



HITO
STEYERL



HARUN
FAROCKI

For a Politics of Imaging Non-Citizenship

By Irmgard Emmelhainz



The juxtaposition of two videos in “The Image Factory” at SBC Gallery of Contemporary Art, invites us to come to terms with, and to reconsider in the light of the present, the two kinds of images that dominated the 20th Century imaginary: militant and witness images. Hito Steyerl’s video *November* (2004) is a self-reflexive narrative about the destinies and transformation of the image of her high school best friend Andrea, who appears in the film as feminist kung-fu fighter, Kurdish Liberation Movement guerrilla fighter, terrorist, and martyr. For his video *Respite* (2007), Harun Farocki recycles the well-known footage that was filmed in the transit camp in Westerbork, occupied Holland, in 1944. Farocki intersperses different texts in the same sequence of images, which repeats itself. The sequence includes people working, playing, dancing, smiling, boarding a train. The images show that there are no apparent anomalies in Westerbork –this serves as a mechanism of distantiation– while they bring to the surface other images of the Holocaust lodged in our memories. Steyerl’s and Farocki’s films reflect upon the processes of discovery and circulation of images by focusing on imagining the presence of images through the different channels and discourses in which they circulate. In other words, both videos are meditations on the circulation of images and on their own material sources. They reflect upon the basis and the conditions of aesthetic and political representation: the chain of production of images and sounds. Moreover, the juxtaposition of both films invites us to ask, What is a politicized image today? And, What are the current conditions of production and dissemination of politicized images?

In elucidating the conditions of image production under Semiokapitalism (according to post-workerist theory, Semiokapitalism is the current stage of capitalism in which the production and dissemination of signs is the main source of surplus value), Hito Steyerl ponders, in her 2009 essay “The Museum as Factory,” whether film could nowadays become a potential space for political relations. Steyerl emphasizes the fact that political films are no longer shown in factories like they were in the 1960s. At the peak of the Fordist factory era, film screenings were considered to be film-events in which workers could learn from anti-colonial and anti-imperialist struggles and revolutions elsewhere. Film screenings thus had the purpose of instrumentalizing film in order to bring about political change. Films shown were by filmmakers like Chris Marker and SLON, the collective he co-founded, or Jean-Luc Godard and Jean-Pierre Gorin, who created the Dziga Vertov Group. These screenings included Third Cinema filmmakers such as Glauber Rocha, Fernando Solanas, Octavio Getino, Santiago Álvarez, León Hirshman, William Klein, etc. Not only were their films part of an international solidarity network addressing urgent struggles, they also prompted new forms of cinematic exhibition, production, distribution and pedagogy.



In their own way, both the militant and the witness image brought the logic of representation into a crisis.

Political films made in the 1960s and 1970s stand for one of the two kinds of images that predominated in the 20th Century's sensible regime: the militant or vanguardist image, which joined poesis and praxis as well as theory and practice together in film, and the witness image – embodied in documentary and witness accounts, of which the Holocaust is the main example. Regarding the witness image, according to many, the 20th Century was the “era of the witness.” This era was marked by visual testimony of the concentration and extermination camps when they were liberated in 1945. While this visual consciousness was evidently filtered journalistically, militarily and politically, the images that bear witness to the atrocities perpetrated by the Nazis, along with those that attempt to recreate them through narrative, bear an intrinsic crisis of legibility because they are caught in a debate about whether these images are even possible at all. An ethics of testimony is at stake: to recur to those images is to demand proof of the events, to recreate the events is to banalize or spectacularize them. Thus, the question becomes: how to render temporarily visible the unimaginable horrors perpetrated by the Nazis?

In their own way, both the militant and the witness image brought the logic of representation into a crisis. Representation as a quest to speak on behalf of others by equating signified and signifier was challenged in May 1968 and by post-structuralism, which questioned signification and the truth claims of visual and textual knowledge. This crisis of representation gave way to self-representation and to reflexivity about the construction of the referents of images. In the case of the Holocaust, representation, as a formal and ethical tool that could bring the absent to the fore to bear witness, is considered to have been rendered impossible because the Nazis eliminated the traces of the extermination: the camps themselves imply the execution of representation, as the relationships between presence and absence, the material and the intelligible, were shattered by the event itself.



