

‘A Collective / Inarticulate Harmony’

A report on the film seminar Doc’s Kingdom (Odemira, November 14 to 19 2025)

Rita Macedo, Kerstin Stakemeier

In 1913, active members of intersecting anarchist and syndicalist milieus came together in Paris to form Le Cinéma du Peuple, a film production cooperative that remained active up until August 1914, when it was dissolved following France’s general mobilisation for war. Some hesitancy preceded the adoption of the cinematic medium. Film had, after all, not only been used by authorities to identify participants in labour protests, but was also widely understood as a vehicle for the reproduction of capitalist ideology. Most commercial cinema productions of this period relegated representations of the working-class to anonymous labouring bodies or background extras devoid of narrative agency or psychological depth. When featured, they tended to appear through moralised and gendered stereotypes, reduced to figures of crime and immoral behaviour, substandard of bourgeois education.

Regrettably, such projections of a standard of modern education modelled on bourgeois self-representations was not exclusive to culture’s wilfully capitalised forms. It had also been implied in much of Marx’s writing on culture some decades earlier and figured prominently in Marxist politics at the time. Take Lenin’s notorious insistence on the progressive identification of peasants as workers, his confrontation of ‘peasant simplicity’ and ‘peasant helplessness’ and his agitation for the adaptation of ‘models, traditions and results of the *existing* culture from the point of view of a Marxist world outlook’, which differed largely from more anarchist and syndicalist forms of organising that foregrounded the reliance on local forms of knowledge and community *against* their modernising capitalisation. While the wide-

spread drawback of the latter position was an accumulation of primitivism that was opposing what Marx had termed the ‘so-called primitive accumulation’ with its nostalgic inversion, this clearly wasn’t the Cinéma du Peuple’s problem. They shared with their Marxist comrades the struggle against the poverty of the labouring masses, the battle against the destitution industrialised labour expedited. However, the Leninist project of *civilising* peasants into identifying as workers and *civilising* workers into identifying as *modern* subjects, the assumption that revolutionary form was itself *modern*, imported a substandard of amodern forms of life, labour and communion that was largely debated at the time. It still is. While the word ‘amodern’ might sound like a mere mannerism, we have chosen it here to characterise a positionality shared by the central filmic practices and practitioners gathered at the 25th edition of *Doc’s Kingdom: Forms of life and labour* that are accosted by and become implied in the colonising measures of modern life, but that are, while struggling with and against them, not primarily invested in being anti-modern, not giving into their negative identification. Instead, we follow a range of infrastructures that are agnostic to modernity, and within which this very modernity appears as a common parochialism, one perpetually drowning in its sense/s of violence.

It was this gradient of divergent anti-capitalist convictions, reaching from struggles *over* modernity and the domain over its doubtful progressions, to struggles *with* modernity and its destitution and primitivisation of local sense/s, that characterised the programme of this Portugal-based film seminar, which took its 2025 title

from a poem by Sean Bonney, 'A Collective / Inarticulate Harmony', and took place in Odemira from the 14th to the 19th of November 2025. Under the direction of Catarina Boieiro and Stefanie Baumann, this edition dedicated exclusively to collective forms of documentary film making, was curated by Raquel Schefer and Rita Morais. The six-day program brought together the work of six collectives, Grupo Zero, Ogawa Productions, CAMP, Sueli and Isael Maxakali with collaborators, Mujeres Creando and Video Tracts for Palestine, all producing formats of filmic struggle *with* and *over* modernity.

In 1913 the coming Le Cinéma du Peuple had decided that film's realm of possibility was not exclusive to bourgeois worldviews. And, at the end of the Paris congress of the Revolutionary Anarchist-Communist Federation on August 17th 1913, 'the announcement was made that a committee was to be set up for the purpose of securing a film camera for anarchist propaganda purposes.' Le Cinéma du Peuple was officially established as a limited liability cooperative company later that October. They produced six films, the first of which *Les Misères de l'Aiguille* (1914) depicts women's double exploitation within their wage- and domestic labour relations. Directed by Spanish anarchist director Armand Guerra and the cooperative's artistic director, Raphaël Clamour, this social drama follows Louise, a seamstress and weaver who, after her husband's premature death, attempts to take her own life along with that of her infant son out of financial despair. She is stopped last-minute by a typographer on strike and through him she is introduced to a women's lingerie workers cooperative, *L'Entraide*, who rescue her through their solidarity. While labour organising figures as the only way to survive, the question of (domestic) work and (industrial) labour is never rendered categorically distinct, and *Les Misères de l'Aiguille* renders anti-capitalism not just as a question of mere (re)production, but as a question of life (and death).

