JESSE MATZ

Montage Diversity

IN 1969, PEPSI-COLA LAUNCHED A groundbreaking television advertising campaign with a striking new style. Prior Pepsi ads had been single-scenario fictions, but "You've Got a Lot to Live" mixed many different documentary-style glimpses of real life—assorted shots of actual people on the go, catching cabs and skipping rope, flirting and laughing and grabbing a snack and, of course, drinking Pepsi (fig. 1). These quick takes of real people enjoying different lives came together only haphazardly, within a general celebration of the American spirit. And that was the point. At a troubled time in American history, Pepsi found a format for America's resurgence in the visual rhetoric of montage. These fast fragments mingling in dynamic assembly showed America reemerging, its broken pieces becoming a new pattern for national unity.[1]

Pepsi's 1969 campaign also featured a new diversity. The people at work and at play were a surprisingly mixed demographic. That too broke new ground for Pepsi, which, like most big brands of the moment, was unsure how to proceed with integrated marketing. Montage provided a way forward, not only by integrating shots of Black, white, and Latinx Americans, but by suggesting that this diverse togetherness would itself power America's dynamic reemergence. Not only did it bring people together; it celebrated the act of doing so. Montage and diversity were made for each other.

But as much as montage brought people together, it kept them apart. "You've Got a Lot to Live" envisioned exciting diversity, but it did so in separate shots that could only imply a kind of segregation after all. Montage is unifying but fragmentary, and it therefore enabled Pepsi to celebrate diversity without making any total commitment to it. The result was groundbreaking but ambiguous, at once a new melting pot and a scattershot abbreviation of social justice—a fraught combination of progressive inclusion and

ABSTRACT Montage diversity divides even as it unites the people it represents, making it a telling register of possibilities for social inclusion in American visual culture. Montage effects in *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington* (1939) and Pepsi-Cola's 1969 campaign "You've Got a Lot to Live" demonstrate the problems that arise in the combination of social diversity and filmic montage, and, because one was the work of avant-garde film artist Slavko Vorkapich and the other of his son Ed Vorkapich, compose a critical genealogy of montage diversity and its implications for social inclusion. REPRESENTATIONS 161. © 2023 The Regents of the University of California. ISSN 0734-6018, electronic ISSN 1533-855X, pages 41–69. All rights reserved. Direct requests for permission to photocopy or reproduce article content to the University of California Press at https://www.ucpress.edu/journals/reprints-permissions. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1525/rep.2023.161.3.41.

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

FIGURE 1. Montage diversity transforms American advertising in "Big Town U.S.A." (1969), a first spot in "You've Got a Lot to Live, and Pepsi's Got a Lot to Give," Pepsi-Cola, 1969–72. Courtesy of the "Pepsi Generation" Oral History and Documentation Collection, Archives Center, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution.

persistent segregation. This combination I propose to call *montage diversity*, which is at once a bold form of inclusion and a hedge against change, a utopian but uncertain way to edit a diverse society.

And, by now, an all-too-familiar one. Pepsi's 1969 campaign helped create what has since become a widespread vernacular for social inclusion, in the many hopeful composite images and portrait medleys that similarly depict this kind of fragmentary togetherness. Diversity rhetoric often takes montage form, in visual languages of inclusive advertising, public-relations messaging, and political advocacy that splice together aspirational groupings. Familiar examples include the montage diversity we commonly see in promotional materials for colleges and corporations. When these institutions celebrate diversity with richly inclusive visuals in which single images are not themselves inclusive—when difference appears across but not within

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

different frames—montage diversity achieves its best-known effects. These effects go back at least as far as Walt Whitman's catalogues of American types and right up to the opening montage sequence of the 2020 Democratic National Convention. For many years, in many ways, montage has cultivated diversity while maintaining division, its vibrant visions of a diverse America also rearguard forms of containment.

Together, montage imagery and diversity rhetoric imply an optimistic pattern of emergence in which differences themselves generate better unity. That pattern, however, can appear reductive. If montage becomes pastiche and diversity a pretense, montage diversity becomes little more than a deceptive distraction. Classical montage theory is all about the dynamics by which shots joined together achieve something more, the "idea that DERIVES from the collision between two shots that are independent of one another," the "fourth dimension" that emerges with "tendentious" effects.[2] In other words, montage divisions enable a better coherence with invigorating results. But classical montage theory also allows for (or prefers) montage that is merely shocking or fragmentary, distracting or disruptive. Diversity discourse involves a similar ambivalence: it too celebrates the better unity enabled by radical differences while also celebrating difference as such, apart from any collective benefit. It too mixes high hopes with intransigent realities. All these possibilities come to a head in montage diversity, where we might see optimistic assemblies or offensive pastiche, insouciant contradictions or true convictions of unity. What makes the difference? How should we parse this pervasive and often provocative form of social editing?

A good place to start is an old and beloved Hollywood film sequence: the first major montage in the Frank Capra film *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington* (1939). The sequence was the work of Slavko Vorkapich, who was at once the leading practitioner of 1930s Hollywood montage and a European avant-garde film theorist. Here, Vorkapich applied his technical ideal of montage aesthetics to a practical diversity project: envisioning the moment in which Jimmy Stewart tellingly shares space at the Lincoln Memorial with people unlike himself. This influential use of film-editing technique to celebrate social difference is doubly important to the history of montage diversity because of its family legacy: Slavko Vorkapich's son Edward, it turns out, was the director for Pepsi's 1969 ad campaign. In "You've Got a Lot to Live," Ed Vorkapich refitted his father's 1930s form of montage diversity for the cultural politics of the late 1960s. In this unlikely genealogy from the European avant-garde to the Pepsi style of diversity, montage aesthetics and diversity discourse jointly gave American culture a visual rhetoric through which to construct its mixed commitment to full social inclusion.

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

The Vorkapich: Montage Diversity in 1939

The wide-ranging career of Slavko Vorkapich brought European avant-garde principles to Hollywood practice. Vorkapich trained as an expressionist painter in Belgrade, Budapest, and Paris in the 1910s and emigrated to the United States in 1920. His Hollywood breakthrough came in 1928, with his *Life and Death of 9413—A Hollywood Extra*, which he shot, as Sheri Chinen Biesen explains, "with his DeVry camera for 97 dollars using cardboard and cigarette boxes as sets in his kitchen and living room."[3] This independent work somehow caught the attention of Charlie Chaplin, who screened it for a group of Hollywood executives. Paramount then hired Vorkapich to direct and edit montage sequences. First at Paramount and then also at RKO and MGM, he dominated major studio montage production in important 1930s films, including George Cukor's *David Copperfield* (1935) and Sidney Franklin's *The Good Earth* (1937). In these years his name became the very word for Hollywood montage: "Let's have a Vorkapich here," directors would say, and they would get an artful montage sequence perfectly suited to Hollywood objectives.[4]

The montage style that became known as "the Vorkapich" brought a principled aesthetic to Hollywood editing. Vorkapich knew his business, but throughout his Hollywood work he remained very much an avant-garde film theorist. Before and after his early years as the industry's leading montage artist, Vorkapich published a series of critical articles, including "The Motion Picture as an Art" (*Film Mercury*, 1926) and "Motion and the Art of Cinematography" (*American Cinematographer*, 1928), in which he applied the classical theory of cinematic specificity—its special claim to the art of motion—to everyday cinematographic practice. In 1930 he published "Cinematics," an article in *Cinematographic Annual* that made claims not unlike those Sergei Eisenstein made for the cinema of attractions; in 1938 he lectured at Columbia University under the auspices of the Museum of Modern Art; in 1959 he published arguments "Toward True Cinema" in the journal *Film Culture*; and in the 1960s he lectured across Europe and America. (He was still at it in 1969, when his son brought montage to commercial advertising.) All the while, Vorkapich built bridges between theoretical authenticity and Hollywood practicality. As Biesen says, he "succeeded in integrating his theories and ideas of film as an artistic medium into an industry whose commercial aims were often the antithesis of that aesthetic objective to actually improve the quality of the product that was coming out of the Hollywood studio system."[5]

More specifically, he succeeded in making the art of montage an industry resource. He was forever proving that skillful montage could solve practical problems. His vocation was a kind of ongoing promotional campaign

