

ana-marija koljanin

mjesta zatamnjena points of fadeout

1. - 6. Ivan Faktor,
Kangaroo Court, 2007.

● Kadar prikazuje prizor koji će lik psihopatskog djecubojice ugledati u trenutku kad s užasom prepozna vlastiti gubitak slobode. Iz pozicije prestravljenog ubojičina pogleda kamera otkriva sliku nepomičnog mnoštva. Slika je iskričava, iskrzana, crno-bijela. U potpunoj tišini, u trajanju od gotovo pola minute, sporim, horizontalnim kretanjem kamere s jedne strane vidokruga prema drugoj, prikazano je berlinsko podzemlje koje očekuje ilegalno suđenje djecubojici. Stotine pogleda statičnih figura, uperenih u užasnutog okrivljenika - pogleda sitnih provalnika, prostitutki, prosjaka, beskućnika, zguranih u redove u golemom podrumu stare tvornice - gledatelju se otkrivaju u dubini panoramskog snimka koji na trenutak zaustavlja naraciju gotovo veličanstvenom, nijemom slikom.

Kadrom iz pozicije okrivljenikova pogleda film *M* Fritza Langa (1931.) otvara dramatičnu sekvencu suđenja kojom završava priča o potrazi za ubojicom. Film *Kangaroo Court* Ivana Faktora (2007.) bazira se na montaži filmskog zapisa koji dokumentira repliku filmskog seta sa snimanja sekvence suđenja u filmu *M* i premonitiranog tonskog zapisa sekvence snimljene na originalnom filmskom setu koji replika rekonstruirala.¹ Izvođenjem vjerne kopije Langova seta, stilizirane prema originalnom predlošku - uz sudjelovanje gotovo dvjesto kostimiranih statista koreografiranih u pozu, u prostoru nalik originalnoj filmskoj scenografiji - film, u postupku reprezentacije reprezentiranog, konceptualizira ispremiještanost pojmova kopije i originala, fikcije i stvarnosti, simboličkog i realnog.

Učinci su Faktorove apropijacije motiva iz Langova filma definirani postupkom razlamanja vizualnog i zvučnog i uspostavljanja strukturnog poretka pokretne slike dvama različitim režimima vidljivosti, montiranjem snimaka iz pozicija dvaju različitih pogleda. Čijih?

▼ The frame shows a scene that the psychopathic murderer of children will see at the moment when he realizes with terror that he has been deprived of freedom. With the eyes of the terrified murderer, the camera shows the image of immobile multitude. The image is sparkling, jagged, and black-and-white. In complete silence, which lasts for almost half a minute, the camera makes a slow, horizontal move from one side of the field of vision to the other, showing the Berlin underground gathered in expectance of an illegal verdict spoken to the child murderer. Hundreds of eyes of these static figures, staring at the horrified convict - eyes of petty thieves, prostitutes, beggars, and homeless, crammed in the huge cellar of an old factory - reveal themselves to the observer deep inside the panoramic shot, which temporarily arrests the narrative in this magnificent mute picture.

In the film entitled *M* by Fritz Lang (1931), it is this frame, shot from the viewpoint of the convict, that introduces the dramatic sequence of the process, closing the story on the search for the murderer. The film *Kangaroo Court* by Ivan Faktor (2007) is based on assemblage, merging the video materials documenting the replica of the film set for the trial sequence in *M* and the reassembled audio material from the same sequence, recorded on the original set and reconstructed by the replica.¹ By making a faithful copy of Lang's set, styled according to the original model - with the participation of almost 200 costumed extras, choreographed into a posture, in a space similar to that of the original film set - the film performs the representation of the represented, thus conceptualising the substitution of the copy and the original, fiction and reality, symbolic and genuine.

