'To think the home in terms of the factory': Social Reproduction, Postproduction and Home-Movies in Godard and Miéville

Elisa Adami and Alex Fletcher

'[R]econfiguring our image of society as an immense circuit of domestic plantations and assembly lines where the production of workers is articulated on a daily and generational basis'.[1]

In an article written for the French newspaper *Libération*, Jean-Luc Godard described his latest film, *Numéro deux* (*Number Two*) (1975), made in collaboration with his partner, the filmmaker Anne-Marie Miéville, as an attempt to 'think the home in terms of the factory'.[2] Drawing on theories of social reproduction, this essay explores how this metaphor plays itself out within *Numéro deux*, as well as Godard and Miéville's filmmaking practice more broadly, particularly in relation to the production methods that they developed in the 1970s. We focus on how the space of postproduction in film – briefly looking at the editing room as a historically gendered place of work – as well as the medium video is employed by Godard and Miéville as a means to challenge traditional notions of editing and authorship. We conclude with an interpretation of their work for television, particularly its strategy of amateurisation and its investment in the domestic, as well as their partnership more generally, as a form of 'home-movie'.

Numéro deux focuses on the domestic life of three generations of a working class family living in a social housing apartment somewhere (outside 'the city') in France. The film is

---

[1] Silvia Federici, 'The Reproduction of Labour Power in the Global Economy and the Unfinished Feminist Revolution', in *Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle*, PM Press, Brooklyn, New York, 2012, p 96

[2] Jean-Luc Godard, 'Penser la maison en termes d'usine' (To Think The Home in Terms of the Factory), *Libération*, September 15, 1975, in *Jean-Luc Godard par Jean-Luc Godard*, vol 1, Alain Bergala, ed, Cahiers du cinéma, Paris, 1998, pp 380–82

composed of discrete fragments in which the different members of the family are presented and observed in their everyday activities and kinship, with a detached, quasi-naturalistic gaze. As Robert Stam describes it, the film discards 'narrative drama…in favour of the close scrutiny of the everyday', representing 'a kind of ultimate banalization and proletarianization of what is conceivable as a cinematic subject'.[3] Yet, as Harun Farocki notes, its relentless focus on the 'ordinary', does not result in 'a conceptual minimalism, but rather an explosion of meaning'; we begin to see 'that even the most routine household activities and bodily functions are semantically dense'.[4] The matter of fact title of the film similarly signifies multiple determinations. On the one hand, it refers to its subject matter, woman – recalling Simone de Beauvoir's 1949 *The Second Sex* – and the recurring theme of anality and excrement; on the other, it refers to its formal and technological features. Shot on video, and then reshot in 35mm film while the images played on video monitors, two monitors can often be seen playing simultaneously within a single frame, as well as the images within monitors being split in two through superimposition. Doubling also appears in the oppositions that populate the film, such as film/television, sound/image, political/pornographic, factory/landscape, man/woman. Responding to her own question of whether the film is political or pornographic, Sandrine, the mother, asks 'Why is it either/or? It can be both sometimes', affirming the film's drive to undo binary oppositions for a more complicated account of relation and difference.[5] Furthermore, events repeat themselves, or 'happen partially', deferred for a later syntagmatic moment.[6] As Sandrine at one point comments, people always say 'Once upon a time', when they could as well say 'Twice upon a time'.

---

[3] Robert Stam, *Reflexivity in Film and Literature: From Don Quixote to Jean-Luc Godard*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1992, pp 222-23
[4] Kaja Silverman and Harun Farocki, *Speaking about Godard*, New York University Press, New York, 1998, p 141. There is a discernible affinity here in subject matter – if not in style – with another film released the same year: Chantal Akerman's *Jeanne Dielman, 23 Quai du Commerce, 1080 Bruxelles* (1975).
[5] Silverman and Farocki, *Speaking about Godard*, op cit, p 146
[6] Stam, *Reflexivity in Film and Literature*, op cit, p. 230.

Godard's remark that *Numéro deux* is an attempt 'to think the home in terms of the factory' introduces, for Michael Witt, a key notion in the film: that of 'seeing as' – to 'project a in terms of b' – which is the 'premise of all metaphor'.[7] Metaphorical sense is produced through a violation of a terms ordinary usage, which allows a new meaning to emerge. By bringing 'two things together', as Anne Carson notes, we see their 'incongruence' and 'also a new congruence, meanwhile continuing to recognize the previous incongruence through the new congruence'.[8] Metaphors, puns, and double-entendres appear throughout *Numéro deux*, such as in the intertitles, which are continuously transformed letter-by-letter – this is what the subtitle of the film, *Essais Titres* (*Test Titles*), presumably refers to. The principle metaphor is that of the factory, which has a range of applications in the film, and is initially brought out in Godard's opening monologue in his editing studio. He comments that the room, with its machines which need money from a producer to be put to work, is a kind of factory, and that he occupies both the role of a boss and a worker. His body too is a factory, a notion which appears later in relation to Sandrine and Pierre, her husband. Like a factory worker, their bodies go on strike: constipation, in the case of Sandrine, and impotence, in the case of Pierre. The house, Sandrine's site of work, becomes a factory in which mechanical failures accumulate: the toilet gets blocked and the washing machine breaks down. Marriage, as Stam adds, is seen as a 'co-production' and making love, Sandrine tells Pierre, is often a job. 'Childbearing is *re*production' Stam continues, 'while films are made by mechanical – and television programmes, electronic – reproduction'.[9]

In the same monologue Godard describes his interest in the operation of punning: a pun,

---

[7] Michael Witt, *On Communication: The Work of Anne-Marie Miéville and Jean-Luc Godard as 'Sonimage' from 1973 to 1979*, dissertation, University of Bath, 1998, p 180

[8] Anne Carson, *Eros the Bittersweet: An Essay*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1986, p 73

[9] Stam, *Reflexivity in Film and Literature*, op cit, p. 223. For a reading of the prominence of machines and bodies in terms of Deleuze and Guattari's notion of 'desiring machines', taken from their 1972 book *Anti-Oedipus*, see Douglas Morrey, *Jean-Luc Godard*, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2005.

he says, is 'a word that slides on a thing' and 'shows short-circuits' and 'interference'. Or as Carson defines it, in a pun you 'perceive homophony and at the same time see the semantic space that separates the two words. Sameness is projected onto difference in a kind of stereoscopy'.[10] Metaphorical production is played out audio-visually in *Numéro deux*, as a method for projecting ways of *seeing* and *hearing* connections between spheres and spaces usually perceived as separate. As Witt argues, however, this projection is not one way, but 'bi-directional', setting the 'heterogeneous material with which it comes into contact', in tension with it and challenging the 'assumptions of each as premise'.[11] This metaphorical mixing of modes, or what Paul de Man refers to as catachresis, consequently disrupts any epistemological notions of representation not disfigured by rhetorical tropes.[12] This is particularly significant for problem of sexual difference in *Numéro deux*. As Constance Penley contends, 'conceptions of bodies and sexes are necessarily metaphorical, that is, always seen in terms of something else'.[13] There is, she says, no 'non-metaphorical representation' of the sexual difference, or the body, which results not from 'biology', but ' 'the subjects positioning in language and culture'.[14] Godard's monologue on the leitmotifs of work and production is followed by an intertitle: REPRODUCTION. We then cut to two video screens: on the right a football match, and on the left, a cramped household scene with grandparents, father and child. As David Sterrit puts it, reproduction 'has obviously taken place in this family – that is how families are made!'.[15] Reproduction now establishes itself as one of the film's subjects.