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

for montage—a fact strikingly recognized by "Montage Marches In," a 1937 *Photographer* article by Ed Gibbons. Gibbons recognizes Vorkapich as "a leader in achieving this compromise between bread-and-butter and high-blown theory."[6] Montage became routine in Hollywood because Vorkapich knew how to make it pay; Gibbons concludes that montage "has been developed in recent years by that group of workers of whom Vorkapich has snared the most outstanding reputation, not toward the arty and theoretical, but rather toward the practical and essential." Montage artistry saved money by addressing a technical problem: the fact that sound recording could only proceed at 90 feet per minute when visual action could naturally move more quickly. Montage "can offset the bugaboo of talk, talk, talk—at 90 feet per minute—by glossing over essential but familiar and uninteresting story action to allow more precious time for new slants on character or comedy or background or novel situations and scenes." As a far more economical and dynamic means of storytelling than verbal diegesis, montage was at once a practical godsend and a truly cinematic invention: "Hollywood could thus possibly be daring enough to experiment with the subjective rather than the objective approach to a story and still keep the plot rolling along so that even a moron wouldn't be uncomfortable."[7]

Daring experimentation made comfortable for the masses was the signature achievement of "the Vorkapich." His achievement was also recognized across the industry, in articles (such as "Montage: A Look into the Future with Slavko Vorkapich"), invitations (for example, to address the Fifteenth Annual Motion Picture Conference in 1939, where he spoke on "Montage and Editing"), and nods to his authority (as in an internal brief for MGM entitled "The Meaning and Value of Montage," which even includes the helpful tip, "rhymes with garage").[8] In all this interpretive and promotional material, we see montage becoming ordinary cinematic parlance while retaining its avant-garde edge. It was this somewhat paradoxical combination that made it standard American movie material; both its practicality and its high-art dynamics perfectly suited the spirit of American enterprise.

Essentially, Vorkapich clarified the kinesthetic economy of montage, its power to deftly provoke strong affective and embodied responses. Drawing heavily on Gestalt psychology, Vorkapich defined film as a mobile visual aesthetic acting upon kinesthetic experience. Montage became the essence of this aesthetic, since montage could maximize film's visual mobility in such a way as to prompt the most constructive perceptive, affective, and physical engagement.[9] This idea of pragmatic engagement loosely matches the more pointed avant-garde idea of montage's tendentious effects. For Soviet montage artists, the pragmatic question was always an ideological one, asking how film could provoke powerful responses and revolutionary

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

political action. As a Hollywood filmmaker, Vorkapich bracketed this question, but that is precisely what gave his approach to montage its truly American potential. For Vorkapich, montage was not about heavily tendentious effects but kinesthetic ones—uncomplicated embodied sympathies. It was an affectively positive but uncommitted mode of engagement. This more free-floating kinesthetic impact was what made "the Vorkapich" perfect for the aspirational cinematic representation of American culture.

And this was why quintessentially American director Frank Capra hired Vorkapich to do the montage sequences in *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington.*[10] This style of montage was perfect for what we call the Capraesque: "the Vorkapich" delivered economical concision with no loss to sentimental power. It could make people feel good about something simple—simpler than the more complex politics roiling avant-garde Europe, but not therefore simplistically vacuous or deceptive. In *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington*, Vorkapich's montage work exemplifies the affective abbreviation that came to justify this form of film rhetoric and, more specifically, its early use for affirming a diverse society. If that abbreviation appears to oversimplify the social and political claims of society as a whole—if montage diversity here co-opts avant-garde practice—the avant-garde pedigree of "the Vorkapich" suggests how it also constructs a timely feeling of inclusion.

Jefferson Smith's first tour of Washington is a freely chosen adventure: he has ditched his handlers in order to get an authentic first experience of the city's great monuments via public transportation and on foot, out of the official view (fig. 2). This freedom is the first reason for montage, since it calls for an improvised array of sights and sounds more meaningful than any authorized sequence could manage. In addition, the insouciant energies of montage perfectly match Jefferson Smith's combination of humility and ambition, as well as his respectfully subversive ideal of American government. When Smith ultimately arrives at the Lincoln Memorial, a happy alliance of montage form and progressive inclusion seems to emerge, as shots matching Mr. Smith and the nation's great figures include people not typically included in the nation's monumental history. Shots showing Jefferson Smith regarding Lincoln are intercut with shots of an elderly Black man and what appears to be an immigrant grandfather with his grandson (fig. 3).[11] These people become part of the film's patriotic vision thanks to the adherent power of montage, which breaks up, diversifies, and yet still unifies the film's main story. That main story could well have been more inclusive; Jefferson Smith might have shared experiences with the people included here only as fleeting fragments, unconnected to any more representative diegetic development. Here, too, we see that even as montage diversity enables a kind of togetherness, it keeps some people from fully joining in. Diversity emerges only insofar as the Lincoln Memorial justifies

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

FIGURE 2. Jefferson Smith tours the great monuments in *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington*, directed by Frank Capra (1939), DVD.

FIGURE 3. Other people help close the patriotic first montage sequence in *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington* (1939), DVD.

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

the peripheral mention of various types. Here, the Lincoln Memorial and filmic montage are analogous sites for a limited form of public assembly, civic worlds where difference and togetherness could feel compatible.

And yet montage does enable real inclusion. This sequence is by no means just slapped together. Its metrical pattern and match-cutting set up meaningful equivalences among monuments, protagonist, and diverse extras. Prior to its climactic moment, the sequence superimposes Jefferson Smith's face upon what he appreciatively sees, blending his own subjective heroism with its objects of interest. Strong regularity in image alternations and progressions restrains the kind of montage dissonance that might have implied any tension between his ideals and national heritage. This same equanimity includes the other people in this sequence too, and indeed certain camera angles even suggest that these other people matter as much as Jefferson Smith himself: they are accorded subjective close-ups as well as the kind of reverential low angle through which we also see Lincoln, implying that any separation between them and the film's main story is respectful and ennobling. In these ways this sequence primes us for affirmative conjunctions, even as it never narrates continuity between *Mr. Smith*'s ideal of America and the nation's demographic reality. Film theorist David E. James credits this sequence with the kind of "metaphoric connotation and affective eloquence" that produce montage's most powerful effects.[12] That assessment applies also to the vision of diversity in this "Vorkapich," where montage engineers affective connotations that do also signify beyond the limitations of its single images. Montage dynamics provoke us to read the visual rhetoric of diversity for its motivating patterns, for structural premises that correspond to specifics of montage technique. Editing that looks scattershot turns out to have patterns analogous to those of social-difference assembly. We then see how those patterns work, not just formally but as expressions of historical realities. In the case of "the Vorkapich" in *Mr. Smith*, discerning metrical patterns and relations among intrashot compositions shows us how diversity could be composed in 1939—as a matter of equivalences enabled by monumental civic space, as a matter of shareable civic commitment. Here, montage diversity has enough technical brio, targeted gestalt, and constructive vision to reward the kind of analysis articulated in classical montage theory. And the reward includes insight into the construction of diversity discourse—not only its optimistic rhetoric circa 1939 but also the optimism that still often motivates it today.

Diversity as Montage, Montage as Diversity

Optimistic diversity rhetoric often involves what we might call a better-unity dialectic. That is, the rhetoric in question here—the form

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

compatible with montage—stresses the better success of differentiated groups. For example, the United States Census Bureau's 2018 webpages on diversity and inclusion define diversity broadly as "all the ways in which we differ," but more pointedly in terms of the *success* differences yield:

> Among these dimensions are age, gender, mental/physical abilities and characteristics, race, ethnic heritage, sexual orientation, communications style, organizational role and level, first language, religion, income, work experience, military experience, geographic location, education, work style, and family status. Effectively, managing diversity means including people with differences in the design and implementation of programs and valuing their contributions. Why? Because programs become innovative, problem solving is more effective and errors are avoided because organizations create opportunities to draw upon people with different backgrounds which provide new perspectives for organizational and personal success.[13]

Here, diversity is valued less on its own terms than for what it achieves: differences enable a better whole, which becomes more than the sum of its parts in a purposive organization toward success. Differences that might seem to fracture a group in fact solidify and enhance it; differences make for a better unity, which in turn improves personal achievement. Differences may not be unifying, but that is why they generate a stronger and more coherent social design.[14]

Ethical and political arguments in favor of diversity, however, could favor inclusion whether or not it yields excellence; regardless of its contribution to a better and more successful unity, diversity could be a priority, more purely for the sake of equity and justice. But this is not the position of much diversity rhetoric, which commonly resorts to the better-unity dialectic. For example, the rhetorical frame established in the first issue of the trade publication *Insight Into Diversity* maintains that creating a diverse workplace is "an opportunity to achieve the most successful team infused with the most innovative ideas through different perspectives."[15] A key 2009 argument in favor of opening military service to LGBTQ people rejects the ideal of "unit cohesion," which demands troop homogeneity, in favor of evidence proving that differences actually improve combat effectiveness.[16] More broadly, this rhetoric extends to the game-changing 1978 Supreme Court decision in Regents of the University of California v. Bakke, which shifted emphasis from affirmative action to diversity defined as a general educational benefit.[17] In turn, this rhetoric has extended to the "inclusive excellence" model subsequently adopted by many institutions of higher education.