The effects of this appropriation of motifs from Lang's film by Faktor are determined by the

▽
¹ Rekonstrukcija filmskog seta izvedena je u svibnju 2005. u Zagrebu, nakon čega je rad u prvoj fazi projekta realiziran u mediju fotografije (*Kangaroo Court*, 2005., c/b fotografija, 112 x 343,5 cm). Film je u drugoj fazi projekta završno montiran u veljači 2007. (*Kangaroo Court*, 2007., BETA SP, 7'30"). Film *M* Fritza Langa citatna je referenca dvaju autorovih prethodno realiziranih filmova, *Das Lied ist aus* (2002.) i *Mörder unter uns* (2004.), s kojima film *Kangaroo Court* čini svojevrsan triptih. Vidi katalog izložbe: *Ivan Faktor: Fritz Lang und Ich 1994-2004*, Gliptoteka HAZU, Zagreb, 2004.

² IVAN FAKTOR, iz teksta redateljske koncepcije.



1

○
 1 The reconstruction of the film set took place in May 2005 in Zagreb, after which the first phase of the project was realized in the medium of photography (*Kangaroo Court*, 2005, b/w photography, 112 x 343.5 cm). In the second phase, the film was fully assembled in February 2007. (*Kangaroo Court*, 2007, BETA SP, 7'30"). The film *M* by Fritz Lang is a point of reference for two earlier films by the same author: *Das Lied ist aus* (2002) and *Mörder unter uns* (2004), which make a sort of trilogy with *Kangaroo Court*. See the exhibition catalogue: *Ivan Faktor: Fritz Lang und Ich 1994-2004*, Gliptoteka HAZU, Zagreb, 2004.

U ukupnom trajanju od sedam minuta i trideset sekundi, film započinje, nakon potpunog zatamnjenja, prikazivanjem u punome trajanju originalnog Langova kadra, kao što će posljednji kadar filma, prije konačnog zatamnjenja, biti prikaz njegove rekonstrukcije, izveden identičnim kretanjem kamere, takozvanim švenkom. Unutar te simetrične strukture dvaju totala, odnosno nakon protjecanja originalnog kadra i prije pojavljivanja njegova *remakea*, odvija se prikaz kojim dominiraju *close-up* kadrovi i zatamnjenja, montirani iz pozicija dvaju pogleda. Jedan od njih može se imenovati varkom. Varkom u odnosu na što?

“Pri snimanju tako velike scene i s velikim brojem ljudi, koji su morali biti nepomični u određenoj koreografskoj statičnoj izvedbi, neminovno je ponavljanje snimanja desetak, pa i više puta. Između tih ponavljanja, u vrijeme opuštanja, prije nove koncentracije za napornu statičnu izvedbu s nepomičnim pogledom, radili smo švenkove, kao da se ne radi o snimanju ‘naše’ scene. Tim ‘tajnim’ snimanjima, nastojao sam upotpuniti sliku o nastajanju tzv. idealnog kadra. Struktura ovoga filma će biti upravo rekonstrukcija nastajanja tog, idealnog - finalnog kadra.”²

Faktorov “finalni kadar”, kao i Langov, prikazuje pozu. Primjenjujući estetiku dokumentarnosti, u reprezentaciju sekvence fikcionalnog narativa montirane su reinscenirane poze, no i

procedure of fracturing the visual material and the sound and establishing the structural order of the moving picture in two different regimes of visibility, by assembling the shots from two different viewpoints. But, whose viewpoints are they?

With its total duration of seven minutes and thirty seconds, the film begins with absolute darkness and then shows the original Lang’s frame in real time, just as the last frame, before the final fadeout, repeats his own reconstruction by using an identical camera movement, the so-called “schwenk”. Within that symmetric structure of the two long shots, that is, after the original frame has ended and before the beginning of its *remake*, there is a segment dominated by close-up frames and fadeouts, assembled from the two viewpoints. We could call one of them fake. But, fake compared to what?

