism all over the world: for instance, spreading eyewitness videos on online platforms like Twitter/X, evidencing mass mobilization in street protests and victims of police violence; or using the corporate algorithms of platforms like TikTok to generate the viral effects of mobilizing pictures. Such appropriations of digital infrastructures result in new socio-technical strategies of contestation that Milan (2019: 120) calls “cloud protesting”.

In the 20th century, visually performed protest was first of all represented and performed by the use of still pictures, in the arts, in illustration, and in photography (cf. Goddard 2018; McGarry et al. 2019). Today, mediated protest is mainly performed by the use of moving images, especially online-videos (cf. Eder et al., 2020). Accordingly, a broad range of different video genres have emerged around online protesting practices. These are shaped by the affordances of the digital media environments and “embedded materialities” (Neumayer et al. 2019: 3) which are used to create, distribute, and archive contentious moving images: e.g. web-documentaries or informative videos, as well as user-generated audiovisual content like mash-up videos or video-selfies, produced by individual users. Research on the emergence of such contentious moving image genres, their specific aesthetics and functions in digital protest communication is still at its beginning (cf. Askanius 2014; Razsa 2014; Eder et al. 2020; Zutavern 2015; Eder/Tedjasukmana 2020; Fahlenbrach 2020). At the same time, it embraces a broad interdisciplinary scope, ranging from, e.g., political science, sociology, history, media and communication studies, to visual studies. While the social sciences are rather focusing on the political dimension of online media as new public arenas and resources for political actors, this issue focuses on the way moving images are used to mobilize support in globalized digital networks and the way digital platforms are shaping today the different expressive and aesthetic forms of contestation. Under the heading of “Guerilla Moving Images” we are specifically looking at audiovisual practices and aesthetics performed by marginalized groups, using established, corporate media environments as arenas of rebellious mobilization, sometimes blatantly, sometimes in more subversive ways.

Our multifocal point of view is not limited to synchronic aspects, but also involves a diachronic dimension. This may reveal relevant historic backgrounds and roots of current protests and their expressive forms and media practices. This implies an archaeological investigation of those phenomena and
circumstances that have become inescapable today, such as the construction of a police gaze in response to the riots of 1968 in Paris (Schepp 2021), or the "reinvention of the audiovisual beyond the cinema as a technological mechanism and ideological institution" which occurred in the 1970s (Goddard 2018, 193). Considering the emergence of new audiovisual practices and aesthetics of contestation in moments of paradigmatic media change can significantly broaden our understanding of current "Guerilla Moving Images": key moments in the history of moving image contentions are, for instance, the Sowjet Agit-Prop-movies at the dawn of cinema (Didi-Huberman 2016) or the video-activism around in the late 1960s and 1970s when television became the dominant medium (cf. Zutavern 2015). At such paradigmatic moments, activists used new media environments and paved the way for forms of expressions in audiovisual contestation and engagement that still resonate today. Didi-Huberman (2016) has demonstrated the productivity of such an approach, which aims to revisit, in historic images, key moments of tension that in some manner anticipated contemporary ways of contesting the political.