Montage is also often a matter of inclusive excellence, insofar as it too depends on differences among parts generating better wholes. For Eisenstein (and equally, if differently, for other theorists), montage amounts to

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

a kind of aesthetic optimism: as intervals and overtones emerge out of the clash of unlike images, something qualitatively different and better emerges—a higher understanding, a stronger connection, even a better chance of survival in modernity. Eisenstein always stressed that montage "gave rise to a 'third something,'" a new experience or insight generated out of shots juxtaposed.[18] The goal of montage was to produce "another concept which arises from that juxtaposition as something qualitatively new," and the result was "a new, transformed exemplary whole," with the power subsequently to shape better wholes in the human mind and in human society at large.[19] Of course, many Marxists and other montage discontents argued against this premise, lamenting disruptive fragmentation for its persistent confusion or preferring it for its negativity. They saw montage as a subversive or deceptive phantasmagoria that would—or should—undermine any purposively whole enterprise. György Lukács felt that montage disruptions ultimately just enabled ideological manipulation.[20] Inversely, Theodor Adorno thought montage should shock the public out of any faith in organic wholes, and, for him and others, as I discuss below, instrumentalized differences were worse than nothing.

On the one hand, then, montage form and diversity rhetoric share an interest in how wayward differences generate unifying success. This agreement is what can make montage diversity such a powerful and symptomatic register of aspirations toward inclusion. On the other hand, montage form and diversity rhetoric share a problem with success; their shared investment in better unity can also be an ideological distraction through which montage and diversity actually undermine each other—making a pretense of diversity and turning montage into *pastiche*, into a fraudulent patchwork, a distracting ruse. This result is a problem Sara Ahmed has recognized in her work on "racism and institutional life." Institutional commitments to diversity too often devolve into a blandly calculated "repertoire of images," into "collages of smiling faces of different colors" and other optics "easily recognized *as* images of diversity" but actually false to the reality of achieving it.[21] As a "containment strategy," such images make diversity little more than a perfunctory "routine" and permit us to imagine inclusion as a mission accomplished. When colorful posters, brochures, and websites reassure us with kaleidoscopic visuals, they might actually only distract us with a falsely perfected spectacle that enables business as usual. As Ahmed notes, other critiques of this "Benetton model" in which diversity becomes an aesthetic style of "rebranding" see the diversity montage not just as benign affirmation but as a diversion—the kind of ideological effect in play whenever dynamic visual pleasure becomes a hegemonic distraction.[22]

Walter Benn Michaels argues that the rhetoric of diversity can distract from the problem of social inequality, which we ignore when we focus on

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

inclusion defined in terms of the multiplication of identity-based differentials.[23] Michaels's critique, together with what Ahmed and others see in the visual rhetoric of specious inclusion, alerts us to the worst-case scenario for montage diversity—specifically for optimistic representations like the montage sequence in *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington*, and more generally for the collaboration of these analogous efforts at better unity. In this context, the kinetic conjunction of Jimmy Stewart and other Americans might be read not as movement toward justice but as a containment strategy through which the appearance of diversity hedges against progressive change. Montage diversity becomes pastiche—a heedless jumble, an opportunistic and clumsy ruse. We have also seen, however, that the montage sequence in *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington* is fairly mindful and creditably artful, as the work of an artist steeped in the avant-garde tradition defined by awareness of the critical implications of montage effects. And so we might begin to distinguish the worst-case scenario from better ones—*Mr. Smith* from the "Benneton model"—to distinguish montage diversity from what happens when it devolves into a pastiche of inclusion.

The visual rhetoric of diversity inevitably becomes a deceptive mode of containment when its constituents, social and aesthetic, are instrumentalized for an ambiguous idea of success—when differences are lost to the better collective, and when montage is heedlessly performed as a better-unity machine. Then, the compatibility of diversity discourse and montage aesthetics is a danger to both, a matter of bad influences, lowering all expectations for montage diversity, in the case of *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington* and beyond. And so one legacy of that film—the legacy of "the Vorkapich" itself—is this specter of montage failing to do anything other than haunt us with the mere "repertoire of images," diversity conceding to containment not despite but because of the best efforts of the cinematic imagination. Another legacy, however, is what Slavko Vorkapich gave his son: the better judgment to expose the better-unity dialectic.

Montage America: Ed Vorkapich and "You've Got a Lot to Live"

According to Ed Vorkapich, Pepsi first approached him for their 1969 campaign because his "avant-garde photography" and his film background boded well for the campaign's objectives.[24] "What my father taught me about the visual nature of film" had given Ed Vorkapich an avant-garde sense of visual composition, which prompted him to make a bold decision when Pepsi asked for a vibrant, optimistic new vision of American culture. The larger goal, according to Director of Creative Services Alan M. Pottasch, was to define a new "Pepsi Generation" that could take the country out of

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

a "very blue period," to "bring optimism to a country that was longing for it."[25] And so for thirty days Vorkapich traveled all across the country, shooting 22,000 feet of film, looking for "Americana."[26] His plan was to make America's vibrant visual diversity itself drive a new advertising format. Whereas the soft-drink companies had been doing "very structured ads," preplanned with the usual storyboards, Vorkapich let spontaneous sights of all kinds direct his process.[27] He was given wide latitude—a kind of artistic freedom new to the industry—and he used it to find an inclusive answer to his main question: "How do we get real people in commercials?"[28]

His answer to this documentary question involved no artificial exclusion or inclusion. He filmed everyone and decided to let reality govern the ad's ultimate demographics. "The only way to put them in is the way they were in," he said about his approach to including diverse Americans; "I'm not going to force it," he said, meaning that the ad's diversity would be true to American life.[29] But this realism then naturally demanded montage, if anything was to make a composite whole of America's actual demographic differences. No single scenes would include enough of America. This was how diversity drove the montage format, which in turn offered its own take on what American diversity was all about.

Pepsi's prior campaign for national television was "Taste that Beats the Others Cold" (1968). It featured a single setting with young white people frolicking in sun-soaked leisure, a uniform scenario consistent with years of stylistic and demographic homogeneity. One spot, "Rope Swing," shows young white couples swinging high into the air and dropping into placid water before popping open a Pepsi. "Surf Football," another spot, had a similar theme—and the same demographic makeup. But everything changed with the signature ad in the "You've Got a Lot to Live" campaign: with "Big Town U.S.A." (1969), Pepsi's ludic white scenario was fragmented into disparate demographic parts, showing the real diversity of American life. "Big Town U.S.A." was among the first of sixteen ads that ran for a total of four years and consistently presented the American public with combinations of Black, Asian, white, Latinx, and Indigenous people working, playing, and living alongside each other.[30]

"Big Town U.S.A." begins with a young boy of ambiguous race and ethnicity dashing down the steps of a city brownstone. (The setting appears to be New York, but it could be any one of many major American cities.) As the boy makes his way through town to a sports arena, he implicitly observes other city dwellers enjoying themselves—nothing like "Surf Football," but still the kind of exuberance familiar from Pepsi's vision of American life.[31] The real difference is the racial and ethnic makeup of the ad—and its corresponding style of editing. A series of disjunctive scenes presents, in rapid alternation, two apparently nonwhite couples, groups of nonwhite

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

children, a Black boy, a white woman, and (in two exceptional instances) white and Black men and boys together. Pepsi itself makes regular appearances (the logo and the bottle, the fizzy drink, close-up and distant), and other factors (the famous jingle, a richly saturated color scheme) shape the image that emerges. That image is one of dynamic inclusiveness; a big town is a diverse one. But this diversity is nothing more, and nothing less, than what montage will allow, as this pattern of incongruous juxtapositions generates a strong feeling of togetherness while carefully distinguishing the parts that compose it. And so to watch this ad in 1969 would have been to see Pepsi making a real difference while also holding back, using montage to safely rebrand itself for the era of civil rights.