Les Misères de l'Aiguille was produced with a low budget and within the constrained parameters that follow from this circumstance. Seizing the means of cinematic production and deploying them outside the logic of large-scale industrial frameworks widens the possibilities of filmic intervention, while limitations of resources and budgets inevitably translate into form-determining conditions, as well as the full or partial reorganisation of filmmaking's labour structure. In *Les Misères de l'Aiguille*,

production was carried out with a reduced crew and integrated with distribution and exhibition. The screenings took place both at union halls during political events alongside speeches, songs and political discussions, and at the *Palais du Fêtes*, one of Paris' largest venues for public cinema, dance and amusement. Le Cinéma du Peuple was a self-organised effort to understand working life inside and outside of the factories as a social form characterised by both a reproductive communality that needed to be engaged, and a productive collectivity that needed to be won over. Its history is an early instance of cinema being understood as an infrastructural means, a medium the cooperative core of which has allowed it time and again to figure as a training exercise and test case for both communal and political forms of struggle. Think Cine-Liberté, Grupo Cine Liberación or Palestine Film Unit. Like these, the works of Grupo Zero, Maxakali, Ogawa Pro, CAMP, Mujeres Creando and Video Tracts for Palestine help us understand how far the fissions that have characterised the embattled history of radical political organising against life's capitalisation are mapping out the defining traits of our present struggles. And the sometimes violent antagonisms between different Marxist deviations and anarchist deviants of the past today resurface in a different register: The anti-colonial uses and reoriginations of both modern Marxisms and anarchisms over the last century not only bring to the fore the colonial entanglements of all forms of organising that had hoped for modernity to find a liberating realisation, they also refigure the question of what exactly constitutes a revolutionary life. In the films presented as part of this seminar in Odemira this life's realisations and unrealisations were never categorically distinct. And the struggles over their amodernity clearly aren't today.

The programme started right there, where we came together, in Alentejo, with the film cooperative Grupo Zero and their work during the PREC (*Processo Revolucionário em Curso*) and the efforts for land and labour collectivisation. 'The Agrarian Reform, a decisive milestone in this process [of collectivisation], will be the most fruitful outcome of the People-MFA alliance', we are told in the very first minutes of *The Law of the Land*, a feature film shot by the group between 1976 and 1977 and completed in the latter year. Two voices narrate the events following the first agricultural workers' meetings, which started to take place from early May 1974 and resulted in the form-

ation of Agricultural Labourers Unions in each district of the region. After the overthrow of the fascist regime in Portugal in 1974, the wave of land collectivisation was a mostly southern phenomenon, as here ownership and labour had previously been organised through large area estates and a latifundia system. A large part of the working population lived in extreme poverty and illiteracy; conditions inherited from the policies of destitution applied by the *Estado Novo* since the early 1930s. And so, alongside land occupations, large-scale literacy campaigns were set in motion. Organised by several groups, including the MFA (Armed Forces Movement) and the UEC (Union of Communist Students), these militant campaigns sought to counteract widespread structural illiteracy, placing a large emphasis on the learning of revolutionary language to provide the southern population with potential means of self-organisation. In one of the early scenes of *The People's Struggle: Literacy in Santa Catarina* (1977), we see

a teacher making use of a blackboard to show her adult students how to write LUTA, POVO, TERRA (struggle, the people, land). Alfredo, one of the attendees of her class, accompanies the viewer in voice-over through several scenes of the villagers' life and labour and, speaking of his enthusiasm for the self-determination of communal education, also makes very clear how the fascist state had wilfully primitivised the lives of his peasant population. A month and a half after filming, influenced by the approach deployed in an earlier work of Jean Rouch, with whom some members of Grupo Zero had studied, the crew went back to the village in order to show and discuss a working version of the film with its subjects. The filmmakers want to know what people make of their film, what they think about how they are portrayed. The villagers answer that their representation is largely satisfying if, as they keep adding, too short, but that the problems of destitution, their poverty and their dependency on the



Film still, Grupo Zero, *A Lei da Terra* (The Law of the Land) (1977), 67 mins.

means of their now departed overlords, remain.