---

[10] Carson, *Eros the Bittersweet*, op cit, p 34
[11] Witt, *On Communication*, op cit, p 178
[12] Paul de Man, 'The Epistemology of Metaphor', *Critical Inquiry*, vol 5, no 1, Autumn 1978, p 13, p 22
[13] Constance Penley, 'Les Enfants de la Patrie', *Camera Obscura*, 8-10, Fall 1982, p 50. In Butlerian terms, gender is the cultural interpretation of sex, which becomes naturalised and made to appear as if biological. See Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, Routledge, London and New York, 1990.
[14] Ibid, p 50
[15] David Sterritt, *The Films of Jean-Luc Godard: Seeing the Invisible*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999, pp 137-38

Social Reproduction/

For Laura Mulvey, *Numéro deux* is Godard's 'most thorough and self-conscious attempt to depict the problem of sexuality under capitalism', and marks 'a crucial shift in terms of Godard's presentation of sexuality' more generally, in that the problem of sexuality is no longer '*wholly* signified by a woman' – male sexuality is investigated not only as that which 'turns woman into an image of its desire', but is also posited as 'the repression of homosexuality'.[16] As she argues, with the exception of Godard and Jean-Pierre Gorin's *Tout va bien* (*Everything is Fine*) (1972) – their last completed feature, working under the name of the Dziga Vertov Group – previous attempts to portray women often tended to confine their concerns to the sexual or marital, excluding them from the economic, except in terms of 'managing' consumption – for example, Godard's 1966 film *Deux ou trois choses que je sais d'elle* (*Two or Three Things I Know About Her*).[17] In Godard and Gorin's *British Sounds* (1969), for instance, the space of the factory and the home remain discrete, with their own separate discourses to go with them: over images of a noisy car factory, the voice reads lines from *The Communist Manifesto* and in the silent interior of a suburban house, in which a naked woman moves from room to room, we hear lines from a feminist essay by Sheila Rowbotham.[18] What is elided here, as Mulvey contends, is 'the evident fact that the contrast with labour in factory production would, in the home, be domestic labour, that of wife and mother as producer and reproducer of labour-power, with the all-too strident noises that accompany it'.[19]

---

[16] Laura Mulvey, 'Images of Woman, Images of Sexuality', in *Godard: Images, Sounds, Politics*, Colin MacCabe, ed, BFI, London, 1980, pp 95, 97-98

[17] Ibid, p 94.

[18] We could contrast this with a scene in *Numéro deux* in which the character of the grandmother performs housework in silence, while her voice-over reads passages from Germaine Greer's 1970 book *The Female Eunuch*. The silence here, however, is in marked contrast with the strident noises that populate the rest of the film, and serves as an emblem of her marginality, particularly in relation to the talkative grandfather, with his numerous stories.

[19] Mulvey, 'Images of Woman, Images of Sexuality', op cit, p 87

It was notably with Marxist feminists in Italy in the 1970s, rather than within the Anglophone or French contexts, that social reproduction emerged as a key concept for grasping certain forms of gendered domination in their historical under capitalism.[20] Whereas *Operaismo* [workerism] argued that more and more activities that were once considered extra-economic had become subsumed by what they termed the 'social factory', thinkers such as Leopoldina Fortunati, Mariarosa Della Costa and Silvia Federici revealed the central role of the home and the unpaid labour performed by women in producing and reproducing workers, or their labour-power.[21] As Federici recounts,

> 'to us, it was immediately clear that the circuit of capitalist production, and the "social factory" it produced, began and was centred above all in the kitchen, the bedroom, the home – insofar as these were the centres for the production of labour-power'.[22]

In the transition from feudalism to capitalism, as Federici demonstrates in *Caliban and the Witch*, 'a new patriarchal order was constructed', categorizing women as a type of natural commons, 'as their work was defined as a natural resource, laying outside the sphere of market relations'.[23] This naturalisation of, what Silverman terms, 'the so-called "separate spheres" of man's and woman's labour', is exemplified in a scene in which Pierre explains to his daughter, Vanessa, why he finds it 'impossible' to help Sandrine with the washing. For her, he says, it's 'automatic'; 'It's the factory for her. For me, it's home'.[24]

In a later scene, we see Pierre assisting Sandrine with the dishes, while she explains her reasons for leaving a briefly-held job, going on to enumerate her obligations as housewife

---

[20] Endnotes, 'The Logic of Gender', *Endnotes*, 3, September, 2013, p. 57

[21] The term 'social factory' came out of Italian Marxism in the early 1960s, particularly the work of Raniero Panzieri and Mario Tronti, in the journal *Quaderni Rossi*. In the early 1970s Mariarosa Dalla Costa and Selma James founded the International Wages for Housework Campaign – connected to the group *Lotta Femminista* – who developed a critique of *Operaismo* based on the *political* demand that women's work should be acknowledged through a wage.

[22] Federici, 'Introduction', *Revolution At Point Zero*, op cit, pp 7-8

[23] Federici, *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation*, Autonomedia, Brooklyn, 2004, p 97. The book develops on research began in the mid-1970s in collaboration with Fortunati and published in Italy in 1984 under the title *Il Grande Calibano*.