Nowadays, both kinds of images continue to circulate in the Infosphere and in the sensible regime. Images of the Holocaust have become ubiquitous and problematically slick. In spite of the injunction against its representation, not only has the Nazi extermination of the Jews become a subject of many Hollywood films and independent documentaries, art and photography exhibitions and academic conferences, it has also prompted its own field of academic study, a branch of cultural studies called “Trauma Studies.” French historian Annette Wieviorka has even spoken about a “saturated memory,” which implies “a perverse fascination for horror, a deadly taste for the past and the political instrumentalization of the victims.” Documentary and witness images, as well as discourses about the Holocaust, have become the blueprint for the witness image in general, embedded in all images and discourses about catastrophe and empowerment of witnesses denouncing the violation of their rights in order to demand reparation and restitution. Furthermore, images bearing witness to catastrophe elsewhere predominate, parading wounded subjectivities and displaying an ethics of testimony. Such images could be said to define the cultural sensibility of the 20th Century that has persisted in the first decade of the 21st. While we may be skeptical about images’ capacity to render legible certain events, we still privilege their authority. According to W.T.J. Mitchell, we consider “images to be not just a particular kind of sign, but something like an actor on the historical stage, a presence or character endowed with legendary status.” Given the omnipresence of such images in televisual flows, art exhibitions, documentary film festivals, alternative news websites, etc. is it possible to extricate them from the repetitive flow of audiovisual instantaneity, from the banalization of horror and to enable them to disrupt history in order to re-politicize them?



In contrast to the widespread presence of the witness image, militant cinema (films that constitute subjects seeking political self-determination) has become almost invisible; it has disappeared from cinema, television and the public sphere, and it is shown only on rare occasions in universities, museums or film clubs. Militant films have become cult films circulating either as DVD compilations or as 'poor images.' Poor images, Hito Steyerl points out, are: "itinerant images distributed for free, squeezed through slow digital connections, compressed, reproduced, ripped, remixed, as well as copied and pasted onto other channels of distribution." What could this be a symptom of? Has militant cinema lost its relevance as catalyzer for political change? According to Steyerl, galleries and art spaces are often lodged in factories and therefore, political films have, in fact, never left factories. The difference is that, instead of producing commodities, cultural spaces are factories of "images, jargon, lifestyles and values." This new "social factory," following Steyerl, transforms everything it touches into culture and spectators into workers, as their senses are put to work in order to produce even more signification. In other words, the social factory, while embodying the Neoliberal notion of culture as commodity, contributes to the saturation of meaning in an already overloaded Infosphere. The commodification of culture is underscored by the fact that the contemporary spectator of films and video installations in galleries and museums has become an extension of the 19th Century paradigm of the flâneur. According to film historian Dominique Païni, the museum spectator is confronted with myriad screens, as opposed to the traditional viewer who was set before a single screen and, as such, was synonymous with immobility. Nowadays, it is the duration of the spectators' physical itinerary that determines the duration of the narrative of the film and thus, the meaning of many films shown in museums depends on the viewer's self-directed wandering about the gallery or museum. Cultural spaces, moreover, exhibit a window-display effect given form by the Parisian arcades, highlighting the individual and consumerist aspects of watching films inside galleries.



Has militant cinema lost its relevance as catalyzer for political change?





