

STAGING A REVOLUTION

Can choreography serve as a mechanism for staging a revolution?

M.A. Thesis / Ibrahim S. Quraishi / UvU #: 3774880 / August 20, 2012

Universiteit Utrecht / Faculty of Theater Studies

Supervisor: Prof. Bojana Cvejić, Second Reader: Prof. Chiel Kattenbelt

Academic year: 2011 – 2012

Table of Contents

Introduction	04
Research question and content.....	06
Methodology.....	07
1. How to recognize ideology?.....	09
1.1 Louis Althusser: On ideology.....	12
1.2 Andre Hewitt: On social choreography	17
1.3 Ideology and choreography	22
2. Choreographers of an ideology	24
2.1 The case of Eisenstein	24
2.2 The case of Riefenstahl	25
2.3 Synopsis of <i>October</i> and <i>Triumph of the Will</i>	26
2.4 Rehearsed revolutions or documentaries?	27
2.5 Staging the revolutionary body	30
2.6 Staging the individual and the collective body	30
3. A society of actors and spectators	35
3.1 Transforming the individual actor into a social spectator.....	35
3.2 Practicing social actions	38
3.3 Producing and reproducing ideology	39
3.4 Analysis of two scenes from <i>October</i> and <i>Triumph of the Will</i> . 40	
3.4.1 Scene description <i>The Arrival of the leader</i>	41
3.4.2 Scene description <i>A mass scene</i>	42
3.4.3 Actor and revolution	43
3.4.4 Spectator and revolution.....	46
3.4.5 Choreography and revolution	49
3.4.6 Space and revolution	52
3.5 Bodies as modes of revolutionary progression	53

Conclusion	58
Works cited	67
Bibliography / Literature.....	68
Appendix	70
List of movies	70

Introduction

Can choreography serve as a mechanism for staging a revolution? The starting point of this thesis is to study the broad implications of social choreography qua performance of ideology taken as a model of investigating two revolutionary films: *October: Ten Days That Shook The World* by Sergei Eisenstein and *Triumph of the Will* by Leni Riefenstahl. I will focus on these two iconic movies in drawing on the theory of Andrew Hewitt on 'social choreography', a term that is coined by him, and Louis Althusser's conception of ideology and body revolution. How are ideologies brought to the bodies of the actors in these two films? For what collective reason and purpose? And how do these films invite the spectator to participate and be inculcated in the ideologies?

Using Hewitt and Althusser as my main philosophical base, I am interested in researching the presence of the body in the two films mentioned in their connection to the actions in tumultuous moments during the earlier part of the twentieth century. In *October*, Sergei Eisenstein takes the role of the historian who restages actual historical events, i.e.: the October Revolution of 1917. He puts his spectators in the particular role of watching the revolution as though it was in real time. Throughout his re-staging Sergei Eisenstein recycles iconographic images of the actual October revolution that were widely disseminated in the visual propaganda of the times. Leni Riefenstahl made with her *Triumph of the Will*, a semi-documentary of a revolutionary movement that had yet to completely reveal its real intensions.

The actions and gestures as performed both in the 'reality' of a revolutionary action and those of the fiction in Eisenstein's movie or Riefenstahl's docudrama demand a physical collective urgency: They are both built on the cut frame shots coming from the immediacy of a constructed revolution and in some ways glorifying the inevitable violence that is going to impede the

demands of the masses.

In spite of the differences in the way bodies are represented in both films, the topics that permeate in both *October* and *Triumph of the Will* are remarkably comparable. In both films, the spectators are inculcated and confronted with a body in a defined choreographical structure. They offer a specific choreographic frame that shows a series of images which conjure up artistic and political references simultaneously with 'workers' - bodies. Questions are evoked on the connections between the ideological message and our personal views on the physical manifestation of the body, in the way it is choreographed. As a result, this thesis will explore how the use of social choreography in *October* and *Triumph of the Will* allows the spectator to contemplate on the interconnections between the social choreography of the body politics and the ideology of political manifestation.

At the same time, the spectators are involved as witnesses in revolutions that are staged, which forces a reflection on what is real and what is constructed. It forces me to also look at these films as a theatrical construction. This question demands a careful analysis of the performative quality of the representation of the body.

I will research how collective bodies construct a social choreography that is unique to their specific revolutionary zeal. Specifically I will analyze Hewitt's views coming from his notions on gesturing and how nineteenth century bourgeoisie norms have come to play so largely on the codification of physical behavior. As Hewitt states that "It is only when the possibility of an 'ideal' performance in the everyday realm is projected, as a 'choreography', that we confront the phenomenon of an 'aestheticization of political life.'"¹ In the immense potential for understanding how ideology and social choreography are constructed in the performative act, I will explore how

¹ Andrew Hewitt, *Social Choreography: Ideology As Performance In Dance And Everyday Movement*, Duke University Press 2005 pp. 22

collective bodies and their ideology are staged.

The idea of conflating ideology with choreography made me wonder if Hewitt's method on social choreography was applicable inside the concepts of a deliberately staged revolution in a movie. And this already confronted me with the first problem: Was the idea of social choreography applicable to films, in other words could the staged revolutionary movies of Sergei Eisenstein and Leni Riefenstahl be seen as specimen of social choreography in the medium of cinematic image and gaze? To answer that question I had to find out what connection there exists between social choreography and ideology in the time frame of modernity between 1910 and 1940. From this perspective the theory of Louis Althusser, who is analyzing the Marxist theory on ideology and representation seems to be crucial for a better understanding of Hewitt's model of social choreography qua performative ideology.

Research question and content

The aim of this study is to investigate if choreography can be considered as an intentional as well as an analytical mechanism for staging a revolution. By analyzing *October* and *Triumph of the Will*, I try to connect these films with relevant theories and texts coming from performance analysis and philosophy. First of all I will unpack the concepts comprised by Hewitt's and Althusser's theories. For Andrew Hewitt, dance is essentially seen a space in which social possibilities are both rehearsed and performed. In Althusser the definition of ideology represents the imaginable relationship between individuals and their 'live' circumstances. For there is no ideology except for and by the subjects. Ideology here functions through the people and for the people. To connect the idea of revolution here I will probe Althusser's theory on Ideology, Body and Revolution. Secondly, I will look closely at the idea of staging where I will bring up the ideas of Andrew Hewitt on social choreography.

In framing my research question, I will focus my analysis on two specific revolutions and the way they are staged. The revolution in hindsight by Eisenstein is a solidification and reconsolidation of an actual revolution. For Riefenstahl it was the promise of a change in the order of German society according to the ideology that came to power in 1933 when Hitler became Reich Chancellor. In my conclusion I aim to find out if Althusser's theory on ideology and revolution is compatible with Hewitt's theory of social choreography and if Hewitt's method on social choreography provides an answer to my question if revolutions can be staged.

Methodology

The methodology in answering my research question follows an attempt to frame the analysis of these two films with concepts and analytical tools adopted from the two mentioned theoretical sources. In the first place this allows me to make a comparison between these two films and secondly it allows me to further connect these films to real questions on body ideology and its intrinsic relationship to the performance mechanism itself; in the frame of this thesis, to 'social choreography'. Both *October* and *Triumph of the Will* deal with the subject of revolution but both address and treat it in an entirely different fashion. The 'thought' between their images in time and motion represents directly the ideology they are rooted in. The *October* (Soviet) Revolution and Hitler's, *Nationalsozialismus* directly deal with the manipulations of masses through their bodies, their signs and their gestures. Riefenstahl's film was primarily aimed as a support of the ideological change of the new society. The social choreography therein supports the collective physicality to launch a mass movement. As for Eisenstein, the social choreography in his work is trying to sustain the revolution through a revolutionary fervor of recounting the historic moment of the birthing process of an already existing revolution.

I aim to compare and closely examine both movies with their socio-political conditions while also comparing their representation of social imaginings through the utilization of the collective bodies and the construction of ideology. Inside my argument, I wish to reveal the most common characteristics and threads while also making visible their respective differences in both films representing their parallel shifts in the ideological and social imaging's.

I will answer my research question in three chapters and a conclusion. In chapter one I will discuss Althusser's theory and Hewitt's method on social choreography. I will further analyze whether the method of Hewitt on choreography renders visible the staging of revolutions in the work of Sergei Eisenstein and Leni Riefenstahl. In chapter two, I will introduce the makers and their work in relation to the historical revolutions. How much the work is really documentary, I explore in using views by Siegfried Kracauer's writings from *The Mass Ornament* and his book *Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological History of the German Film*, Roland Barthes's book *Image - Music - Text*, Jay Leyda's book *Eisenstein At Work* and Susan Sontag's article *Fascinating Fascism / Under the Sign of the Sun*. Also I will briefly summarize both films as an example of the social and ideological. At the end of this chapter, I will explore the way both makers have staged their revolutions and connected to the idea of Hewitt on social choreography. In chapter three, I will apply Hewitt's and Althusser's theories to prove how ideology and choreography are at work in relations to the spectator of the cinematic image and I will treat this spectator as the spectator of the revolution. I will analyze and discuss chosen scenes from the movies and contextualize them in what role they have and can take as performances of choreography. In this step I will come to a conclusion of comparative similarities and dissimilarities in both movies. Chapter four will conclusively present how the views of Hewitt and Althusser confirm in making visible my two subjects (*October and Triumph of the Will*) in terms they are not usually seen. Through the nuances of the method I aim to prove that a revolution can be staged as a form of social choreography.

1. How to recognize ideology?

To answer my question, 'Can choreography serve as a mechanism for staging a revolution?' I will research the connection between revolution and choreography. Here I understand 'revolution' as "a manipulation to shape the new ideological truth into a reality" from Slavoj Žižek's definition² and choreography as "disposed bodies in a social space", from Andrew Hewitt's definition of Social Choreography. Staging for me is defined by Maaïke Bleeker's statement that: "Theatre is all about staging events in relation to the place from where they will be seen, and the notions of *theatrical* and *theatricality* have long a history of being used to describe the behavior that (all too explicitly) takes into account the awareness of being seen."³

The main subjects of my study are the movies *October: Ten days that shook the world* by Sergei Eisenstein, released in 1927⁴ and *Triumph of the Will* by Leni Riefenstahl, released in 1934.⁵ These movies offer a wide range of possibilities to analyze the connection between ideology and (mass)-choreography. So what are they about? At a first glance one could say that: Both movies have a revolution as their main subject. In the case of Eisenstein it is a historical reconstruction of the real Communist revolution of October 1917 in Russia and the former Soviet Union. In the case of Riefenstahl it is the 1934 Nürnberg rally of the National-Socialist Party in Germany. Although the October Revolution of 1917 does not seem to raise questions about its revolutionary character, but in this respect the ideological change that the *Nationalsozialismus* forced between 1923 and 1934 seems to provoke a discourse. In bringing up the Nazi's as a revolutionary force I follow the main German Third Reich scholar Joachim Fest in his use and detailed analysis of

² Slavoj Žižek, *New Theory on Revolution Historical Materialism* (2000b:177) pp. 18

³ Maaïke Bleeker, "Theatre of/or Truth" in *Performance Paradigm 3: The End of Ethics? Performance, Politics and War*. (www.performanceparadigm.net) pp. 3

⁴ Sergei Eisenstein *October*, Mosfilm Studios USSR 1927, 99 min - For an extended credit list see Appendix

⁵ Leni Riefenstahl *Triumph of the Will*, UFA Germany 1935, 114 min - For an extended credit list see Appendix

the National-Socialist revolution.⁶ Also the English specialist on World War 2, Ian Kershaw in his extensively researched biography called *Hitler: A Biography*, elaborates the idea on the National Socialist revolution being much more than a personal force of Adolf Hitler but a revolutionary process that was emerging from National Socialist forces between in 1918 and 1933.⁷

So, with *October* and *Triumph of the Will* two opposed and competitive ideologies were brought 'live' to the cinema and actually became icons of the revolutionary zeal. Furthermore one can state that the aim of both movies is the same: They want to praise their revolution and proclaim the rise and implementation of a new ideology. The idea behind both movies is to demonstrate the revolution to the spectator and to educate the spectator in the revolution's ideology. The means that are used by both filmmakers to achieve this goal show remarkable similarities. In both movies there is no dialogue, hardly any words are shown in the silent film *October* and few words are yelled in the mostly silent and musically supported film *Triumph of the Will*.⁸ It is primarily the language of bodies that speak, as Andrew Hewitt states:

Choreography is not just another of the things we "do" to bodies, but a reflection on – and enactment of – how bodies "do" things, and on the work that the work of art performs. Social choreography exists not parallel to the operation of social norms and strictures, nor is it entirely subject to those strictures. It serves – "catapultically," we might say – to bring them into being.⁹

⁶ In his book *Hitler*, (translated from the German by Richard and Clara Winston, A Harvard/HBJ Book 1992) Joachim Fest states: "The fact was that co-ordination – *Gleichschaltung* – was the peculiar form in which the Nazi Revolution was carried to completion. Hitler had repeatedly decried old-fashioned and sentimental revolutionaries who saw in revolution 'a spectacle for the masses.' We aren't wide-eyed revolutionaries who are counting on the lumpenproletariat. The revolution Hitler had in mind was not a matter of rioting but of directed confusion, not anarchy but the triumph of orderly violence." pp. 400

⁷ Ian Kershaw, *Hitler: A Biography*, W.W. Norton & Company, New York London 2008) From pp. 196- 235 Kershaw explore the Nazi Revolution and on pp. 201 Kershaw explores Hitler's own idea on revolution.

⁸ In Eisenstein's *October*, the classical silent cinema technique is intermittingly used in placing black cards to break sequences to either announce the changes of a scene or to highlight a certain situation. Eisenstein is quite clever in building textual cards as political banners. In *Triumph of the Will* over-layered text is occasionally used to announce a particular day of the rally and also voices of soldiers or the public cheering is interwoven with the musical sound track.