**AUDIOVISUAL ARCHAEOLOGIES OF PROTEST**

In an astonishing picture published on Paris Match on the 29th of June 1968, we see one of the corridors of Sorbonne University – one of the key spaces of students’ contestation during those months. The shot, taken slightly from above, directs our attention towards something written on the wall: "Prenez vos désirs pour des réalités" [Take your desires for realities] (Mauge 1968, 100). The practice of writing on the walls of public spaces, thus transforming them into material repositories of slogans and polemical claims, was typical of the Parisian May 1968 and also extremely common in other uprising contexts (Frankel et al. 2012). As this example demonstrates, the act of revolting is always deeply intertwined with creative processes, that range from elementary forms of writings to more complex forms of mediation, image-making or performance (cf. Fahlenbrach, 2017a, 2017b). However, even in its most basic quality, this graphical act seems to encapsulate a couple of essential traits that the global rise of contemporary uprisings made progressively evident. First of all, this sort of graffiti stands for a much larger class of linguistic acts that, regardless of their media specificity, seem to provide visual evidence of what Foucault (2008; 2009) labelled *parresia*. The deed that someone performs when telling the truth in the face of power and regardless of the possible risks seems to be a constitutive part of the whole idea of uprising, where the arithmetical calculation of the outcomes becomes secondary, in light of an attempt to fulfil a (common) desire to change the status quo. Moving from an often traumatic episode that epitomizes the contradictions of a certain context (e.g. the self-immolation of Mohamed Bouazizi as the starting point of the Arab Springs), revolt becomes an
act of re-imagination of the present, an attempt to experience the political space differently and to subvert marginalizing power structures.

Recalling an event from 1968 at the beginning of a special issue on contemporary revolts may seem unintuitive. Given the high number of interesting case studies that contemporary uprisings have to offer, coming from almost every corner of the globe, is it really necessary to go back to something that is so widely canonized? While scholars have largely analyzed the various forms of contemporary rioting, the specific contribution that visual studies can provide in this field is still often overlooked, although a media-archeological approach may provide useful and innovative insights in this direction. This is even more surprising considering that art historian Georges Didi-Huberman (2016) devoted an important exhibition to the issue, highlighting the potentialities of a transcultural approach to the gestures of revolt, capable of focusing on recurrent actions that have to do with the ways in which we approach images as political devices, while putting in the background the specific reasons that motivated the struggle. Moving from this framework, we can ask ourselves what is the specific role played by images in practices of revolt; after all, we are still experiencing May 1968’s graffiti through pictures, thus a form of mediatization somehow shapes our experience of what a revolt is, and how it can be historicized. Of course, the Parisian uprising is not the first example of this tendency, but – following the aforementioned anachronistic methodology – we might argue that can potentially both epitomize and anticipate subsequent phenomena; after all, in an archaeological perspective, is most of all the deep time of unpredictable connections that comes to foreground.

The history of a genealogical approach to uprisings is still to be written. Although relevant contributions regarding revolts in early modernity (cfr. Clover 2016) surely constitute a useful starting point in this sense, it is nonetheless challenging to identify the emergence of visual practices or theoretical issues that are still relevant in the visual culture of contemporary uprisings. This task seems particularly difficult because it urges us to untie ourselves from a linear vision of temporality, opting for a more karstic and unpredictable one. As the Italian scholar Federico Tomasello (2020: 69-70) has brilliantly summarized, revolts as a general phenomenon seem to dismantle the consequential and teleological aspect of historical time, as they can be seen as various instantiations of a narrative in which present, past and future are deeply imbricated and continuously, reciprocally influenced.

One of the loci in which this idea becomes evident, also in a metareflexive sense, is Eisenstein’s masterpiece Battleship Potemkin (1925), in which the Soviet director tells the story of a mutiny and of a subsequent uprising in the city of Odessa. Unanimously considered a masterpiece, the film has over time produced a considerable amount of literature including, recently, an accurate and innovative analysis by Didi-Huberman (2020), who concentrated his focus on the third act of the movie (“A Dead Man Call Out For Justice”). Here, after the corpse of the sailor Vakulenchuk (tragically killed during the mutiny of the battleship) is deposed in the dock at dawn, a large mass of citizens gathers
around him to pay their respects. In an extremely complex sequence, that the author analyzes extensively, a kind of mysterious process is depicted and, through a propagation of gestures, Eisenstein is able to visualize the emotional economy of rebellion: "at a certain point the weeping of individuals will become a collective chant, then a political claim [...]. Then anger. Finally, revolt [...]. In this process emotion stopped saying I [...] and knows how to say We [...]" (2020: 189).

