

Deleuze *and* Cinema

Webster Lecture Theatre A, Robert Webster Building, UNSW | 30th November — 1st December 2015

Nadine Boljkovac
University of New South Wales

Gabrielle Lowe
La Trobe University

Mark Steven
University of New South Wales

Gabrielle Dixon-Ritchie
University of New South Wales

Sharon Mee
University of New South Wales

Lisa Trahair
University of New South Wales

Gregory Flaxman
University of North Carolina

Mairead Phillips
University of Melbourne

Saige Walton
University of South Australia

Greg Hainge
University of Queensland

Robert Sinnerbrink
Macquarie University

Raymond Younis
University of Notre Dame

Richard Smith
University of Sydney



UNSW
AUSTRALIA

Film as Philosophy
Understanding Cinematic Thinking



Australian Government
Australian Research Council

6th Workshop on Cinematic Thinking: Deleuze and Cinema

Workshop Organizers: James Phillips, Robert Sinnerbrink, Lisa Trahair

Despite lamenting cinema's failure to realise the dreams of its early pioneers and theorists (Dziga Vertov, Abel Gance, Sergei Eisenstein, and Élie Faure), in the second half of his second book on cinema Gilles Deleuze elaborates the basis for cinema's potential to meet the challenges presented by our contemporary modernity. Suggesting a whole new schema for thinking about a cinema whose co-ordinates are no longer classical, Deleuze gives us seers rather than people of action, clairvoyance rather than sight, the power of the outside rather than the open whole, free indirect discourse rather than internal monologue, and so on. The 'new cinema' begins with Welles, Dreyer, Kurosawa, Mizoguchi, and Rohmer, and although Deleuze sometimes refers to their work as modern, he does not conceive their aesthetic practices as part of a modernist teleology of a succession of styles, nor as a series of negations undertaken simply to oppose mainstream culture or purely for the purpose of coming to understand the nature of the medium. If there is, for him, a modern cinema that might rekindle in us some of the hope held by its earliest progenitors, it resists the negative dialectics, formalism and self-cannibalisation that impacted other arts because of a sense of possibility about this medium's capacity to directly engage with the world in which we live by rendering time and thought through images.

For this workshop we have asked scholars to return to Deleuze's cinema books in order to re-evaluate their legacy in relation to contemporary cinema, whether by investigating the challenges and opportunities posed by new technologies and social and political realities, or by adding to Deleuze's exploration of cinema through dialogue with the work of other philosophers and theorists, either his specific interlocutors (Plato, Aristotle, Spinoza, Leibniz, Kant, Bergson, Nietzsche, Artaud, Blanchot) or those whose work either resonates with or challenges his thought (Rancière, Badiou, Cavell, Derrida, Lyotard and Lacan).

6th Cinematic Thinking Workshop: Deleuze and Cinema

30th November—1st December 2015

Webster Lecture Theatre A, Robert Webster Building
Kensington Campus, University of New South Wales

Monday, 30th November

- 9.00-9.15 *Registration*
- 9.15-9.30 Welcome by **James Phillips**
- 9.30-10.30 **Nadine Boljkovac**, 'Beyond Herself: "A power to love" through Riva, Resnais and Haneke'
- 10.30-11.30 **Lisa Trahair**, 'Belief in this World: the Dardenne brothers' *The Son*'
- 11.30-12.00 *Morning tea*
- 12.00-1.00 **Gabrielle Lowe**, 'Correspondences: Cinematic Dialogues in Time'
- 1.00-2.00 *Lunch*
- 2.00-3.00 **Mairead Phillips**, 'We deserve better critics: *True Detective* and the Powerlessness of Thought'
- 3.00-3.15 *Afternoon tea*
- 3.15- 4.15 **Gabrielle Dixon-Ritchie**, 'Representation After Deleuze'
- 4.15 to 5.15 **Robert Sinnerbrink**, 'From Belief to Politics: Deleuze's Cinematic Ethics'
- 7PM Dinner at Nomad