[24] Silverman and Farocki, *Speaking About Godard*, op cit, p. 162. Pierre's 'psychic intractability' is linked to male desire; 'not wanting to see her dirty panties', as he puts it.

and mother. 'There's too much…yet not enough', she concludes, recognising the social limits and constraints put upon her. We then cut to a shot containing two monitors: the left portrays the grandmother cleaning the floor and the right Sandrine performing fellatio – 'women's work' as Silverman notes.[25] In a voice-over, Sandrine describes her labour in terms of producing at a loss, asking 'Who was profiting?', answering her own question with, 'not him…someone behind', and then 'something between us', which she names 'work'. Sandrine generates the metaphor for producing at a loss in order to understand her own peculiar form of production, housework (and sex work), in which her products are used rather than exchanged, and therefore not directly visible.[26] In her 1981 *The Arcane of Reproduction*, Leopoldina Fortunati attempted to show how this elusive activity of 'indirectly waged reproductive work' constitutes a disavowed necessity for capitalist value production, which is nonetheless 'posited as "natural" production', *appearing*, as she says, 'as the creation of *non-value'* (emphasis in the original).[27] Despite the 'seeming separation' of production and reproduction, or 'value/non-value', this appearance, for Fortunati, is based on their 'indissoluble connection', which is not simply ideological, but structural.[28] That is, under capitalism (or the value form), we structurally and practically perform this separation between value/non-value, or productive and unproductive labour.[29] While some Autonomist Marxist feminists argue that 'every activity which reproduces labour-power produces value', it is therefore more precise to say, as Endnotes do, that 'for labour-power

---

[25] Ibid, p 164

[26] Ibid, p 164. As Dave Beech explains, insofar 'as workers appear as use values to capitalists, mothers can be said to produce use values'. Dave Beech, *Art and Value: Art's Economic Exceptionalism in Classical, Neoclassical and Marxist Economics*, Brill, Boston, 2015, pp 323-24.

[27] Leopoldina Fortunati, *The Arcane of Reproduction: Housework, Prostitution, Labour and Capital*, Hilary Creek, trans, Autonomedia, Brooklyn, New York, 1995, pp 69, 8. For an excellent exposition of the book, see Maya Gonzales, 'The Gendered Circuit: Reading *The Arcane of Reproduction*', *Viewpoint Magazine*, issue 3, 2013: https://viewpointmag.com/2013/09/28/the-gendered-circuit-reading-the-arcane-of-reproduction/

[28] Ibid, p 8

[29] As Beech argues, the 'deconstruction' of Marx's 'distinction between productive and unproductive labour cannot be achieved by claiming that certain practices are productive of something'. Marx's distinction 'refers exclusively to the production of profit'. Beech, *Art and Value*, op cit, p 324.

to have a value, some of these activities have to be cut off or dissociated from the sphere of value production'.[30] Or as Jason W. Moore puts it, we are 'captive to capitalism's either/or organization of reality': 'Value does not work unless most *work* is not valued'.[31]

For Fortunati, 'the sexual division of labour' takes a spatial form in the place of the home, 'seen' as 'a "mode of production" in itself', 'a non-capitalist "island" existing in the heart of capital'.[32] A more generic idea of nature as a place lying outside the social, transpires in a recurring formula in *Numéro deux*, initially spoken by the children near the beginning of the film. 'There was a landscape, and we put a factory in it', Nicholas, the boy states, to which Vanessa responds, 'There was a factory, and we put a landscape around it' – a variation of this statement occurs in relation to whether the children think their parents are a factory or a landscape. One way to make sense of Vanessa's enigmatic retort, is to read it together with Henri Lefebvre's *The Production of Space* (1974).[33] For Lefebvre, space is not a neutral medium, which capital occupies through the site of the factory, for instance; space is what capital produces, reproduces, and transforms. Forms of production and patterns of consumption shape *social* space, as well organizing what appears as *non-social* – from the island of the home to the rural landscape.[34] Pierre seems to convey this idea in an aphoristic remark: 'In fact, there isn't one factory and one landscape. The two are one'. As Doreen Massey notes, many readers are blind to a central argument that Lefebvre makes concerning 'space's gendering and its implicit but forceful sexuality'.[35] Lefebvre defines spatial abstraction in capitalist modernity as a type of 'castration': 'Over abstract space reigns

[30] Endnotes, 'The Logic of Gender', op cit, p 62

[31] Jason W. Moore, *Capitalism and the Web of Life: Ecology and the Accumulation of Capital*, Verso, London and New York, 2015, pp 2, 54.

[32] Fortunati, *The Arcane of Reproduction*, op cit, pp 13, 8. For the distinction between 'spheres' and 'space', see Endnotes, 'The Logic of Gender', op cit, p. 57.

[33] Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, Donald Nicholson-Smith, trans, Blackwell, Oxford, 1991

[34] For a Lefebvrian account of the way landscape photography is transformed by spatial abstraction, see John Roberts, *Photography and Its Violations*, Columbia University Press, New York, 2014, pp 120-45.

[35] Doreen Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender*, Polity, Cambridge, 1994, pp 183-84

phallic solitude and the self-destruction of desire'.[36] The most evident aspects of this 'joint control of spatiality and identity', for Massey, is the distinction between public and private, particularly the '*spatial separation* of home and workplace'.[37] The construction of 'home' as 'a woman's place' is, therefore, one example in which space is articulated through the 'mutual accommodation' of capitalism and patriarchy.[38] Correspondingly, the 'limits of women's mobility' is framed, in *Numéro deux*, as a 'rigid division between inside and outside', with the camera echoing Sandrine's 'imprisonment', by 'never moving outside the confines of the flat' – the apartment is glimpsed only once from the exterior, at a distance, in a monitor near the beginning of the film, functioning as a countershot to a monitor with the children on the balcony.[39] The division of interior/exterior as one of sexual difference is manifested in a repeated scene shot from the balcony of the apartment, in which successive shots of Pierre leaving for and returning from work are superimposed over an image of Sandrine lying asleep in bed.[40] In Mulvey's interpretation, the 'bed evokes a space more intimate yet more confined, the cosiness of the home inside the prison block, but at the same time takes us back to essential associations between woman and sexuality'.[41]

In an attempt to portray the complex entanglement of economic, social and spatial relations, *Numéro deux* constructs a series of *spatial* montage techniques – the aforementioned doubling of video monitors and the layering of images within the single screen. As Amie Siegel writes, the film '*enacts* the housing block' in which it is set, 'placing individual scenes as simultaneous architecture within the frame', with the shots or

---

[36] Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, op cit, p 309. Lefebvre, in the same passage, refers to this as a process of 'metaphorization', whereby 'the image of the woman supplants the woman herself'.
[37] Massey, *Space, Place and Gender*, op cit, p 179
[38] Ibid, p 180
[39] Mulvey, 'Images of Woman, Images of Sexuality', op cit, p 96. The apartment and consumer goods it contains, as Mulvey notes, recalls the post war development of capitalism documented in previous films by Godard, which there 'stood for *embougeoisement*', but now stands for 'the basic subsistence of working-class life'. Ibid, p 95
[40] In another scene, we also see Sandrine returning from a failed job search and encountering a woman campaigner whom she declines to engage with.
[41] Mulvey, 'Images of Woman, Images of Sexuality', op cit, pp 95-96

tableaux mirroring the 'communal and isolated, connected and distant' relations of the

building, as well as the 'apart and together' experience of 'familial proximity'.[42] Farocki

characterises the use of this doubling as 'soft montage', since 'what is at issue is a general

relatedness, rather than a strict opposition or equation'. The film, he argues, 'does not

predetermine how the two images are to be connected; we must build up the associations

ourselves in an ongoing way as the film unfolds'.[43] To borrow Yvonne Rainer's phrase, the

film proceeds by a logic of 'accretion'.[44] By accreting a series of audio-visual fragments,

