

ly an opposition between two film-makers and contemporaries. Certainly, Epstein's sophisticated ideas of *photogénie* and pure cinema should be taken as a point of elucidation. Rancière does not make any gesture of a *hiérarchisation* of the both early cinema artists, but, regarding the point of his whole debating of the important unfolding of cinema as art, it is obvious that he, for reason in his idea of the politics of aesthetics, in a given constellation somehow favours Chaplin.

*The art of moving images cannot be reduced to that of the camera's movements. The 'medium' of cinematic art cannot be identified with the instrumental paraphernalia that captures movements, gathers and projects moving images. A medium is neither a basis, nor an instrument, nor a specific material. It is the perceptible milieu of their coexistence* (Rancière, *Aisthesis*, ch. 11).

And exactly the notion of *immediacy* in "Chaplin's version" determines not only what we always knew as the art of cinema, but also what we know now as visual culture. Rancière does not bluntly define the concept of immediacy, but he brings it into a relation with the "redemption of empirical world proclaimed by German idealism: the redemption of sensible world where spirit recognizes the exterior form of a divine thought that it knows from now on as its own thought" (Ibid., ch. 4).

The notion of immediacy brought forward by cinema as art makes it possible to explain much more than it seems at first sight. Immediacy has nothing to do with simplicity; it has to do with exactly the opposite: the complexity. Although film as an art form and as entertainment for a wide range of audiences was transforming through time the effect of immediacy of what is contained, narrated, recognised, perceived and so on in the movement of images, remains a constant and most powerful "tool" of cinema as an art. This power works both ways: it is, for instance, used in visual advertisement and it works as a subversive impulse of all genre and non-genre cinema – often as a rule against a filmmaker's intention. In Rancière's terminology immediacy is operating the dissensus propelled by the complex *imagité* of films.

My concluding remarks require further elaboration and explications, but let me just give a hint of a possible understanding of film productions within the capitalist market system and their polyphonic meanings through the notion of immediacy. In all its incarnations, Hollywood was always a cinematic condensation of capitalism as spectacle. Howev-