⁹ Andrew Hewitt: *Choreography is a way of thinking about the relationship of aesthetics to politics* / 2007, within Documenta 12 magazine project Interviewed by: Goran Sergej Pristaš

The bodies in both movies are representing the ideology of its respective revolutionary systems. Both movies are not showing real footage of 'real' events per se. For both films 'the' revolution was staged in front of the camera. At the same time the way the revolution was filmed suggests a documentary style in order to make the spectator believe that all what happened before the camera lenses was real. The staged revolutions have different historical references. In the case of Eisenstein's *October*, there is a specific reference to a past. It is a historical reconstruction of the real Communist revolution of 1917, which happened ten years before the making of the film. In the case of Riefenstahl's *Triumph of the Will* there is a reference to the future. Although Riefenstahl mixed live events and staged scenes during the actual Nürnberg rally of 1934, her revolution in black and white moving pictures (frames and shots) is presented in such a way that it could function as a live revolution. Riefenstahl was showing the consolidation of Nazi power, in depicting Nazi strength and also affecting this new change to the vast majority of Germans.

In both films, the human body is used as a symbol of the revolution that in solo and mass-scenes represents what the spectator could be and should be: A good member of the society that will be governed by the new ideology. The choreography in *October* represents the positivistic re-invigoration of the fight for the struggle to maintain the ideals of Communism, the choreography in *Triumph of the Will* represents the National-Socialist ideology marked by an imagined Teutonic past built on the romanticized Germanic greatness coming from the Middle Ages. The ways the bodies are presented in the two movies, in their actions, gestures and movements seem to have a direct connection to the theater dance that was very popular in the interbellum (1918-1940), especially the mass-choreographies which also simultaneously correspond to the imaginings of the two ideologies inside the collective regime of representation.

1.1 Louis Althusser: On ideology

Louis Althusser never gives an exact definition of ideology but from my reading of his works: “Ideology is representing the imaginable relationship between individuals and their living (live) circumstances”¹⁰ Since Althusser was much more concerned with the way ideology operates, his definitions in part are initially rooted in a system of beliefs. Although, Althusser saw capitalism as intrinsically exploitative, with his *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses* he makes apparent culturally produced behaviors and beliefs. In his theory, ideology controls us through what he calls the (repressive) State Apparatuses and Ideological State Apparatuses. The (repressive) State Apparatuses are direct representatives of institutions of the State. They include government bureaucracies, the judicial system, the armed forces, the police and the prison establishment. These (repressive) State Apparatuses (SA) are often public institutions that have a tendency to exhibit institutional violence in various forms. Ideological State Apparatuses (ISA) on the other hand are primarily private in that they include a broad range of societal structures which can loosely be defined as a basis for civil society. They include religion, the legal system, trade unions, the mass media, family, the cultural establishment and the dissemination of education. Althusser views ideology as habitually existing in an apparatus. While ideology in general has no history, specific ideologies have a history of their own. And that ideology thus has a “*material existence*”¹¹ in that “an ideology always exists in an apparatus, and its practice, or practices. This existence is material.”¹²

The analytical approach of Louis Althusser I have traced back to four steps:
(1) He looks at society on the level of the ‘what’: What is produced and what

¹⁰ This is from Thesis I - Louis Althusser, *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation)* in *Mapping Ideology*. Edited by Slavoj Žižek, Verso, London New York pp. 79

¹¹ This is from Thesis II - Louis Althusser, *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation)* in *Mapping Ideology*. Edited by Slavoj Žižek, Verso, London New York pp. 80

¹² Louis Althusser, *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation)* in *Mapping Ideology*. Edited by Slavoj Žižek, Verso, London New York pp. 81

is reproduced? (production and reproduction), (2) In the next step he looks at the 'who': Who is producing and who is reproducing? (differentiating the power hierarchy), (3) When 'the what' and 'the who' are mapped, Althusser differentiates the different forms of (institutional) ideologies within that society. (4) In this last step Althusser dissects how ideology materializes (which forms and materials are used to sustain the ideology?).

In this regard, they are also four core divisions that are brought to the forefront. They are: (1) Interpellation (Althusser states that all "all ideology hails or interpellates concrete individuals as concrete subjects...the existence of ideology and the hailing or interpellation of individuals as subjects are one and the same thing"), (2) Recognition ("The one hailed always recognizes that it is really him who is being hailed"), (3) Misrecognition: ("That an individual is always already a subject." For Althusser we are all born into an ideology, a concepts that he borrows from Jacques Lacan.) (4) The Absolute Guarantee; ("That everything really is so, and that on condition that the subjects recognize what they are and behave accordingly, everything will be alright.") Althusser states that ideology erases its presence in that it never jumps up and announces itself as ideology for we unconditionally accept the presences and subjugation of ideology itself.

Althusser further touches on many different logical positions on defining his method in broader terms. On the level of the reproduction of the conditions of production he says that: "The ultimate condition of production is therefore the reproduction of the condition of production."¹³ In order to live, all social norms must reproduce their conditions while also producing its social norms in being able to reproduce. For Althusser, this production of labor takes place outside the firm or the place of the material production and re-production. Althusser goes on to explain:

¹³ Louis Althusser, *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation)* in *Mapping Ideology*. Edited by Slavoj Žižek, Verso, London New York pp. 1

...the reproduction of labour-powers requires not only a reproduction of its skills, but also at the same time, a reproduction of its submission to the rules of the established order, i.e. a reproduction of submission to the ruling ideology for the workers, and a re-production of the ability to manipulate the ruling ideology correctly for the agents of exploitation and repression, so that they, too, will provide for the domination of the ruling class 'in word.'¹⁴

Althusser points out that the school, the church and the army teach the expert know how to ensure what he calls the "...subjection to the ruling ideology or the mastery of its practice."¹⁵ To support this, he brings up the layout of the notion of Infrastructure and Superstructure. He states that the Infrastructure is basically the economic base. It consists of the relations means and forces of production. Then there is the Superstructure which has two levels which Althusser calls Instances, like a building. These levels are in two forms, one on the level of Law and State (only political and legal) and the second is the level of Ideology (religion and philosophy).

For Althusser this is a spatial metaphor. And a spatial metaphor is "the metaphor of a topography [topique]..."¹⁶ which occupies many spaces of those diverse realities. The bottom is the base and the superstructure is above. The important thing here is to understand that the top floors cannot sustain themselves without the base. Althusser uses classic Marxist topography where the base is thought in two ways: "(1) there is a 'relative autonomy' of the superstructure with respect to the base; (2) there is a 'reciprocal action' of the superstructure on the base."¹⁷ In other words, the upper levels are relatively free from the base. There is a mutual action and connection imposed by the superstructure on the base. It is here where 'The State' comes in.

The state is conceived as a repressive apparatus. That is the machine of the state, a mechanism that by nature is repressive. The state equals State

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 67

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 67

¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 68

¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 68

apparatus (SA) and here Althusser offers us that the state is a classic repressive State apparatus that murders, exterminates, colonizes and also easily uses censorship to dominate any kind of dissent. This is what Lenin called the 'dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.' In the essentials of the Marxist theory of the state, Althusser further points out that the state does not have any meaning except or besides the function of State power. All the political class struggles circle around the state itself.

To return to the basic question, how is the reproduction of the relations of production secured, Althusser answers this by pointing out that in the topographical language of infrastructure and superstructure this answer is secured by the legal-political and ideological superstructure; it is locked down within the utilization of State power in the State Apparatus and (repressive) State Apparatus on the one hand and on the other end by Ideological State Apparatus (ISA).

For Althusser, ideology has no history because of its paradoxical position. He formally adapts the German term that "ideology has no history" but he takes it in a positive light. Althusser thinks that it is possible to believe that ideologies have a history of their own. And it is indeed possible to believe and hold on to the view that ideology in general has no history, but not in a negative sense. History is external to it. Here Althusser uses Freud's expression in describing ideology "like the unconscious"¹⁸ and he justifies it "by the fact that eternity of the unconscious is not related to the eternity of ideology in general."¹⁹ For Althusser it makes sense to use the plain term ideology to designate in general that ideology has no history. It means that ideology is omnipresent in its fixed form throughout history.

There is no ideology except for the subjects and by the subjects as Althusser points out. Ideology functions through the people for the people and here to

¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 78

¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 78

make it successful one must have concrete subjects as individuals. The interactions of the subjects must be nothing except its functioning in the material form of existing. And right here comes the idea of the function of recognition of ideology (the inverse being misrecognition (fr. *meconnaissance*)) at work. This is important in the frame of this study because through the recognition process ideology can gain a sympathetic hold. Althusser's 'hailing' is a ritual of recognition (fr. *Interpellation*). All handshakes or calling you by your name or hailing, for instance "hey you" on the street are part of the basic ritual in which this ideological recognition occurs. Thus it is the consciousness (i.e. the recognition) which gives us the knowledge to be able to have a discourse as subject to subject. What I argue here is that the basic forms of hailing leads one to have an ability to work with the same ideological state apparatus. Further according to Althusser:

Ideology hails or interpellates individual as subjects. As ideology is eternal, I must now suppress the temporal form in which I have presented the functioning of ideology, and say: ideology has always –already interpellated individuals as subjects, which amounts to making it clear that individuals are always –already interpellated by ideology as subjects, which necessarily leads us to one last proposition: individuals are always-already subjects. Hence individuals are 'abstract' with respect to the subjects which they always-already are.²⁰

It is captivating to see in the frame of this study how Althusser points out that actors in the mise en scene of interpellation play their respective roles. In a nutshell, for Althusser the worker, the actor, the boss and the soldier are embodiments of the subject of ideology. In that sense God (lets say the leader) is the Subject par excellence and he is through himself and for himself similar to a mirror reflections. The Subject (God/Leader) needs the subject who in return needs the master signifier (the subject) and its makes sense here that hailing or interpellation is needed to follow what we can recognize (comprehend) ideologically. The importance of Althusser's claim is that the individual is interpellated and transformed into a subject in order that s/he shall submit freely to the commandments of the Subject, i.e. in order to be

²⁰ Ibid., pp. 95

free, s/he shall (freely) accept his subjection to be saved or to have a better life in the future. Basically, in the Lacanian sense, the whole system exists to subjugate the subjects as tools for the production mechanism of reproduction for the Master Subject (s) and the different levels of ideology are used to attain the different results in the complex web of subjection.

1.2 Andrew Hewitt: On social choreography

In his study on the politics of choreography since the 18th century, Andrew Hewitt has developed the concept of social choreography where the connection between the structures of dance and the structures of modern society “denote a tradition of thinking about social order that derives its ideal from the aesthetic realm and seeks to instill that order directly at the level of the body.”²¹ Hewitt, states that dance “creates a space where social connections were practiced and staged”²² and that “the choreography of a certain dance style can be regarded as a blueprint for the thinking about and influencing of modern society”.²³ For he investigates his illustrations regarding social choreography from what can be seen as early modernity and in every respect as an expansive period in history spanning between 1793 through 1930. According to Hewitt’s argument all body movements are essentially choreographed. For he sees in choreography the ideal method through which social order is instilled and rehearsed on the level of the base and here the ideological is the aesthetical that demonstrates the choreographic. Hewitt explains that:

What I am calling “choreography” is not just a way of thinking about social order; it has also been a way of thinking about the relationship of aesthetics to politics. Aesthetic dance – and here we encounter the importance of the

²¹ Andrew Hewitt, *Social Choreography: Ideology As Performance In Dance And Everyday Movement*, Duke University Press 2005 pp. 3

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 4

²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 14

performative within our notion of social choreography – functions as a space in which social possibilities are both rehearsed and performed.²⁴

To appreciate Hewitt, one has to be aware that his method of social choreography is built upon Fredric Jameson's critical analysis on *The Political Unconscious*. Jameson asserted in 1982 that the 'superstructure,' which entails the state with all its dimensions of legality of ideology, religion, philosophy and culture, comprises a semi-independent status from its own economic base. For the simple fact that the 'superstructure' could influence the base due to its comparative independence in its relationship to the feudal agrarianism which pre-set the conditions for mass slavery to follow. Jameson envisioned that a two-tier model should unfurl into a horizontal structure of mutual regards in which the ideological, political, juridical (State functions) and the cultural means would have direct rapport with the economic modes of manufacturing and thus technical developments. Thereby serving a direct link between the intermingling of ideology impregnating its cultural influence through larger functions within the economically based structures.

In that light, Hewitt's social choreography is analyzed in four steps here. First he looks in the society of his study for: "unreadable body ejaculations."²⁵ Then inside the second step he analyzes the cultural hegemony of that particular society. In the third step Hewitt looks for gestures and actions. For, these gestures and actions built what he calls his social choreography: "disposed bodies in social space". Then in the fourth and last step, Hewitt explores how "the individual body is educating it experience of itself and in its movement towards a language as an expression of that experience."²⁶ To comprehend the ideological frame in Europe during the beginning of the 20th century, and to acquire a method that will enable me to study the two

²⁴ Goran Sergej Pristaš, *Andrew Hewitt: Choreography is a way of thinking about the relationship of aesthetics to politics*, Documenta 12 Magazine Project 2007
<http://www.tkh-generator.net/en/openedsources/andrew-hewitt-choreography-a-way-thinking-about-relationship-aesthetics-politics-0>

²⁵ Andrew Hewitt, *Social Choreography: Ideology As Performance In Dance And Everyday Movement*, Duke University Press 2005 pp.81

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 78

important revolutionary processes that marked the historical time frame (here I am specifically referring to the October Revolution of 1917 and the Nazi revolution from the 1930s), it makes it doubly pertinent to look at Hewitt's gaze at the century. For the bourgeois society was always presenting itself, as dramatically changing and with the upcoming of new classes, new bodily presences were evolving with new 'gestures'.

According to Hewitt, the phenomenon of 'gesture' is a bourgeois phenomenon. Whether through a spasm, or other bodily ejaculations or more specifically through stumbling, gesture unfailingly proliferates by the moment of stumbling. And it is that stumbling that preciously initiates the idiom of the actual gesture itself. Hewitt's gesture is the equivalence of a habitual reality. It is what he calls an "aesthetic construct" where the gesticulation represents the uncontrollable reflexes. Thus, according to him, dance was first seen as a "social game," now the emphasis was put on dance as work. So if the gesture of that very culture inevitably disappears then what happens to those bourgeois gestures? Are new gestures required then? In an understanding of cultural hegemony of the bourgeois society Hewitt refers to those who understand cultural hegemony, as a certain regimen of reading and writing, and gesture would be the action "wherein that regimen attempts to take on apparently transhistorical and natural forms."²⁷ So then, it becomes the body and not the class demanding to speak and be heard. With the end of bourgeois society and the loss of their cultural hegemony and gestures, a new society and a new self-consciousness of that new society needed to emerge. Modern forms of dance on the contrary are more focused on the pure physical energy: How the body can produce power that will make our modern societies run like well oiled machines with an unending supply of energy. The body will produce power energy that is the fuel of our modern industrial and post-industrial societies. "Modernism had one big obsession: To trace or to localize the

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 81-82

roots and the power of labor.”²⁸ And this is exactly what modern dance does, tracing the source of the labor power of the body. With a result that formal dance movements could no longer inspire the modern body, instead, the body produced a rhythmical stamping of the feet. So the controversial Ballets Russes, with its principle dancer and choreographer Nijinsky (1890- 1950) can be placed in the same ideological space as the development of dance in the modern American culture: The expressive dance of pioneers like Isadora Duncan (1878-1927).