Tuesday, 1st December

- 9.15-10.15 **Raymond Younis**, 'Cinema the Symbolic Order of the Vanishing World (On Kant, Nietzsche, Heidegger)'
- 10.15-11.15 **Greg Hainge**, 'Deleuze, Cinema, Bacon, Grandrieux'
- 11.15-11.30 *Morning tea*
- 11.30-12.30 **Saige Walton**, 'Movement Image, Time Image or Fold? *Bastards* (2013) as Baroque Dark Matter'
- 12.30-1.30 **Mark Steven**, 'Uncontrollable Organs'
- 1.30-2.15 *Lunch*
- 2.15-3.15 **Sharon Mee**, 'Jean-François Lyotard's foregrounding of Gilles Deleuze's "Open"'
- 3.15-3.30 *Afternoon tea*
- 3.30-4.30 **Richard Smith**, 'Unbound alternation: organic movement in cinemas of globalisation'
- 4.30-5.30 **Gregory Flaxman**, 'Afterlife'
- 6PM Drinks at the pub

Nadine Boljkovac, 'Beyond Herself: "A power to love" through Riva, Resnais and Haneke'

nadine.boljkovac@cantab.net

This talk, a work-in-progress from my forthcoming *Beyond Herself: Feminist (Auto)Portraiture and the Moving Image*, focuses on questions of self-creation and re-creation as it investigates instances of women's (self-)portraiture. With a focus on 'auto perception', a concept I put forward in *Untimely Affects: Gilles Deleuze and an Ethics of Cinema* in relation to Chris Marker's oeuvre, this presentation explores a woman's perception and dissolution as foregrounded by Emmanuelle Riva, and as witnessed through Alain Resnais's 1959 *Hiroshima mon amour* and Michael Haneke's 2012 *Amour*. A network of transnational film, philosophy and disability studies perspectives informs my reading of the films' folding of gazes between viewer, subjects, filmmakers. These doubling relations witness a process of simultaneous identity and separation as the perception of an Other becomes also a perception of one's self and self-fracturing. Consciousnesses of various reflective screens and surfaces become important – mirrors, eyes of all the worlds a subjectivity confronts – as they produce not only a woman's awareness of self as a moment of identification and separation but also a consciousness of the moment of things that materializes as a unique experience of time and duration. While scholars have begun to assess the self-portrait in film, this talk intercedes not to celebrate a more intimate and knowing relation with any subject but to discern how the 'moving' (self-)portrait might proffer women a means for shattering any pure and stable construction of identity.

Nadine Boljkovac (Postdoctoral Fellow, Visual Culture & the Moving Image, Centre for Modernism Studies, UNSW / PhD Cambridge) is author of *Untimely Affects: Gilles Deleuze and an Ethics of Cinema* (Edinburgh University Press, 2013 / paperback 2015) and co-editor of *Deleuze and Affect* (forthcoming). Peer-reviewed pieces appear in a *Film Theory Handbook*, ed. Tom Conley and Hunter Vaughan (forthcoming); *Understanding Deleuze, Understanding Modernism; Deleuze Studies; Open Letter: A Canadian Journal of Writing and Theory* ('Remembering Barbara Godard'); *Anamnesia: Private and Public Memory in Modern French Culture; Gilles Deleuze: Image and Text*. A second monograph in progress, *Beyond Herself: Feminist (Auto-)Portraiture and the Moving Image* (Palgrave Macmillan), examines works of feminist portraiture by film, literary, dance, and visual artists that manifest women's experiences of self-knowledge, reinvention, acuity, and diverse mental states. Most recently Nadine was the Brown University 2012-13 Carol G. Lederer Postdoctoral Fellow (Pembroke Center for Teaching and Research on Women, 'Economics of Perception' Seminar).

Gabrielle Dixon-Ritchie, 'Representation After Deleuze'

g.dixon.ritchie@gmail.com

One of Deleuze's primary manoeuvres in his *Cinema* books is to conceptualize a cinematic semiotics. The *Cinema* books pose a substantial challenge to many of the assumptions and conventions of contemporary film studies, which are still largely – and most often, unconsciously – authorized by psychoanalytical and linguistic interpretive frameworks, which are the inheritance of influential film theorists like Christian Metz. Dissatisfied with Metz' attempt to deploy Ferdinand de Saussure's semiology (linguistics) as a theoretical apparatus for film studies, Deleuze instead turns to Charles Sanders Peirce's tripartite general theory of signs: semeiotics. In so doing, Deleuze is able to excavate the immanent, material property of the filmic sign as it exists before it is overwritten by linguistic semiology, which tends to usurp the cardinality of the material under its own interpretative auspices, a posteriori. Deleuze therefore constructs a taxonomy of signs and images which correspond to filmic matter as 'a plastic mass', or as an 'a-signifying and a-syntactic material' (*Cinema 2: Time-Image*, p.29).