Godard and Miéville compel us to consider what Lefebvre termed the 'ambiguous

continuity' between spheres and spaces that appear as separate, as well as the divergence

that is revealed in such moments of connection.[45] Moreover, as Fortunati, Massey and

others remind us, the film indicates how these spheres are articulated with and articulations

of gender. For Mulvey, a central question raised by *Numéro deux* is the possibility of

representing or narrating the dynamic processes and abstract relations that over-determine

our everyday lives.[46] The fact that the factory is never *seen* in the film, and that the monitors

are mostly framed by a disproportionately large void of empty black space, suggests what

Louis Althusser in a 1966 essay terms 'the *determinate absence* which governs' and

'*informs*' our 'concrete', lived relations.[47] This absence is not simply 'off-screen' – the

factory from which Pierre returns every evening – but the impersonal and intangible

[42] Amie Siegel, 'Factories and the Factory', in *A Companion to Jean-Luc Godard*, Tom Conley and T Jefferson Kline, ed, John Wiley and Sons Inc, Malden, MA, 2014, p 355

[43] Silverman and Farocki, *Speaking about Godard*, op cit, p 142. In his 2002 essay 'Cross Influence/Soft Montage', Farocki described his point of departure for *Interface* (1995), his first installation using double-projection, as deriving from *Numéro deux*. See *Harun Farocki: Against What? Against Whom?*, Antje Ehmann and Kodwo Eshun, ed, Koenig books, London, 2009, p 72.

[44] This phrase is borrowed from an intertitle appearing in her 1974 film, *Film About a Woman Who…*, which reads 'An emotional accretion in 48 steps'. For the script, see *The Films of Yvonne Rainer*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1989, p 82.

[45] Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, op cit, p 87

[46] Mulvey, 'Images of Woman, Images of Sexuality', op cit, p 100

[47] Louis Althusser, 'Cremonini, Painter of the Abstract', *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, Ben Brewster, trans, Monthly Review Press, New York and London, 1971, p 237. For an account of the influence of Althusser on Godard and Miéville see Witt, *On Communication*, op cit, pp 21-29.

relations of what Sandrine refers to as 'the State', and then, 'the social system'.[48] As Althusser argues, the system '*as a structure*', 'can never be depicted by its presence, *in person*, positively, in relief'; we can merely 'paint' the 'visible connexions' of its 'traces and effects'.[49] Music in the film becomes another alternative to the failure of vision, for experiencing, or hearing, what both the Grandfather and Sandrine term, 'to see the unbelievable', which Sandrine defines as 'what you don't see'.[50] The question then, is not merely 'how those relations are caught in the image', as Mulvey asks, but how they emerge in the connections *between* images, as well as text, sound, music, and voice-over.[51] It is the sphere of postproduction, and the place of the editing room in particular, where such connections occur, and to which we now turn.

Postproduction

Numéro deux is the first work to be realised by Godard and Miéville with their production company Sonimage (discussed below). Made a year after *Ici et ailleurs* (*Here and Elsewhere*) (1976) was completed, but a year before it was released, what unites these and subsequent projects by the two filmmakers is an experimental use of video technology and 'the dual emphasis on subjectivity and production'.[52] Although Godard had experimented with video prior to his collaboration with Miéville, *Ici et ailleurs* marks a significant step in their sustained exploration of the medium.[53] Video, as Witt observes,

[48] For an extensive theoretical exploration of the (im)possibilities of 'representing' capital in contemporary art and popular culture, see Alberto Toscano and Jeff Kinkle, *Cartographies of the Absolute*, Zero Books, 2015.
[49] Althusser, 'Cremonini, Painter of the Abstract', op cit, p 237. State functionaries, like all individuals, for Althusser, on a significantly simplified reading, are merely the '*Träger*', 'supports', or 'bearers', of the system. See Louis Althusser and Étienne Balibar, *Reading Capital*, Ben Brewster, trans, Verso, London, 1970.
[50] Music is mostly used to intimate the psychic interior space and feelings of individual family members, which is sometimes faded in and out in, an often discordant, non-diegetic manner, or is heard through Pierre's circulating pair of headphones which family members secretly borrow.
[51] Mulvey, 'Images of Woman, Images of Sexuality', op cit, p 101
[52] Colin MacCabe, 'Godard since '68', in *Godard: Image, Sounds, Politics*, op cit, p 23
[53] Michael Witt, *Jean-Luc Godard, Cinema Historian*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 2013, p 45. This exploration, as the book details, can be seen as a series of experimental investigations leading

offered a technical means for 'conducting comparative visual research', since it allowed the 'fluid, quasi-musical passage to and fro between different moments', 'that is more difficult and time consuming to achieve in 35mm'.[54] The idea of doubling the image in *Numéro deux*, Farocki infers, must have came to Godard and Miéville from working with video editing technology, which 'is usually done while sitting in front of two monitors', so that the editor 'becomes accustomed to thinking of two images at the same time, rather than sequentially'.[55] As both Witt and Farocki highlight, video gave Godard and Miéville the possibility to *formally* actualize the metaphoric processes articulated in *Numéro deux*, in the guise of a comparative audio-visual thinking, or what Witt refers to as 'videographic thinking'.[56] Video is not employed mechanically 'as a tool for processing and connecting images and sounds', but is rather treated as an instrument of thought, 'presenting the process and effects of the comparison' for further reflection.[57]

Commenting on *Ici et ailluers*, Gilles Deleuze identifies the primary place of the 'interstice' in the associational logic of the film, with the emphasis on 'difference' providing a space for 'resemblance to be graded'.[58] Quoting the film, Deleuze states that it ceases to be 'an uninterrupted chain of images each one the slave of the next', and instead becomes 'the method of BETWEEN' – between 'two actions…two affections…two visual images…two sound images'. This mode of linkage is construed by Deleuze as 'the method of AND', 'this and then that'. Indeed, this primacy of the 'and' (*et*) appears in *Ici et ailleurs* in the form of image, figured, for instance, as expanding electronic text on a screen, or a sculptural model lit from different angles. Deleuze latches on to the grammatical form of the