In addressing social choreography as “the disposition of bodies in space,” Hewitt investigates a more ‘lateral’ transcendence. He points out, that the political theory of the Hobbesian period during the early Enlightenment regarded the movement of bodies through space as a basic notion of political freedom. This is crucial in Hewitt’s method that is following Henri Bergson²⁹ in his differentiation of gesture and action. Bergson says: “The attitudes, gestures and movements of the human body are laughable in exact proportion as that body reminds us of a mere machine.”³⁰ For Bergson, there were two important forces at work in life: Tension and elasticity.

Tension and elasticity are two forces that are mutually complimentary, which life brings into play... Society will therefore be suspicious of all inelasticity of character, of mind, and even of body, because it is the possible sign of a slumbering activity as well as of an activity with separatist tendencies, that inclines to swerve from the common centre round which society gravitates: in short, because it is the sign of eccentricity.³¹

Hewitt wants us to see how Bergson views this prevailing of rhythm and elasticity as a reflection of an “anti- humanist agenda,” as a foreclosing of constitution of character. He brings in Hannah Arendt’s condition of labor

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 42

²⁹ Henri Bergson (1859–1941) was one of the most influential French philosophers of the late 19th century-early 20th century.

³⁰ Andrew Hewitt, *Social Choreography: Ideology As Performance In Dance And Everyday Movement*, Duke University Press 2005 pp. 91

³¹ Ibid., pp. 92

because this kind of flexibility would come very close to the idea of work rather than freedom. Gesture would be the attitudes, the movements and even the language by which a mental state expresses itself outwardly without any aim or profit, from no other cause than a kind of inner itching. For Hewitt, gesture thus makes a profound difference from action. Action is the intentional or at any rate conscious while gesture slips out un-aware. Therefore Hewitt introduces Ann Morgan³² in her interpretation of François Delsarte.³³ According to Hewitt, Delsarte, and in his footsteps Ann Morgan, do not give any space to the absences of meaning when looming at the body in action. Every gesture is significant. Delsarte's body models of reading are warmly embraced by Morgan, who applauds Delsarte in the following quote:

Thanks to the genius of Delsarte, we are in possession of means whereby we may obtain muscular strength, but not to the expense of flexibility, which is the basis of grace. He has given us a perfect method by which we may not only obtain freedom and elasticity of action, but one which adds force and meaning to our every moment. It frees the body from all restrictions, and renders it as it should be, - subservient to its master, the will.³⁴

It is impressive how Hewitt analyzes Morgan's views on bodies which have to be read and written at the same time, out of fear that the signs of the body maybe be unclear or open to miss-interpretation. Morgan's idea of a universal bodily language can be attractive in its physical and social musculature as products inside the jouissance of the American Zeitgeist. But Hewitt's argument shows that ideology is installed and exercised directly on the bodily level and bodily regimes from gesture through complex cultural formations which are thus choreographed. As he makes clear that :

It is the function of choreography...to question that understanding – not in the name of a more fundamental notion of the real (a notion we might identify with hypostatized notions of truth, or with the materialist romance of the body), nor through some relativizing gesture that would reject truth outright. In dance productions, truth – and perhaps it seems old-fashioned to insist

³² Ann Morgan is an American theorist who wrote on Delsarte: *An hour with Delsarte, a study of expression* 1889.

³³ Françoise Delsarte (1811 - 1871) is a French pedagogue, musician and theorist who developed a system of study on the physical deportment of public speaking

³⁴ Andrew Hewitt, *Social Choreography: Ideology As Performance In Dance And Everyday Movement*, Duke University Press 2005 pp. 99

upon the truth content of art,... but without it, there is no need to talk of art – is of the nature of an event. Perhaps this is what choreography performs and re-performs – the belief that the truth is written in the future tense.³⁵

1.3 Ideology and choreography

In following the views of Althusser and Hewitt it shows that the primary topic of my thesis is the intrinsic relationship of the possible representation and reproduction of ideology in the form of social choreography. *October* and *Triumph of the Will* have formal conventions but it is within the views of Hewitt, through his delineation on 19th century codes on gestures, that they are implicit on the social behavior of how people act in public sphere. How they are staged for example in film and how their leisure mechanism is not separated from the constructed political space around them. Through Althusser we can see that in his Ideological State Apparatuses nothing is separated from the origins of ideology, because the ideology conducts the social and mass behavior of its state performers i.e. citizens. In this regard, both Althusser and Hewitt come to a similar junction. Their central interest is how the function of society influences the behavior and construction of the state and her masses. Essentially, I observe that a certain regard to societal behavior allows one to move away from the limited perception of how both ideology and social choreography can be seen in an enclosed or even isolated light. In fact, the action represented in both *October* and *Triumph of the Will* represents a much broader implication on the imaginings and on constructing ideological and choreographic communities. Both *October* and *Triumph of the Will* invite the spectator to immerse him/herself and enter a world where the individual body is a representation of the collective ideology. There the individual and the collective become one in their display of how body representation can either instigate a revolution or maintain one. In the following chapter, I am going to introduce Sergei Eisenstein and Leni

³⁵ Goran Sergej Pristaš, *Andrew Hewitt: Choreography is a way of thinking about the relationship of aesthetics to politics*, Documenta 12 Magazine Project 2007
<http://www.tkh-generator.net/en/openedsources/andrew-hewitt-choreography-a-way-thinking-about-relationship-aesthetics-politics-0>

Riefenstahl and their works in relation to the time – frame they were produced, while linking them to their historical events and the political systems they were working in.

2. Choreographers of an ideology

In this chapter I will discuss the historical underpinnings of Sergei Eisenstein and Leni Riefenstahl and their revolutionary zeal. I also intend to integrate certain arguments with historical discussions on both Eisenstein and Riefenstahl. To further examine I will place 'social choreography' inside the conditions that dictated artistic practices through the prevailing ideology of both the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany.

In chapter three, I will further offer a more detailed analysis of their works and apply the method of Althusser's ideology and Hewitt's social choreograph to both Sergei Eisenstein's *October* and Leni Riefenstahl's *Triumph of the Will*.

2.1 The case of Eisenstein

The Soviet motion-picture maker, theater director and theorist, Sergei Mikhaylovich Eisenstein (1898-1948), showed that he was able to find enough artistic licenses to create within the prescribed goals of the official ideological line issued by the Central Committee when commissioning the film to mark the official tenth anniversary of the October Revolution. To better comprehend the political position of Eisenstein, it should be noted that he enthusiastically joined the Red Forces as a voluntary soldier. Eisenstein was literally building bridges while altruistically putting to practice his engineering talents. Captivated by the developing avant-garde theater scene, Eisenstein joined Moscow's famous Proletkult (short for "proletarian culture") aided by the new Bolshevik authorities to enlighten all Soviet populations in all things revolutionary and political. Following his apprenticeship under Vsevolod Meyerhold's tutelage, Eisenstein enrolled in the School for Stage Direction. In this new revolutionary environment, Eisenstein developed a bold theory of applying the possibility of linking the impact of motion imagery in rapid resonance to evoke a predetermined emotional response. Eisenstein's theory of "montage of attractions" became the bulwark to commemorate the tenth

anniversary of the October Revolution. The foundation of Eisenstein's philosophy is a dynamic concept of things: "Being, as a constant evolution from the interaction of two contradictory opposites. Synthesis arising from the opposition between thesis and antithesis."³⁶ The Central Committee commissioned him to make *October*. As his last major silent film, 'Eisen' was keenly aware that the Soviet political elite harkened the most epic documentary possible. Here, the state assigned one of its youngest and one of its most theoretical makers to write the visual history of the officially sanctioned October Revolution. The new state had also given Eisenstein all the possible means to construct his mass narrative, his 'peoples' narrative.

2.2 The case of Riefenstahl

The German film director, Leni Riefenstahl (1902-2003) began her career as an interpretive dancer. During the late 1920's she was experimenting with post Duncan forms of body movement. Then she switched to acting and very quickly gained popularity with the German public in silent films. From then on things moved quite rapidly. She directed her first major film in 1932 called *The Blue Light*. During the same time she heard Adolf Hitler speak and was captivated by his power of mesmerizing the masses. Riefenstahl was converted and according to her : "In 1934 people were crazy and there was great enthusiasm for Adolf Hitler. We had to try and find that with our camera."³⁷ Riefenstahl, the dancer, the actress and finally the codifier of Nazi ideology as a film director, undoubtedly regurgitated an 'acceptable' explanation for her supposed accidental reasons in being the visual mouthpiece and also the most famous poster girl of the Nazi regime without supposedly having an ounce of knowledge of the totality of horror even until the regime's final collapse. According to Riefenstahl, Hitler merely hired her to make an unrehearsed short on the Nazi Party rally of 1933 in Nürnberg immediately following his election into power. This supposed accidental

³⁶ Sergei Eisenstein, *Film Form: Essay in Film Theory*, translated by Jay Leyda, Harcourt Publishers UK 1969 pp. 37

³⁷ Ray Müller, *Die Macht der Bilder: Leni Riefenstahl / The Wonderful Horrible Life of Leni Riefenstahl*, DVD 1983 Omega Films and Nomad Films 189 min

event was shot totally unrehearsed and entirely spontaneous as Riefenstahl claimed.³⁸ *Triumph of the Will* (1934) was commissioned by the newly crowned Führer himself, the film is essentially about the adoration, of all things, Adolf Hitler and the staging of the Nazi Party Congress.

2.3 Synopsis of *October* and *Triumph of the Will*

October is structured in a five act format. The soundtrack by Dmitri Shostakovich was added in 1966. In Act 1, the film opens with the symbols of the Tsarist Russia. Immediately followed by images of the oppressed Russian people (suffering women, factory workers and hard working farmers). The statue of the Tsarist is thorn down by the angry masses while they yell "For all, for all". At the end of the act a text card says: "Long live the Socialist revolution". Act 2 shows the fight between the Petrograd workers and their opponents. At the end of the fight the workers and the Bolsheviks stand together. In Act 3 a *coup d'etat* is planned and prepared by the Bolsheviks and the Provisional Government. The Bolshevik Revolutionary Military Council draws strategies and plans for the uprising while using the map of Petrograd. Act 4 and 5 are the key scenes of the movie: The red troops take over the Winter Palace. The Bolshevik regiments occupy the strategic positions of the city. The storming into the Winter Palace is dominating the movie in more then 17 scenes. The last scene of the movie shows the Bolsheviks in the Winter Palace and a text, actually Lenin's statement proclaims: "The workers and farmers revolution has succeeded, long live the world socialist revolution".³⁹

³⁸ Ray Müller, *Die Macht der Bilder: Leni Riefenstahl / The Wonderful Horrible Life of Leni Riefenstahl*, DVD 1983 Omega Films and Nomad Films 189 min

³⁹ Sergei Eisenstein, *October*, Mosfilm Studios USSR 1927 99 min

Leni Riefenstahl's *Triumph of the Will* covers events of a four days rally at the Sixth Nürnberg Party Congress. Musically the movie is supported by the overture from Wagner's opera - *Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg*. The movie starts with a prologue and follows a four acts structure, based on the four days of the rally, called Day 1, Day 2, Day 3, Day 4. The prologue is a text that gives a context to the historical date of September 5, 1934, the day on which Adolf Hitler arrived at the rally in Nürnberg. In Act 1 (Day 1) the arrival of Hitler by plane on the airport/airfield is shown and the ride in an open car into the city. Act 2 (Day 2) shows preparations by Nazi-officials and the opening ceremony with speeches by prominent Nazi-elite. It presents the members of the Reichsarbeitsdienst while marching with spades over their shoulder. Hitler's opening speech is followed by a parade in the dark by the SA with torches. Act 3 (Day 3) is dedicated to "the youth": Members of the Hitlerjugend march in front of the Nazi-officials, Hitler's speech addresses 'youth', and so do the other speeches by Nazi-leaders. The act ends with a speech by Hitler on the State and Party 'being one.' Act 4 (Day 4) shows more than 150,000 SA and SS soldiers parading in different formations and patterns. Hitler memorializes the soldiers who died in World War I by laying a wreath at the memorial. Hitler inspects the parading soldiers. Nazi flags are initiated by holding them against the 'Blood Flag'. After a final parade, Hitler gives his final speech in which he claims that "all good Germans will join the National Socialist party". The movies' finale is a collective singing of the *Horst Wessel*-song by all participants and a huge swastika flag waving in front of the parading soldiers.

2.4 Rehearsed revolutions or documentaries?

The films *October* and *Triumph of the Will* both deal with aspects of our imagination in the way popular culture of the times was envisioned. The claims for a docudrama (*October*) or documentary (*Triumph of the Will*) rest more on the ideological lens of the times than on the actuality of the events they proclaimed to be showcasing. Simply put, Eisenstein re-constructs a

revolution that had already occurred. But the time span between the real revolution and the construction of an officially recorded history of that very revolution done with the latest cinematic technology gave the film a sense of urgency. Since it was filmed in the actual locations of the real revolutionary events, *October* codified the impressions of how the Russian Revolution was lived for “real.” Eisenstein’s re-creation of the storming of the Winter Palace was in all details an attempt to be as close as possible to the real events. The man who is playing Lenin was an untrained amateur called Nikandrov but he looked so a like the real Lenin that the effect is almost scary. Eisenstein's reconstruction apparently is so authentic that scenes from the movie are used all over the world, purporting to be real footage from the Soviet revolution.