“When you shoot such a large scene with so many people, who have to stand still while performing in some sort of static choreography, it is inevitable that you should repeat it, sometimes ten times or even more. Between these repetitions, in the moments of relaxation before concentrating on a new tiring static performance with immobile gazes, we were doing the “schwenks”, as if it were not about shooting ‘our’ scene. With these ‘secret’ shots I wanted to complement the picture of the creation of the so-called ideal



2

- ▽
- ³ WALTER BENJAMIN, *Umjetničko djelo u doba svoje tehničke reproduktivnosti*, *Život umjetnosti*, 6 (1968.), 73.
- ⁴ RUDOLF ARNHEIM, *Film als Kunst*, Berlin, 1932., 176-177., citirano u: WALTER BENJAMIN (bilj.3), 74.
- ⁵ NICOLE BRENEZ, citirano u: ANJA STREITER, *Prema kinematičkom tijelu: uz Agambenove "Bilješke o gestama"*, u: Tvrda, 1/2 (2006.), 181.
- ⁶ NICOLE BRENEZ, citirano u: ANJA STREITER (bilj. 5), 181.

"tajno" snimljene geste, spontani, neinscenirani pokreti. Postupkom montaže figura poze i geste, zapisanih u dokumentarnom, realističkom kodu, te govora, u kodu naracijskog *voice over* iskaza, film destabilizira narativom utvrđeno, naturalizirano značenje. Materijalizirajući u obliku medijskog zapisa reprezentaciju nekontrolirane performativnosti događaja, izvorno normiranog naracijom, izvodi pomak u percipiranju aspekata fikcionalnog kao zastrašujuće realnog, prikazujući pogled na bivanje uvjetovano stvarnošću, na mjestu fikcionalnog referenta. Bivanje, izvedeno iz odmaka od bivanja u pozi, ne od glumljenja uloge, objekt je reprezentacije pogleda proizvedenog varkom.

Aparatura, koja prikazuje kreaciju filmskog protagonista, nije sposobna tu kreaciju poštovati kao totalitet, piše Walter Benjamin 1936. u često citiranom eseju *Umjetničko djelo u doba svoje tehničke reproduktivnosti*: "Pod vodstvom snimatelja neprestano mijenja stajalište u odnosu na glumu. [...] Publika se uživlja u glumca samo onda ako se uživi u aparat. Preuzima dakle

frame. The structure of this film will be precisely reconstructing that ideal, final frame."²

Faktor's "final frame", as well as Lang's one, shows a posture. By applying the aestheticism of a documentary, he not only inserted re-staged postures into the representation of the sequence of the fictional narrative, but also "secretively" shot gestures, spontaneous, non-staged movements. In an assemblage of figures of posture and gesture written in a documentary, realist code, and speech in the code of the narrative, "voice-over" utterance, the film destabilized the meaning that was determined by the narrative and naturalized. By materializing the representation of the uncontrolled performativity of event, originally defined by narration, in the form of media recording, it shifted the perception of the aspects of the fictional as terrifyingly real, presenting a view on an existence conditioned by reality instead of a fictional referee. Existence, a result of detachment from existing in posture rather than from playing the role, is an object of representation of a view produced by illusion.



3

njegov stav: testira.”³ Prema tome, u filmskom se prikazu “najjače djelovanje postiže kad se što je moguće manje *glumi*... Najviši je stupanj - za Arnheima god. 1932. - kad se s glumcem postupa kao s karakterističnim rekvizitom koji se izabere... i postavi na pravo mjesto.”⁴ Nicole Brenez uspostavio je razlikovanje klasičnog (o kojem pišu Arnheim i Benjamin, te kojem pripadaju Langovi glumci) i modernog glumačkog sustava u filmu, pri čemu klasični sustav utjelovljenja, “inkarnacije”, cilja prema uvjerljivosti fikcije, dok moderni režim “otkrivanja” ili “očitanja” “cilja na prisutnost nečega što ne pripada fikcijskom poretku, nego ‘postojanju’”.⁵ U klasičnom se sustavu “gluma definira kao dispozitiv ulaska u ulogu, dakle kao transformacija subjekta-glumca u objekt, koji je i sam oslonac za drugi subjekt-lik. Dakle, gluma se shvaća kao prolazni, vektorizirani dispozitiv. [...] Sve cilja prema prezentifikaciji, na prisutnost efekata fikcije.”⁶