---

up to Godard's cinema history series *Histoire(s) du cinéma* (1988-1998).
[54] Ibid, p 54
[55] Silverman and Farocki, *Speaking about Godard*, op cit, p 142
[56] Witt, *Jean-Luc Godard, Cinema Historian*, op cit, p 52
[57] Ibid, pp, 52-53. As Witt adds, a 'simple technique' used as 'a tool for visual thinking' was 'videographic superimposition', which allowed for 'the creation of composite images through montage *within* the frame'. This technique is especially present in Godard and Miéville's film *Comment ça va* (How is it going?) (1978). Ibid, p 53.
[58] Gilles Deleuze, *Cinema 2: The Time Image*, Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta, trans, Athlone, London, 1989, p 180

conjunction AND, in order to emphasize the disjunctive aspect that is retained in the film's method of joining, or synthesis.[59] Jacques Ranciere, in discussing Godard's *Histoire(s) du cinéma*, which is nonetheless applicable, refers to this 'sentence-image' grammar, as the method of parataxis.[60] As a poetic form, parataxis describes a fragmentary mode of transition, which undermines subordination to hypotactic logic: conjunctions such as 'therefore'.[61] Akin to Farocki's notion of 'soft montage', parataxis gives an integrity or self-sufficiency to compositional elements, while leaving their connection open for the reader or viewer. The conjunction in the film's title refers to the 'here' of France, which is put in relation to the 'elsewhere' of the of Palestine. The film developed out of an uncompleted film project by the Dziga Vertov Group, entitled *Jusqu'à la victoire* (*Until Victory*), which documented, in a propagandistic and triumphant manner, the future return of the Palestinians to their homeland. Four years later, *Ici et ailleurs* reworks the ten hours of rushes shot in Lebanon, Syria and Jordan, scrutinizing and deconstructing the footage and the film's ambitions. Working with video technology in postproduction, Godard and Miéville carefully endeavor to recover the *voices* captured in the images that had been drowned in the impulsive superimposition of the filmmakers (this is figured especially in the technique of video superimposition in the film). Miéville recounts that she and Godard spent every day for a year and a half organizing and editing the material.[62] Images of the elsewhere of Palestine are set in tension with here of France, via the domestic family setting in which the television set becomes key for how individuals receive and consume such

[59] This is what, elsewhere, Deleuze terms a 'disjunctive synthesis'. See Gilles Deleuze, *The Logic of Sense*, Mark Lester and Charles Stivale, trans, Athlone, London, 1990.
[60] Jacques Rancière, *The Future of the Image*, Gregory Elliot, trans, Verso, London and New York, 2007, pp 43-51
[61] For a philosophical account of parataxis, see Theodor W. Adorno, 'Parataxis', in *Notes to Literature*, vol 2, Shierry Weber Nicholsen, trans, Columbia University Press, New York, 1992, pp 109-49.
[62] Witt, 'On and UNDER Communication', in *A Companion to Jean-Luc Godard* op cit, p 320

images. Postproduction in *Ici et allieurs*, as in their subsequent works, thus becomes a central space for self-interrogating and reflecting on their production methods. [63]

In his opening monologue in *Numéro deux*, Godard implicitly puts into dialogue the home and the editing studio, two spaces typically seen as separate from production proper, by thinking both in terms of the factory. Although not explicitly stated, we could argue that the separation of the reproductive labour of the home from that of the factory, is approximated in the conception of editing as a minor and structurally distinct role in *film* production. Indeed, as the history of editing attests, postproduction has not only been conceived as something temporally secondary to production, but as something second-class.[64] Historically, as Timothy Barnard notes, editors were conceived as 'lowly cutters', and their work, therefore, has seen 'near invisibility in film history'.[65] Moreover, as Barnard writes, this work was often performed by women, since 'cutting was one of the few jobs in the classical film industry deemed menial and insignificant enough to be entrusted to a woman', whose main role was 'to parcel out the images in accordance with the shooting script'.[66] Even in the Soviet film industry of the 1920s, where editing was perceived not only as hack-work, but also as an art, we can see the gendering of this practice, as well as the privileging of production, most famously embodied in the title of Dziga Vertov's *Man with a Movie Camera* (1929).[67] As Barnard quips, 'Vertov's masterpiece was not called

---

[63] In an early article from 1956, entitled 'Montage, my fine care', Godard argues that invention and 'improvisation takes place in front of the moviola just as much as it does on the set'. In *Godard on Godard*, Jean Narboni and Tom Milne, ed, Da Capo Press, New York and London, 1972, p 40. For an excellent account of editing in Godard, and its connection to thought, see Volker Patenburg, *Farocki/Godard: Film As Theory*, Michael Turnbull, trans, Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, 2015.

[64] For a similar argument, although primarily focusing on digital postproduction, and connecting it to debates around immaterial labour, see Hito Steyerl 'Cut! Reproduction and Recombination', in *The Wretched of the Screen*, e-flux journal and Sternberg Press, pp 176-90.

[65] Timothy Barnard, *Découpage*, Caboose, Montreal, 2014, pp 15-16. Barnard argues that 'the term editor only really took hold amongst cutters with the founding of the Society of Motion Picture Editors in 1937, when they adopted it in the hope of parlaying the lofty term into higher pay'.

[66] Ibid, p 15. Famous women film editors working in Hollywood in the early days of cinema include Anne Bauchens, Margaret Booth, Dorothy Spencer, and Barbara MacLean.

[67] As the credits of *Man with a Movie Camera* express, the factory-like hierarchy goes: 'Author-supervisor experimenter: Dziga Vertov', 'Chief Operator Mikhail Kaufman', 'Assistant Editor: E.

"Man with a Moviola", after all'.[68] That the person who was sitting at the editing table was a woman, Vertov's partner and collaborator Yelizaveta Svilova, is telling. Another pioneer of Soviet film editing, and the inventor, as Jay Leyda argues, of what came to be known as the 'compilation film', was that of Esfir Shub.[69] Shub's mastering of montage came out of her experience working at the state film production body Goskino (later Sovkino), where she worked as an editor, in charge of titling and re-editing imported foreign films for domestic distribution, rendering these films 'suitable' for Soviet audiences. In her first film, *The Fall of the Romanov Dynasty* (1927), Shub uses preexisting film footage, such as newsreels of official parades and Romanov home-movies, to critically reflect on historical events leading up to the Russian revolution. Shub's commitment to intentionally minimizing her authorial presence, in which evaluation and interpretation is articulated through a more subtle building up of the whole, comes across in the only credit in the film and film's poster: 'Work by E.I. Shub'.[70] As Martin Stollerey contends, 'it is historically significant that it was a woman who pioneered' a genre 'based upon a repudiation of established notions of authorship'.[71]

In the 1960s and '70s political filmmakers and critics drew on Walter Benjamin's Brechtian notion of 'The Author as Producer', in order to align their art 'with work rather than inspiration or creation', relegating 'the artist to the status of a labourer', and allowing 'for a more collective...notion of the conditions under which an artwork comes to be'.[72]

Svilova'. For an account of work and art of editing and re-editing in Soviet film culture in 1920s see Yuri Tsivian, 'The Wise and Wicked Game: Re-editing and Soviet Film Culture of the 1920s', *Film History*, vol 8, no 3, 1996, pp 327-43.