The claim that *Triumph of the Will* was a documentary, poses numerous problems. Firstly, the claim was perpetuated by the artist herself, by the Führer, by Propaganda Minister Joseph Goebbels and by the Nazi state apparatus. Ever since the Second World War, Riefenstahl has denied that she made the film with unlimited facilities and un-hindering support from the Nazi Party. Secondly, when looking beyond the official surface, a parallel truth comes into being.⁴⁰ Even before the shooting of *Triumph of the Will*, Riefenstahl had already had a series of mass rehearsals on how the image of Hitler and the other Nazi Party elite would be constructed. Then all the mass scenes were rehearsed and essentially pre-staged as in preparation for the camera. Collective drills were conducted days before the official arrival of Hitler to ensure that Riefenstahl would get the perfect shot. Then there was the physical construction of the venue in Nürnberg, designed by Hitler’s chosen architect Albert Speer who in consultation with Riefenstahl designed the lighting for the night shots. Interior to the structure of the film itself, there is no independent commentary, independent voice or any questions of

⁴⁰ The source of Leni Riefenstahl’s contradictions are well documented in Ray Müller’s, *Die Macht der Bilder: : Leni Riefenstahl / The Wonderful Horrible Life of Leni Riefenstahl*, but they are also discussed in Hilmar Hoffmann’s *The Triumph of Propaganda: Film and National Socialism 1933/1935*, Berghahn Books Providence Oxford 1997

journalistic spontaneity even for the times when the film was shot. Questions of impartiality can also be laid to rest, when according to Riefenstahl herself, “the movie was a pure documentary precisely because there was no external commentary.”⁴¹ The mere fact that for Riefenstahl image making vindicates the film from being a propaganda tool, says volumes regarding her true ideological position. The Nazi state apparatus supported every inch of the production with thirty two cameras, airplanes for the aerial shots and mass human bodies at Riefenstahl’s disposal. Here the material support cannot purport any notions of independency as the claim of Riefenstahl continued till her death. The claim of a documentary has been widely discredited in both academic and artistic circles. The film even won a gold medal at la Biennale de Venezia in 1935, the Grand Prix (Médaille d’Or) in the World Exhibition Paris 1937 and German Film Prize when it came out.

Both films stake a claim to history. Both films stake their veracity on the notion of unveiling their respective truths. I argue that given the evidence at hand there is absolutely no question that Eisenstein’s construction of a historical narrative of the October revolution is an immense codification of actual historical events with the greatest possible realism. Whether one agrees or disagrees with the visual modalities of the faux documentary style and the cinematic tools used by Eisenstein himself is besides the point. Eisenstein’s cinematic codification is rooted in facts but the stylistic interpretation of that given truth is essentially fictive in its modes of the construction of historical visualization. In Riefenstahl’s case on the other hand, reality is deliberately truncated to showcase a living truth that both Riefenstahl (with Hitler) construct to further the Führer’s image of infallibility and thus promulgate a messianic message of the coming promise designed for the savior and redemption of Aryan bodies.

⁴¹ Ray Müller, *Die Macht der Bilder: Leni Riefenstahl / The Wonderful Horrible Life of Leni Riefenstahl*, DVD 1983 Omega Films and Nomad Films 189 min

2.5 Staging the revolutionary body

So far, a first explorative analysis shows that both these films rely on the subject of revolution or revolutionary zeal as a construction for the spectator's view. Interior to this construction, there is the obvious difference in how the revolution is presented and specifically idealized inside both films. In *October* the revolutionary is an iconic worker (who is also a Bolshevik activist), who uses his working body in attempting to take over the means of production and takes on the collective responsibility for mobilizing masses (the people) into action against the oppression of the bourgeoisie and the provisional government and overcoming with ultimate victory. In *Triumph of the Will* the revolutionary is the ideal soldier who is subservient to all the levers of power without question.

2.6 Staging the individual and collective body

To further examine my argument, I will refer to four different writers on the analysis of the representation on the collective space and the individual body of the revolutionary worker and soldier. They include journalist Siegfried Kracauer, poststructuralist literary theorist Roland Barthes, cultural historian Jay Leyda and cultural critic Susan Sontag. I have chosen these four experts as part of a sample to directly address the subject at hand.

The journalist Siegfried Kracauer witnessed first-hand when in the 1930s he saw newsreels that were intended to present to both the international community and the German public a positive image of Hitler's new Germany. Kracauer was stunned how Riefenstahl in her movie showed a mass display which he described as the "utilized reduced temporal and spatial dimensions

of bodily expression.”⁴² Kracauer argues, that these masses were so efficiently devised out of abstract, geometric shapes, that there was no room for them to mean anything. Through Riefenstahl’s editing however the film *Triumph of the Will* conveys as “regressive organic meaning.” Such meanings are re-inscribed on to displaying, meaningless mass patterns, rather than showing the disorder of society. According to Kracauer *Triumph of the Will* creates an image that signifies an ideal ordered society. Concerning Riefenstahl’s relationship to the individual and the mass, Kracauer states that the effect of the marching party members appeared as mass ornaments to Hitler and his staff who must have appreciated as configurations symbolizing the readiness of the masses to be shaped and used at will by their leaders.

In his book, *Eisenstein At Work* Jay Leyda⁴³ points out that Serge Eisenstein’s life long passion was for commedia dell’arte connected to the commedia dell’masque (comedy of masques), which has developed over the years into what is called “Eisenstein’s typage-theory” for his films and theater performances. Leyda points to the fact that Eisenstein’s technique was elevated from his early encounter with Meyerhold’s theatrical experiments. And as time passed it reached to the level of a “conscious creative instrument.” It means that Eisenstein would select people, non-actors particularly on the basis of their facial characteristics; The audiences would immediately have an instant identification of their social and psychological characteristics or personage, without any second-guessing. Over the years Eisenstein typage-theory resulted in precise type casting to which according to Leyda, Eisenstein would use the character as a signifier to reveal the precise state and role of the “worker inside the mass.” This is how Eisenstein staged the role of real revolutionary actions with all their ideological underpinnings in directly informing his selection process in the construction

⁴² Siegfried Kracauer, *From Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological History of the German Film*. Edited by Leonardo Quaresima, Princeton University 2004, pp. 114

⁴³ Jay Leyda is an Eisenstein specialist who also translated *Eisenstein’s Film Form: Essay in Film Theory*, Harcourt Publishers UK 1969

of the suffering of the workers and their need for a positivistic representation inside the mass. Here it can be said that the relationship between the representation of the image of the body and the public's identification becomes one of the most important tools for the construction of an individual's empathy for the pulsation of fighting for liberation and freedom with and through the masses (identification).

On the other hand, Roland Barthes in his book *Image Music Text*, refers to Diderot in his definition of collective composition and states that: "A well composed picture [*tableau*] is a whole contained under a single point of view, in which the parts work together to one end and form by their mutual correspondence a unity as real as that of the members of an animal."⁴⁴ As I infer from Barthes, the collective body is thus expressly introduced into the idea of the tableau. The shots in an Eisenstein movie are consisting of many tableaux' but it is the whole body that is so introduced in the collective makeup of those various tableaux. Barthes in his essay of the *Third Meaning*, writes that the truth of the Eisensteinian aesthetic and the empathetic truth of his gestures are part of the important moments of life constructed in the ideology of the film. He argues that the truth of the proletariat moments requires emphases. In Barthes words "The Eisensteinian aesthetic does not constitute an independent level: it is part of the obvious meaning, and the obvious meaning is always, in Eisenstein, the revolution."⁴⁵ Barthes goes on by stating that: "The filmic begins only where language and metalanguage end...The filmic, then lies preciously here, in that region where articulated language is no longer more than approximative and where another language begins."⁴⁶ In the above quote from Barthes, the "other meaning" is, as I comprehend it, the language of the film that plays an active role when articulated verbal language dissipates into the representative realms of construction.

⁴⁴ Roland Barthes, *Image - Music -Text*, Translated by Stephen Heath, Hill & Wang 1977 pp. 71

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 56

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 64-65

In the case of Riefenstahl the filmic is in the language of the State in the most blatant and obvious way. The metaphor and the meta-language posit only one entry point into the filmic. The collective and the individual stand together for the sole purpose of transferring individual identity into the realm of ideological supervision. As Susan Sontag writes in her essay on Riefenstahl : “All four Riefenstahl’s commissioned Nazi films - whether about Party congresses, the Wehrmacht, or athletes - celebrate the rebirth of the body and of community, mediated through the worship of an irresistible leader.”⁴⁷ For Sontag examines how *Triumph of the Will* utilizes over-populated wide shots of “massed figures alternating with close-ups that isolate in a single passion, a single perfect submission”⁴⁸ in a so called temperate zone with clean – cut men in uniforms grouped “as if they were seeking the perfect choreography to express their fealty.”⁴⁹ According to Sontag, the fascist aesthetic thus makes people into mere objects of things. For her, the multiplication or replication of things and the grouping of peoples as things all around are a force to be reckoned with. This is exactly what de-neutralizes any space for an individual identity inside the collective body to make the ideology replace all individual responsibility. Here I quote Sontag again:

The fascist dramaturgy centers on the orgiastic transactions between mighty forces and their puppets, uniformly garbed and shown in ever swelling numbers. Its choreography alternates between ceaseless motion and a congealed, static, “virile” posing. Fascist arts glorifies surrender, it exalts mindlessness, it glamorizes death.⁵⁰

Unlike the Eisensteinian aesthetic that Roland Barthes speaks about when showing the realm of the individual inside the collective, Sontag points to the analysis of how the filmic in *Triumph of the Will* is moreover focused on how

⁴⁷ Susan Sontag’s *Fascinating Fascism*, Article in New York Reviews of Books, February 6 1975 and republished in Under the Sign of the Sun (New York 1980) pp. 8

⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 9

⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 9

⁵⁰ Ibid., pp. 11

“overpopulated shots” utilized mass bodies to totally anesthetize the soldier’s body and already prepare it to surrender to the mechanizations of militaristic patterns of marching and parading. This rendering of movement in grandiose and rigid patterns is another argument for how choreography rehearses the very unity of its polity. Like Hewitt says dance rehearses or allows rehearsing of a society to reconfigure their social norms. In contrast to Eisenstein, Riefenstahl takes the deliberate position of how the mass rendering of her soldiers are very much rehearsing the choreographies of their immediate militarist spectacles of the real life to follow. They construct the primary iconography where the male sexual energy is transferred to the messianic adoration of the Führer. Sontag further points out that, contrary to the asexuality presented within socialist art, Nazi art codifies sexual energy as both “prurient and idealizing.”⁵¹ Thus the fascist ideal is constructed to transform sexual energy into a ‘spiritual’ force. For the benefit of the community and through the anesthetized anonymity of an individual’s identity that is being deemed a worthy ingredient where the aesthetic is based on the containment of vital sexual forces. The movement here is relegated to marching and parading collectively, all held tight for the worship for the leader and its consuming ideology. Finally both Siegfried Kracauer and Susan Sontag are essentially arguing that the idealism of the ideology leaves no room for the representation of the individual outside the mass. On the other hand, in the case of Jay Leyda and Roland Barthes we see that the individual has his/her own expressive trajectory and through this personalized trajectory comes the contribution inside the mass ideology of revolution.

⁵¹ Ibid., pp. 12

3. A society of actors and spectators

In this chapter, I will address the connection of 'staging' and 'revolution'. In exploring the phenomenon of staging a revolution, I will analyze the two movies *October* and *Triumph of the Will*. I will focus on the aspects of actor, spectator, choreography and space. From this analysis I wish to arrive to conclusions that will allow me to answer the research question.

3.1 Transforming the individual actor into a social spectator

In my understanding, Hewitt's ideas are intrinsically connected to the production of gesture. More specifically I refer to the idea of gesture as a rehearsed form in the public domain for producing individual and social action. Hewitt traces the concept of bourgeois gesture as the universalizing embodiment of solidifying and recognizing class stratifications. He demonstrates that reflections on gesture always results from a moment of stumbling and the self-assured bourgeois 'promenade' has always been a potentially precarious affair. In Hewitt, the "dialectic of tact" is a system of communications for a society fallen from grace (or self-immanence). The 'promenade,' therefore is a form of the dialectics of tact that represents a significant social gesture. This is a historical anachronism even before the nineteenth-century heyday. For I would argue that this marks the likelihood of the body signifying a symbolic or mimetic state position without engaging in gesticulation.

Hewitt's interpretation of society is largely depending on the societal structure they are made in. The connection of a body to society is based on the reactions of how that body communicates. Hewitt's two poles of understanding society are connected to the 'mimic' and the 'performative.' The mimetic polarity would be the discourse that claimed to uncover hidden social scripts and the performative would stress the moments of performance itself. The performative polarity is manifestation of how society

functions as an ideological mechanism. Ideology needs to be seen as something that is enacted through society (including the state) by way of performance. In Althusser's case society is embedded in the fabric of ideology by the very nature of its inherent oppression.

For Hewitt, the gesture being the foundation of the bourgeoisie society during 19th century was further encoded as the method where the mimetic was being produced while simultaneously performed. Visibly laid-out, in the public domain for a collective demarcation of how the society appraised the individual 'actor.' Inside this public domain the gesturing is elongated and exaggerated in modes of working with unreadable body ejaculations. I claim here that the actor in this realm is also the spectator in that s/he is meant to be linked to the idea of *expose* (promenading or public walking) as a (typical) bourgeois norm in the collective regards (*vision*). I argue that the totality of this whole phenomenon is a way of 'staging.' This 'staging' itself was the conscious demonstration of a bourgeois self-consciousness. It is this act of consciousness that creates the crystallization of the performing gesture in transforming the individual actor into a social spectator and thus staged. What I argue here is, that in my view of 'staging' Hewitt's act of the reconfirmation of the society's socio-political standing is at work. This 'staging' has the very public actors readily staging their class codifications through their public gestures.

Althusser's idea of how certain class demarcations are kept separate, plays right into the universe of divided social categories. Here, Althusser touches the fundament of Marxism as a science: The division of the base. I am specifically referring to the Althusserian idea that inside the state structure there are essentially two levels, with two different kinds of actors: Those on the base and those in the upper floors. I argue that these two actors perform their individual 'stagings' according to their specific scripts in how they are clearly marked by the representation of their social categorization (organization). Althusser constructs the state as an oppressive organism. It is

here inside the ‘willed’ oppression of the subject (performers) where the staging happens. The realization of how the ideology exists, occurs through staging in a material ideological apparatus, prescribing material practices, governed by material ritual and / or practices (going to church, school etc).