The agrarian reform and the literacy campaigns in the south were Grupo Zero's main themes. The group operated through small, flexible production teams that travelled to different locations, where they sought to produce newsreel-style documents. Founded by Alberto Seixas Santos, it drew inspiration from the methodologies of collectives such as the Medvedkin and especially the Dziga Vertov group, co-founded in the late 1960s by Chris Marker and Jean-Luc Godard with Jean-Pierre Gorin respectively. When asked about the conception of collective cinema within Grupo Zero, Acácio de Almeida, one of the cooperative's members present at *Doc's Kingdom*, himself a cinematographer, remarked that while 'cinema may be the result of collective work, it is not conceived collectively ...: it is conceived by the director.' In Grupo Zero's case, it's not only the chasm between collective labour and collective authorship that persists, but also that between those who film and those who are filmed, reinforced by the fact that the operational mode of Grupo Zero at no point includes relinquishing control over the cinematic means of production to the peasants. The urban filmmakers document the rural workers, asking them to stage their life and labour, of which the filmic device becomes no part. Accordingly, the footage, in which the degree of enactment for the camera varies, is reassembled in sequences that align with urban ideas of rurality and its social bodies. It is an infrastructural fissure that renders Grupo Zero's work affirmative of the division of modern cinema from the unmodern Alentejo peasants. Grupo Zero resisted entangling their own cinematic devices with those that shape the lives of the subjects filmed. The peasants are not shown by their local sense/s, as they were for instance in Želimir Žilnik's 1968 feature film *Modern Works*, in which local peasants were engaged to first play-kill the actors in their roles as pseudo-revolutionary students coming to their village, and then opted to show the magic tricks they held up their sleeves. Grupo Zero shot in Portugal in 1976 and '77 and, as they finished shooting, the stabilisation of parliamentary democracy in Portugal had brought into effect the Barreto Law, putting an early end to the Agrarian Reform and institutionalising literacy efforts into state education programs, foreclosing a much too short period of collective experimentation. Watching Grupo Zero's films, we learn nothing about the specific knowledge,

the localised culture or indeed the amodern technologies that were developed in Alentejo resisting the Estado Novo or even outliving it into the times after PREC. The localised temporality is dropped in favour of the future, a modern narrative begins, and the primitivised peasants become modernised workers who, from 1977 onwards, were made stately, yet again.

It is such modern and stately narratives that the Japanese collective Ogawa Pro consequentially undid in their work for and behind the cameras. Initiated by Shin-suke Ogawa in 1968 in response to the student revolts in Tokyo, the collective existed for almost thirty years, but did not survive Ogawa's death in 1992. Notwithstanding this collective's foundation in an explicit hierarchy, Ogawa Pro lived and worked together for decades, embedding themselves into the scenes their films were dedicated to. Initially, Ogawa had travelled with fellow film students to Tokyo's outskirts to document the militant struggle of the local farmers of Sanrizuka against the construction of Narita International Airport. These farmers, who had cultivated the volcanic soil for centuries to make it amenable to survival, mobilised their lives and that of all inhabitants of the regional villages against their displacement and against their practical alienation into uprooted contract workers, like those that had been hired to build the airport. Sanrizuka resisted their primitive accumulation and Ogawa Pro's seven feature film documentaries dedicated to Sanrizuka are grounded in their efforts to adapt their filmic forms to the lifework of those struggling, leading to the collective's full relocation to Sanrizuka. For a decade Ogawa Pro not only worked in film but also learned the technologies of local rice farming and became part of the village's social fabric. The collective, however, was facing a different form of double exploitation than that portrayed by Le Cinéma du Peuple: They were sharing the farmer's poverty while at the same time putting their means of survival into the filmic infrastructure they built for and with the villagers, leading to often dramatic destitution. At *Doc's Kingdom*, two of Ogawa Pro's Sanrizuka films were shown and Ricardo Matos Cabo, who has worked with the materials of Ogawa's open archives for years, screened unused recordings from the militant struggles Ogawa joined the farmers in displaying their tactics – like forming units of women and children placed and shielded off right at the centre of the clashes with the riot police – with Ogawa's shaking