[68] Barnard, *Découpage*, op cit, p 16

[69] See Jay Leyda, *Films Beget Films*, Hill and Wang, New York, 1971; Esther Leslie, 'Art, Documentary and the Essay Film', *Radical Philosophy* 192, July/Aug 2015, pp 7-14.

[70] Leyda, *Films Beget Films*, op cit, p. 25.

[71] Martin Stollery, 'Eisenstein, Shub and the Gender of the Author as Producer', *Film History*, vol 14, no 1, 2002, p 96. Shub's investment in editing, as Stollerey points out, appears less voluntary and more of a creative resort in face of a gender-based exclusion from pursuing film directing.

[72] Silverman, 'The Author as Receiver', *October* 96, 2001 p 27. Walter Benjamin, 'The Author as Producer', in *Understanding Brecht*, Anna Bostock, trans, Verso, London, 1973, pp 85-103. For an example of 1970s Brechtian film theory see in *Screen*, in particular, issue 15,2, Summer 1974.

Although typically associated with the idea of the director-centred approach of the *auteur*, connected with the journal *Cahiers du cinema*, Godard could be said, even in his earliest films, as Silverman contends, 'to be working toward authorial divestiture'.[73] This deconstruction of the author clearly took a much more 'sustained and self-conscious' form during his Dziga Vertov Group period. Formed in 1968 – the year of the publication of Roland Barthes's *Death of the Author* – the quasi-anonymous group, as Witt puts it, constituted a 'concrete demonstration of the Structuralist challenge to authorship', which continued with his collaboration with Miéville.[74]. For Silverman, *Numéro deux* 'represents an even more concerted attempt at authorial divestiture', in the way that the film is *produced* with not only Miéville, but also the actors.[75] As she writes, the categories 'direction' and 'writing' are replaced by the 'much more labour-significant "production", which is credited not to one, but four names'.[76] As the credits, recited by Sandrine, state: *Numéro deux* is 'a film produced by A.-M. Miéville and J.-L. Godard, with S. Battistella, P. Oudry and Others'. In a scene towards the end of the film Godard, slumped over a recording console, listens to Sandrine, whose voice has come to take on a meta-critical function, challenging the male director as an originator of discourse. 'The heroic creator', as Farocki comments, has 'become a simple conductor of prerecorded music', or what Silverman terms the author as *receiver*.[77] In this last segment, abandoning her character-role, Sandrine the actress argues that 'Letting others tell you news about yourself is a crime', and, pointing to the presumption of filmmakers to speak not only for their subjects, but their audience,

---

[73] Silverman, 'The Author as Receiver', op cit, p 20-21.
[74] Witt, *On Communication*, op cit, p 7. The fact that Miéville's role is often obscured by critics who commonly conflate their co-productions with the proper name of Jean-Luc Godard, as well as failing to recognise the centrality of her work and influence, often as a co-writer and co-editor, on his other 'singularly authored' features, is emblematic of traditional (Gorin often also suffered the same fate) as well as gendered preconceptions of authorship already discussed. See Jerry White, *Two bicycles: The Work of Jean-Luc Godard and Anne-Marie Miéville*, Wilfrid Laurier University Press, Waterloo, Ontario, 2013.
[75] Silverman, 'The Author as Receiver', op cit, p 21
[76] Silverman and Farocki, *Speaking about Godard* , op cit, p 145
[77] Ibid, p 169

continues, 'We go to the movies. We buy a ticket. We sell our role as producers in exchange'. Here instead Sandrine speaks for herself, articulating her position as woman and worker.[78]

Conclusion: Home Movies

In a 1973 interview, published in *Cinéma Pratique*, Godard remarked 'that the real "political" film' that he would like to make, would be 'a home-movie', because, for him, it is a mode of filmmaking that represents 'the popular base of cinema'.[79] Although the films that followed this pronouncement, such as *Numéro deux*, are not home-movies in the strict sense – which are, or used to be, as Godard says, made to be shown to other family members (such as the Romonov home-movies that Shub appropriated for her film) – the genre category is nonetheless useful for thinking about the work and production methods Godard and Miéville went on to pursue.[80] Soon after this statement was made, Godard and Miéville left Paris and established their company, Sonimage: an experimental studio-laboratory in Grenoble, in the French Alps, moving it to Rolle, in Switzerland, in 1977.[81] The initial idea behind this move, as MacCabe writes, 'was to work against the whole process of economic, political and cultural centralization', embodied, for Godard, in the

---

[78] This question of speaking for others is discussed by Godard in an interview from 1972, concerning *Tout va Bien*. In it, he questions workers documentaries that think they can 'listen directly' to people who 'have been denied a voice for so long' and filmmakers who think they 'can be of use to them with no problem'. We can see a parallel with such filmic concerns in the debates around the method and purpose of a 'workers' inquiry' that took place in Italian Marxism in the 1960s and '70s, particularly those who argued that it needed to be a workers' *self*-inquiry. See Asad Haider and Salar Mohandesi, 'Workers' Inquiry: A Genealogy', *Viewpoint Magazine*, issue 3, 2013: https://viewpointmag.com/2013/09/27/workers-inquiry-a-genealogy/

[79] Quoted in MacCabe, 'Godard Since '68', op cit, p 23

[80] The Internet and digital sharing culture, and online platforms such as youtube, has clearly transformed the idea of a home-movie, and amateur film more generally, being confined to a future audience consisting of *only* family and friends.

[81] White, in a slightly odd, yet nonetheless intriguing comparison, connects the idea of the home-movie in Godard and Miéville with that of Stan Brakhage. Both, as he points out, moved to the countryside (Brakhage, in the US, to the Rock Mountains) in order to practice small-scale production, and both shared a preoccupation with the domestic. White, *Two Bicycles*, op cit, p 31.

city of Paris.[82] Godard's antagonistic relation to the overly centralized film industry is manifested in his monologue in *Numéro deux* when he claims that his studio, away from the city, 'is a factory', but one that is different from the others such as Fox, Metro, Mosfilm and other big multinational companies. 'We have taken power' he quips.