Although Didi-Huberman’s analysis is quintessential in order to reposition the role of cinema and moving images at the core of the debate on the mediatization of revolts (as this special issue as a whole tries as well to do), surprisingly enough, his almost 500-page study devotes only marginal attention to the events leading up to Vakulenchuk’s death, when the Potëmkin’s sailors take the decision to rise up against the unliveable conditions imposed by the officers (and thus by the tsarist power). Re-inspecting the sequence in which the ship’s commander threatens to hang all the sailors who refuse to comply with his orders is particularly fascinating because, in this short and overlooked passage, something extremely significant seems to take place.

At a certain point, while he is threatening his sailors, the commander points with his finger towards the flagpole, which is off-screen and shown in the subsequent shot. Its image is then juxtaposed to the close-up of a young officer, that complacently observe it; immediately afterwards, in three successive shots, we see small groups of sailors also looking at it. The reverse shot of this rapid sequence presents again the image of the ship’s mast, where this time, however, the hanging bodies of the rioters appear in superimposition. Immediately afterwards, two more officers look towards the flagpole, that however appears empty again.

What happens in this short passage is that another temporal dimension disrupts the linearity of the present, producing a torsion that makes the uprising finally possible. This previsualization of the future belongs to the realm of hypotheses. It articulates something that can potentially happen, that is going to occur, at least in the light of the current status quo. So it represents a sort of prophecy. If it is true that every image inevitably poses a question about time and temporality (Didi-Huberman 2000), it may be productive to address the visual in its ability to let the long durée of historicity emerge through non-linear configurations, as pionieristically noted by Benjamin (2003: 297). Contemporary uprisings and older riots are, in this sense, not only connected in a constellation of reciprocal recalls and anticipations (e.g., BLM as a new iteration of the Rodney King Uprising of 1992), but they are also capable of posing a question concerning the possibility for the future to be thought of otherwise. Ecological video-activism is maybe the prototypic example in this sense, because its images urge us to act in order to modify our imminent future, which will only continue to be imaginable if we do – but this issue seems broadly to intersect the heterogeneous galaxy of rioting. To write an anachronistic history of uprisings, in this sense, means to generate connections through heterogeneous phenomena, looking for continuity and divergence, including in their political impacts and implications. We should not
forget, in this sense, the role played by technical devices in shaping a certain culture of witnessing, with strong implications in the development of revolts: movie cameras, portable camcorders, and digital interconnected devices have profoundly impacted the ways in which collective struggles become visible and are told, as the crucial turning point of the new millennium clearly showed.

BORN UNDER AN AUDIOVISUAL SIGN: UPRISINGS, MEDIA, AND THE NEW MILLENNIUM

The relationship between temporal regimes and media cultures in acts of revolt is at the core of the essays comprising this special issue of Cinema&Cie, which proposes a transdisciplinary reflection on the role that moving images and video technologies play within contemporary uprisings, also looking at potential points of origin for specific features of such events. To this end, referring to “contemporary” does not mean necessarily attempting to outline chronological limits, but first and foremost to highlight the disjunctions and anachronisms that define the relationship an event maintains with its own time (Agamben 2009). All the essays in this volume try to address this question through different methodologies and perspectives, providing a broad overview of case studies and hence a rich map of this phenomenon.

Though a possible periodization is not at stake in this issue, the turn of the century – particularly the year 2001 – marked a crucial cornerstone for our topic from political as well as aesthetic points of view. While 9/11 has been unanimously considered as the "year zero" of the new millennium for its consequences on global politics and the new social discourses it gave birth to, it also created a radical transformation of the epistemic relationship we maintain with technically reproduced images (cf. Baudrillard 2002; Zizek 2002). As Dinoi (2008) has observed, whereas early cinema struck its audiences for "looking like real", the attack at the World Trade Center astonished NYC citizens (and the global audiences soon after) for "looking like a movie", thus producing a complete overturning in our belief in the capability of images to attest reality. To this end, two consequences are worth mentioning: on the one hand, that event proved the effectiveness of cinema as the "eye of the century" (Casetti 2008) that shaped human perception of the world; on the other, it questioned the possibility of audiovisual images to witness reality solely through the force of their recording capability, of their "being there" and facing the event. Both questions are highly relevant to understand contemporary forms of videoactivism and extensively intersect the essays in this volume.