Upravo taj sustav prezentifikacije Faktorov film razara montažom diskontinuiranih poza i gesta statista. Čas su vidljivi kako uvjerljivo

The machinery that shows the creation of a film character is incapable of respecting that creation in its totality, as Walter Benjamin wrote in 1936, in his often cited essay on *The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility*: “Guided by the cameraman, the camera continually changes its position with respect to the performance. [...] The audience’s identification with the actor is really an identification with the camera. Consequently, the audience takes the position of the camera, its approach is that of testing.”³ Accordingly, in the film “the greatest effects are almost always obtained by ‘acting’ as little as possible... In 1932, Rudolf Arnheim saw ‘the latest trend... in treating the actor as a stage prop chosen for its characteristics and... inserted in the proper place.’”⁴ Nicole Brenez has established a distinction between the classical (on which Arnheim and Benjamin wrote and to which Lang’s actors belonged) and modern system of film acting, whereby the classical system of embodiment or “incarnation” aimed at the credibility of fiction, whereas the modern

-
- ² IVAN FAKTOR, from the director’s conception.
- ³ WALTER BENJAMIN, *The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility* (1936).
- ⁴ RUDOLF ARNHEIM, *Film als Kunst*, Berlin, 1932, pp. 176-177, cited in: WALTER BENJAMIN (as in n. 3).



⁷ NICOLE BRENEZ, citirano u: ANJA STREITER (bilj. 5), 181.

⁸ GIORGIO AGAMBEN, Bilješke o gestama, u: Tvrđa, 1/2 (2006.), 173.

⁹ GIORGIO AGAMBEN, (bilj. 8), 176.

¹⁰ GIORGIO AGAMBEN, (bilj. 8), 176.

¹¹ GILLES DELEUZE, *Cinema 2. The Time-Image*, London i New York, 2005., 216-224.

¹² Organizirana potraga podzemlja za ubojicom započet će nakon prvih tridesetak minuta trajanja filma, tajnim sastankom predstavnika organizacija kriminalnog miljea, na kojem će vođa kriminalaca i, kasnije, lik koji vodi suđenje, već odlučiti da "to čudovište nema prava živjeti", "mora nestati", "biti eliminirano", "bez suosjećanja, bez skrupula".

¹³ GILLES DELEUZE, (bilj. 11), 133.: "This time the question of truth, that is, of tribunal and judgement, will reveal its full ambiguity: *M* can be tried by a court of thieves which is hardly motivated by truth."

¹⁴ Neuspjele policijske potrage za djecomubojicom, "autsajderom" kriminalne kaste, kao i sumnja da počinitelj zločina pripada podzemlju, uzrok su svakodnevnih policijskih racija, koje "interferiraju" s poslovima berlinskog podzemlja i ometaju njegovo normalno funkcioniranje.

¹⁵ Navedeno prema: Black's Law Dictionary.



4

"utjelovljuju" langovsku pozu, postajući "živuće statue",⁷ čas njihov pokret "ništa ne predočuje".⁸ Montiranjem fragmenata svjesnih i nesvjesnih pokreta u sekvencu suđenja uvedeno je rascjepljenje kauzalnosti geste i koherentnosti naracije, potencirano izmjeničnim podudarnostima i nepodudarnostima između geste u registru vidljivog i govora u registru čujnog. Prema Giorgiou Agambenu "gesta je uvijek gesta stalnog-ne-snalaženja-u-jeziku - ona je stalno *gag* u pravom smislu riječi".⁹ Agamben piše: "Nijemost (koja nema veze s prisustvom ili odsustvom tonske trake) u filmu je bitna kao nijemost filozofijskog postojanja-u-jeziku: čisti pokret."¹⁰ Možda Faktorov film predočuje takvu vrstu nijemosti.

