Collision of Ideas

"Montage is conflict."

Circuitous, elaborate, intellectual, Sergei Eisenstein, most famous of the Russian film directors, presents his view that montage is not built up by linkage of shots, as Pudovkin suggests, but by collision, like atoms in experimental physics. He compares it to "the series of explosions of an internal combustion engine, driving forward its automobile or tractor: for, similarly, the dynamics of montage serve as impulses driving forward the total film." Even the single frame may be a "particular, as it were, molecular case of montage" within which there may be conflicts of masses, movement, and light.

Eisenstein was the director of Potemkin (1925), Ten Days That Shook the World (1928), Old and New (1929), Alexander Nevsky (1938), and Ivan the Terrible (Parts I and II, 1944–1948). He also taught at the state cinema school in Moscow. In this selection, he claims that his friend Pudovkin reached agreement with him, but a study of their films reveals that each continued to go his own way.

The shot is by no means an element of montage.

The shot is a montage cell.

Just as cells in their division form a phenomenon of another order, the organism or embryo, so, on the other side of the dialectical leap from the shot, there is montage.

By what, then, is montage characterized and, consequently, its cell—the shot?

By collision. By the conflict of two pieces in opposition to each other. By conflict. By collision.


Collision of Ideas

In front of me lies a crumpled yellowed sheet of paper. On it is a mysterious note:

"Linkage—P" and "Collision—E."

This is a substantial trace of a heated bout on the subject of montage between P (Pudovkin) and E (myself).

This has become a habit. At regular intervals he visits me late at night and behind closed doors we wrangle over matters of principle. A graduate of the Kuleshov school, he loudly defends an understanding of montage as a linkage of pieces. Into a chain. Again, "bricks." Bricks, arranged in series to expound an idea.

I confronted him with my viewpoint on montage as a collision. A view that from the collision of two given factors arises a concept.

From my point of view, linkage is merely a possible special case.

Recall what an infinite number of combinations is known in physics to be capable of arising from the impact (collision) of spheres. Depending on whether the spheres be resilient, non-resilient, or mingled. Amongst all these combinations there is one in which the impact is so weak that the collision is degraded to an even movement of both in the same direction.

This is the one combination which would correspond with Pudovkin’s view.

Not long ago we had another talk. Today he agrees with my point of view. True, during the interval he took the opportunity to acquaint himself with the series of lectures I gave during that period at the State Cinema Institute.

So, montage is conflict.

As the basis of every art is conflict (an "imagist" transformation of the dialectical principle). The shot appears as the cell of montage. Therefore it also must be considered from the viewpoint of conflict.

Conflict within the shot is potential montage, in the development of its intensity shattering the quadrilateral cage of the shot and exploding its conflict into montage impulses between the montage pieces. As, in a zigzag of mimicry, the mise-en-scène splashes out into a spatial zigzag with the same shat-
As the slogan, "All obstacles are vain before Russians," bursts out in the multitude of incident of War and Peace.

If montage is to be compared with something, then a phalanx of montage pieces, of shots, should be compared to the series of explosions of an internal combustion engine, driving forward its automobile or tractor; for, similarly, the dynamics of montage serve as impulses driving forward the total film.

Conflict within the frame. This can be very varied in character: it even can be a conflict in—the story. As in that "prehistoric" period in films (although there are plenty of instances in the present, as well), when entire scenes would be photographed in a single, uncut shot. This, however, is outside the strict jurisdiction of the film-form.

These are the "cinematographic" conflicts within the frame:
Conflict of graphic directions.
   (Lines—either static or dynamic)
Conflict of scales.
Conflict of volumes.
Conflict of masses.
   (Volumes filled with various intensities of light)
Conflict of depths.

And the following conflicts, requiring only one further impulse of intensification before flying into antagonistic pairs of pieces:
Close shots and long shots.
Pieces of darkness and pieces of lightness.

And, lastly, there are such unexpected conflicts as:
Conflicts between an object and its dimension—and conflicts between an event and its duration.

These may sound strange, but both are familiar to us. The first is accomplished by an optically distorted lens, and the second by stop-motion or slow-motion.

The compression of all cinematographic factors and properties within a single dialectical formula of conflict is no empty rhetorical diversion.

We are now seeking a unified system for methods of cinematographic expressiveness that shall hold good for all its elements. The assembly of these into series of common indications will solve the task as a whole.