camera filming the children's games. The material that made it into the films often moves at a different pace, as it attaches itself to the village's proceedings. In instances such as when some villagers are imprisoned – a regular occurrence – we are shown both the community's meetings over their loss, the tactical discussions around how to proceed, and the young men's reports on their incarceration to the community after their return. It is a conversation that both deals with their fears and their commitment to the shared cause. This sense of commitment, which as we learn in scenes discussing the uncompassionate social exclusion of those who agree to hand over their land to the state, is not the least of what Ogawa and the farmers come to share. It also plays out in the portrait formats included in the film, in which individual villagers introduce their customs, like Mrs. Tsubaki who, for a ceremony by the village's women to honour the gods, carves a radish into a phallus with balls and grass pubic hair, 'to make it funnier.' The farmers are militantly opposing their modernisation, the loss of their community, their skills, their sovereignty and their customs. But they share them with Ogawa Pro, as with thousands of militant students who temporarily joined the villagers struggles in the first years from 1967 onwards. Both the Communist and the Socialist Party of Japan got involved in the struggles, as did numerous other groups, which helped to uphold the militant resistance for a decade, with a first tranche of the airport only opening in 1978. The resistance remained. The last evictions of farmers took place in 2023.

At *Doc's Kingdom*, Ogawa Pro came to figure almost as something of a template to understand other collectives' works shown throughout the six days. Their work, in its boundless commitment to its subjects, presented an exemplary case of making modern means – the filmic infrastructure – work against its own origin in industrial production. Ogawa Pro demonstrates materially that where giving amodern forms of life a filmic form is not founded within a nostalgia that ultimately, too, primitivises all livelihood that resist its primitive accumulation, the filmmakers too become exposed to the destitution such resistance entails. These stately attempts at rural dispossession rupture the land, the people living on it, and, as Ogawa Pro's films trace, ultimately unrealise the temporalities of all life tethered to the land's cycles. In the films of Ogawa Pro collective form is taking shape as

a history of violence. They went on to move to Magino village, another community of rice farmers, entangled in another struggle against stately forces, with whom they would go on to work, shooting, again, a series of films. Amongst them was *The Sundial Carved with a Thousand Years of Notches: The Magino Village Story* (1987), with which the seminar closed, and which consists not only of documentary material but also of fictional scenes, co-conceived and rehearsed with the village community and a few actors. It is a film that takes its timing from the lifespan of a rice plant: six months.

The question of how to establish one's filmic timing proved to be another central concern that surfaced not only in many of the films screened at *Doc's Kingdom* last year, but also in the discussions surrounding it. The film seminar follows a strict programme. The participating collectives had been announced just before registration closed, but, as in each previous iteration, it remained unclear to the very end what films would be shown. In Ogawa's case Matos Cabo had been invited to contextualise the group's discussion of their works, but in all other cases members of the collectives joined the seminar and offered introductions situating their work within the seminar's timely premise.

The Mumbai-based collective CAMP manoeuvres the modern ruptures of lived temporalities in a largely different register: They plant and feed archives. In CAMP's work, too, the re/productive temporalities of imperial accumulation are crossed, albeit not in the collective's life-form, but within its multimedia existence as both a producing and a mediating entity of individual contributors. CAMP's presence is not exclusively the result of films and videos produced by its members, but also follows from the building, maintenance and perpetual re/calibration of several open-source online resources, among them [pad.ma](#), [indiancine.ma](#), [bak.ma](#) and [leftover.rs](#). CAMP is less a collective of filmmakers, and more a cooperative of makers and mediators whose terms of production are distributed along the lines of each individual project. CAMP produces forms of legibility and visibility and thereby shares sense/s of forms of life and labour that are systemically excluded from the re/productive sense/s of our dominant imperial infrastructure. At *Doc's Kingdom*, Shaina Anand offered an introduction to the collective's decentralised forms of working that started from [pad.ma](#) and [indiancine.ma](#). These archives follow a labyrinthian