Following Steyerl, the militant image has therefore been “thrust into digital uncertainty at the expense of [its] own substance.” As cine-events in the 1960s, political films were meant to create “visual bonds”, that is, links amongst workers and revolutionaries of the world in order to inform, entertain and organize them. International solidarity and its symbolic and discursive catalyzers have disappeared, however, along with the figure of the worker as the leading figure of socio-political change. On the one hand, the international left no longer exists as – ironically – its internationalist perspective has been replaced by the cutthroat titans of capital: the new plutocracy with a liberal mentality carrying out entrepreneurial charity, seeking to change the world by applying the same formulas that made them rich in the first place. On the other hand, the Neoliberal cultural project has brought the idea of militancy to the trash, and anyone who resists being given moral lessons about armed struggle or violence is marginalized in the name of security and rights. Paradoxically, transnational wars are being waged in the name of security and rights. The demise of the internationalist perspective of the left, according to Alain Badiou, is explained by the fact that our current period is one of “Restoration.” In France, this period is known as the return of the King in 1815, after the Revolution and Napoleon. In our current Restoration period (after the massive political movements of the 1960s), liberal capitalism and parliamentarism (its political system) are posited as the only acceptable solutions, while revolutionary ideas are considered to be utopian and criminal. The demise of party politics and the reconfiguration of the political landscape into social movements, has given way to an array of sporadic struggles isolated from each other, lacking signifiers that would encompass all struggles and find ties throughout the rest of the world. The last massive, international mobilization of people took place in 2003, as 50 million people marched against the war in Iraq: Steyerl shows herself being of this mobilization in Berlin in November, pondering self-reflexively in the voiceover on the futility of the march, and pointing out the constructed nature of her gestures and image. Since then, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, Libya and Syria have been shattered. By means of expropriation, isolation, killings, siege and harassment, the destruction of the lives of Palestinians and the ways in which they make a living in the Occupied Territories and Gaza continues. Furthermore, the equivalent of militant cinema produced today, that is, the audiovisuals accompanying social movements, could be said to operate at the level of counter-information: new media activism is a kind of supplement that unveils what the mainstream media do not show. Within this frame, the main objective of much of contemporary politicized images is to achieve visibility of given struggles or injustices perpetrated elsewhere. Exploitation and repression are common all over the world, as the new wave of accumulation by way of dispossession reaches every corner of the planet. Parallel to this, our visual field is saturated with images that bear witness to traumatic events, which make us skeptical of the capacity of images to remember or redeem these events. Within this framework, victims are subject to ethical restitution framed within the discourse of Human Rights. This is perhaps why, following Alain Badiou, the idea of absolute evil is so central to our times: from the Holocaust to Stalinist terror, African genocides, Latin American dictators and torturers. For Badiou, evil depends on the events that either weaken or destroy the subject and therefore

constitute it as a kind of “wounded subjectivity.” The problem with the discourse of absolute evil is that it is outside the field of political self-determination, as its victims are given visibility only insofar as they demand restitution from the ethical framework of Human Rights.

Following Steyerl, the militant image has therefore been “thrust into digital uncertainty at the expense of [its] own substance.” As cine-events in the 1960s, political films were meant to create “visual bonds”, that is, links amongst workers and revolutionaries of the world in order to inform, entertain and organize them. International solidarity and its symbolic and discursive catalyzers have disappeared, however, along with the figure of the worker as the leading figure of socio-political change. On the one hand, the international left no longer exists as – ironically – its internationalist perspective has been replaced by the cutthroat titans of capital: the new plutocracy with a liberal mentality carrying out entrepreneurial charity, seeking to change the world by applying the same formulas that made them rich in the first place. On the other hand, the Neoliberal cultural project has brought the idea of militancy to the trash, and anyone who resists being given moral lessons about armed struggle or violence is marginalized in the name of security and rights. Paradoxically, transnational wars are being waged in the name of security and rights. The demise of the internationalist perspective of the left, according to Alain Badiou, is explained by the fact that our current period is one of “Restoration.” In France, this period is known as the return of the King in 1815, after the Revolution and Napoleon. In our current Restoration period (after the massive political movements of the 1960s), liberal capitalism and parliamentarism (its political system) are posited as the only acceptable solutions, while revolutionary ideas are considered to be utopian and criminal. The demise of party politics and the reconfiguration of the political landscape into social movements, has given way to an array of sporadic struggles isolated from each other, lacking signifiers that would encompass all struggles and find ties throughout the rest of the world. The last massive, international mobilization of people took place in 2003, as 50 million people marched against the war in Iraq: Steyerl shows herself being of this mobilization in Berlin in November, pondering self-reflexively in the voiceover on the futility of the march, and pointing out the constructed nature of her gestures and image. Since then, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, Libya and Syria have been shattered. By means of expropriation, isolation, killings, siege and harassment, the destruction of the lives of Palestinians and the ways in which they make a living in the Occupied Territories and Gaza continues. Furthermore, the equivalent of militant cinema produced today, that is, the audiovisuals accompanying social movements, could be said to operate at the level of counter-information: new media activism is a kind of supplement that unveils what the mainstream media do not show. Within this frame, the main objective of much of contemporary politicized images is to achieve visibility of given struggles or injustices perpetrated elsewhere. Exploitation and repression are common all over the world, as the new wave of accumulation by way of dispossession reaches every corner of the planet. Parallel to this, our visual field is saturated with images that bear witness to traumatic events, which make us skeptical of the capacity of images to remember or redeem these events.