The process of 'decentralization', combined with the use of video technology, made it possible, for Godard and Miéville 'to work collaboratively with small production teams'.[83] As Farocki says, the intimacy and physically confined nature of a film like *Numéro deux,* would have been difficult to achieve in 35mm, a technology that 'usually requires a large crew'. [84] Employing video meant that they 'only needed a crew of three', resulting in a lack of invasiveness that Farocki deems 'very close to a home-movie'. What is distinctive about video in comparison to its home-movie antecedents, such as 16mm and 8mm film, is not its handicraft format, but rather the fact that the 'independent videomaker or home consumer has been relieved of certain mediating contingencies – material, temporal – that separate shooting from viewing'.[85] The 'immediacy' of video, as Witt observes, significantly 'democratized the filmmaking process', for Godard, in that it 'facilitated dialogue, and helped to dissolve the divisions and hierarchies between the various technical roles'.[86] A contributing factor is the fact that the 'video image can not only be viewed by the entire crew as it is recorded, but can also be immediately reviewed and subjected to collective discussion', which 'resulted in significantly different and generally much smoother working relations' in making *Numéro deux* .[87]

Godard's employment of video and his conception of the home movie as representing a democratic or popular form of film-making can be seen to converge with the notion of

[82] MacCabe, 'Godard since '68', op cit, p 23
[83] Witt, 'On and Under Communication', op cit, p 319
[84] Silverman and Farocki, *Speaking About Godard*, op cit, p 142
[85] Michael Renov, 'Video Confessions', in *The Subject of Documentary*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 2004, p 198
[86] Witt, 'On and Under Communication', op cit, p 325
[87] Ibid, p 325

'deskilling' in twentieth-century art history and the numerous artistic endeavours to eliminate ideas of 'competence', based on a normative criteria of artistic skill, from the 'horizon of both artistic production and aesthetic evaluation'.[88] To identify with the home-movie, is to identify with the amateur, in order to challenge both the hierarchy of artistic skill and the limited catalogue of subjects deemed legitimate for art-making.[89] Home-movies could be said to be the 'popular base of cinema', in the way that, as John Roberts shows in discussing the relationship of popular forms of photography to art, its 'deflationary logic…hides a genuine democratizing impulse, an impulse that continually reconfigures itself in art and culture as a return of the repressed'.[90] This 'strategy', of what Witt calls 'deprofessionalization and amateaurization' can be seen in Godard and Miéville's first television series, *Six fois Deux (Sur et sous la communication)* (*Six Times Two* [*On and Under Communication*]) (1976).[91] The series consists of six pairs of episodes, around 50 minutes in length, that were broadcast on French television on consecutive Sunday evenings. It generally features long and unstructured interviews with various people, mostly unknown, as well experimental visual-essays, using devices such as a video pen to write electronically over images or empty screen, much like writing on a blackboard.[92] Godard and Miéville refer to this process in one episode as wanting 'to show

---

[88] See Hal Foster et al, eds, *Art since 1900: Modernism, Antimodernism, Postmodernism*, Thames & Hudson, London, 2011, p 531. For an art theoretical account of the concept of deskilling, see John Roberts, *The Intangibilities of Form: Skill and Deskilling in Art After the Readymade*, Verso, London and New York, 2007. Whereas deskilling in twentieth-century art history typically meant the displacement of artisanal forms of craft labour by technological forms of production and reproduction, in Godard's case, deskilling designates the adoption of low-cost technologies and small-scale modes of production, more akin to 'artisanal' ideas of working, as a strategy to de- professionalise and democratise the highly professionalised, factory-like, production methods of the large film studios.
[89] As White points out, Brakhage too aligned himself with the amateur in his 1972 essay titled 'In Defense of Amateur'. For Brakhage, 'any art of the cinema must inevitably arise from the amateur, "home-movie" making medium'. Stan Brakhage, *Brakhage Scrapbook*, Robert A Haller, ed, Documentext, New Paltz, NY, 1982, p 168.
[90] Roberts, *Photography and Its Violations*, Columbia University Press, New York, 2014, p 88. As Roberts notes, the photographic snapshot, akin to the home-movie, reclaims the domestic and the contingent and reinvests photography 'with a nonprofessional ethos borrowed from Conceptual art and (to a lesser extent) workers' photography of the 1930s'. Ibid, p 77.
[91] Witt, 'On and Under Communication', op cit, p 330
[92] Margaret Ganahl and R. S. Hamilton, 'One Plus One: A Look at *Six Fois Deux*', *Camera Obscura*,

what a television screen is'; a 'surface on which things are written', which they seek to deconstruct.[93] The episodes 'provoke speculation' about the way in which 'professional' television production influences 'the way we see the world and our position in it'. As Margaret Ganahl says, it 'enacts its analysis of the process of communication and offers us a distinctly different form of television'.[94] Again, television is compared with the factory, in order to denaturalize its shaping and transmission of information, and the experimental method, casts in relief the rigid conventions and codes of television, which are made to seem strange and unfamiliar.[95] The professional/amateur binary also appears at the level of content, for instance, in episode 3b, which is composed of an interview with Marcel, an amateur filmmaker, sat at his editing table. Earning his living at a watch factory, where we see him perform similarly minute labours, Marcel insists that he would never want to be paid for his hobby, which he does purely for pleasure.[96]

As Witt argues, Sonimage's attempt to work in the medium of television came out of a recognition of the profound changes brought about in mass media, and effects this had on distribution and consumption.[97] Godard refers to television as a 'family affair', in that the spectator of television, unlike the isolated cinema-goer, is the unit of family.[98] In Sonimage's second television series, *France tour détour deux enfants* (*France Tour Detour Two Children*) (1979), questions around television, the family, and French society more generally, are explored through two children: Camille and Arnaud. Loosely inspired by a nineteenth century school primer, the twelve-part series analyses how television has taken the place of the primer as *the* form of mass communication. Like television, as Penley says,

8-10, Fall 1982, p 93

[93] Ibid, p 94

[94] Ibid, p 89

[95] Ibid, p 330

[96] For an interesting reading of that episode, as well as the series more generally, see Deleuze, 'On "Sur et sous la communication": Three Questions About "Six Fois Deux"', in *Jean-Luc Godard: Son + Image, 1974-1991*, Raymond Bellour with Mary Lea Bandy, ed, Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1992, p 84.