A u nijemom je filmu slika naturalizirana, doživljava se kao neposredan, izravan prikaz života, jer supostoji s posrednom, indirektnom, lingvističkom razinom diskurza u kojoj je govorni čin nužno pisan i koja se čita. U zvučnom filmu govor postaje izravan i čini vidljivima aspekte ljudskih interakcija kakve nije bilo moguće vidjeti u nijemom filmu.¹¹ Faktor prisvaja sekvencu iz prvog Langova zvučnog filma, no ljudske interak-

regime of "disclosing" or "manifesting" aimed at the "presence of something that belongs to 'existence' rather than the order of fiction."⁵ In the classical system, "acting is defined as a device for entering the role, that is, as a transformation of the subject/actor into an object, which is itself a basis for the next subject/character. Thus, acting is understood as a transitory, vectorized device. [...] Everything tends towards presentification, the presence of the effects of fiction."⁶

It is precisely this system of presentification that Faktor's film has destroyed by assembling the discontinued postures and gestures of the extras. One moment they are seen "incorporating" Lang's posture with great credibility and becoming "living statues,"⁷ while another moment their movement "shows nothing."⁸ By assembling the fragments of conscious and unconscious movements into the trial sequence, the author has introduced a dissociation between the causality of gesture and the coherence of narration, intensified by the alternating agreement and disagreement between gesture in the register of visibility and speech in the register of audibility. According



5

cije prikazuje aktiviranjem kodova nijemog filma, čineći vidljivom nemogućnost čujnosti njihova govora. Realno “nevine” pokrete statista prekriva diskurzom koji okrivljuje.

U Langovu je filmu - nakon cenzure originalnog naziva *Mörder unter uns* [*Ubojica među nama*], podnaslovljenom *Eine Stadt sucht einen Mörder* [*Grad traži ubojicu*]- mnogo prije sekvence suđenja presuda već donesena,¹² a ilegalno suđenje nije motivirano potragom za istinom.¹³ Razlozi suđenja su pragmatični, kao i argumenti presude.¹⁴ Pojam *kangaroo court* “opisuje lažirani pravni postupak u kojemu se prava neke osobe potpuno zanemaruju i u kojemu je rezultat već predodređen zbog pristranosti suda ili sudbene vlasti”,¹⁵ kao što Faktorov film na samom kraju otkriva, nakon što će slika nestati, a glas će izgovoriti početak - i kod Langa samo započete - rečenice: “U ime zakona...”, označavajući prekid suđenja dolaskom predstavnika vlasti.

Premontirani tonski zapis započinje otkrivanjem nevjerodostojnosti suda: “Svi su ovdje prisutni stručnjaci za slovo zakona! Od šest tjedana

to Giorgio Agamben, “the gesture is always a gesture of being at a loss in language - it is always a gag in the literal sense of the word.”⁹ Agamben writes: “Muteness (that has nothing to do with the presence or absence of sound tape) in film is as essential as the muteness of philosophical being-in-language: it is pure movement.”¹⁰ Perhaps Faktor’s film presents this sort of muteness.

But in the silent film the image is neutralized and experienced as a direct, unmediated enactment of life, since it coexists with the indirect, mediated, linguistic level of discourse, in which the speech act is necessarily written and which is read out. In the non-silent film, speech becomes direct and renders visible those aspects of human interactions that could not be seen in the silent film.¹¹ Faktor adopts a sequence from Lang’s first sound film, but presents human interactions by activating the codes of the silent film, thus showing that the speech cannot possibly be heard. The actually “innocent” movements of the extras are thus overwritten with a blaming discourse.