This format was a strategic response to the market demographics of the moment, conditions described in Dorothy Cohen's 1970 article "Advertising and the Black Community," which recognized the growing power of Black consumers and urged advertisers to do better by them. Cohen cited a 1967 study on the low percentage of Black people in television advertising and called upon the industry to increase it, declaring that advertising "has the power and the responsibility to provide a means by which blacks can be accepted and acknowledged in the mainstream of American life."[32] D. Parke Gibson's 1969 book *The $30 Billion Negro* also asserted both the moral demand and the financial incentive.[33] Of course, Pepsi's response to this demand was incomplete, only going so far as to represent the white mainstream of American life, with the Black community and other minorities playing a separate part within it. And that is indeed what montage circa 1969 enabled, this compromise of including minorities in advertisements without risking fully inclusive scenarios—a strategy very much consistent with the kind of containment strategy typical of corporate America at this moment, which had been complaining of "being damned if they do and damned if they don't" when it came to integrating their advertisements.[34] The crucial thing, it seems, was what Cohen called a "credible integrated setting," and this was what montage could most easily but cynically provide.[35] In other words, montage was itself a "credible integrated setting," if not a complete one. Montage could make diversity plausible for the public as a whole, at a time when the question "*Is integrated advertising the right way?*" was yielding uncertain answers: "The first advertisers who used this tactic risked 'backlash' from whites, who might view integration as undesirable, and product boycott from blacks, who might view it as hypocritical."[36] For brands unsure how to make a unified consumer base seem genuine and attractive, montage could supply a reassuring—if more cynical—set of rhetorical tactics.

If montage offered one solution to the problem of integration in marketing, what might montage *theory* tell us about that solution? In Pepsi's 1969

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

montage we see people of different races and ethnicities separately together. What does this format tell us about the ways mid-century American consumer culture tried to mediate cultural feeling about, and possibilities for, an inclusive marketplace? How did montage structure that credible setting for an as yet incredible outcome?

Classical montage theorists probably would have looked at "Big Town U.S.A." and seen only "American" montage at its worst—a failure of parts to generate any meaningful larger thematic other than profit. This loose collection of impressions would probably have seemed to them nothing more than a lazy distraction out of which only a commercial product—a brand identity—emerges. That is, they might have seen pastiche doing a disservice to a potentially utopian diversity of identities in service of the nonidentity that is Pepsi-Cola, the kind of ideological totality that montage ought to disrupt. They might have agreed with Adorno, who regretted that "the principle of montage," which was "conceived as an act against a surreptitiously conceived organic unity" and "meant to shock," had "been neutralized."[37] This possibility of montage devolving into regressive pastiche—and diversity devolving into an ideological deception—is what we have identified in critiques of the "Benneton model" and other co-optations in which only the bare junctural principle of montage obtains.[38]

But montage means more than that to "Big Town U.S.A." Ed Vorkapich was his father's son, and his approach to commercial montage shared both the pragmatic and the artful designs of *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington.* His vision for assembling diverse elements involved a kinesthetic ideal like the one through which his father had mediated avant-garde theory and Hollywood practice. Its realization in "Big Town U.S.A." rewards the kind of scrutiny that is characteristic of montage criticism less given to blanket rejections and more precisely aware of the whole array of specific dynamics through which montage actually functions. Something less like Adorno's nostalgic purism and more attuned to Eisenstein's original anatomy of montage techniques can articulate more accurately how "Big Town U.S.A." mediates the morphology of diversity in the United States circa 1969.

Eisenstein's technical terms offer some apt language for reading montage diversity. To explain how vital social ideas could emerge out of mere images, Eisenstein (and the critical tradition he founded) developed classifications sensitive at once to the inner shape of camera shots and their various correspondences. Intra- and intershot relations of various kinds came together in a rhetoric of montage capable of realizing all the subtle mechanics of film editing and, by extension, registering diverse forms of aesthetic and social patterning. For example, *metric* montage combines shots of regular lengths at a steady pace, while *rhythmic* montage varies pacing according to the content of each shot and the combined effects of many.[39]

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

With this basic distinction, Eisenstein identifies technical differences that might also be social ones—patterns of visual rhetoric that would also argue in different ways for relationships among people. These patterns call attention to how montage performs sociological constructions, even if they might seem only to fracture social wholes.

This potential increases when Eisenstein explains more fully how the content of individual shots interacts with the structural relations between different shots. The distinction between *vertical* dynamics (movement within a shot) and *horizontal* developments across shots develops a complex matrix for determining how individual characteristics interact with group dynamics. With *tonal* montage, rhythms go beyond pacing to include the many effects that multiply intrashot differences—the determinants of difference itself. These basic determinants work toward the main focus in Eisensteinian montage theory: the overtone. Overtonal montage is really the essential montage effect, insofar as it is where diverse determinants yield that better unity essential to this tradition of critical thought and practice. That "ultimate, common whole" that was for Eisenstein the locus of filmic achievement was the effect of the overtone, especially as it yielded *emotional* and *intellectual* montage, each developing the tendentious capacity of film editing to a further pragmatic and worldly effect.[40] In the rhetorical outcome whereby the "fourth dimension" became a capacity of feeling and of thought, montage is defined as a transformative cognitive and affective structure. Film editing correlates to social attitudes and behaviors. In that correlation, this critical tradition offers a critical vocabulary for what emerges from the montage style of diversity we see, feel, and understand in "Big Town U.S.A."

Reading Montage Diversity: "Big Town U.S.A." and the Rhetoric of Brand Equity

The montage style of "Big Town U.S.A." is mainly metrical. That is, relatively even shot-lengths measure out a calm consistency despite the busy urban setting and despite Pepsi's more likely association with rhythmic excitement. Less even shot-lengths could have generated more energy, but "Big Town U.S.A." instead establishes equivalences, and that itself suggests something about the style of diversity in play here: equanimity is its baseline, a kind of composure suggesting that this integration of people is a matter of course rather than a remarkable provocation. Shots show Latinx and Black couples vibrantly enjoying themselves, but the larger composition does not react to them by speeding up or cutting more quickly among diverse images.

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

The total effect is actually surprisingly inert—again, stressing that there is room and time enough for everyone in this urban American environment.

Then again, there is a great deal of movement in "Big Town U.S.A."—movement within each shot, as the camera zooms in or out and as bodies contribute their own dynamic gestures to each frame. Rhythmic montage is in play here after all but *vertically,* within shots that *horizontally* develop a metrical pattern. This too tells us something about the style of diversity Pepsi promotes: each diversity element is a kinetic contributor to the composed whole, each offering spirited life to what becomes a calm collective. "Big Town U.S.A." actually depends upon the energy generated within each shot to power what then becomes a necessarily serene, peaceful whole. This dynamic suggests that montage diversity must harness vertical, intrashot energy for the whole in order to better justify a whole itself lacking in spirited conviction.

The relationship here—between energetically singular verticality and composed horizontal diversity—sometimes does occur within single shots. There are telling instances of affirmative intrashot inclusion in "Big Town U.S.A.," shots that do include diverse people together. Although the main tendency is the segregating style of togetherness characteristic of montage diversity, three shots show Black and white working men and children playing together. There is also one scene of a mixed-race commercial transaction (at a hot dog stand). But these seem to feature as safe exceptions that reinforce the more general tendency toward fragmentation, and they have the effect of reinforcing the ad's formal solution to the problem of diversity, its tendency to rely upon intrashot energy to bring people together from one shot to the next and to hedge against full rhetorical endorsement of plural social unity.

This metrical equivalence among vertically dynamic shots gains further productive energy through those that include no people at all. In one telling instance, a shot offers only a low-angle view straight up at skyscrapers, a point-of-view leap into the skyline. Nearly a self-conscious reference to verticality, this shot explicitly performs the kind of internal emphasis through which "Big Town U.S.A." more generally generates its kinetic equivalences. In other words, the ad directly indicates the significance it accords to each of its elements—they too are sky-high—even as it seems to treat each element equally. Perhaps the most telling example is the empty stadium that raises the roof on the ad's last shot. Here, the effort to energetically affirm diversity without fully visualizing it gets literalized in a space that could accommodate thousands but actually includes no one. Again, the effect is that of a social whole untroubled by its differences, indeed better composed because of the way forceful vitality obtains within rather than among its different elements.

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

"Big Town U.S.A." is ultimately an example of overtonal montage. The overtone that emerges from the ad's diverse shots is that of a dynamic unity more unified for its separate dynamism. But one particular object dominates: Pepsi itself. For every two or three shots populated by diverse people, there is one shot of Pepsi alone (the bottle, the logo, the pouring liquid). The recurrence of the product gears the ad's overall equanimity toward another message: the value of brand equity. Brand equity is the surplus value extending beyond the actual product to the public perception of it, but brand equity also involves the stake or share consumers have in a product, its social role.[41] In "Big Town U.S.A.," this role extends to inclusion. Diversity emerges as an effect of consumer culture—more specifically, of the equal opportunity to consume a product that is so equally available. Everyone has an equal stake in Pepsi: this is the rhetorical statement made by montage here, as it alternates among images of dynamically different people and the consistent image of Pepsi itself. This is unsurprising—"Big Town U.S.A." is a big-brand advertisement—but it has striking implications for montage diversity.