This paper hypothesizes that certain films engage artistically with Deleuze's cinematic material in a way that, though still intelligible as a plastic mass (and so not undermining the impetus of Deleuze's classificatory-evolutionary gesture), is also and simultaneously *interpretable* as a plastic mass. For instance, one of my contentions is that Léos Carax's *Holy Motors* (2012) is the 'spiritual automaton' *represented* or *narrativised* (which amounts to its operational death), which is not to deny the viability of mutually exclusive anti-representationalist readings or encounters with this film.

This paper suggests that it is not necessarily through self-conscious or acknowledged involvement with Deleuze's philosophy that certain films exhibit a kind of a-signifying-signifying fusion. I contend that many postmodern films inadvertently represent their pre-linguistic material, which is perhaps of little wonder given postmodernism's penchant for recalibrating everything under the aegis of a social constructivism unable to access reality beyond itself.

Gabrielle Dixon-Ritchie is a PhD candidate at the School of Arts and Media, UNSW. Her doctoral research focuses on the question of postmodernism in the emerging cultural paradigm, 'new materialisms'.

Greg Hainge, 'Deleuze, Cinema, Bacon, Grandrieux'

g.hainge@uq.edu.au

Deleuze's cinema books are, of course, not only about the cinema but form part of a larger philosophical project, a project that is advanced in ways that it could not be without the detour through the cinema we find in *The Time-Image* and *The Movement-Image*. Conversely we can suggest that these two volumes are not the only books that might be of use for thinking about the cinema, not only in terms of the philosophical content that certain films may seem to express but, more significantly, in terms of their formal construction as cinematic expression.

This very claim has been made by French filmmaker Philippe Grandrieux who in a recent interview has stated: 'I think the book of Deleuze on Bacon is very interesting, for me it's really the book about cinema he wrote, much more than *The Time-Image* and *The Movement-Image*. I think the book on Bacon is a book on cinema' (<http://specchioscuro.it/interview-philippe-grandrieux-intervista-grandrieux/#english>). In this paper I wish to take this claim very seriously and to use it as a point of entry into Grandrieux's films, employing Deleuze's book on Bacon as a means to understand the formal procedures at work in Grandrieux's cinema.

In doing this I hope to offer a different kind of analysis to those that have dominated the critical literature dealing with Grandrieux's films. Often cited as one of the most 'challenging' of contemporary filmmakers whose experimentation pushes the boundary of narrative cinema and representational forms further than any other (e.g. Beugnet, *Cinema and Sensation*, 2007: 113-24; Brown, *Supercinema*, 2013: 140), analyses of Grandrieux's cinema often figure it as one which deploys 'affect' and 'sensation'. Such analyses are often (as with much work on the *cinéma du corps*, extreme cinema or cinema of sensation according to one's preferred terminology) big on rhetorical excess yet slight on close textual analysis. As frustrated by much of this work as is Eugenie Brinkema (see *The Forms of the Affect*, 2014: xiii), in this paper I will argue that Grandrieux's cinema can be engaged with differently if we take seriously Grandrieux's statement above and approach his work via Deleuze's book on Bacon. In doing this, we are obliged to attend to the film's forms, by which I mean both their medium-specific expressions of a cinematic ontology and the forms that are figured in them. An understanding of the work of figuration will thus be seen as key to understanding Grandrieux's *modus operandi*, for it is what enables form to be figured without sacrificing the dynamism of affect and sensation. It is also controversially, however, that which demands that we engage with this work outside of any pre-existing epistemological, moral or political forms.