-
- ⁵ NICOLE BRENEZ, cited in: ANJA STREITER, *Prema Kinematičkom tijelu: uz Agambenove “Bilješke o gestama”* [Towards a cinematic body: On Agamben’s “Notes on Gesture”], *Tvrđa 1/2* (2006), p. 181.
- ⁶ NICOLE BRENEZ, cited in: ANJA STREITER (as in n. 5), p. 181.
- ⁷ NICOLE BRENEZ, cited in: ANJA STREITER (as in n. 5), p. 181.
- ⁸ GIORGIO AGAMBEN, cited in *Tvrđa 1/2* (2006), p. 173.
- ⁹ GIORGIO AGAMBEN (as in n. 8), p. 176.
- ¹⁰ GIORGIO AGAMBEN (as in n. 8), p. 176.
- ¹¹ GILLES DELEUZE, *Cinema 2. The Time-Image*, London and New York, 2005, pp. 216-224.

▽
 16 Radovi Ivana Faktora, kako je ustvrdila Leonida Kovač, "umjesto nekog određenog značenja artikuliraju pitanja o modalitetima konstrukcije značenja, među njima i značenja pojma identiteta" LEONIDA KOVAČ, "Nepoznat netko", u: *Ivan Faktor: Fritz Lang und Ich 1994-2004, Gliptoteka HAZU, Zagreb, 2004., 8.; Pitanje "o značenjima postupaka identifikacije" ponovno je artikulirano recentnim autorovim filmom, u kojem se prepoznaju i postupci strukturiranja njegovih prethodnih filmskih radova, npr. postupak montaže videomaterijala iz autorovog ratnog dnevnika s tonskim zapisom filma M u filmu Das Lied ist aus (2002.) ili postupak ponavljanja kadrova zatamnjivanja slike (kao metafore za nemogućnost da se čuje) u filmu Željko Jerman - Moj mjesec (2005.).*

17 GIORGIO AGAMBEN, (bilj. 8), 175.

○
 12 The search for the murderer, organized by the underground, begins around the thirtieth minute of the film, with a secret meeting of the representatives of criminal organizations, where the leader of the criminals, who later directs the trial, decides that "the monster has no right to live," that it must "disappear", "be eliminated," "without any compassion or scruples."

13 GILLES DELEUZE, (as in n. 11), p. 133: "This time the question of truth, that is, of tribunal and judgement, will reveal its full ambiguity: *M* can be tried by a court of thieves which is hardly motivated by truth."

14 Futile police quests for the child murderer, the "outsider" of the criminal caste, as well as the presumption that the perpetrator of the crime must necessarily belong to the underground milieu, cause regular police searches that "interfere" with the business of Berlin underground and disturb its normal functioning.



6

u zatvoru Tegel do 15 godina u Brandenburgu. Dobit ćeš čak i branitelja. [...] - Oni će se pobrinuti da pravda bude zadovoljena! Sve po redu i zakonu." Ubojica nije vidljiv, ne postoji u snimci, a govor ne pripada prikazanom tribunalu. Kako je onda moguće identificirati zakon?¹⁶ Tko ga utjelovljuje? U čemu je materijaliziran? Zakon se pokazuje u svojoj apstraktnosti, obestijeljen, kretanjem kamere koja se odvaja od logike prizora, vireći iz prikrajka ili se približavajući, bilježeci neprikladnost situacije u kojoj je moguće samo bivati, a zbivanje je uvijek samo periferno, negdje drugdje. Kao da bilježi ritual kakvog nijemog mnoštva u kojem je tijelo instrument procesa, prikazano u svome opiranju automatizmu gestom. "Gesta pripada poretku etike i politike (a ne samo estetici)", govori Agamben.¹⁷

No, koja je funkcija ponavljanja kadrova zatamnjivanja, inzistiranja na montaži mračnih međufaza u kojima se nema što vidjeti osim praznine crnog ekrana, ili djelomičnih zatamnjivanja slike, prepreka pogledu, iza kojih se naziru samo dijelovi zbivanja? Nesumnjivo, kadrovi mraka demontiraju kontinuitet pogleda, djelo-