This combination of visual fragments and a sociocultural proposition is not unlike what montage theorists hoped montage could achieve. Something like Eisenstein's "socially interpreted generalization" indicative of progress toward utopian social equality seems to be the objective of "Big Town U.S.A."—until equity via brand identity redirects it.[42] "Big Town U.S.A." suggests that brand equity might be the great equalizer, the true if cynical basis for a society held together by its differences.[43] Cynical, but nevertheless still very much a "socially interpreted generalization," brand equity is also co-optation, but with critical potential, since montage diversity in "Big Town U.S.A." frankly performs the social structure that enables Pepsi to function as a social good.

Certainly, a montage assembly of this kind, if actually directed more authentically at social justice, might have featured fuller integration as a fact of urban life and done more to explore its prospects. And as we have seen, montage can appear to justify distraction from any more coherent narrative of what does or does not enable a diverse society and its viable functioning. But we have also seen that montage dynamics here preserve critical relations among images in such a way as to embody the rhetorical effects of a consumer culture in which brands become a proxy for shared interests, in which group identities draw manageable energy from brand-based consensus. Any more totalizing image of diversity circa 1969 might instead dream up a more perfect world, but this one shows the construction of the real one—or, rather, the uncertain and marketized dynamics by which some could hope, in 1969, that differences would yield a better social whole. This is to say that montage diversity is disappointingly but tellingly distinct from any more totalizing

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

approach to the composition of social differences—just as it is distinct, in another way, from pastiche, which offers only broken images, with no organizing idea of their composite relations. This is to see in montage diversity something more than a deceptive assemblage of appealing images and something less than an optimistic whole—not just an opportunistic hedge against diversity, but not diversity's best form. Neither pastiche nor totality, montage diversity embodies the pattern of social reality in such a way as to expose given relationships between identity-based differences and their situated social wholes. And this is to argue that montage diversity has telling affinities with a very different approach to imaging difference in social worlds: the form of visual anthropology known as ethnographic montage.

Montage Diversity as Visual Anthropology

In 1971, Coca-Cola debuted its own diversity campaign, Bill Backer's "I'd Like to Buy the World a Coke," better known as "Hilltop." More famous than "You've Got a Lot to Live" (and recently back in the public eye thanks to *Mad Men*), "Hilltop" was another attempt to make a brand encompass racial and ethnic difference. But it took a very different visual and ontological approach to human assembly, one that was more global, more unified, and more totalizing.

Backer says he was inspired to reconceive Coca-Cola by the sight of diverse people enjoying the product while delayed together at an airport: he resolved "to see Coke not as it was originally designed to be—a liquid refresher—but as a tiny bit of commonality between all peoples, a universally liked formula that would help to keep them company for a few minutes."[44] This universal formula sounds like the brand equity envisioned by Ed Vorkapich for Pepsi, but it visually framed universality very differently. Coca-Cola's ad represents people from different nations, races, and ethnicities actually standing together, singing in perfect harmony. No montage dissonance divides them, and, although the ad is not a single shot, it has the feel of one, with slow-fades rather than jump cuts taking us from one slow pan to the next (fig. 4). A much more coherent optic offers a totalized vision of diversity, a complete commitment to togetherness. But this total diversity is very much a fantasy; the premise as well as the format suggests a certain insouciance, and together they produce a utopian rhetoric as unconvincing as it is attractive. The ad ends with a statement that inadvertently emphasizes the unreality of the fantasy in play here: "On a hilltop in Italy, we assembled young people from all over the world . . . to bring you this message from Coca-Cola bottlers all over the world. It's the real thing. Coke." But it's not a real thing, since it took such a strange effort to assemble these people from

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

FIGURE 4. Total diversity optimistically envisioned in "Hilltop." © 1971 The Coca-Cola Company. Courtesy of the Coca-Cola Company.

all over the world, and because the result is so staged. By contrast, Pepsi's diversity montage, with its documentary-style vignettes left separate, looks much more true to life, if less fully unified.

"Hilltop" is an example of *total* diversity—the complete and perfect assembly of different kinds of people, the full unity that involves at once a fuller commitment to diversity and more questionable judgment. Total diversity outdoes montage diversity with its progressive allegiance to social-justice ideals, but its rhetoric can be much more rhetorical, and even more subject to preemptive motives. Whereas montage theory holds that juxtapositions "evoke" a "total image" of a film's thematic message, total diversity puts that total image first, preempting the effects of the juxtapositions.[45] By forestalling any emergence of diversity's total image, by disallowing montage dynamics, "Hilltop" offers a vision of world culture that blocks recognition of what actually puts people together (and confirms their relative identities) under the aegis of global forces. By contrast, montage diversity, with its lesser commitment to total togetherness, has a greater sense of these dynamics—and a structural likeness to the techniques that define montage practice in the field of visual anthropology. Anthropologists trying to make observational film truer to the dynamics of human difference have turned to montage for help, and their practice—the field of ethnographic montage—can help explain the difference between the totality of "Hilltop" and the realities of "Big Town U.S.A."

George E. Marcus's seminal 1990 article "The Modernist Sensibility in Recent Ethnographic Writing and the Cinematic Metaphor of Montage" called upon the field of anthropology to adopt montage techniques of analysis. Marcus affirmed the long-standing use of film in anthropological work but said it had missed the opportunity to revolutionize anthropological methods: film could help the field "rethink the project of ethnography itself" by disrupting observational narrative, by challenging the still-dominant realism of nineteenth-century social theory. More specifically,

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

montage could “disrupt and reconceive the way social and cultural process as action is represented in ethnography,” by attending to the true construction of cultural identities.[46]

For Marcus, identities could not be understood solely in terms of their own coherent narratives. Rather, they had to be seen in relation to others and to larger social wholes. This dispersed, diverse, and relative pattern for identity construction had become inevitable in the age of globalization, necessitating a new pattern of anthropological representation; a “homogeneity-diversity problematic” demanded a style of witnessing to match. And that was montage, for many reasons. Problematizing space, time, and perspective; applying dialogic appropriation of concepts and narrative devices; asserting bifocality and critically juxtaposing alternative possibilities, montage was well-suited to representing the kind of dispersed diversity Marcus had in mind.[47] More importantly, montage involved the visual equivalent to the “homogeneity-diversity problematic”: its format for the dynamic relationship between individual elements and whole properties could show the truth about the give and take between local identities and totalizing forces. Montage could match “the operation of institutionally diverse agencies to constitute an entity and organization which they all fragmentally share,” envisioning how fragmentary participants actually make up societies. Inversely, montage could show how “distinctive identities are created from turbulence, fragments, intercultural reference, and the localized intensification of global possibilities and associations.” In other words, montage editing—its turbulence of fragments constituting more than the sum of its parts, its unique way of putting diversity and homogeneity into dialectical relations—could refocus a field looking for better ways of “mimetically confronting difference in a powerfully homogenizing world.”[48]

And the field responded, with widespread efforts to install montage analysis at the core of every kind of ethnographic encounter, and with parallel efforts to theorize the result. These efforts afford an explanatory framework for montage diversity—for identifying exactly how, when, and with what implications montage diversity approaches the ethnographic validity Marcus attributed to montage more generally. Marcus saw that true recognition of human diversity could be enhanced by the optical form of diversity unique to montage. He saw how montage has not only survived beyond its avant-garde origins but redoubled its relevance to critical reflection, how montage diversity has been developing not simply as some sham pastiche of juxtapositions no longer able to generate dynamic disjunctions, not only as a hedge against true diversity, but also as a format adequate to current demands for critical immersion in cultural difference. Subsequently, montage ethnographers have taken things even further, into the

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

wider realm of "transcultural montage" and its new vision of human diversity. Their work is montage diversity's most exacting frame of reference.