“

For Badiou, evil depends on the events that either weaken or destroy the subject and therefore constitute it as a kind of “wounded subjectivity.”

”

Within this framework, victims are subject to ethical restitution framed within the discourse of Human Rights. This is perhaps why, following Alain Badiou, the idea of absolute evil is so central to our times: from the Holocaust to Stalinist terror, African genocides, Latin American dictators and torturers. For Badiou, evil depends on the events that either weaken or destroy the subject and therefore constitute it as a kind of “wounded subjectivity.” The problem with the discourse of absolute evil is that it is outside the field of political self-determination, as its victims are given visibility only insofar as they demand restitution from the ethical framework of Human Rights.

Bearing this in mind, Ariella Azoulay's conceptualization of the "Non-citizen" is useful for thinking about the political referents that could constitute militant images under the current world order. In her groundbreaking book *The Civil Contract of Photography*, Ariella Azoulay articulated the distinction between Citizens and Non-citizens within the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The 1948 Declaration of the Rights of Man considers citizenship as an inalienable, universal right bestowed upon the individual by the nation-state. Non-citizens are thus those who are co-governed with citizens but without the rights of citizens or with a different set of rights than citizens. The status of non-citizenship or impaired citizenship is not unique to Palestinians but applies also to the underclass, those left out of the system with no education or job prospects, as well as to immigrants, refugees, illegal workers, people displaced by wars, famine, the industrialization of the countryside, urban development, etc). Azoulay insists that the Declaration of the Rights of Man posits a universal notion of citizenship that renders the citizen the only figure capable of struggling against the abuses of power. In other words, a citizen is defined as an individual who owes allegiance and is entitled to the protection of a sovereign state. By establishing the categories of citizenship and non-citizenship, Azoulay suggests that the ghost of nationalism be done away with and that the UN's definition of citizenship be substituted with a non-universalizing and territorializing notion of citizenship, thereby awarding political status to non-citizens. In doing so, Azoulay also seeks to problematize Giorgio Agamben's figure of "bare life" as well as Judith Butler's figure of "non-mournable life," because they lack the possibility of political self-determination.

What currently distinguishes a citizen from a non-citizen is political participation and the entitlement of protection. The non-citizen is an individual with no permanent status where he or she resides, and is the bearer of a limited number of rights and obligations. Azoulay's politicization of non-citizenship is thus necessarily based on a radical separation of state and nation and on the principle that everyone everywhere is entitled to citizenship in the territory in which he or she lives. Azoulay's politicization of non-citizenship, moreover, diverges from a conception of political conflict based on the violation of rights and ethnic cleansing, which poses dispossession and obliteration as moral and ethical problems and Palestinians as dispossessed refugees demanding restitution and recognition. In her account, the humanitarianization of conflicts (that is, the way in which conflicts are posited as 'solvable' with humanitarian aid) circumscribe our field of vision of them. How could citizenship be conferred to non-citizens who are governed as exception to the rule? What are the conditions of visibility of non-citizens or "impaired citizens" that could open up political action, beyond the denunciation of the violation of their rights? How could their ordeals be politicized through their own images? Moreover, how could the figure of non-citizenship encompass, beyond civil and political rights, economic and social rights?

Considering images of catastrophe and disaster that already exist, Azoulay and Susan Sontag urge us to take responsibility for what is visible, stressing a shift away from ethics in discourses about war and conflict, in an effort to bring back politics as a space for speech and action. They place stress on a visual praxis that would imply watching images that bear the traces of the administered perpetuation of disaster, in order to draw visibility out of them, with the purpose of establishing a referent that would exceed the images' status as documentation. Film and photography are posited not as the documentation of events, but as a politicized space that can actualize speech and action. In this regard, dutiful viewership is not merely a factory of signs and cinema regains its role as a political tool, as the mediator of political relations.

“

Revolution is not only about signs and discourses,
but about gestures, beliefs, and resonances.