Greg Hainge is Reader in French at the University of Queensland. He is the author of a monograph on Céline as well as *Noise Matters: Towards an Ontology of Noise* (Bloomsbury Academic 2013) and is currently preparing a monograph on the work of Philippe Grandrieux (Bloomsbury Academic 2016). He serves on 5 editorial boards, including *Studies in French Cinema and Culture*, *Theory and Critique*, is co-editor for the Bloomsbury Academic series 'ex:centrics' and has published numerous articles on film, literature, new media studies, experimental and popular music and critical theory.

Gregory Flaxman, 'Afterlife'

gflax@email.unc.edu

One of the peculiar liabilities of Gilles Deleuze's 'cinema books' is that, having rewritten the history of the medium, he seems to write us out of the cinema altogether. Roughly divided between classical and modern cinema, Deleuze's two volumes describe the formulation of the time-image only to deposit us on the other side of this high-water mark. In the aftermath of cinema's new waves, Deleuze leaves off on the brink of a digital revolution that transforms the medium and experience of cinema. This talk concerns the prospects of ciné-philosophie 'post-Deleuze', and above all, I want to consider how we can understand the significance of power and life in new regime of images.

Gregory Flaxman is an Associate Professor in the Department of English and Comparative Literature. He is the author of the author of *Gilles Deleuze and the Fabulation of Philosophy* (University of Minnesota Press, 2011) and the editor of *The Brain is the Screen* (University of Minnesota Press, 2010). His latest book (coauthored with Robert Sinnerbrink and Lisa Trahair) on 'cinematic thinking' will be published by Edinburgh University Press in 2016. A fellow this year at the Humanities Research Center (Rice University), Flaxman is writing a short book on American history and biopolitics, *Off the Grid*, and working on a longer project dedicated to the history of off screen space.

Gabrielle Lowe, 'Correspondences: Cinematic Dialogues in Time'

G.Lowe@latrobe.edu.au

In this paper, I will look at Deleuze's concept of modern cinema in conjunction with his later work on the discipline of art, developed with Guattari in *What is Philosophy?* In *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*, Deleuze thinks of cinema in evolutionary terms, and sees modern cinema as a continuing project. This sits in contrast to cinema theorists who see cinematic modernism as a particular historic period (spanning 1960s-late 1970s). As Deleuze's books were written in the 1980s, many of the examples he uses are the same as those used by theorists who see modernism as a specific period. This, coupled with the fact he barely mentions cinema again, lends weight to his critics' argument that he is mistaken in his concept of modern cinema. However, even though he does not write specifically about cinema again, I will argue he continues to develop these ideas through his and Guattari's concept of the discipline of art. Specifically, I will draw similarities with their concept of chaos (the infinite) and Deleuze's notion of time (explored in *Cinema 2*). I will look at earlier incarnations of this idea of chaos, found in Pier Paolo Pasolini's work on cinema *The Cinema of Poetry*, and the influence of this on Deleuze's cinematic philosophy. I will then look at how this relates to a contemporary example: a recent exhibition of cinematic letters (filmmakers who exchange a series of filmed-letters). Between 2006-2012 the Centre de Cultura Contemporània de Barcelona (CCCCB) commissioned a set of six filmmakers to correspond via cinematic letters. It began in 2006 with an exchange between Spanish filmmaker Victor Erice and Iranian filmmaker Abbas Kiarostami. After the success of this exhibition it was developed further to include another five pairs of filmmakers: José Luis Guerín-Jonas Mekas, Albert Serra-Lisandro Alonso, Isaki Lacuesta-Naomi Kawasi, Jaime Rosales-Wang Bing & Fernando Eimbcke-So Yong Kim.

Gabrielle Lowe is a research Masters candidate in the Media: Screen + Sound department at La Trobe University, Melbourne.

Sharon Mee, 'Jean-François Lyotard's foregrounding of Gilles Deleuze's "Open"'

mee.sharonjane@gmail.com

In this paper I investigate the aesthetics of the cinematic apparatus in relation to what Gilles Deleuze calls in *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation* and *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image* the Open. For Deleuze, the living being is the Open whole that is 'open upon a world, and the world, the universe, is itself the Open' (Deleuze, c1986: 10). The image of cinema, in the sensorial relation, is thus defined as an imbrication of consciousness and the world: one that is Open. To accept this Deleuzian formulation—one that Deleuze notes preceded cinema itself when it first appeared in Henri Bergson's *Matter and Memory*—is to conceive of time, or rather duration (*durée*), as inscribed in the Open as relations: the 'vibrations' that travel through the 'immense body' of matter (Bergson, c1911: 276).