However, 9/11 is only one possible point of origin among others that we could use to trace the features and characteristics of audiovisual practices that document, foster, and even constitute contemporary uprisings. Articulating new chronological threads also means charting different geographies: to this
end, reflecting on recent uprisings as events that adhere to and at the same
time keep a distance from their own time defines a more diverse and inclusive
history of the present. This is the most distinctive features shared by the six
essays comprising this issue.

Diego Cavallotti’s essay deals with another key event for the intertwining
between aesthetics and politics taking place in 2001, that is, the anti-G8 protests
in Genoa. There, for the first time, audiovisual production was considered crucial
for participants and more specifically for the Social Forum Movement: images
of protesters with “media prosthesis” recording the demonstrations became
a trademark of those days, testifying of the awareness of participants in the
role of audiovisual media as a mandatory tool for collective uprisings. If 9/11
footage is mainly characterized by the fortuitous condition of the witnesses,
in the Genoa case, on the contrary, videos are conceived as instruments for
political struggle, exploiting the still developing digital ecosystem which is
now the “natural environment” of the audiovisual practices in contemporary
uprisings.

The anti-G8 protests can thus be considered as the symbolic foundational
moment of contemporary forms of videoactivism as a "proxy profession"
(Ristovska 2021). As a crucial moment when pre-digital and digital cultures
collided, this event created a complex media ecosystem. To this end, it perfectly
embodies most of the questions that were at stake at the turn of the century and
encapsulates many of the features that will be later developed in the tactics of
more recent upheavals, such as letting offline and online communities interact,
creating and preserving archives with audiovisual evidence and testimonies, or
fostering professionalism in videoactivism.

But if 2001 can be regarded as the starting point of the new millennium, which
was born under the sign of aesthetics as the real field of political struggle, the
first traces of the close relationship between video production and uprisings
could also be traced back to the end of the “short twentieth century” (Hobsbawn
1994). Johanna Laub’s essay proposes a comparison between Harun Farocki’s
and Andrej Ujica’s film Videogramme einer Revolution (1992), about the
Romanian Revolution of 1989, and Fragments of a Revolution (2011), the latter
dealing with the Iranian Green Movement of 2009 and 2010 and produced
anonymously under the pseudonym Ana Nyma. Both cases investigate the
possibilities of giving testimony of events in real time beyond a mere presentism
by emphasizing “connection to delay, rupture and non-simultaneity”, thus
exploring “the possibility of historical experience” (cf. infra) conveyed by such
representations. In particular, the 1989 Romanian revolution encapsulated the
conflict between the official image of dictatorship – which is steady, unique,
and without any possible off-screen space – and the several amateur videos
documenting the fall of the regime. The core of Farocki’s and Ujica’s film consists
in editing these videos together to produce a broader perspective on the event:
a new aesthetics therefore becomes possible, along with vast off-screen spaces
which awaited to be filled with a new political meaning.

The turn of the century – in the long threshold between the end of 1989
and 2001 – thus proves to be a key moment in which we can detect specific meaning configurations of contemporary uprising and the crossroad between technology, experiences, and aesthetics in the media scenario, specifically the audiovisual one. Indeed, the global revolts that have marked the first quarter of the new millennium not only attempt to subvert the power in charge, but also aim to subvert the aesthetics of this very power and claim the freedom to create a new one. Reflecting on the intertwining between aesthetics and politics thus means exploring the core of these uprisings, in terms of both their logics and their demands. From this point of view, questioning the very concept of archive is crucial, as the examples of Bucharest and Genoa prove and as the other essays in the issue explore, through different methodological perspectives, geographical contexts, and media practices.