Work collected in *Transcultural Montage* (2013) pursues eclectic efforts to see (and to use) montage as "an analytic for understanding the complex cultural forms elaborated in the wake of colonial encounters and burgeoning global interconnection."[49] This new work looks back to the city-symphony films of Dziga Vertov and forward to Michael Taussig's idea of "interruptedness" and Trinh Minh-ha's theory of the "interval" as a post-structural and postcolonial mode of ethnographic representation.[50] As for Marcus, the objective is at once to disrupt the narrative subtexts of traditional ethnography—to "splinter . . . totalizing ideas of pan-human commonalities"—and to recognize, via montage, the ways individual identity formation takes place within larger structures.[51] Indeed, for this new generation of ethnographers, the formal dynamics of montage are even more important; montage's way of generating critical unities out of differential fragments is more vital to an enterprise dedicated to performing the emergence of cultural diversity. As Christian Suhr and Rane Willerslev put it in their introductory overview of transcultural montage, "montage, as understood here, may expand our possibilities for transcultural perception only by shattering commonsense understandings of the constitution of the world, thereby allowing the invisible ground of social life to take presence."[52] What actually unites diverse identities while preserving their differences becomes visible through the emergence montage performs. Montage stages for visible apprehension forces governing the circulation and thus the production of transcultural differences.

Of course, examples of this dynamic include no big-brand advertisements. Although the "invisible ground of social life" for ethnographic montage could certainly include corporate marketing, examples of transcultural montage are mainly filmic representations that are explicitly demystifying—self-consciously autoethnographic efforts to expose rather than perpetuate exploitative power dynamics. Nothing like "Big Town U.S.A." in their relationship to dominant cultures, examples of montage ethnography matter here more specifically for what they say about the abiding social implications of montage technique. Sharply aware not only of the advantages but also the limitations of montage as an explanatory technique, scholars and practitioners of transcultural montage have developed a critical view well suited to reading all conjunctions of filmic montage and ethnographic representation. Julia T. S. Binter describes Austrian film director Michael Glawogger's 1998 documentary *Megacities* as an example of the ways "experimental montage shape[s] social critique," but within limits.[53] Glawogger's suggestively combined vignettes do "enhance our perception of subaltern living and working conditions in global cities," but his authority as a creative artist

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

exerts a shaping force that ultimately unbalances his critique, totalizing away some of the urgent actuality of his vignettes.[54] Here as elsewhere, montage raises questions about the dynamics of social perception by foregrounding presumptive relations between individual identities and whole formations. Transcultural montage is all about self-conscious technique, all about reflexive performance of those montage techniques it shares even with less mindful—and more commercial—efforts to encompass worlds of difference.

For Jakob Kirstein Høgel, Brian Moser's 1971 documentary *War of the Gods*, which contrasts the lives of missionaries and the Indigenous people of the Vaupés region of Colombia, exemplifies "montage as analysis" only insofar as "the film crosscuts between the two cultures in demonstrative ways."[55] Because Moser shares the ideological objectives of Eisensteinian montage—what Terence Wright calls "directed meaning"—*War of the Gods* creates a kind of "uniformity" incompatible with more disruptive autoethnography.[56] Such distinctions are crucial to the interpretation of how montage actually functions in its many mediatory encounters with difference, and they clarify the larger project surrounding montage diversity: to determine how emergent wholes—the overtone that is a diverse society, inclusive excellence, the transcultural network—actually shape the imagination of diverse identities. In this ethnographic context, montage diversity takes shape as a form of social editing that makes visible the grounds of social life by simulating the relationship between enriching social differences and the totalizing frameworks that, for better and for worse, construct their emergence.

Conclusions: Montage Diversity/Diversity Pastiche

War of the Gods was contemporary with both "You've Got a Lot to Live" (which ran from 1969 to 1972) and Coca-Cola's "Hilltop" ad, and like those ads it raises questions about the nature and effects of the forms of visual inclusion we have been articulating here—montage diversity and its variants, including the diversity pastiche, the totalizing view, and the ethnographic critique. Of course, *War of the Gods* is an anthropological film rather than a commercial text, but it therefore follows the pattern observed by George E. Marcus in such a way as to clarify how montage diversity essentially works and what sets it apart from those variants that work instead to pastiche and to totalize social worlds of difference.

War of the Gods observes the decline of local practices among the Maku and Barasana peoples, closely representing precarious hunting, food preparation, and ritual activities as observed by anthropologists Peter Silverwood-Cope and Stephen and Christine Hugh-Jones. The film also documents the work of missionaries in these regions of Colombia. This links missionary

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

incursions to the decline of valuable local Indigenous traditions, but the goal is to set up (for the 1971 viewing audience) a comparative view confirming visually the nonsuperiority of missionary practices. The film's observational style gives these different cultures equal treatment to reveal what really distinguishes them: different ritual technologies. *War of the Gods* focuses on the diverse equipment used in different ways by these different cultures—books and statuary, feathers and the hallucinogenic plant yahei—to make a larger ethnographic point about the more total complex of faith technologies across the Americas. One particular scene drives this point home. A montage sequence contrasts an Indigenous faith ritual with a missionary religious service, cutting back and forth between a Barasana ritual (involving body painting, group motion, and chanting) and a Christian service focused around choral song.[57] What emerges is a comparative sense of these ritual media as alternatives within a larger cultural system. Again, the point is to level hierarchies, but the film also labors to demystify a larger conceptual network within which hierarchies are constructed. Its version of Marcus's "homogeneity-diversity problematic" splices these different cultures together in view of the emergent idea that these ritual technologies are alternatives within a larger cultural system.

This dynamic is what defines montage diversity, and it also operates this way—toward different ends, of course, and with different motives—in *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington* and in Pepsi's "Big Town U.S.A." In all these cases, montage and diversity collaborate around some emergent ethnographic concept that unifies differences it must also preserve. And if *War of the Gods* helps us see what is meaningful about the relationship between montage and diversity in Pepsi marketing circa 1970, one last example can clarify, finally, what happens when this relationship fails and montage diversity devolves into *diversity pastiche.*

"Big Town U.S.A." uses montage to have it both ways—to celebrate diversity while also hedging against it, to capitalize on the energy of social difference while maintaining a safe distance from it. "Big Town U.S.A." ultimately admits that only the Pepsi brand holds people together in its vision of American society, and its montage dynamics, even as they generate such energy around the product, reveal this ideological relation between Pepsi's vision of American diversity and the particular kind of unity that emerges from it. Montage structures an ideological ruse while revealing, through its design structure, how that ruse works. In this duality, montage diversity in "Big Town U.S.A." has the critical design of ethnographic montage, even if it does not share the explicitly autoethnographic objectives of visual anthropology. But advertisements that look like montage don't always work this way by any means, and failure to do so was the problem with

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

another, more recent ad for Pepsi-Cola: “Live for Now,” the now notorious Kendall Jenner spot that aired very briefly in 2017.[58]

“Live for Now” depicts a fictional Black Lives Matter rally, with Kendall Jenner at first off-site at a modeling shoot but then the rally’s leader: Jenner joins the protest to crown its victory against police violence by charming a police officer into drinking a Pepsi. The ad is a kaleidoscopic blitz of joyful difference that pops along against a telling counterpoint situation: as we glimpse diverse marchers and other young people across the city, we also see a photographer in her studio trying to assimilate a diverse array of proof-sheet images. Ironically, the photographer seems to be enveloped in montage, and when she gives it up—crumpling her proof sheets, racing out to photograph the crowd—Pepsi seems to give up on its history of montage diversity in favor of something else. The alternative, in “Live for Now,” is at once more haphazard and more mystifying. Individual shots develop no critical relations, and the overall implication—the soft-drink solution to the problem of police violence, which naturally drew so much outrage—is no credible vision of what subtends or might emerge from the combination of diverse interests. Collective activism here devolves into a spectacle of dissociative energy, thanks to the ad’s pastiche of images that remains pastiche because the total result—Pepsi disarming the police—is so nonsensical. Pastiche and totality together drain “Live for Now” of any montage critique of what happens when diverse interests collide.

By contrast, montage diversity is what we see in Pepsi advertisements when montage matches some actual emergence of diverse identities around and through a unifying concept. The result may be just as mercenary—just as corporate, just as Hollywood—but, because it works according to the better-unity dialectic that diversity and montage share in common, it amplifies ethnographic insight into the workings of the social world.