”



Steyerl's *November* (2004) is a reading of our Neoliberal present of the Restoration seen through the perspective of the past that persists in the contemporary world (the legacy of the militant image, and the prevailing wish and need for such an image) and necessarily reconfigures its relation to history (how do we situate ourselves with regards to the history of international radical movements from the 1960s). *November* further posits the question of how to understand militant practice and the militant image today, against the normalization of Neoliberalism? In its frame of revolutionary hang-over, activist defeat and angry melancholia, Steyerl's video could be considered to be an epilogue to *Deutschland im Herbst*, a film from 1977 by Rainer Werner Fassbinder, Volker Schlöndorff and Alexander Kluge. The film is a collage of documentary and fiction seeking to come to terms with German society at the time of the end of the RAF terrorism era. The frame of action of the film is the week after 18 October 1977. The documentary images it shows are: the state funeral of Hans Martin Schleyer (kidnapped and murdered by the RAF), the minutes in silence inside the Daimler-Benz Factory in Stuttgart on behalf of Schleyer, as well as images of the funeral march for Andreas Baader, Gudrun Ensslin and Jan-Carl Raspe in October 1977. The film is about the aftermath of the war that was waged in the 1970s in Germany between the corporativized State against the revolutionaries/terrorists. The episode signed by Fassbinder depicts the hysterical atmosphere of the German people in this period. The filmmaker, playing himself, is portrayed as having a crisis with his boyfriend analogous to the crisis in German society prompted by the events. We see Fassbinder in discussion with his mother, criticizing her political conformism and her right wing view of the events ("The state was right to murder them"). If in *Deutschland im Herbst* the revolutionary ideal that holds together the opposition against the State and corporations is about to die, and is collectively mourned, in Steyerl's video, mourning of revolutionary failure takes place on a personal level. The video tells the story of Andrea Wolf, Steyerl's best friend when she was 17, who died in 1998, when she was shot as a Kurdish terrorist in Eastern Anatolia. For Steyerl, the video is about liberation after the end of history, which means that what today is called terrorism, before was called internationalism, and that only the gestures of revolution keep circulating nowadays. The video incorporates footage from a feminist martial arts film that the artist made together with Andrea in the early 1980s. In light of Andreas' death, the film had become a document, and in *November*, Steyerl juxtaposes this old footage with Andrea's image as a Kurdish revolutionary and martyr, which had become a traveling icon of resistance. Steyerl's use of reflexivity, as well as the historical narrative woven into the video, both links *November* to, and sets it apart from political films from the 1960s. Furthermore, in the voiceover, Steyerl states: "November is the time after October, when revolution seems to be over and peripheral struggles become impossible to communicate." The film raises pressing questions: How could Andrea's image, as an icon of resistance, be internationalized? Revolution is not only about signs and discourses, but about gestures, beliefs, and resonances. How to construct the 'common language' that is lacking today that could be used as a political tool?

Similarly to Chris Marker's *Lettre de Sibérie* (1957), where he adds different voiceovers to the same sequence of images, in *Respite*, Harun Farocki inserts different intertexts in a series of images that repeats itself. This strategy serves both to enclose and to expand the images. The images for *Respite* come from well-known footage shot in Westerbork (Netherlands), the refugee camp for Jews fleeing Germany built in 1939 and converted into a transit camp after the occupation in 1942. The film was commissioned by Nazi officer Albert Gemmeker of Rudolf Breslauer, a Jewish photographer who was ultimately deported and murdered. Breslauer's images do not record, but evoke the extermination, as they embody Gemmeker's wish to show the economic efficiency of the camp, which is depicted as a model of productivity. In the film, we see images in which the prisoners at Westerbork appear smiling, doing gymnastics, dancing, doing everyday tasks. The footage also shows inmates working, checking other inmates into the camp or cutting up mechanical parts, generating an image that contains a disturbing mixture of diligent labor and summer camp fun.

By repeating the sequences and interspersing different texts among them, Farocki re-functions the images, positing a new relationship to seeing and imaging the Holocaust. On the one hand, the repetition of the clips underscores the impossibility of images to have stable meanings. On the other, Farocki highlights the separation or gap that exists between things, images and our perception of them. Like Steyerl, Farocki also addresses the issue of the transhumance of iconic images: the main image of the film is that of a young girl who is known to have been deported to Auschwitz; the same girl is the subject of Ad Wagenaar's quest to find her identity (a Roma from Holland). Breslauer's images do not depict the Holocaust but record it: the ordinariness and normality of its images are made to resonate in the viewer's mind with other scenes and images of the Holocaust that populate our collective memory and imagination. Farocki's *Respite* thus evokes memory-images of the extermination by creating a palimpsest of images made up of perceived images and those recalled from memory when perceiving the images and relating them in the different intertexts.