logic with overlapping systems of annotation that often allow freely engaging contributions by users. CAMP has been growing a regionally distinct sense of worldwide distribution in different formats since its foundation by Anand, Sanjay Bhangar and Ashok Sukumaran in 2007. Accessing it demands active participation, and what is more, a drastic time commitment on the part of those entering from places and times disidentified from CAMP's own grounds. CAMP archives local sense/s and, in annotating and affiliating them, documentation serves as a means of identification that can be consequentially and continuously redistributed. The two CAMP films the organisers chose to screen at Doc's Kingdom, *The Neighbor Before the House* (2011) and *From Gulf to Gulf to Gulf* (2013), feature CAMP's members more in the function of editors or amplifiers than in that of authors. In the latter case, camera-shot materials by CAMP congeal around phone-shot labour and leisure materials shared by sailors between the Gulf of Kutch, the Persian Gulf and the Gulf of Aden, along with their soundtracks, mapping the making, the decorating, the sailing, the over/loading and the undoing of the wooden ships on which they move deadstock of all kinds between the Gulfs.

While Grupo Zero, Ogawa Pro and CAMP differ largely in their understanding of what the status, knowledge and persistence of un- or primitively accumulated life is, they are aligned in the professional infrastructure out of which their own praxis grew. In all three cases the authoring – or, in CAMP's case the de-authoring – subjects are filmmakers, professionals of a thoroughly modern discipline turning to amodern struggles. In the case of the Tikmũ'ün (Maxakali) people,¹ and more specifically of Sueli and Isael Maxakali, it was an inversion of said infrastructure that led them into making film their medium. Having been in exchange with Rosângela de Tugny, an ethnomusicologist studying the Tikmũ'ün's musical repertoire, some Tikmũ'ün people started to engage in Intercultural Training for Indigenous Educators offered at Tugny's home institution. Taking on film as an infrastructural medium of the Tikmũ'ün concerns from there however, meant to break with the identifications educational mediations implied by state institutions. Where in the efforts of Grupo Zero, Ogawa Pro and CAMP we see modern sense/s as a given that stands corrected, questioned and displaced by its encounter with amodern political subjects (be that the cooperatives in

Alentejo, the rice farmers of Sanrizuka or the sailors across the Gulfs), in the work of the Tikmũ'ün modern sense/s are taken up as violent extras to indigeneous life. The Tikmũ'ün produce testimonies of a people, self-identifications that remain more lived than laboured, guided by a set of four fundamental questions:

- a) how to make a long, uncut version and circulate the film in the villages for one's own relatives to watch;
- b) how to make a film that contains the viewpoint not only of the 'author-director' but also of his or her people as a whole, including the opinion of the elders and the shamans;
- c) how to make a cinema or a 'version' for people outside the village as a means of communicating with the white world;
- d) how to make cinema into a tool that 'keeps' the culture – knowing that in this process 'keeping' is 'inventing'?

Nũhũ yãg mũ yõg hãm: Essa Terra É Nossa! (This Land is Our Land!) (2020), one of three works by Sueli and Isael Maxakali that were part of the program in Odemira, shows the ongoing struggle for survival of their people. The Tikmũ'ün, ancestral inhabitants of the forests in the region today mapped as the north-east of Minas Gerais and the south of Bahia in Brazil, are currently spread across five non-contiguous territories due to forced displacements carried out both by the state and by violent attacks by settlers, miners and ranchers. In the beginning of the film, we see Isael in a classroom with a group of Tikmũ'ün men, who are writing down a long list of names of murdered Tikmũ'ün, impunely killed by white ranchers, their foremen and employees. Isael and the other men remember the dead by talking and singing. The song form abounds in Tikmũ'ün films because it abounds in Tikmũ'ün world. The song records and preserves everything: the rivers and the sky, the car and the airplane, and also animals that are no longer there, as 'they have not ended, because they are in songs. They do not end because our painters are recording them as well. They have ended, but they do not end.'

Nũhũ yãg mũ yõg hãm: Essa Terra É Nossa! articulates the circumstances in which the Tikmũ'ün persist despite the conditions imposed on their lives. Isael and others film themselves while walking across land that has been turned into property, while narrating the killings of several Tikmũ'ün at the hands of 'whites and ranchers' that took place on those very roads, involving some of

the very people they meet on their way. In a small group, they revisit several locations in which their people were found lifeless, and we witness an interaction with a local white business owner who harasses them as they walk by, justifying deadly violence over his claims of a stolen light bulb from his shop front. It is an unfathomably casual interaction that documents the reality of an ever-present genocidal violence. Although one of the questions of Tikmũ'ün filmmaking is, as mentioned, to articulate 'a means of communicating with the white world', film here cannot be said to be a means of self-modernisation, but rather a highly selective documentary of Tikmũ'ün life, as what is shared is their exposure to the eradicating violence of the 'white' world.