Contemporary uprising needs to confront and deconstruct the archives that were conceived as expressions of oppressive power on situated imageries. Giacomo Paci’s essay analyses the case of We No Longer Prefer Mountain (2022), a film by Palestinian artist Inas Halabi which develops a counternarrative of the Druze community in Israel/Palestine through oral history and “fukeiron”, a specific methodology of analysing the landscape emerged in Japan at the end of the 1960s. Halabi’s film therefore shows how displacement – both in time and in space – can be considered as a productive analytical and theoretical approach (cf. Zucconi 2019): on the one hand, it aims to highlight contemporary strategies of land occupation and the reconfiguration of landscape through the narration of personal stories which cover more than seventy years, from 1948 to the present day; on the other hand, it provides an alternative account of the environment surrounding the Druze community by resorting to a film aesthetics developed in a complete different culture. This way, a new archive of memories and stories, images and words, is created, challenging Israel’s official imagery which depicts Druze “as unconditionally loyal to the state and its army” (cf. infra).

Archives are not only repository of imageries but they can also be conceived as powerful weapons by opposite propaganda strategies. This is the case of the so-called Ambazonia crisis in Cameroon as analyzed in Floribert Patrick Endong’s essay. Here, government and separatist forces have started a war of images which resorts to the aestheticization of violence as an ultimate resource. This conflict between imageries – whose effectiveness is rooted in the manipulation of long-term beliefs and stereotypes – reproduces the tactics of modern warfare, which clearly emerged with the war on Terror in the aftermath of 9/11, in the field of audiovisual media. In this sense, images prove to be the favourite means to “shock and awe” the enemy (cf. Ginzburg 2017), in a long thread that leads from the fall of the Twin Towers to Daesh’s communication (Previtali 2020), becoming an essential tool for guerrilla practices developed by both governments and insurgents.

But archives can be also be conceived as a resource created by protesters to keep track of struggles, serving as documentation for future needs. Celykaslan’s and Erensoy’s essay deals with the protests in Istanbul’s Gezi Park in 2013,
focusing on bak.ma, an online repository that was born out of that struggle to preserve the visual memory of the protests. By analyzing the process of its creation, Celykaslan and Erensoy highlight how one of the greatest achievements of such an operation was the creation of a transmedia community around the event, even before the production of a counternarrative that could oppose the Turkish government’s account of the uprising. Resorting to a hybrid methodology that also comprises auto-ethnography, the essay shows how archiving can be a militant practice aimed at “actively creating possibilities of a living memory of the social movements through the collectivization of memory” (cf. infra).

Finally, archives can be considered as a living and ever-expanding discourse where different activist strategies confront each other to challenge social norms and cliches. Sofia Pirandello’s essay analyses examples of a creative use of self-recording on social media which conceals political stances within content that otherwise seemingly reproduces stereotypes. The female protagonists of these videos “smuggle” solidarity with oppressed people in make-up-tutorials to bypass state censorship, or provide tech tips to increase girls’ knowledge about privacy and security in both online and offline worlds while pretending of giving advice about beauty routine. Through a post-feminist analysis of these creative uses of new media, the essay highlights that far from being a mere tool for self-promotion, or even self-exploitation, “self-recording can be used to raise collective awareness of critical issues related to the status of women, also trying to improve it, reaching millions of users” (cf. infra). Reflecting on the contemporary, mutual relationship between the embodied dimension of the political discourse and the political dimension of bodies, Pirandello points out new directions for videoactivism in the present, directions that are inextricably enmeshed with the media scenario of our epoch.

It is by offering rich, in-depth-analysis on video-activism in recent history that the essays collected in this issue reveal archaeological traces of “guerrilla images” across time and media change. In this way, they contribute to a broader aesthetic understanding of video-activism. They show aesthetic strategies and iconographies of earlier contentious moving images, still informing audiovisual expressions of protest in online-video-activism today. By presenting these studies, this issue aims to further encourage consideration of contemporary online activism, particularly video activism, in the context of historical expressions and rhetoric of protest.
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