And yet, previous to Deleuze's claim that cinema is Open, Jean-François Lyotard had begun *Libidinal Economy* with a call to action: 'Open the so-called body and spread out all its surfaces' (Lyotard, c1993: 1). For Lyotard, the opening of the libidinal band/skin is an energetic investment of components. Juxtaposed with the investment of libidinal energies are 'structures' that channel and exploit; *dispositifs*. The cinematic apparatus, from this point of view, can be considered an opening and channelling or exploitation of energies. Although Lyotard did not conceive of cinema in this way, the cinematic encounter, I argue, is found in the opening of the ephemeral and heterogeneous 'skin' of the film.

This paper provides a way of thinking about cinema as a sensory manifold in which open and organic relations occur. I apply Lyotard's Open to cinema—something that is minimally imagined by him in his book—and use that as a baseline for explicating the work of Deleuze. I will argue that Lyotard foregrounds the work of Deleuze on the Open of cinematic movement, paving the way for a conceptualisation of the libidinal and the affective that is critical for contemporary cinema theory.

Sharon Jane Mee is a PhD research candidate at UNSW. She is writing her dissertation on the cinematic pulse in horror and horror erotic film using theorists Jean-François Lyotard, Gilles Deleuze and Georges Bataille. Her areas of interest are aesthetics, psychoanalytic philosophy and poststructuralism.

Mairead Phillips, 'We deserve better critics: *True Detective* and the Powerlessness of Thought'

maireadphillips@gmail.com

My title is a play on a line from HBO's *True Detective*: 'my strong suspicion is we get the world we deserve'. *True Detective* shows us a world wholly corrupt and moribund to the core. There is not an inch of space within this milieu that escapes the all-pervading undercurrent of impulse-driven venality, crime and moral-bankruptcy, like the poisoned central corridor that is at the heart of a land deal that kicks the series off, along with a corpse that tours the city with unseeing eyes burnt out by acid. This corpse that cannot see has everyone in the dark, and renders with it 'a hole in appearances' a 'figure of nothingness'. In *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*, Deleuze believes we must study Artaud in relation to 'the possibility of thinking in cinema through cinema' (C2: 165), where we find that 'what cinema advances is not the power of thought but its "impower"' (C2: 166). Deleuze argues that the question of thought bears upon the specificity of cinema in a unique way: cinema has thought as its higher purpose, which is sadly not the case, however, for the majority of films, then as today. Might it be the case, nonetheless, for the new long-format television series? Does the almost universal critical backlash to *True Detective's* lauded first season hint at something crucial here in relation to thought and its powerlessness, the presence of the unthinkable in thought as it bears upon Artaud's hope for the future of cinema? In the words of one of the show's central characters: 'I don't know if it'll make any difference, but it should because we deserve a better world'. It is my strong suspicion that we also deserve better critics.

Mairead Phillips is a film scholar and writer. Born in Melbourne, she completed a double major in literature and philosophy at Deakin University. She is completing her doctoral thesis at the University of Melbourne on the philosophy of Alfred Hitchcock's cinema. Mairead provided audio commentary on *Secret Agent* (1936) in a Madman Entertainment release of Hitchcock's British films. Mairead has taught cinema theory from an undergraduate to a masters level at the University of Melbourne. Mairead will be teaching a course at the Melbourne School of Continental Philosophy this coming summer on *Cinema's Naturalisms*. Past courses have included 'Alfred Hitchcock and the Unstable Image', 'Hitchcock and Theory: The French Connection' and 'An Introduction to Deleuze's Film Philosophy: The Movement-Image'.