The subjects in Althusser’s theory on “Ideology Interpellates Individuals,” I argue can stand in for Hewitt’s gestures. For me it is apparent that right here Althusser’s ‘hailing’ -phenomenon comes into play. The hailing is directly connected to the notion of the actor becoming the spectator when one is calling out in the public sphere. The person who is being called out has immediate ideological recognition by the way who is hailing him/her. Through that recognition s/he performs the actions as an actor while also watching the spectatorship of the others response. For it is this reciprocity of these two actions which, I claim, is embedded in the staging. Thus it is the consciousness (i.e. the recognition), which gives the performer the knowledge to further able to stage with his fellow subjects from one subject to the other; both recognizing their two similar ideologies as being one and the same. This Althusserian hailing reveals how “all ideology hails or interpellates concrete individuals as concrete subjects”⁵² who are both actor and performers simultaneously.

Further, I argue that in Hewitt’s case the actor performs the social order that is ‘elegant’ but in doing so s/he recognizes the fundamental function of social cohesion performed by the aesthetic itself. Thus, the historical significance is a mere retrospective of ‘stumbling’. For Hewitt, it is the stumbling of the actor and not ‘falling’ or ‘walking.’ At the same time, Althusser confines the role of his actor in much more rigor. I would argue that the Althusserian actor is a “Unique and Absolute Subject who is ‘specular.’” Since all actors have the mirror duplication it is the absolute subject (actor) who occupies the centre space of the Althusserian makeup. In other words, the actor of Althusser is a leader who is unique and holding absolute power over the masses. Because

⁵² Louis Althusser, *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation)* in *Mapping Ideology*. Edited by Slavoj Žižek, Verso, London New York pp. 1

of his *hailing* (similarity) and interpellation of recognition the masses look up to him as a mirror reflection of their best desires while he holds them down on their respective basis. This can be illustrated by the following: In her article on *Hitler's Movement Signature* Marta Davis has compared Hitler's movements to those of Saddam Hussein and George Bush and she states that their movements in their public performances are representing the cultural ideology of the three different political leaders⁵³ Hitler's kinetographic gestures were rehearsed over and over in front of a mirror, coming from a total controlled and tensed body. David Efron even traces down Hitler's collection of gestures and distinguishes three types of gesture in Hitler's performance: (1) the forward stabs, (2) the crushing fist, (3) the snapping or punching.⁵⁴

3.2 Practicing social actions

For Althusser social action is the mechanism and functioning of the different Ideological State Apparatuses. Since all elements of the state are oppressive by nature, it only stands to reason that the 'free' agents inside Ideological State Apparatuses's private spheres conduct the social action within the state to ensure the function of the production of the re-production. Here different aspects of the Ideological State Apparatuses offer semi-independent forms of outlets. All these sub-Ideological State Apparatuses exist to reinforce the superstructure and the infrastructure. Inside the dynamics of the Ideological State Apparatuses's there is the social action of hailing which again brings up the point of recognition. Through recognition, I would argue one would follow the processes of the social oppression and transposes it in a social action. The form the recognition takes place is predicated on the simple fact on how the different Ideological State

⁵³ Marta Davis & Dianne Dulicai. *Hitler's Movement Signature*, The Dream Review 36, no. 2 (T134), summer 1982

⁵⁴ The source of Hitler's movement study comes from Marta Davis's, *Hitler's Movement Signature*, Drama Review Cambridge 1992 / David Efron's, *Gesture and culture*, The Hague Mouton Publisher 1970

Apparatuses's have implemented their social ideology in the social space. They become part of the interior of the mass oppression which thus becomes the social action inside the state. Hewitt shows when political communities can no longer embrace themselves quite literally, they resort to gesture. I would argue that for Hewitt, to study gesture, basically amounts to the study of institutions in the failure to connect with the social action. Thus, the most basic of gestures would be the gesture that signifies the lack of connection, the gesture that displays its own failure in direct physical connection. Furthermore, according to Hewitt, choreography is a reflection on the enactment of how bodies 'do' things, and work that transforms them into social action and also into works of art. The bodies are always performing and through the performance they erase their own internal societal boundaries.

3.3 Producing and reproducing ideology

In an Althusserian sense, ideology can be best defined as part of an imaginary relationship that exists for the real conditions of living. Ideology is a construction of mechanism of a binary relationship between the forces of labor and power. The role of ideology within the State is find a proper system (through different stages) and to find societal differences of its divisions ((repressive) State Apparatus verses the different Ideological State Apparatuses) to consolidate the ultimate state power and state apparatus.

I argue that Althusser lays out in his different stages a method to procedurally demonstrate how through the production and reproduction, hierarchy is entrenched within that state power through state ideology as active functions from what we are taught in schools, churches. Through this 'education process' we establish our positions inside the realm of the ideological class codifications of infrastructure / superstructure : Which is the division of labor powers. And through his descriptive theory, Althusser places the State as a contradiction of itself. Further, his sign recognition system of hailing is one of

most imperative aspects that the relationships between class powers which will be consolidated, simply by the way we automatically recognize one and the other being similar or wanting to be similar. We thus inculcate ourselves into our own ideological positions and statuses through the images we project through hailing.

Hewitt, on the other hand is trying to locate social vision within the broader Enlightenment tradition in thinking about the relation of the physical body to the body politic from the gestural. Since, the basic tradition of thinking concerning social and political order derives its' ideals from the aesthetic realm seeking to instill an order directly on to the level of the body through all its gesturing. I argue that in Hewitt's social choreography, ideology is used as a way of examining how the aesthetic is not purely supra-structural, but that it is exploring how the relationship of aesthetics to the political is exhibited. In my reading of Hewitt, the concrete shouldn't be opposed to the abstract, but as something in which the essential in the ideological is revealed. Since, Hewitt attempts to locate social visions while dealing with the relationship of the physical body through ideological expressions. Ideology for Hewitt is choreography in a way of educating the individual body in its experience of movements toward language as an expression of that experience. To investigate ordinary movements (outside the choreographic context) while also examining the way in which bodily experiences prefigure and prepare the subject's passage into a social language that equals the physical movement of what can be called stumbling.

3.4 Analysis of two scenes from *October* and *Triumph of the Will*

To begin answering my initial research question I will now re-visit the two films that are the main subject of my study and see how they can be instrumental in the analysis of staging a revolution. I intend to describe and compare two scenes from both *October* and *Triumph of the Will* and then I will apply the theories of Andre Hewitt and Louis Althusser on the two films.

In my analysis, I have chosen two scenes (from each film) that offer an unmistakable possibility for comparison. The first comparative scene is the 'Arrival of the leader,' while the second comparative scene is connected to how both Eisenstein and Riefenstahl present their mass choreographies. I have chosen to call the second comparative scene 'A mass scene.'

From Hewitt's method on social choreography four elements will be explored in the chosen scenes: (1) Are there 'unreadable bodily ejaculations'? (2) What can be said about the way 'cultural hegemony' is represented in the scene? (3) Which gestures and actions can be perceived? (4) What can be said about choreography ('disposed bodies in a social space')? From Althusser on ideology I will explore three elements in the scenes mentioned: What can be said about the relation of the ideological bases of production and reproduction? Are State Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus detectable in the scene? And what can be said about 'the material versus the ideology'?

3.4.1 Scene Description *The arrival of the leader*

October (Eisenstein): 'Arrival of the Leader', scene 5, at '11.53

Location: Finlandia Station, Petrograd
 Music: Dmitri Shostakovich - tone poem *October op.131*

SHOT 1: Total shot, night. Camera on left track of the station. A closed, smoky station hall where approx. 400 people are looking at the tracks in expectation. There is tension, fear on the people's faces. There is darkness and smoke. The people look full of expectation but also anxious

SHOT 2: Close up shot, night. Side angle. An old man's face shows fear

SHOT 3: Medium shot, night: a group of 20 people talking

SHOT 4: Total shot of smoke clouds. Through the smoke clouds we see huge masses of people. The station is totally crowded

SHOT 5: Reverse total shot of distance. A train is coming closer

SHOT 6: Cut to total shot of people cheering

SHOT 7-9: Different fast close ups of people's faces cheering

SHOT 10: Total shot of Lenin standing in open train door. Train stops

SHOT 11: Close up angle shot of Lenin shaking his arms, fists in the air and showing expression of fighting spirit in his face

SHOT 12-15: Close up of faces of people (men, women, old, young, farmers, workers) responding to Lenin's arm movements and facial expressions. They are applauding, wild of enthusiasm and a lot of smiling

SHOT 16: Music builds to a crescendo. Lenin moves his arm rhythmically, almost on the count of the music

SHOT 17: Close up of faces of people responding to Lenin's arm movements and facial expressions. They are applauding, wild of enthusiasm and a lot of smiling

Triumph of the Will (Riefenstahl): 'Arrival of the Leader', scene 1, at '03.00

Location: Airfield / airport, Nürnberg
 Music: Richard Wagner - *Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg*

SHOT 1: The screen is dark for one whole minute. Wagner's intro from *Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg* gives a heroic reference. Then a close up of a statue of an eagle is followed by a swastika sign on a banner. Total shot of clouds. Early morning, bright light, Arial view
 SHOT 2: Total shot of a plane in the air
 SHOT 3: Camera on ground. Total shot. Frontal. A group of approximately thousand people are waving their hands and looking in the air. The arms are raised in the Sieg Heil-salut
 SHOT 4: Medium shot of the landing of the plane
 SHOT 5-8: Close up of people who are doing the Sieg Heil salutation
 SHOT 9: Pan to the mass of people who are doing the Sieg Heil and standing in a line excited
 SHOT 10: Medium shot plane come to a stop
 SHOT 11: Close up of the opening of the plane door. Joseph Goebbels comes out of the door, wearing a white trench coat.
 SHOT 12: Close up to a group of five women (young blond girls in summer dresses) who are doing the Sieg Heil and yell and almost crying from joyous hysteria.
 SHOT 13: Close up shot of the face of Adolf Hitler who is standing outside the plane, surrounded by his luminaries. Hitler's face is smiling and looking around.
 SHOT 14: Medium shot of hundreds of people doing the Sieg Heil, shot is supported by the sound of the Sieg Heil mixed with Wagner's music

3.4.2 Scene Description A mass scene*October (Eisenstein): Scene 86, at '88.00*

Locations: The river Neva, Bolshevik conference room, Winter Palace.
 Music: Dmitri Shostakovich tone poem *October* op.131

SHOT 1. Total. Night. Camera on land, filming a ship on the river Neva firing a shot
 SHOT 2: Medium. Night. Interior. Conference room. Men in Bolshevik uniform arguing with a man in suit, spectacles and a beard
 SHOT 3: Close up. Night. A group of twenty people, men and women, running left to right in streets.
 SHOT 4: Close up. Guns.
 SHOT 5-8: Close up. Faces of men of different age
 SHOT 9: Total. Exterior. Thousands of people walk in a determined way to the Winter Palace
 SHOT 10: Medium. Conference room. People are applauding. A banner shows the text: "The Bolsheviks will have victory, this is the moment."
 SHOT 11: Total. Exterior. Reverse direction. Thousands of people walk in a more determined way to the Winter Palace.
 SHOT 12: Close up. Weaponry being moved onto the street
 SHOT 13: Medium. Four men have entered through the sewers and canal system the palace.
 SHOT 14: Medium. Exterior. At the Palace' gate, are four cadets who cannot resist the uproar.
 SHOT 15: Medium. Interior. Table with four sleeping men
 SHOT16: Medium. . Interior. Table with the clothes of the four sleeping men
 SHOT.17: Total. Exterior. Thousands of people in front of the gates of the Winter Palace
 SHOT 18: Close up. Exterior. A man climbing the big gates and forcing it to open, He waves his hands in victory
 SHOT 19: Total. Exterior. Hundreds of people actually enter the Winter Palace, swelling into the Thousands

SHOT 20: Total. Interior. Masses of people taking the main staircase of the entrance to the Winter Palace

SHOT 21: Total. Interior. Masses of people stop the cadets inside the Winter Palace. There are fire shots and there is fighting.

SHOT. 22: Total. Interior. Masses of people run up the stairs of the Winter Palace. They force the doors open.

SHOT. 23: Close up. Door opens up. The members of the provisional government are sitting at a circular table behind the doors. They are charged and arrested by the revolutionaries who have come into the room. Surrounded and encircled the provisional government comes to an

Triumph of the Will (Riefenstahl): Scene 10, at '40.30

Location: Open air stadium Nürnberg

Music: Richard Wagner's *Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg*

SHOT 1. Total. Daytime. Open-air stadium Nürnberg, Aerial shot of a hundred thousand men in uniform. A white path between two groups of a hundred thousand men in black uniforms

SHOT 2. Medium. Ground camera. Three huge flags of the Nazi-party, like vertical banners.

SHOT 3: Close up. Hitler, wearing the Nazi-uniform, walks. Behind him two men in uniform. Walking from right to the left, solemnly.

SHOT 4: Total. First the camera is focused on Hitler, than pans to two soldiers standing on both sides of Hitler.

SHOT 5: Close up. Camera back to Hitler

SHOT 6: Total. Panning again to soldiers

SHOT 7: Close up. Back to Hitler

SHOT 8: Close up, pan to soldier, right

SHOT 9: Close up. Back to Hitler

SHOT 10. Total, pan to soldier, left. Camera suggests seeing soldiers through Hitler's eyes

SHOT 11: Medium. Camera behind Hitler, Hitler walking

SHOT 12: Total. Camera behind Hitler

SHOT 13. Total. Camera in front of Hitler

SHOT 14. Total. The three Swastika banners

SHOT 15. Panorama. Standing soldiers

SHOT 16. Close up. Face of Hitler, standing and watching

SHOT 17. Total. Frontal, from Hitler's point of view, all soldiers make the Sieg Heil-salutation.

SHOT 18: Panorama. Saluting soldiers.

SHOT 19; Close up. Soldiers' faces while saluting and facing Hitler.

SHOT 20. Medium. Smaller groups of soldiers start to move inside the bigger formation

SHOT 21: Total. Hitler on stage with the three Swastika banners flying behind him

SHOT 22. Close up. Soldiers' faces while marching

SHOT 23. Close up. Soldiers' faces while raising flags

SHOT 24. Medium. Face of Hitler, standing and watching

SHOT 25: Close up. Soldiers' faces while marching

SHOT 26. Total. Aerial. Marching soldier groups create diametrical formations and patterns.