Such insight has long been accorded to montage praxis. Walter Benjamin wrote of wishing to “carry over the principle of montage into history,” suggesting that the “perceptibility” of history depended upon montage reconstruction.[59] The perceptibility of human assembly, too, grows with the kind of graphic dialectics special to montage. Eisenstein saw montage as a result of Soviet research, a response to a certain emergent idea of social conflict and its resolution and, more than that, a form patterned on historical human relations. “It must pattern itself on that prototype,” he wrote—on “the real, living, joyful and suffering, loving and hating, singing and dancing human originals.”[60] Something much like this pattern’s surprising optimism explains why montage has lent a form to the rhetorical construction of diversity, providing for Slavko Vorkapich a safe civic setting for an early nod to civil-rights advocacy and (for his son Ed) a revealing way to answer the question of integrated advertising circa 1969. And if a co-opted form of montage thereby brought

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

an unlikely avant-garde impulse to the worlds of advertising and Hollywood film (not to mention some downstream modes of public relations and corporate branding, through which montage diversity fails to optimize our everyday lives), it has done so with better judgment built into its better unities, with insight into the ways diversity really works for any given world.

Notes

For their help with parts of this article I would like to acknowledge: the Modernist Studies Workshop at the University of Michigan; participants in the seminars on "Montage" and "Theorizing Cinema Before World War II" at the 2018 Modernist Studies Association; the Modernism Group at the Ohio State University; the Kenyon Seminar; the Modernism Seminar at Harvard's Mahindra Humanities Center; and in particular my hosts at these events (at Michigan, Aaron Stone and Amanda Greene; at MSA, Margaret Flinn and Ryan Friedman; at OSU, Stephen Kern; at Kenyon, Piers Brown; and at Harvard, Samuel Alexander and the late John Paul Riquelme). I would also like to thank Jim Carson, Iris Martin, Ted Mason, Pashmina Murthy, Heath Sledge, and Diana Wise, as well as the archivists at the Smithsonian Institution, the Cinematic Arts Library at USC, and the Reid Cinema Archives at Wesleyan University.

1. Jackson Lears sees this Pepsi campaign as a co-optation of avant-garde filmic montage by American advertisers trying to deal with the disruptive effects of 1960s radicalism: "the Pepsi campaign displayed some venturesome techniques. The rapid-fire clustering of images recalled early-twentieth-century modernist antecedents . . . most directly, the technique of visual montage developed in the photographs of John Heartfield and the films of Sergei Eisenstein. What had originated as forms of protest found circulation as expressions of power"; Jackson Lears, *Fables of Abundance: A Cultural History of Advertising in America* (New York, 1995), 343. Lears's work was my introduction to Pepsi's 1969 campaign, which I have also discussed in my *Lasting Impressions: The Legacies of Impressionism in Contemporary Culture* (Baltimore, 2016), 81–82.
2. Sergei Eisenstein, "The Dramaturgy of Film Form (The Dialectical Approach to Film Form) (1929)" and "The Fourth Dimension in Cinema (1929)," in *The Eisenstein Reader*, ed. Richard Taylor, trans. Richard Taylor and William Powell (London, 1998), 95, 115. "Tendentious" is a translation of Eisenstein's term for the purposeful viewer-based effects of montage. See Eisenstein's summary statement on "the fundamental significance of the 'act of montage' as being above all a tendentious and socially purposive act, the reconstitution of images of reality in the interests of transforming and refashioning reality itself"; "Laocoön," in *Sergei Eisenstein: Selected Works*, ed. Michael Glenny and Richard Taylor (London, 1987), 2:132. See also his "Beyond the Shot (1928–1929)," in *Sergei Eisenstein: Selected Works*, ed. Michael Glenny and Richard Taylor (London, 1987), 1:138–50.
3. Sheri Chinen Biesen, "'Kinesthesis' and Cinematic Montage: An Historical Examination of the Film Theories and Avant-Garde Mediation of Slavko Vorkapich in Hollywood," *Studies in Visual Arts and Communication* 2, no. 1 (2015):

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

2–3. Biesen offers the best available account of Vorkapich's aesthetic perspectives.

4. Ibid., 6.
5. Ibid., 8.
6. Ed Gibbons, "Montage Marches In," *International Photographer* (October 1937): 25.
7. Ibid., 29.
8. "Montage: A Look in the Future with Slavko Vorkapich," *Cinema Progress* 2, no. 5 (December 1937–January 1938): 18–21, 34; program for the conference titled "The Making of Motion Pictures," Fifteenth Annual Motion Picture Conference, National Board of Review of Motion Pictures (2–4 February 1939), Hotel Pennsylvania, New York City, held in the David Shepard Collection, Cinematic Arts Library, USC; "The Meaning and Value of Montage," Internal MGM Brief (21 September 1938), David Shepard Collection, Cinematic Arts Library, USC, binder 2, 38.
9. In his account of "effective cinematography," Vorkapich stresses pragmatics: "Modern psychology teaches us that our primitive emotions can be sublimated and our reflexes conditioned. In other words, and in the present case, we may create pleasures and entertainment by suggested motions. By merely seeing motion on the screen our minds, conscious or subconscious, may be made to react in a similar manner as in active participation"; "Cinematics: Some Principles Underlying Effective Cinematography," *Cinematographic Annual* 1 (1930): 30. In his lectures on "Understanding Cinema" for the American Film Institute Theater, he cited Gestalt theorists, including Karl Duncker, on such matters as "induced motion" and argued that "fully developed cinematic visual sensibility should be able to identify with all the movements perceivable in visual reality and on the screen. One should be able to feel bodily, kinesthetically, all the movements presented to one's perception"; lecture notes for "Understanding Cinema" (28 January–1 April 1963), presented at the American Film Institute Theater, Kennedy Center, New York City, held in the David Shepard Collection, Cinematic Arts Library, USC.
10. As Frank Capra affirmed, "If we wanted something special, we'd get this guy Vorkapich. . . . He was excellent at doing this sort of thing"; "Frank Capra," interview with John F. Mariani (1975), in *Frank Capra Interviews,* ed. Leland Poague (Jackson, MS, 2004), 139.
11. Disability also seems to distinguish the grandfather from Jefferson Smith, perhaps as much as his unascertainable ethnic or citizenship status. Inversely, his whiteness seems to allow for closer proximity between the two men than what is allowed for the Black man who comes into view only through more complete montage differentiation. For a relevant discussion of the "displaced theme of immigration" in *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington,* see Jonathan J. Cavallero, *Hollywood's Italian American Directors: Capra, Scorsese, Savoca, Coppola, and Tarantino* (Urbana-Champaign, 2011), 27. For insight into why the film may have tried haltingly to affirm these forms of American diversity in response to Nazi aggression in Europe specifically, see Michael P. Rogin and Kathleen Moran, "Mr. Capra Goes to Washington," *Representations* 84 (Fall 2003): 230.
12. David E. James, *The Most Typical Avant Garde: History and Geography in Minor Cinemas in Los Angeles* (Berkeley, 2005), 74. *Mr. Smith* is now commonly seen as a film about the power of film, its growing political charisma, and even its power to restore American ideals despite modernity; see Raymond Carney, *American Vision: The Films of Frank Capra* (Cambridge, MA, 1986), 308, and Rogin

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

and Moran, "Mr. Capra Goes to Washington," 218. That film could connect with its audience and restore more personal forms of agency, despite mid-century political corruption, was the fantasy at work in the way Jefferson Smith—and film—win out against political forms of mediation. More specifically, we might say that *Mr. Smith* becomes a fantasy of social-justice empowerment through montage.