Steyerl's and Farocki's videos, address indirectly – or by way of different discursive formations – the ordeals of non-citizens, as militant and witness images. Beyond dutiful spectatorship to images that already exist of people undergoing catastrophes and injustices, how can the non-citizen be figured and politicized in the 21st Century? What common language could be the discourse born by such images? Can images bring about change? Can an image of change be shown? What could an image change?





very attentively, first as films or as historical documents and later of course in view of whether we could learn from them.

Ariella Azoulay

The Civil Contract of Photography (Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 2009).

Alain Badiou

interviewed by Christoph Cox, Molly Whalen "On Evil: An Interview with Alain Badiou" Cabinet Issue 5, Evil Winter 2001/2002. Available online: <http://www.cabinetmagazine.org/issues/5/alainbadiou.php>

Sources **Georges Didi-Huberman**

Images malgré tout (Paris: Minuit, 2003).

Thomas Elsaesser

"Holocaust Memory as the Epistemology of Forgetting? Re-wind and Postponement in Respite," in Harun Farocki: Against What Against Whom, ed. by Kodwo Eshun and Antje Ehemann, (Köln: Walter König, 2010).

Irmgard Emmelhainz

Review of Ariella Azoulay's The Civil Contract of Photography, AMCA Journal (September 2009), available online: <http://www.amcainternational.org/Irmgard%20final%20edits.pdf>

Kodwo Eshun & Ros Gray

"The Militant Image: A Ciné-Geography Editor's Introduction" Third Text 25:1 (March 2011), pp. 1-12.

Hal Foster

"Something Becomes Visible," Artforum (November 2004)

Judith Goudsmit and Asad Raza

"Interpretations: Harun Farocki, Respite (2007)" 3 Quarks Daily, available online: <http://www.3quarksdaily.com/3quarksdaily/2009/02/interpretations-harun-farocki-respite-2007.html>.

Pablo Lafuente

"For a Populist Cinema: On Hito Steyerl's November and Lovely Andrea," Afterall (Autumn-Winter 2008), available online: <http://www.afterall.org/journal/issue.19/populist.cinema.hito.steyerls-november.and.lovely>.

Garry Leech

"Promoting Injustice: The Bias of Human Rights Watch" Counterpunch, March 13, 2013, available online: <http://www.counterpunch.org/2013/03/14/the-bias-of-human-rights-watch/>.

W.J.T. Mitchell

Iconology: Image, Text, Ideology (Chicago: The University Press, 1996), p. 2.

Dominique Païni

"Le retour du flâneur / The Return of the Flâneur," Art Press 255 (2000), pp. 33-41.

Hito Steyerl

"The Articulation of Protest" (September 2002), available online: http://republicart.net/disc/mundial/steyerl02_en.htm

Hito Steyerl

"Is a Museum a Factory?" e-flux journal #7 (June 2009) Available online: <http://www.e-flux.com/journal/is-a-museum-a-factory/>

Hito Steyerl

"In Defense of the Poor Image," e-flux journal #10 (November 2009) available online:

Paul Virilio

"The Museum of Accidents" International Journal of Baudrillard Studies Vol. 3, Nr. 2 (July 2006), available online: http://www.ubishops.ca/baudrillardstudies/vol3_2/virilio.htm

Annette Wieviorka

The Era of the Witness (Cornell University Press, 2006).

LA FABRIQUE DES IMAGES

THE IMAGE FACTORY

Ce texte a été produit par SBC Galerie d'art contemporain dans le cadre de l'exposition LA FABRIQUE DES IMAGES, sous le commissariat de Pip Day. L'exposition s'inscrit dans le projet de recherche 2012-2014 de SBC portant sur la Souveraineté.

This text was commissioned by SBC Gallery of Contemporary Art on the occasion of the exhibition THE IMAGE FACTORY, curated by Pip Day as part of SBC's 2012-2014 research program on Sovereignty.

SBC galerie d'art contemporain
372, rue Sainte-Catherine Ouest, Espace 507
Montréal (Québec) H3B 1A2
T. 514.861.9992

info@sbcgallery.ca
sbcgallery.ca