SHOT 27. Total. Aerial. Marching soldier groups create diametrical formations and patterns. The end pattern is the form of the Swastika.

3.4.3 Actor and revolution

The relationship between actor and revolution, in both films does not reveal 'unreadable bodily ejaculations' (Hewitt). Here all movements are controlled, announced by the primary actor. In the case of *Triumph of the Will*, the actor

is ceremoniously shown. The 'disposed bodies' (Hewitt) in both movies are connected to different individuals inside a mass group, bound by one ideal and one leader. *October* shows a dispersed chaos versus the structure of a collective in a circle. Joy and fear are expressed in individual faces and body movements. Here the actor is not a single entity. For *October* shows how human 'chaos' becomes a clear structure for the placed actors. Scattered people are united and different individuals can be one people in the singular form. The choreography announces individual physical differences and personality traits, but the individual ideals are aiming towards the same results. For example in the arrival scene of Lenin, Eisenstein cuts with a rapid speed in order to make people blend together while showing their individual character differences. As a result, those people on the platform waiting for Lenin are visibly coming from different walks of life to become one in their struggle without shying away from their emotively demonstrative energies, it could almost be that they can conceivably stand in for Lenin if needed.

In *Triumph of the Will* there is a clear mechanism at work concerning 'one gesture, one action'. The leader has one gesture and the people have one action. There is no room for any other gestures or actions besides the saluting of the leader. Eventual spontaneous behavior of children is immediately brought in the shape of the Sieg Heil-greeting. Here the leader plays himself as the actor *par excellence*. Completely staged in his gestures, every nuance is rehearsed and performed in the same repeated manner. On the other spectrum, Lenin's movement language in *October* resembles sign-language. Lenin's scenes are presented as though the actor was in fact the reincarnation of the Lenin himself, with a precise movement reconstruction of the deceased leader. It could not be helped that the manner of showing Lenin, through brief interludes, one could associatively take the actor for the real thing. Here the people apparently knew how to read the signs of their primary actor. The signs and gestures in *October* are mimetic in that the actor is literally mimicking the real Lenin's gestures not only to construct a

reality but also as an instructive tool for new gestures and actions for the movie spectators to copy and perform.

It is a rehearsal process through and through that hopefully will affect the real-life arena. Here Althusser's idea on production and reproduction can be interpreted as the artist and the audience, the filmmaker and his movie spectator. The artist is directing and choreographing the ideal that needs to be brought to the people. The spectators will be educated in this ideal. The movie is materializing the ideal and will be thus used to reproduce and distribute the ideals of the respective leader. For example: Eisenstein's camera presents Lenin from a floor shot up, to stress his central and power position in the scene. He also shows that this is a historical moment. To prove that Lenin will merge with the people who are listening to him, the camera goes immediately down to the people. Inside the frame of *October* the artist (Eisenstein) is part of the base of the masses and his camera creation shows that everyone is part of the collective base. In *Triumph of the Will* the hierarchy is quite clear: Riefenstahl has one message and one message only and that is to simply follow the Leader. She had Albert Speer design a stage specifically for Hitler. He would always be elevated so there would never be a confusion between the leader and his people. And in the way the image of this primary actor would be relayed and codified. The function of the movie spectator in *Triumph of the Will* is only to be taken by the hand and to be guided quite literally. For here the spectator merely needs to absorb the images and be ready to emulate them in precision.

The artists Sergei Eisenstein and Leni Riefenstahl are close to their ideological subjects and respective power hierarchies. Both film-makers represent the leaders of the revolution and its ideology as intrinsic units. In essence the leaders are the voices of their respective revolutionary momentum. In that sense both *October* and *Triumph of the Will* are part of the Ideological State Apparatus, and not of the State Apparatus. Both films

represent 'cultural hegemony' (Hewitt) in sharing an ideal. For there is one people with one ideal. This is visualized in: (1) the decision for the location, a public space that has a closed architectonic form that can be easily controlled, (2) the similarity of facial expression (expectation and excitement). Individuals act as a group in a shared space for the same reason. In *Triumph of the Will* the Sieg Heil-salutation is an extremely dominant element in unifying and binding the people to their primary actor. People are instructed in the way the leader wants to be saluted and they repeat the instructions over and over. In a Hewittian sense it is rather an action than a gesture because the action in *Triumph of the Will* is relayed as an intentional mechanism rather than something that is coming from the inside.

3.4.4 Spectator and revolution

The spectators are supposed to parallel the people they see on the screen in both films (education and propaganda being in the Althusserian sense part of the ISA). Through associative empathy they have become the workers, the fighters, the soldiers who participate. Although the spectators are not watching a 'live' revolution, they need to have the feeling that what they are watching is live insofar as keeping the urgency alive and kicking. Riefenstahl aims to create a collective euphoria that is based on using non-verbal transmitters of ideology: The symbols of the eagle, banners with swastikas, Sieg Heil-salutes and the singing of the *Horst Wessel*-song. With a uniformity in physical behavior that is repeated over and over again to reinforce a choreography that deliberately sets to work in establishing the Nazi dominated world. All world that includes 'all the good Germans' as ideal and necessary participants to rejuvenate the splendors of the Germanic race, ideology and thus collective power.

In relaying historical facts, *October* seems to be much more educative than the *Triumph of the Will*, which is singularly monotone on the position of the leader in commanding his masses. In Eisenstein's choreography, the

audience deciphers individual character traits and sees associative connections. To achieve this, many of his images are structured in a way that can be called circular. In the way the camera is filming, it would seem that one half of the circle is formed by the actors on the screen, while the other half is left open for the viewing public to complete. As if the screen cuts an imaginary circle in two: One part being inside the film while the other exists in the auditorium. The patterns of this cinematic choreography spills out into the auditorium and thus Eisenstein invites the audience to construct the missing half and while associatively participating in the choreography itself. An example from *October*: When the camera pans to the cheering masses, Eisenstein always makes believe that you, the spectator, are inside the circle of those people on the screen. Riefenstahl, on the other hand, displays a choreography that is completely self-contained. Inside the confines of the kino-screen, her choreography is 'imposing' itself on the audience. Here nothing needs to be imagined, nothing needs to be completed. Her images are made to be looked at, to be awed by, but not to enter in. The ground patterns of *Triumph of the Will* are completed on location. For Riefenstahl repeatedly uses the square and the opposition vertical-horizontal framing of the lens. For example, the verticality of the raised arms in the Sieg Heil-greet, and the horizontal line that is built by the flying plane; the descending of Joseph Goebbels (vertical line) and the pan into the masses (horizontal line). *October* creates choreographic patterns while being watched. The spectator has to imagine that s/he completes the choreography. It is essentially a choreography that spectators can emulate. While *Triumph of the Will* presents completed, meticulously designed structures, akin to a painting based on mathematic patterns and a sense of visual and spatial logic that comes to embody the ideological imaginings of the New Order.

Looking at Hewitt's "educating the individual body in its experience of itself and in its movement towards language as an expression of that experience" in *October*, the people on screen and the cinema spectators belong to 'one community'. The struggle on the screen mirrors the spectator's own

ideological imaginings. Accordingly they see that the struggle of the revolution was not lost in vain. In *Triumph of the Will*, there is only one actor as I have stated before. The Führer is presented as the ultimate Super spectator who is also the primary actor. He is inspecting his troops, soldier's, workers, and metaphorically all the German people. The marching soldiers do not even know how the physical formations they create, look like. These physical formations can only be seen from a removed distances. From the high point of an alter or aerial position or through the camera. The Führer, like the embodiment of God can of course see his people from above. The spectators see it inside a cinema theater. Removed in the way that only through an imagining of perfected construction the spectator can join in the adoration of the Führer and his people. Riefenstahl gave her spectators, in the cinema an almost divine point of view to be able to watch and take in the patterns of the New ideology.

October shows how Althusser's State Ideology and ISA (Ideological State Apparatus) are used to educate and make propaganda for a revolution. In *October*, the different ISA's (school, family, art) are coming together and breaking out of the initial stranglehold of the State ideology and also out of the (repressive) State Apparatus of the Imperial forces. The verticality in *October* is constantly broken by diagonal and horizontal lines. We see the base striking out of organizing in vertical relationships where the differences of hierarchy are being broken down. A clear shift in the ideological representation from the imagined rooted in the material real to the active real comes into play. In *Triumph of the Will* submission, militarism and repression are glorified. The (repressive) state apparatus is in visible control of all aspects of the state and the ISA's only position is secondary, to educate, show and glorify the wonders of the (repressive) State Apparatus.

Looking at the Althusserian regard to the "material verses ideology" in *October* the ideas of hailing are at play. The actors of the cinema screen are basically calling the audience to join the continuing struggle by way of

making them part of what is happening on the screen. In reconstructing the historical events, the movie is in the material by its means of location and even some of the people who participated in the real revolution. The reconstruction is an ideological tool. The movie is reproducing ideology simply because it is purporting to supposedly reveal the ideological truth in an imaginary (re-) construction of factual events. It is almost a classic reproduction of the production. In the case of *Triumph of the Will*, people are reduced to architectural patterns. They are deprived of their individuality in favor of an ideal reality. This becomes accomplished through the distorted visual effects created by Riefenstahl's telephoto lens; this reduction of people into masses is juxtaposed to an equally distorted elevation of the Führer. From the vantage point, Riefenstahl continues to develop the god like presence that began with the motif and music in the early moments of the film. Now the controlling images are the recurrent shots of the huge crowds. A clear picture of a faceless and unidentified mass. There is no outside practice except for the ideology at hand and if we follow the world views in the *Triumph of the Will*, the hailing can only be truly possible for those who have a direct access, desire or will to enter into an unconditional following of the repressive State apparatus.

3.4.5 Choreography and revolution

In looking at social choreography inside *October*, differences in background and difference of direction resolve. Everyone to belong to the collective. The collective gives power. Here chaos becomes structured through the goal of the revolution. All individuals charge the choreography of the collective. There is an on going shift between individual and collective inside *October*. Movements are always on and within groups. Out of these different groups a different Hero/Heroine stands out but inevitably returns to the fold of the group. The heroic action of an individual can be physically dismantled by anyone inside a group and can be part of a transitory nature of power shifts.

Triumph of the Will functions in a kaleidoscopic fashion. Here no-other meanings are made evident except the showcasing of a two dimensional image: A system of collective movements in unison is essentially always repeating itself. A linear system of confined, held tight and held in military movements in which marching and saluting seem to be the central phrases and representative of all working structures in side the particular ideology. Riefenstahl uses wide shots of mass figures alternating with close-ups that isolate a single ideal. It is a non-stop motion of masculine demonstrations of surrender to command. The readiness to die, the willingness to kill I argue is imbedded in this choreography. In Hewitt's view : as a rehearsing of the order of the new society. Choreography and music are intrinsically connected to the physical manifestation of the image. Wagner's music is used to support the choreography and here, choreography and music are one unified materialization of the ideology.

From Hewitt's 'disposed bodies,' in *Triumph of the Will*, the masses are without any individual personality. Even when the faces of the individual soldiers are shown, they essentially and deliberately configured as the same. Individual personality is not important. It is the numerical contribution of the soldiers to the mass that counts. The bodies are part of the construction that is an end in itself. People reduced to things, objects, ornaments, architectural patterns.

In looking at Hewitt's "unreadable bodily ejaculations" *October* has no clarity of physical comprehension. The masses here are all going in one direction. The intention is shown and made readily visible. The people (masses) are going to take over the power. The cultural hegemony is shown as a united front of the people, coming from different directions and backgrounds. They are united in their one and only goal. The gestures are collective attacking, fighting, breaking and storming movements of arms, hands, and shoulders. In *Triumph of the Will* they are none "unreadable bodily ejaculations." Everything is hyper controlled. Directed in a precise uniformed structure, the

soldiers display a uniformity that allows only a brief space for individuality to show the collective ideology.

In looking at *October* from Hewitt's 'cultural hegemony', actions have a collective physical resonance in that all the moments of the mass bodies are actually preparing for the exact same action. We see the individual identity inside the group formation. There is a sense of chaos in the individual actions but that chaos has the function of reflecting on the various dimensions of showing how individuality is part of the physicality of the collective masses. In *Triumph of the Will*, the cultural hegemony is in the first degree. Here the collective becomes a controlled group by a singular representation of the one leader. "Ein Volk, ein Reich, ein Führer" (one people, one empire, one leader). No space for individualism. Here gestures and actions are predicated by one voice, one gesture, one people and leader. All the rehearsing and re-rehearsing is for the solidification and unity between the leader (=the state) and the people. Here all gestures lead to the one and only final gesture, the salutation to the leader. And all the soldiers built a singular soldiers/ workers body. The only other body that has a place in this configuration is that of the leader. For the ideal image constructed here is that all individual amounts to a single body and that the collective body mirrors the leaders' body. The actions are marching, saluting and working for the leader.

In the Althusserian sense of looking at relation of the ideological bases of production and reproduction in both films, editing is crucial in transmitting the ideology which is at stake. Eisenstein's brand-mark in *October* is what he called : "The intellectual montage or the montage of dialectics." Every image has a counter-image (thesis and anti-thesis). Eisenstein cuts an image of material wealth with an image of abject poverty, an image of joy with an image of grief, an image of mass with an image of an individual. This method of montage is decisive in his strategy to move the spectator inside through the prism of his gaze. These sequences produce the rhythmical drama of revolution in *October*. Contrary to Eisenstein, Riefenstahl's mathematical

montage uses a calm and almost cerebral rhythm. Like a religious procession, her construction even transforms joy and excitement into highly controlled materializations.

3.4.6 Space and revolution

The public space is where the action takes place in both films. Hewitt's 'social space' can be traced back to the metaphor of the arrival platform (train station or airfield/airport) for a new ideal in configuring a new society. Here the public space represents arrival and departure, as a form of freedom and a possibility of new beginnings, while simultaneously both locations have enclosed forms. As both the train station and the airport can be easily encircled and controlled whenever needed. In both films smoke and clouds are used to support the arrival of the leader, a metaphor to emphasize the divine, holy even superhuman mission of the leader. Out of the smoke comes the new leader or the new ideal. Out of the mist of an unclear and clouded political situation the savior comes to the masses. In both films technology is used to bring the leader to the people via train and airplane, as a way of showing how modern technically is made accessible to advance this new future society.