Film still, Grupo Zero, *A Luta do Povo* (The People's Struggle) (1976), 25 mins.

In the second film by the collective presented at the seminar, *Yāmiyhex, the Women-Spirit*, we are with Sueli and Isael at Vila Verde Village, during the preparations for the several day-long celebrations that mark the departure of the *Yāmiyhex* (Women-Spirits). Again, we accompany actions and processes through a hand-held camera that joins in with everything: the dancing, the playing, the eating, the talking. The ritual unfolds through figures such as serpents, otters and other *yāmiyxop* (non-human spirits and ancestral entities, that inhabit Tikmũ'ün territory), that assume corporeality in inhabitants of the village. The many-part ritual is spread out over seven days and takes place concurrently with the daily lives of the village's community. While the camera foregrounds those directly involved in the events of the celebration, other residents of the village

are seen going about their day-to-day activities in the background, underlining the fact that the structures of ceremonial occasion and everyday life are inseparable. Unlike ethnographic filmic approaches, what appears in the Tikmũ'ün films is not primarily dictated by its legibility to non-Tikmũ'ün viewers. In contrast to Grupo Zero's disentangled representation and Ogawa Pro's embedded participation, Tikmũ'ün cinema enacts its dissimilitude through manifestation. Here, the appropriation of the cinematic means of production does not simply abolish the separation between filmmaker and subject as a relation imposed from without, but opens a space for the reinvention of the very function of film. In Tikmũ'ün cinema, the assembly of a work is a result of the filmmakers' continuous exchange with their pajés (shamans) and their community: the pajés guide both the ritual and the filmmaking processes, determining 'what can be "depicted" or shown, what should be "cut" (or left unshown) and what should be made explicit in the relation between humans and spirits, men and women.' The pajés assume both the roles of *cosmological diplomat* and 'cinematographic co-director, assisting the director or camera operator in the mise-en-scène (or modulation) of the visible and the invisible ...' The camera, a participant in the ritual's unfolding, becomes integrated into the ritual itself, within a framework that understands land as indivisible, collective and the origin of all knowledge. The Tikmũ'ün spaces and times of life predate colonial property regimes and, in their films, they confront the imperial logics of cultivation in service of colonial accumulation on their own terms. As Isael said repeatedly, 'without land there is no cinema', because without land there is nothing.

If Tikmũ'ün's practice of cinema is in part an educational project, *Mujeres Creando*, another collective featured at *Doc's Kingdom's* 2025 edition, might be described as a populist one. Both, however, are geared towards nothing less than the possibility of survival despite the imperial identification of their living forms as identities passed. But while the Tikmũ'ün identify filmically by creating a specific difference between the viewer and themselves, *Mujeres Creando* mobilise performances for the camera in order to present it with a both provincial and popular representation of themselves. Founded in 1992 by Maria Galindo, Julieta Paredes and Monica Mendonza, this anarcha-feminist group originates from

a profound discontent with ‘the arrogant, homophobic and totalitarian Left of Bolivia during the 1980s, where heterosexuality was still the model and feminism was understood to be divisive.’

The group has been instrumental in organising large associations of female sex workers, supporting the establishment of cooperative-run brothels while providing their own legal name to protect the identities of those involved. Such long-standing relation forms the basis of *Revolución Puta* (*Whore Revolution*) (2023), where DIY-style recordings of street interventions intersect with interviews. These strategies are consistent with the group’s broader practice, as demonstrated in *Virgin Barbie* (2010), in which a Virgin Mary figure played by a white performer is carried through public space by indigenous women, while delivering an anti-patriarchal speech.

As with *Le Cinéma du Peuple*, film production in *Mujeres Creando* is not an autonomous aesthetic endeavour, but an instrument for a given political practice. Film here is one modality amongst many, alongside direct action, graffiti and publishing. Across these fronts, the collective generates a popularised form of their lives to use for feeding a widely international marketing back

into their local politics.