Robert Sinnerbrink, 'From Belief to Politics: Deleuze's Cinematic Ethics'

robert.sinnerbrink@mq.edu.au

For all the scholarly work that has been done on Deleuze's two *Cinema* books, one area that has only recently attracted attention is the relationship between cinema and ethics in his work. In this paper, I explore Deleuze's cinematic ethics, suggesting that what Deleuze adds to Cavell is a diagnosis of cinema's response to a shared cultural-philosophical crisis of meaning (what Nietzsche called *nihilism*),

and what we might call an 'ethico-existential imperative': to affirm cinema's powers of perceptual and cognitive engagement that allow it to explore new modes of existence, to summon a 'people to come', or to give us 'reasons to believe in this world'—all of which are responses to the experience of nihilism (the cultural problem of scepticism).

As D. N. Rodowick remarks, the parallels between Deleuze and Cavell on cinema and ethics invite further philosophical reflection. Both philosophers claim that cinema can confront our *cultural and philosophical disorientation* in a context where inherited paradigms of perception, representation, and action are in crisis. Cinematic ethics, for both thinkers, thus concerns the relationship between *cinema and belief*: how do moving images express or elicit conviction for us? What can cinema do when paradigms of representation (what Deleuze calls 'sensory-motor action' schemas) begin to break down? Can cinema restore a sense of belief in the world understood as an assemblage of images in which we no longer quite believe? These questions, evoking a Nietzschean affirmation of art in response to nihilism, lie at the heart of Deleuze's cinematic ethics. In conclusion, I examine the prospects of Deleuze's attempts to bring together the 'existential' affirmation of belief in the world with the political modernist demand for cinema to contribute to the creation of a 'people to come'.

Robert Sinnerbrink is Australian Research Council Future Fellow and Senior Lecturer in Philosophy at Macquarie University, Sydney. He is the author of *Cinematic Ethics: Exploring Ethical Experience through Film* (Routledge, 2015), *New Philosophies of Film: Thinking Images* (Continuum, 2011), *Understanding Hegelianism* (Acumen, 2007), co-editor of *Critique Today* (Brill, 2006), and is a member of the editorial board of the journal *Film-Philosophy*. He has published numerous articles on the relationship between film and philosophy in journals such as *Angelaki*, *Film-Philosophy*, *Necsus: European Journal of Media Studies*, *Screen*, and *Screening the Past*. He is currently co-authoring a book (with Lisa Trahair and Gregory Flaxman) entitled *Understanding Cinematic Thinking* (Edinburgh University Press, 2016).

Richard Smith, 'Unbound alternation: organic movement in cinemas of globalisation'

r.smith@sydney.edu.au

Henri Bergson defines existence as duration. Organic life is a form of existence. The taxonomy of the movement-image initiated in the first 3 chapters of *Cinema I* presents a concept of cinematic existence wherein material objects and living things are integrated into a Whole that endures. Organic montage integrates the living and the material through a rhythm of alternation. The evolutionary history of the cinema is evident in the first instance by the emergence of modes of integration different from organic montage, Soviet, French and German.

The principle of change or differentiation is then a founding political and aesthetic issue in film theory and Deleuzian film philosophy. Eisenstein criticised American parallel montage on the basis of a lack of a generative principle of division and of development, for conceiving of the organic unity 'in a completely extrinsic way as a unity of collection, the gathering together of juxtaposed parts, and not as a unity of production' (CI. 32-33). From a Bergsonian perspective, this criticism amounts to a claim that American montage is without duration, devoid of life, indeed not an organism but an object, not an organized body but an unorganized body, and Eisenstein's claim is precisely to organize the body on dialectical principles.

A central claim of *Creative Evolution* (Henri Bergson 1907) is that the theory of life has traditionally been subsumed by a theory of knowledge that treats organisms in the same way it treats objects, as "isolable systems." The implication here, from the perspective of film theory, is that American organic montage, as described by Eisenstein, has a long intellectual history, and is indeed part of the history of the evolution of the intellect. It is perhaps unrealistic then to expect that its power to be undermined in a mere century of cinematic production: something evident in *Cinema I* when the efflorescence of the pre-sound movement-image is quickly overcome with the advent of sound and the solidification of the action-image.