The space in a Hewittian sense inside *October* is the public space used as a stage. The streets of the city of Petrograd (St. Petersburg) have become the domain where the roles of actors and spectators are in constant flux and shifting. The movie spectator is participating by means of visual identification. Everybody can become a hero of the revolution and the 'abnormal' behavior of people in their normal space (the street) is rehearsed and mimicked. The social space transforms due to the abnormal behavior in that the streets become a battlefield, a political platform, a stage for action. People conquer spaces that they never before had access to: The private domain of those in power becomes public domain. The city (and the world) has become one social space. Eisenstein is translating political ideas into

visual images and announces one of his dominant metaphors: Those ascending steps are moving to power, those descending are losing power. The people, the antithesis, have come to oppose the Tsar's power. In *Triumph of the Will*, Albert Speer built a site-specific arena specially imagined for the mass bodies to be captured and configured by Riefenstahl and her cameras. The spectators of the rally are seated like a normal audience for a sports event. A social space where winners are glorified, where the best will win, where well trained, ideal people are showing almost superhuman perfection. The ideology makes a strong link between sports, military and images of a super race. The ideology of the 'Heile Welt', where nature is controlled and at the same time left to its primitive needs and desires. The arena shows those elements of control and primitive instincts. Exactly on these grounds the new bodies are shown to the new citizens in the new social spaces.

3.5 Bodies as modes of revolutionary progression

I have argued that both Eisenstein and Riefenstahl persisted on the different aims and goals with their art. Both were believers in the physical presence of the body as an instrument of radical revolutionary modes of representation. At the same time they were also constructing an iconography on how physical bodies can be represented as modes of revolutionary progression while being tools of mass indoctrination and also representing an imagined real. The oeuvre's of both Riefenstahl and Eisenstein were not only obviously linked to their immediate contexts but in retrospective they are governed by a group and community identity that can be characterized by the following list.

- 1) The work (movie or documentary) is collaborative. It is a messenger and mediator of the part ideology.
- 2) The work is politically messianic. It creates a belief among the masses for the ideology and its leaders.
- 3) The works is layered, but simple and yet socially familiar
- 4) The work is emotionally evocative but artistically not provocative.
- 5) The work pretends to purport the truth and yet it is fictive.

The movies of Eisenstein and Riefenstahl present ideologies that are indisputably products of the time, a period of massive changes of the Western societies in Europe and the United States. A period that started with the Industrial Revolution halfway the 19th century then came a catastrophic end halfway the 20th century with the fall of the Nazi Third Reich with the ending of Colonialism. In between numerous ideologies were at work to take over the current dominating ones; from socialism, to fascism, to communism, to Keynesianism, to psychoanalysis and two World Wars mark the era. The changes in society related to new ideas on labor, work, power, fighting, going to war, colonizing, beauty, wealth and poverty, the distribution of wealth. The paradox of this period seems to be a huge desire for freedom, and at the same time a strong need for the controlling of that desired freedom. The body took a dominant position as the materialization of the ideology. The body was omnipresent. The body was educated, trained, dissected, labeled, analyzed and choreographed. The discourse was focused on the body, the freedom of the body and the control over the body. All revolutions of that era are based on this paradox. The era of the body paradox, the shifting changes of ideologies that we're always connected to ideas on the body. The unbreakable link between ideologies and body makes that period interesting to research when it comes to the body and choreography itself. The moment the body was released from certain codes of behavior, the gestures of freedom were immediately brought under control and codified instantaneously.

On the level of choreography both films divulge in the romantic actions as a heightened choreographic gestures on movement structures. I state that both films construct their physical presences on the basis of how the gestures and gesticulations are made evident in a classic reproduction means. It is through the construction of the iconic gestures that the choreography is developed into transforming the revolutionary into mechanism for the classic worker i.e. the soldier. The construction of bodies

that purport to be real in both *October* and *Triumph of the Will* are in fact total theatrical constructions. *October* is the reproduction of the production of an actual event that occurred and *Triumph of the Will* is the production of an event pertaining to become a reproduction in real life for all its spectators and participants to follow. One film uses historical gesticulations to rekindle mass revolutionary action while the other film uses the uniformity of mass formation as a new method to kindle the masses into the exact order of the desired images of its ideology.

In staging a revolution, the ingredients follow a clear method on how different ideologies show different aesthetical approaches to create the parameters of theatrical imagining coming from the last two or three centuries. Both Eisenstein and Riefenstahl use their staging of the revolution on the level of gesture and action in choreographing the collective representation of the body as a means of unveiling their respective ideas on how physicality serves their ideologies. The primary difference that though both are in a way totally immersed in the collective representation of body image, Riefenstahl treats all the mass bodies she creates as a singular object-subject. Her physicality is all about the geometricalization and linear patterns of movements that showcase the subservient (almost redundant) mechanization of physical movements themselves. Eisenstein I would say is almost 'messy' by comparison to Riefenstahl, his choreography is built on emotional impetus and seemingly chaotic in its physical manifestation. The collective scenes have their power in the lack of absolute physical conformity. The body's gesticulate in different ways and show an astute hyper-sensitivity to the preparations and consequences of violence that will follow. The way Eisenstein uses gesture is invariably more indicative to a certain idea of how history transpired. In his gestures the theatricality reveals a physical narrative that is almost akin to a kind of revolutionary 'mimicking.' In Riefenstahl's case the gestures are not concerned with story telling but making a visual aesthetical image of physical totalities, we could even call it revolutionary actions. The bodies are moving in slow tempi as in some ritualistic

procession. The hand, facial or foot gestures never offer an emotional click, narrative or have any false note. The power of both methods lie in the way how one humanizes or dehumanizes the masses in a way that they have 'real' histories just by their gestural expressions. Here the Hewittian model of performing mimicking comes to mind when thinking about how Riefenstahl atomizes the masses as real menaces of living machines with only one direction, one thinking (following one singular outlook) while Eisenstein gives his masses a sense of emotive power who are coming from many directions. Both vehicles are useful in the way the power of labor serves the visual needs of the ideology. As a conclusion, I argue that as long as revolutions are 'labor' driven both models easily work to play off the other. The determination of the working masses verses the foot soldier marching; both are rehearsing the new order. Often the two forms are counter-punctual to the other. Both forms of revolutions do not complement the other and both can inadvertently push the unknowing masses to go in one or the other direction of the dividing line.

In both movies, the social space has a strict relation to the respective ideologies. Here Hewitt and Althusser are in unison with each other. Ideology equals society in which society equals choreography in which choreography equals the Althusserian Ideological State Apparatus. The (re-)construction of a revolution is an ideological tool. In reconstructing the historical events the movies are the material by its means of location and even because of some people who participated in the real revolution. Both films by the virtue of their construction and physical layout transform all actions into a theatrical gesture. These gestures form the larger pictograms of actions, timed in very specific, controlled and syncopated rhythms of the respective ideological (historical) imaginings of their respective time span that wished to be disseminated.

Apparently the effects of (re-)staging are connected to the way the images of that revolution are symbolically constructed. The physical presences of

bodies need to play (through gesture) against the political cohesion of their respective societies in the most simplistic and most potentially theatrical way. The (re-)staged revolution's actual social space serves as a theatrical signature of the revolutionary production itself. The bodies of the mass and individual performers need to consciously address the physical layout as choreographic construction. I would argue that both films give the foundation ingredients of how the body (through the camera lens) needs to function in staging a revolution by using the external architecture. The architecture complements and even constructs the collective body's physical actions inside the given physical space. This complementary relationship is akin to being inside a deliberate theatrical construction with live dancers and actors.

Conclusion

This study commenced from the assumption that in every 'spontaneous choreography' of a people in revolt certain patterns of images, actions and gestures are at work. After reading Louis Althusser and Andrew Hewitt, this assumption had to be critically and carefully revisited, especially when applied to the staged revolutions of Sergei Eisenstein and Leni Riefenstahl. Both movies *October* by Eisenstein and *Triumph of the Will* by Riefenstahl present their respective bodies in the context of a revolution that is staged. In *October*, Eisenstein takes the role of the historian who restages actual historical events, i.e.: the October Revolution of 1917. While Riefenstahl in her *Triumph of the Will* made a semi-documentary of revolutionary militarism that had yet to be materialized in its entirety. In spite of the differences in the way bodies are represented in both films, the topics that permeates in both *October* and *Triumph of the Will* are remarkably comparable. Through an encounter of these works with theories, concept and ideas from academic fields of study like performance, philosophy and critical theory, I have scrutinized how these movies can be interpreted as a way of staging a revolution.

A closer assessment reveals that in both films, the role of the actor, spectator, choreography and the space have to come into play as the primary vehicle when working through the staging process of a revolution. Apparently there is no escape from ideology. Actor and spectator cannot escape their ideological entanglements. Here the response of the spectator to the image that carries itself in the way the spectators imagines his/ her ideals play an absolutely instructive link on how the image of the leader is brought to the real life performance arena. The actor is the visible face to the ideological desires and the spectator, in endowing the primary actor with his role, becomes an active participant in this binary relationship.

Andrew Hewitt's ideas on social choreography furnished awareness into the relationship of the role of the spectator to the subject of both movies. If we take the basic Hewittian principle of the actor and spectator we arrive to the idea that how Hewitt looks at the body in a social space that is disposed (choreography) and how the individual body in that very society has been educated in the experience of itself and its movement towards language as an expression of that experience. I have argued that art (including dance performances and movies) has an important role in this educative process of the individual body in this experience. So it would stand to reason that there is not only the production of gestures of the ideology as regards to the relationship between the actor and spectator but that there is also a mutual demonstration of those gestures. For the actor in the very realm is also the spectator. Both of them are meant to be linked with the idea of expose.

Louis Althusser's notion of ideology functioned as a theoretical frame for this observation. According to Althusser, an individual or a group of individuals (an elite) consisting of one primacy leader / genius or a group of similar thinkers will define and construct an ideology. This ideology is the bridge between the ideal and the citizens of a society. It will create a system that will make it possible that people will make other people live their lives and behave according to the prescribed ideologies themselves. This system will consist of a State power, repressive State Apparatus and Ideological State Apparatus among other intertwined levels. The important aspects of Ideological State Apparatus that are pertinent to looking at the two films' is how the role of education and family (and to a lesser extent now the religion) are so instructive in the systematic imposition of ideologies. These apparatuses are the material world that allows the immaterial ideas to exist.

The utilization of two specific ways of using the social space related to ideology and disposing bodies through gesture and actions played a crucial role in my study of how the spectator is invited to look at these movies. The social space in *October* and *Triumph of the Will* is directly engaging the

audience on a social platform inside the material world. Here my first conclusion would be that the material world (Althusser), which is the physical world including the body (Hewitt), will always be manipulated (both Althusser and Hewitt) to make people 'believe,' and 'follow,' the ideology to exist and prosper. An important part of the manipulation in the social space would be again the role of education but also the way the body is presented and re-presented in that very society. According to the level of the manipulation of the body, the phenomenon of 'social choreography' will be visible in that very society. There can be a direct connection between the ideology and manipulation or an indirect or even a more blurry relation between the two. There are levels of manipulation. Depending on those levels of the manipulation, the staging will in its theatricality have a direct, indirect or more-subtle link to the ideology and the body that is being pronounced.

Furthermore the use of the idea of re-production in the way ideology is brought to the spectator is linking both Hewitt and Althusser's method in analyzing deeper the aspect of actor/artist and spectator/participant in their binary relationship. The hierarchy between actor/artist and spectator/participant has been dissected on the level of the one who owns the production means (actor/artist) and the one who is aiming to participate in owning the production means (spectator/participant). For it is here that the spectator cum actor performs the social order and in so doing s/he recognizes the fundamental functions of the social cohesion performed by the aesthetic itself. The binary relationship does not merely work on the level of the passive spectator. Through the intrinsic hailing process of Althusser the very spectator becomes an active recognizer on the primary level of the staging of actions. As for Hewitt, performing (societal action) is more important than the clear communication of how that message is brought to the society or state.

In a wider perspective and on the level of revolution, while reading Althusser on ideology and Hewitt on social choreography, I discovered that in studying

and applying both these thinkers to the two films of Eisenstein and Riefenstahl, Althusser has been extremely valuable in pointing out that a society is primarily based on what is produced and reproduced. Here the hierarchy of the producers and reproducers of a revolution is ultimately about changing the system. Essentially Althusser's point on the material of ideology gave me the key insight in the method of investigating my thesis question. The ideology here needs to be embodied and the materialization of the ideology needs to find a place in the choreography of the bodies. Without the bodies there can't be a revolution. Here I discovered that the one who owns the bodies ultimately makes the revolution happen. It is striking that there is a direct link between choreography and revolution. Thus my second conclusion would be that without the physical manifestation there cannot be a revolution. So actually, choreography in the definition of Hewitt's "disposed bodies in social space" is an intrinsic part of a revolution that uses Althusser's production and reproduction means. Bluntly stated, the one who owns the body is the one who owns the means to make the revolution happen. It makes it clear coming from both Althusser and Hewitt, that the physical manifestations of bodies in a society are part of the production means of that society, which need to be reproduced over and over again. We could say that the one who owns the choreography owns the production means and thus has a possibility to make a definite change. Here there is a direct link between social choreography and power which is highly significant in analyzing the position of the artist and the spectator. Future research on this topic could offer new insights to performance studies and analysis.

On the level of choreography, Hewitt was very instructive in making clear that the gestures and action in a society represent the way ideology in that particular society functions. Hewitt's analysis of gestures and actions in a society implies that the choreography of the change (revolution) needs to employ other, totally different, actions and gesture which are the opposite from the ones existing in the society these new gestures and actions will materialize the change. This is an important element to think of in how the

staging of a revolution, not only, represents the revolutionary ideology but also how it can embody the change in over-ruling the current existing gestures and actions. Third, the gestures and actions in the choreography of change need to be open to the shifting positions of actor and spectators. According to the ideology one is placed, either the leader of the revolution has a hierarchical position that cannot be touched or that leader can become one of the participants of the revolution. In that case the participants in the revolution could possibly become one of the leaders given the right circumstances. In this latter version, there is a perception of equality and uniformity (we are all one, subject to subject, we are all the same etc) and there is even an element of 'simplicity'. Here I mean that the gestures of the choreography would be openly accessible and readable to everyone who is participating.