13. "Diversity and Inclusion," *United States Census Bureau*, accessed 21 August 2018; as of December 2022, this webpage no longer exists.
14. For a comprehensive account of this diversity ideal, see Scott E. Page, *The Difference: How the Power of Diversity Creates Better Groups, Firms, Schools, and Societies* (Princeton, 2007).
15. This statement appears in the feature article of the journal's inaugural issue under its new name, after thirty-five years as *Affirmative Action Register*; Jeana Bruce, "Letter from the Editor," *Insight Into Diversity* (November 2009): 3.
16. See Om Prakash, "The Efficacy of 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell,'" *Joint Force Quarterly* 55 (Fourth Quarter 2009): 90–91.
17. For a critical reading of Lewis Powell's opinion in Bakke, one that stresses the costs of this focus on diversity as a general educational benefit (as opposed to affirmative action as a necessary reparation), see Peter Wood, *Diversity: The Invention of a Concept* (San Francisco, 2003), 99–118. As this essay goes to press, the Supreme Court is once again considering race-based admissions programs in higher education in suits against Harvard University and the University of North Carolina, respectively.
18. Sergei Eisenstein, "Montage 1938," in *Sergei Eisenstein: Selected Works*, ed. Michael Glenny and Richard Taylor, trans. Michael Glenny (London, 2010), 2:298.
19. Ibid.; Eisenstein, "Laocoön," 197.
20. See Tom Levin, "From Dialectical to Normative Specificity: Reading Lukács on Film," *New German Critique* 40 (Winter 1987): 57, for an account of Lukács's position on montage relative to those of other Marxist theorists.
21. Sara Ahmed, *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life* (Durham, NC, 2012), 51–52.
22. Ibid., 52, 53. Ahmed cites Celia Lury, "The United Colours of Diversity," in *Global Nature, Global Culture*, ed. Sarah Franklin, Celia Lury, and Jackie Stacey (London, 2000), 147–87; and Alana Lentin and Gavan Titley, "More Benetton than Barricades?: The Politics of Diversity in Europe," in *The Politics of Diversity in Europe*, ed. Gavan Titley and Alana Lentin (Strasbourg, 2008), 9–30.
23. Walter Benn Michaels, *The Trouble with Diversity: How We Learned to Love Identity and Ignore Inequality* (New York, 2006). See also James M. Thomas, *Diversity Regimes: Why Talk Is Not Enough to Fix Racial Inequalities at Universities* (New Brunswick, NJ, 2020), and Pamela Newkirk's account of "Diversity, Inc."—the set of institutional enterprises that actually hamper real efforts at social justice by substituting "models of compliance" for actual achievements, for example when "many institutions have continued to initiate diversity programs that no longer specifically target historically disadvantaged racial groups"; *Diversity, Inc.: The Failed Promise of a Billion Dollar Business* (New York, 2019), 208, 183. Programs and rhetoric thrive, Newkirk warns, while diversity itself is "conspicuously lacking" (200).
24. Interview with Ed Vorkapich, "Pepsi Generation" Oral History and Documentation Collection (NMAH.AC.0111), Archives Center, National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution, Series 3: Oral History Interviews,

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

Subseries 3.1: Audio-Cassette Reference Copies: Box 18, "Ed Vorkapich" (14 November 1984), Research Tape 1, Side A, 6:50; 29:30. Vorkapich also said that his father was his biggest influence, giving him his sense of film as an art form (B 12:30). Quotations courtesy of the "Pepsi Generation" Oral History and Documentation Collection, Archives Center, National Museum of American History, Smithsonian Institution.

25. Interview with Alan M. Pottasch (Pepsi-Cola Director of Creative Services), "Pepsi Generation" Oral History and Documentation Collection, Box 19, "Alan Pottasch" (8 May 1984), Research Tape 1, Side B, 0:30.
26. Interview with Ed Vorkapich, A, 10:00.
27. His approach—"no storyboard, no nothing"—led producers to wonder, "what the fuck is he doing?"; interview with Ed Vorkapich, A, 21:55, 22:45.
28. Ibid., B, 1:50.
29. Ed Vorkapich has also been quoted as saying, "You got to be careful that the white guy doesn't relate too much to the black girl and that the black guy doesn't relate too much to the white girl," but in the "Pepsi Generation" Oral History recordings he makes clear that this was the corporate-executive view rather than a principle he himself accepted or observed (ibid., B, 8:00).
30. The sixteen ads that compose "You've Got a Lot to Live" are: "Big Town U.S.A.," "Inner City," "Leisure Time," "Small Town U.S.A.," "Young America," "Man in Motion," "This Happy Land," "Young Love," "Portrait of America," "School," "After Dark," "Family Love," "Heart Land," "Outdoors," "Outing," and "Snow." Although patterns and versions of the campaign's jingle varied, and although some later ads include voice-overs, the individual spots all feature the same diversity composition, with couples and families from different racial and ethnic groups mainly appearing separately but sometimes intermingling in circumstances involving men or children working and playing together. "Inner City" is notable for featuring a mainly Black demographic and showing Black and white couples socializing.
31. "Big Town U.S.A." did have a single story of a kind—that of the young boy moving through the big town, encountering different kinds of people along the way—but his story is only lightly organizational, and subsequent ads in this campaign proceed without any visual through line.
32. Dorothy Cohen, "Advertising and the Black Community," *Journal of Marketing* 34, no. 4 (October 1970): 10–11.
33. D. Parke Gibson, *The $30 Billion Negro* (London, 1969). See also his "Why the Negro Market Counts," *Business Week*, 2 September 1967, 64, and Leonard Evans, "The Negro Market," *Advertising Age* 40 (October 1968): 27, for different views on how to approach the Black consumer base.
34. James L. Collier, quoted in Cohen, "Advertising and the Black Community," 6.
35. Cohen, "Advertising and the Black Community," 7.
36. John W. Gould, Norman B. Sigband, and Cyril E. Zoerner, Jr., "Black Consumer Reactions to 'Integrated' Advertising: An Exploratory Study," *Journal of Marketing* 34 (July 1970): 20; emphasis original.
37. Theodor W. Adorno, *Aesthetic Theory*, ed. and trans. Robert Hullot-Kentor (Minneapolis, 1997), 155–56.
38. This reading would confirm the view held by Bill Nichols and Sarah Hamblin that because "Eisenstein's radical Marxist aesthetics are now popular in advertising, music videos, and action films and have thus been co-opted by the very system that Eisenstein opposed, montage finds itself similarly dissociated from its original revolutionary context and its potential as a radical aesthetic strategy

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023

exhausted under the injunctions of this new historical moment"; Sarah Hamblin, "Exhausted Montage: Radical Cinema Post '68," *Cultural Politics* 15, no. 3 (November 2019): 367.

39. For these and subsequent definitions, see Sergei Eisenstein, "The Fourth Dimension in Cinema (1929)," 116–23. Here I expand on what Eisenstein called the "four categories of montage" to include the fuller basic anatomy developed out of them (116).
40. Eisenstein, "Montage 1938," 298.
41. For a representative account of this aspect of brand equity, see David A. Aaker, *Managing Brand Equity: Capitalizing on the Value of a Brand Name* (New York, 1991), 114–20.
42. Eisenstein, "Rhythm," 247.
43. For a similar argument about diversity and branding in Benetton advertising—how "the difference of diversity can be seen as the defining feature of the artificial personality that is the Benetton brand"—see Lury, "The United Colours of Diversity," 160.
44. Ted Ryan, "The Making of I'd Like to Buy the World a Coke," *Coca-Cola Journey* https://www.coca-colacompany.com/stories/coke-lore-hilltop-story.
45. Sergei Eisenstein, "Vertical Montage," in *Sergei Eisenstein: Selected Works*, ed. Michael Glenny and Richard Taylor (London, 1987), 2:327.
46. George E. Marcus, "The Modernist Sensibility in Recent Ethnographic Writing and the Cinematic Metaphor of Montage," *SVA Review* 6, no. 1 (Spring 1990): 3, 9.
47. Ibid., 5, 6–7.
48. Ibid., 11, 6, 21.
49. Stuart McLean, "All the Difference in the World: Liminality, Montage, and the Reinvention of Comparative Anthropology," in *Transcultural Montage*, ed. Christian Suhr and Rane Willerslev (New York, 2013), 59.
50. Rane Willerslev and Christian Suhr, "Introduction: Montage as an Amplifier of Invisibility," and Catherine Russell, "Women in Cities: Comparative Modernities and Cinematic Space in the 1930s," in *Transcultural Montage*, ed. Christian Suhr and Rane Willerslev (New York, 2013), 9, 166.
51. Willerslev and Suhr, "Introduction," 10.
52. Ibid., 9.
53. Julia T. S. Binter, "Radioglaz and the Global City: Possibilities and Constraints of Experimental Montage," in *Transcultural Montage*, ed. Christian Suhr and Rane Willerslev (New York, 2013), 184.
54. Ibid.
55. Jakob Kirstein Høgel, "Montage as Analysis in Ethnographic and Documentary Filmmaking: From Hunting for Plots Toward Weaving Baskets of Data," in *Transcultural Montage*, ed. Christian Suhr and Rane Willerslev (New York, 2013), 219. *War of the Gods*, dir. Brian Moser (London, 1971), can be viewed here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OVWx07wepds.
56. Høgel, "Montage as Analysis," 219.
57. *War of the Gods*, 1:07, 53:49–57:00.
58. "Live for Now" can be viewed here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j9x15lR9VIg.
59. Walter Benjamin, *The Arcades Project*, trans. Howard Eiland and Kevin McLaughlin (Cambridge, 1999), 461.
60. Sergei Eisenstein, "Tolstoy's Anna Karenina: The Races," in *Sergei Eisenstein: Selected Works*, ed. Michael Glenny and Richard Taylor (London, 1987), 2:291.

Downloaded from http://online.ucpress.edu/representations/article-pdf/161/1/41/769917/rep.2023.161.3.41.pdf by guest on 04 June 2023