In Lang's film - after the original title *Mörder unter uns* [Murderer among Us], subtitled *Eine Stadt sucht einen Mörder* [A City Searching for the Murderer] has been censored - the verdict is passed long before the trial sequence¹² and the illegal process is not motivated by the quest for truth.¹³ Its reasons are more pragmatic than that, and so are the arguments for the verdict.¹⁴ The term *kangaroo court* describes "a sham legal proceeding in which a person's rights are totally disregarded and in which the result is a forgone conclusion because of the bias of the court or other tribunal,"¹⁵ as Faktor's film reveals at its very end - when the image has faded out and a voice speaks out the beginning of a sentence (that also remains unfinished in Lang's film): "In the name of the Law..." marking the interruption of the trial upon the arrival of the authorities.

The pre-assembled sound recording begins with the disclosure of the court's lack of veracity: "Everyone present here is a legal expert! From six weeks in the Tegel prison to 15 years in Brandenburg. You will even get a lawyer. [...] They will take good care that justice is done! All

mična zatamnjenja slike otkrivaju poziciju “tajnog” snimanja, bilježenja nedopuštenog pogleda. Želi li pogled svojim razotkrivanjem priznati svoju ograničenost? I koja se pozicija iskaza ukazuje u prepoznavanju poznatih lica, među njima i autorova, u slici? Utjelovljenja, otkrivanja, ili nečeg drugog? Mjesta zatamnjenja? ▽

in accordance with law and order.” The murderer cannot be seen, he is not in the frame, and the speech is not that of the presented tribunal. How is it then possible to identify the Law?¹⁶ Who is incorporating it? Where does it materialize? The Law is shown in all its abstraction and disembodiment by the movement of the camera, which is detached from the logic of the scene and lurks from the hiding or else comes closer, documenting the inappropriateness of a situation in which it is only possible to exist, while the events are always peripheral or somewhere else. It is as if the camera were documenting the ritual of some mute multitude, in which the body is just an instrument to the process, shown in its resistance to automatism by gesture. “Gesture belongs to the realm of ethics and politics and not simply to that of aesthetics,” says Agamben.¹⁷

But what is the function of repeating these frames of fadeout, of insisting on the assemblage of dark intervals, in which one cannot see anything except for the void of the black screen, or of partial fadeouts that obstruct the view and allow merely glimpses of events? Undoubtedly, these frames of darkness deconstruct the continuity of gaze, while partial fadeouts disclose the position of “secret” shooting, of documenting an illicit gaze. Is it that the gaze wants to admit its limitations by disclosure? But what position is implied by the recognition of familiar faces in the picture, among them the author’s face? Is it the position of embodiment, of disclosure, or something else? Is it the point of fadeout? ○

¹⁵ Cited according to: Black’s Law Dictionary.

¹⁶ As Leonida Kovač has written, works of Ivan Faktor “articulate questions on the modalities of the construction of meaning, among them the meaning of the notion of identity, rather than particular meanings.” LEONIDA KOVAČ, “Nepoznat netko” [An unknown somebody], in: *Ivan Faktor: Fritz Lang und Ich 1994-2004*, Gliptoteka HAZU, Zagreb, 2004, p. 8. The question on the “meanings of identification procedures” has been rearticulated in a recent film by the same author, which again shows the structuring method characteristic of his previous work, e.g. assemblage of video material from the author’s wartime diary and sound recordings from *M*, as in the film entitled *Das Lied ist aus* (2002), or repetition of the frames of fadeout (as a metaphor of the impossibility to hear), as in the film entitled *Željko Jerman - Moj mjesec* [Ž. J. - My moon] (2005).

¹⁷ GIORGIO AGAMBEN (as in n. 8), p. 175.

— Ana-Marija Koljanin, likovna kritičarka i nezavisna kustosica, živi i radi u Osijeku.

— Ana-Marija Koljanin, art critic and a free-lance curator, lives and works in Osijek.