The choreography should not demand any particular training or specially trained skilled bodies but the choreography should be open to any type of body and body state. Riefenstahl 's choreography based on military and gymnastic actions was open to any variety of bodies as long they belonged to the Aryan race. The gestures and actions are actually almost ridiculously simplistic. Riefenstahl 's military and gymnastics choreography was a clear statement against the decadent bodies of the Weimar republic. Eisenstein shows a more complicated choreography. For him, freedom and equality needed to be sold to the public. So more individuality in the movements and gestures and actions was needed. At the same time the repetitive phrases in Eisenstein's choreography are also simplistic and easily reproducible: The shaking of the fist in the air, shaking of the hands of others, hugging and tapping on the shoulders, these actions can readily be reproduced by anyone who participates in that revolution. And then the third element in the choreography, both Althusser and Hewitt make clear that re-production is an important element in sustaining and consolidating the ideology, this counts also for the choreography. For my third conclusion would be that the more elements of the choreography can be reproduced the better for the

consolidation for the ideology. The more people who do the Sieg-Heil salutation the better, the more people shake their fist in the air the more the sign of the ideology will be read by more people. Again this proves that choreography is an un-missable element in the revolution and it conforms the Althusserian idea that the choreography is an intrinsic part of the material of the ideology and the Ideological State Apparatus.

A fourth element that has a huge impact on the choreography is of course the social space of what Hewitt is talking about. Where and how is the choreography presented and manifested in a power location (palace, parliament, university, military casern etc), in the public space (street, square, station, airport etc) or in a theatre (which is also part of the public space but focused on 'presentation'). Riefenstahl and Eisenstein have been extremely clever in selecting the locations for their revolutions. The space is indicative for their ideology. Riefenstahl's stadium is like an isolated spot, like a camp, dominated by military order, where freedom is dictated in all its forms and details. Eisenstein's railway station represents traveling from all kinds of directions and backgrounds and simultaneously this is the platform where the new ideology arrives on the wings of the latest technology. In staging a revolution, the situated place for the choreography has to be carefully selected.

On the level of mechanism, in a people's movement like revolution, clear and simple formats are needed in order to bring masses together. Complicated messages and complicated body behavior will not support the actual happening of the desired change. In this sense the word mechanism needs to be read. A mechanism suggests a possibility to reproduce, the possibility to use it when ever needed, to fix it when its broken and to bring it to work without a lot of unforeseen preparations. A choreography inside a revolution needs to have a character of a mechanism, something that can be set up easily, can be done easily and can be understood easily. Again, here the element of hailing that Althusser is talking about comes into play. The

recognition and the readability of gestures and actions go hand in hand with the need for the reproduction. The artistic innovations in a choreography of a revolution should be focused on both hailing and reproductive elements. It is stunning that these characteristics come very close to the basics of capitalist advertisements and propaganda features. Here the element of selling to a large audience and making people believe and making people repeat seem to go back to an almost primitive level of human behavior. I would like to connect this for instance to the social choreography of our times. The mass choreography on so-called dance events and rave happenings epitomize for a huge amount of people very simplistic and basic movement vocabulary, directed by a dominating bass rhythm. Simplistic movements of the hips, minimal feet moving back and forth and arms or hands raised in the air while making small hand gestures. Every ideology will be forced to find their ideological gestures inside the limited range of possibilities of human mass happenings and here I also come to my fourth conclusion that society educates the gestures and actions of the time, for they are heavily informed by the societal shifts that are indeed in constant flux. I believe that in staging a revolution, it means not only finding the common points of grievances or the common points of hailing but the mechanisms of those gestures might take entirely different forms from iconic representations in *October* and *Triumph of the Will* but they will nevertheless stay simplistic in their choreographic representation.

Both Althusser and Hewitt's ideas on social choreography and ideology are addressed to societies of pre-post modernism, pre-globalism, pre-social media, pre-internet and pre/911. Their societies had strict frames and identifiable ideologies. I question whether the direct connection between ideology and choreography is applicable to the times that we are currently living or to a future where globalization and social media will take a bigger role in global ideologies. The cultural hegemony that Hewitt was speaking about is no longer so homogenous anymore. I argue that social choreography will start to look more and more alike the more we will share

the same social space. As for Althusser, the relationship to ideology changes only insofar as the connections inside the social media changes our educative dynamics on how we operate inside the newly self-constructed Ideological State Apparatus's, (from which there is no escape, we will indeed construct our own for eternity). So my fifth conclusion would be that immaterial of the world we are currently part off, which is the physical world including the body (Hewitt), will always be manipulated (Althusser & Hewitt) to make people "believe," and "follow," the ideology to exists and prosper whether through the net or not and regardless of the fact that homogeneity is giving way to a mass globalized modes of thinking and operating. And here in this mode of manipulation, education continues to function as a primary mode of operation; also in the way the body is presented and re-presented in that very society. According to the level of the manipulation of the body, the phenomenon of social choreography (Hewitt) will be visible in that very society. There can be a direct connection between the ideology and manipulation or indirect or even blurrier vague relations between the two. But the levers of manipulations will always continue.

To study ways in looking at the significance that is produced at the individual and collective bodies inside both the social and ideological realm, I brought in Siegfried Kracauer, Susan Sontag, Roland Barthes and Jay Leyda as external voices dealing with the paradoxical relationship between ideology and social choreography. Here I researched the complex relationship of how the body is represented not only in the two films as possible re-staging's but given the similar yet subtle differences I went straight to the Hewitt premise that the dance of a period, which rehearses the order of the society of that period. Since, Hewitt has been focusing on the area of the bodily paradox (freedom and control). Work was the keyword in the body ideologies of that time in both Hewitt and Althusser: The workers era, the soldiers' era, the leader and followers era.

Finally, this thesis is built on the idea that texts of Louis Althusser and

Andrew Hewitt could be helpful in finding ways of developing choreography into a mechanism in staging and re-staging a revolution. To the particular staging of body metaphors the application of these academic texts on Sergei Eisenstein's *October* and Leni Riefenstahl's *Triumph of the Will* reconfirms the theatres capacity to evoke a reflection on the way spectators are invited to participate and look. My final conclusion would be that the method of Althusser and Hewitt allowed me to study and look at the ideology and choreography inside Eisenstein and Riefenstahl and confirmed that choreography instills the ideology of the time. Furthermore choreography was the main tool or mechanism that enabled education, learning, practicing, and reproducing the ideology, both in Althusserian and Hewittian way. By more, choreography was the materialization of the ideology. There was no other means or mechanism that would do better, given the features of the ideology that are inescapable. The way artists' stage the bodies will one way or the other mirror the system of ideologies they are working in and they are no two ways around it. For there is no escaping that in ideology we are all implicit in our complicities of how we consciously perform those ideologies and where they are performed by whom and with whom. Ideology cannot be escaped; not even by those who are supposedly working outside the frame, independently of it.

Works Cited

Althusser, Louis. *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation)* in *Mapping Ideology* Edited by Slavoj Žižek Verso, London New York

Althusser, Louis. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation)* Translated by Ben Brewster, Monthly Review Press 1971

Arendt, Hannah. *Between Past and Future: Six Exercises In Political Thoughts*, The Viking Press New York 1954

Barthes, Roland. *Image - Music -Text*, Translated by Stephen Heath, Hill & Wang 1977

Bleeker, Maaïke. "Theatre of/or Truth" in *Performance Paradigm 3: The End of Ethics? Performance, Politics and War*. (www.performanceparadigm.net)

Davis, Martha & Dianne Dulicai. *Hitler's Movement Signature*, The Dream Review 36, no. 2 (T134), summer 1982

Efron, David. *Gesture and culture*, The Hague Mouton Publisher 1970

Eisenstein, Sergei. *October*, Mosfilm Studios USSR 1927 99 min

Eisenstein, Sergei. *Film Form: Essay in Film Theory*, translated by Jay Leyda, Harcourt Publishers UK 1969

Fest Joachim C. *Hitler*, translated by Richard and Clara Winston, A Harvard/HBJ Book 1992

Hewitt, Andrew. *Social Choreography: Ideology As Performance In Dance And Everyday Movement*, Duke University Press, Durham and London 2005

Hoffmann, Hilmar. *The Triumph of Propaganda: Film and National Socialism 1933/1935*, Berghahn Books Providence Oxford 1997

Karina, Lillian and Marion Kant. *Hitler's Dancers: German Modern Dance and the Third Reich*, Berghahn Books New York & Oxford 2003

Kracauer, Siegfried. *The Mass Ornament*, Cambridge, Mass – London: Harvard University Press 1995

Kracauer, Siegfried. *From Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological History of the German Film*. Edited by Leonardo Quaresima, Princeton University 2004

Kershaw, Ian. *Hitler: A Biography*, W.W. Norton & Company, New York London 2008

Leyda Jay. & Zina Voynow. *Eisenstein At Work*, Pantheon Publishers, New York 1982

Müller, Ray. *Die Macht der Bilder: Leni Riefenstahl / The Wonderful Horrible Life of Leni Riefenstahl*, 1983 Omega Films and Nomad Films 189 min

Pristaš, Goran Sergej. *Andrew Hewitt: Choreography is a way of thinking about the relationship of aesthetics to politics*, Documenta 12 Magazine Project 2007, TkH generator <http://www.tkh-generator.net/en/openedsources/andrew-hewitt-choreography-a-way-thinking-about-relationship-aesthetics-politics-0>

Riefenstahl, Leni. *Triumph of the Will*, UFA Germany 1935 114 min

Riefenstahl, Leni. *Leni Riefenstahl*, Picador UK 1995

Sontag, Susan. *Fascinating Fascism*, Article in *New York Reviews of Books*, February 6 1975 and republished in *Under the Sign of the Sun* (New York 1980)

Žižek, Slavoj. *New Theory on Revolution* *Historical Materialism* (2000b:177) / (2002a:153)

Žižek, Slavoj. *Mapping Ideology* Verso, London New York

Bibliography / Literature

Al Jazeera, "Day of Revolt" January 25 2011 / Tahrir Square Protest /Egyptian Revolution (January through June 2011) <http://www.aljazeera.com/>

Badiou, Alain. *L'Hypothese communiste*, Paris : Lignes 2009

Bleeker, Maaïke. 'Step Inside' in *Visuality in the theatre: The Locus of Looking*. Palgrave 2008

Borradori, Giovanna. *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogue with Jürgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*, University of Chicago Press, 2003

Breasted, James Henry. *Dawn of Consciousness*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York 1933

Butler, Judith. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of The Performative*, Routledge New York & London 1997

Cvejic, Bojana. *To the end judgment by way of clarification...* "Inventory : Dance and Performance Congress / Live Act / Intervention / Publication" 3 – 5 March 2005 Tanzquartier Wien

Debord, Guy. *Society of the Spectacle*, Black & Red Detroit 1983

Eisenstein, Sergei. *Battleship Potemkin*, Mosfilm Studios USSR 1925 71 min

Eisenstein, Sergei. *The Film Sense*: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich UK 1969

Feral, Josette, *Theatricality: The Specificity of Theatrical Language*, In: *Substance* #98/99, Vol.31, 2&3, 2002 (Board of Regents, University of Wisconsin Press 2002)

France May 1968 Movement (Part-1)
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SlgJixhY3v0&feature=related>

Freud, Sigmund. *Moses And Monotheism*, Vintage Books 1939

Foucault, Michel. *What is Critique? The Political*, ed. D. Ingram Blackwell, Publishers 2002

Hallward, Peter. *Staging Equality : On Rancière Theatrocracy*, *New Left Review* Jan/Feb 2006

Hitler, Adolf. *Mein Kampf*, Verlag Franz Eher Nachfolger GmbH 1925/27

Kershaw, Baz. *The Radical in Performance: Between Brecht & Baudrillard* Routledge 1999

Lacan, Jacques. *The Other Side of Psychoanalysis* (Seminar Books XVII) New York, Norton 2007

Lehmann, Hans-Thies. *Postdramatic Theatre*. Routledge 2006

mai 68 images rares (part3) <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j1U1Y1puft0&feature=related>

Mills, Mary. *Poisoning Young Minds in Nazi Germany: Children & Propaganda in the Third Reich*, (Article Social Education / 1999 USA)

Nelson, Alan Richard, *A Chronology and Glossary of Propaganda in the United States* 1996

Paris Uprising May 1968, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tUJZgkhSCq8>

Rancière, Jacques. *The Aesthetic Revolution and Its Outcomes* New Left Review, mar/apr 2002 # 133

Rancière, Jacques. *The Emancipated Spectator* *Maska*, Vol 18 (2003), no 2-3

Rancière, Jacques. *The Future of The Image*, (Translated by Gregory Elliot) Verso 2009

Sennett, Richard. *The Fall of Public Man*, W.W Norton & Company, 1992

Willis, Susan. *Empire's Shadow*, New Left Review 22, July-August 2003

Žižek, Slavoj. *Living In The End of Times*, Verso 2011

APPENDIX

LIST OF MOVIES

Triumph of the Will

(Original German title: Triumph des Willens)

Directed by Leni Riefenstahl

Produced by Leni Riefenstahl

Written by Leni Riefenstahl and Walter Ruttmann

Starring Adolf Hitler, Herman Goring, Joseph Goebbels and other Nazi Leaders and 30.000 extras.

Music by Herbert Windt and Richard Wagner

Format: Black & White, full screen

Editing by Leni Riefenstahl

Distributed by Universum Film AG

Released on March 28, 1935

Running time: 114 minutes

Language: German

For this study the following copy on DVD has been used:

Leni Riefenstahl's Triumph of the Will, ASIN B00004WLXZ, Released by Studio Synapse, April 17, 2001, Los Angeles

October: Ten days that shook the world

(Original Russian title: Октябрь (Десять дней, которые потрясли мир))

Directed by Sergei Eisenstein

Produced by Sovkino

Written by Sergei Eisenstein and Grigori Aleksandrov

Starring Vladimir Popov, Vasili Nikandrov, Layaschenko

Music by Dimitri Shostakovich

Cinematography and editing by Vladimir Nilsen and Vladimir Popov

Format: Black & White, full screen

Distributed by Sovkino, 1927

Released on January 20, 1928

Running time: 99 minutes

Language: Silent film with Russian inter-texts

For this study the following copy on DVD has been used:

October by Sergei Eisenstein, MW2080, Released by Moskwood Media, Haarlem, 2007