While film here clearly figures as an afterthought, it is not least this demonstrative destitution of the medium in *Mujeres Creando*’s work that renders it instrumental to a discussion around political film: While the assemblies at Doc’s Kingdom showed that many younger people had joined that year because their own praxis was firmly grounded in collectivities in- and outside of film, the academic acculturation of aesthetic media was all but absent from our conversations. Both *Mujeres Creando* and the *Tikmũ’ün* make films within which we are not supposed to find comfort in aligning our causes with theirs: We are aesthetically pushed to understand our own situatedness within imperial Europe and its violently bourgeois aesthetics as systemically opposed to their survival. Bourgeois aesthetics remain a political matter, and an imperial one at that.

The often anonymously and radically decentralised working group Video Tracts for Palestine moves along a similar line of political confrontation as *Mujeres Creando* and the *Tikmũ’ün*, but leading towards vastly different consequences in both the means of production, distribution, and their according aesthetic manifestations. While



Film still, Sueli Maxakali, Isael Maxakali, Roberto Romero, and Luisa Lanna, *Yōg ātak: Meu Pai, Kaiowá* (2024), 93 mins.

the cause of the Palestinian people and the genocidal violence they have been exposed to repeatedly since 1948 was an integral part of countless debates and conversations within 'A Collective / Inarticulate Harmony' in Odemira – as we all understood Raquel Schefer's and Rita Morais' curatorial plot not as one of a merely historical interest in filmic collectivity, but as one oriented towards the current standards of its active reorganisation – *Video Tracts for Palestine* was the seminar's most casual contribution. Having come into being shortly after October 7th 2023 their name proposes an actualisation of the 50 ciné-tracts that were produced in 1968: pamphlet-like short 16 mm documentary formats generated from a mix of filmed struggles, secondary materials and newspaper clippings that, while widely anonymous, are famous for the engagement of Jean-Luc Godard, Alain Resnais and Chris Marker in them. Already now the video tracts drastically outnumber their predecessors. They are distributed through an Instagram account and, even though they are throughout translated into digitised materials, their styles, rhythms and legibilities are unaligned. In being conceived for phone screens in the exact length, format and resolution allowed for by Meta, the limitations they are made of heighten the task of employing vastly modern means for vastly amodern ends as an all but historical task. *Video Tracts for Palestine* set rhythms that are wilfully out of sync, undoing the temporality inferred by national news outlets all over Europe that are portraying genocide as 'civilisation', as 'modernisation' and replacing it with ranges of Palestinian sense/s. And while the works of Grupo Zero, Ogawa Pro, CAMP, Sueli and Isael Maxakali, and *Mujeres Creando*, too, are dedicated to concrete struggles, *Video Tracts for Palestine* differs from each of them in devising a praxis that is embedded

within a central infrastructural means of our daily lives, the smartphone. CAMP's digital archives also aim to install a technology of alienation as a lever for disalienation, but the literacy they propagate makes a different demand on their users: a rupture within habitual timing, a drift into the archive. Ghassan Salhab, who presented *Video Tracts for Palestine* within 'A Collective / Inarticulate Harmony', distanced them sharply from being an archive, insisting that they are each of the now, and that they each lose their sense/s at the speed with which the live documentation of Palestine's being undone reaches us. The video tracts are momentary reformulations that pick up the visual and textual materials in the midst of which we all exist, and salvage from them a language of struggling reorigination. Far from being defeatist, they are actions with a clear demand, and that does connect them back to all collectives present at *Doc's Kingdom* – Grupo Zero, Ogawa Productions, CAMP, Sueli and Isael Maxakali with their collaborators, and *Mujeres Creando*. In Salhab's words: Don't be a middleman. And we would add: Don't be all modern.

Rita Macedo is a filmmaker and educator who teaches at the Brunswick University of Arts and programmes for the European Media Arts Festival (Osnabrück). Kerstin Stakemeier is a writer and educator who teaches at the Academy of Fine Arts Nuremberg and writes in Berlin.

Notes

1. Tikmū'ūn is the self-denomination used by the people in their own language. Maxakali is the widespread, external ethnonym used to refer to them. Until very recently Tikmū'ūn was used internally only, but today its use has expanded, becoming the term that is most commonly employed.