[97] Witt, 'On and Under Communication', op cit, p 326

[98] Constance Penley, 'Les Enfants de la Patrie', p, 34

the children are 'programmed': the interviews 'ceaselessly points to the serialization, the regulated flow and repetition of their domestic, school and leisure schedules'.[99] The emphasis on the control of space and time, as well as the comparisons of school with the prison, show a clear influence of Michel Foucault's *Discipline and Punish* (1975). The 'many puns on copying and reproduction' invoke, as Penley observes, Foucault's 'motif of the body as a recording surface', with the children figuring as what Foucault calls 'Docile Bodies', who are shaped by their 'various institutional settings'.[100] The series evidences the way that questions of social reproduction are entangled and imbricated with the state – or what Althusser called 'ideological state apparatuses' – such as the school, in preparing potential, and docile, labour-power.[101] We also witness the work that the state deems remunerable in the two scenes where the children are asked whether their mothers are paid for their work, and receiving a 'no', why? At stake in the series as a whole, as Penley notes, is Sonimage's desire engage with television in order 'to change the programming': its 'economics, distribution, themes, temporalities, forms of address and viewers'.[102] Most of all, she says, they 'would like to make "local" television (television's version of home movies), programs that we would make to show others, telling them about our lives and work'.[103] This desire is captured in a two-minute film that Godard and Miéville made for the French TV in 1977. In it we see Miéville's adolescent daughter, distractedly watching television (supposedly broadcasting a popular song by Patrick Juvet, *Faut pas rêver* [*Do not dream*]), while Miéville off-screen asks her about her day. The scene cuts to a scrolling electronic text, which states, 'When the left takes power, will television still have so little

---

[99] Ibid, p 34
[100] Ibid, p 35
[101] Althusser's renowned short text 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses' was published in 1970. The essay was in fact an extract from a much longer book to do with the reproduction of capitalism as a whole, only recently published in English. See Althusser, *On the Reproduction of Capitalism*, G M Goshgarian, trans, Verso, London and New York, 2014.
[102] Penley, 'Les Enfants de la Patrie', op cit, pp 53, 41. Rather than being shown as a prime time series, as Penley notes, it was in fact slotted into the late Friday night art cinema spot on France's second channel in March and April, 1980. Ibid, p 40
[103] Ibid, p 53

relation to people'.[104]

'Decentralizaton, local autonomy, personal and community production' are the politics proposed by Sonimage.[105] Low cost technologies such as video meant that Sonimage had 'control over the whole production process', from 'filming and editing to postproduction'.[106] Video gave them 'a high degree of economic and creative autonomy', allowing them to work in the Sonimage laboratory-workshop more like an artist in a studio, which would be difficult in the mainstream film industry.[107] The move into television, however, was part of a larger historical shift, which saw decreasing opportunities for radical and experimental film within the institution of cinema. Yet TV was also embraced for its potential to reach a far greater audience, as well as a key arena of the public sphere that necessitated engagement rather than being left to the enemy. Sonimage's work therefore pre-empts a larger history of avant-garde filmmakers producing for television.[108] In Britain, it was the conception of Channel 4 in the early 1980s, and The Independent Film and Video Department, in particular, that fostered such work.[109] It is a film made for Channel 4 in 1985, *Soft and Hard (Soft Talk on a Hard Subject Between Two Friends)*, that, as Catherine Grant argues, Godard and Miéville come closest reprising the

[104] Nicole Brenez, 'The Forms of the Question', Jann Matlock, trans, in *For Ever Godard*, Black Dog Publishing, London, 2004, pp 162-63.

[105] Penley, 'Les Enfants de la Patrie', op cit, p 51

[106] Witt, 'On and Under Communication', op cit, p 325

[107] Ibid, p 325

[108] A notable comparison in Germany would be the work of Alexander Kluge, whose move into television was formalised in 1988, with the establishment to of his company DCTP. See Stuart Liebman, 'On the New German Cinema, Art, Enlightenment, and the Public Sphere: An Interview with Alexander Kluge', *October* 46, Fall 1988, p 29. In recent years, as Maria Lind and Hito Steyerl note, due to the increasing privatization of media and cuts in public funding, experimental film and documentary 'has again been increasingly pushed into the art field' (Farocki would be a key example). Maria Lind and Hito Steyerl, 'Introduction: Reconsidering the Documentary and Contemporary Art', in *The Greenroom: Reconsidering the Documentary and Contemporary Art #1*, Sternberg Press, Berlin and Annandale-on-Hudson, NY, CSS Bard, 2008, p. 14.

[109] As Rod Stoneman recounts, the overall context of this period involved the movement of people associated with *Screen*, the BFI and the London Filmmakers Co-op, into Channel 4's The Independent Film and Video Department. This in part, was a consequence of the drying up of funding for experimental film from bodies such as the BFI and the Arts Council England. See Rod Stoneman, 'Sins of Commission', *Screen*, 33, 2, Summer 1992, pp. 127-144. See also, *Experimental British Television*, Laura Mulvey and Jamie Sexton, ed, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 2007.

idea of a home-movie.[110] In it, the camera is turned on themselves, performing their daily routines in domestic and rural settings, in a sometimes slapstick, sometimes serious, fashion. It features the couple on their sofa discussing questions of communication, television and art, as well as their joint and separate work, and their everyday life.[111] The 'factory' is again invoked in a scene in which we see Miéville at the editing table.

The space of the home and the small-scale production we see in *Soft and Hard*, and Sonimage's work more generally, should be construed not as one of retreat from the reaches of the 'social factory', into bourgeois notions of the artist as secluded individual, for instance, but a place where alternative modes of production and ways of working collaboratively can be tested and explored. As Volker Paternburg, in relation to the proliferation of various filmmaking couples that appeared in the 1970s, recently speculated, perhaps this follows the logic that the couple is the smallest collective unit.[112] Most crucially, as Witt contends, the work of Sonimage was an 'attempt to live out a working practice in which the division of labour and of the sexes were dissolved'; and, like Marcel the amateur filmmaker, to find 'pleasure in one's own work', not by selling our role as producers in exchange, as Sandrine says in *Numéro deux*, but by practicing a different type of exchange: 'to love work, and work at love'.[113]

---

[110] Catherine Grant, 'Home-movies: The Curious Cinematic Collaboration of Anne-Marie Miéville and Jean-Luc Godard', in *For Ever Godard*, op cit, p 111. *Soft and Hard* was commissioned by McCabe for Channel 4 in order to raise funding for Godard and Miéville's *Je vous salue, Marie* (*Hail Mary*) (1985), which Godard was needed money to finish. MacCabe, *Godard: A Portrait of an Artist at 70*, Bloomsbury, London, 2003, p 292.

[111] Ibid, p 111

[112] As Patenburg observed, there is a film history of the working couple that remains to be written. The most notable examples from the 1970s include: Jean-Marie Straub and Danièle Huillet, Laura Mulvey and Peter Wollen, Valie Export and Peter Weibel. These remarks are taken from an unpublished paper, 'The Third Avant-garde: Laura Mulvey, Peter Wollen, and the Theory Film' presented at the Whitechapel Gallery, Saturday 14 May 2016, for the Mulvey and Wollen retrospective 'Beyond the Scorched Earth of Counter-Cinema'.

[113] Witt, *On Communication*, op cit, p 10