Much of the history of the cinematic avant-garde has been dedicated to inventing forms of cinematic life that eschew rhythms of alternation. However, the past two decades or so have witnessed a number of auteur films, in some ways isolated, and certainly not organised into a movement, that use rhythms of alternation in new ways, and to different ends. Films by Ulrich Seidl, *Dogdays*, *Import-Export*, Christian Petzold, *Ghosts*, Michael Haneke, *71 Fragments* and *Code Inconnu*, Gregg Araki *Mysterious Skin*, Alejandro Gonzales Iñárritu, *Babel* and *Amores Perros*, Lukas Moodysson *Mammoth* all work with rhythms of alternation and in what seems to be an attempt to come to terms with globalisation. In this paper I explore the question of organic montage in the cinema books, especially as they engage with Bergson's philosophy of evolution, so as to ask if these films present globalised film culture as something more than a set of juxtaposed parts.

Dr Richard Smith teaches Film Studies at the University of Sydney. He completed his PhD at UNSW's then School of Theatre Film and Dance on the related questions of action and time in Deleuze's work on cinema. His current research examines the intersection of political-economy, philosophy and criticism in contemporary film and theory.

Mark Steven, 'Uncontrollable Organs'

m.steven@unsw.edu.au

Of all the philosophical ideas that lend themselves to a discussion of horror films few seem nearly as applicable as the "body without organs." This prodigiously expansive concept originated in a radio play by Antonin Artaud and from there it went on to serve a major role in the vocabulary of philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. For those two, the body without organs is a vast many things, not least of which is the result of economic articulation. Though undoubtedly less present in the cinema books by Deleuze, the body without organs is nevertheless alluded to on several occasions, and most explicitly with reference to the ideological force and demystifying potential of Soviet montage. "Here," writes Deleuze about Eisenstein, "the intensive series dislocates its function, which is to pass from one quality to another, to emerge on to a new quality." This paper introduces a materialist theory of montage based on the body without organs. It argues that such a technique or aesthetic is exemplified in the sub-genre of body horror, which rose to prominence in the mid-to-late 1980s. By looking at scenes from several popular films from that period – *Videodrome* (1983), *Hellraiser* (1987), *Tetsuo: The Iron Man* (1989), and *Society* (1989) – the paper seeks to show that body horror's unique version of montage retains a capacity for political thought both affirmative and critical. Ultimately, the paper suggests that body horror is a period-specific inheritor of Eisenstein's legacy as interpreted by Deleuze.

Mark Steven is a Research Fellow at the Centre for Modernism Studies in Australia, based at the University of New South Wales. He has published chapters and articles on modernist literature and film. He is the co-editor of *Styles of Extinction: Cormac McCarthy's The Road* (Continuum, 2012) and of *The Cinema of Theo Angelopoulos* (Edinburgh UP, 2015), and is author of a forthcoming monograph entitled *Splatter Capital: The Political Economy of Gore Films* (Repeater, 2016).

Lisa Trahair, 'Belief in this World: the Dardenne brothers' *The Son*'

L.Trahair@unsw.edu.au

The films of Jean-Pierre and Luc Dardenne are profoundly secular and seemingly humanist films that strive to recognise the individual's capacity for transcendence of extremely brutal socio-economic states of affairs and unforgiving turns of events. Many of the characters in their films are *sans papiers*, subsisting on the periphery of legitimate economic, social and political citizenship. But most of them demonstrate a willingness, if not a wilfulness, to believe in their capacity to continue to negotiate future existences for themselves in spite of odds irrefutably stacked against them. The question the brothers' films repeatedly raise is from where or what does such determination issue: Does it derive simply from the most primitive drive to live? Or does it come from resignation to a life of suffering, from some kind of ethical commitment to living, even while dying? Or from a belief in this world as a belief in the absurd? It is not a question to which the brothers necessarily have a straightforward answer, and different films favour one alternative or even pair of alternatives over another. *Rosetta* (1999), for example, seems to suggest it is pure drive, as does *The Child* (2005), which counterbalances the vicissitudes of the will to

live in the young man with the maternal drive of the young woman. This paper will examine how *The Son* (2002) brings all three into the mix—drive, ethical commitment and belief in the absurd—by offering an interpretation of the film with a view to Gilles Deleuze's discussion of theorems and problems, Kierkegaardian belief and choice and Pier Paolo Pasolini's application of the concept of free indirect discourse to cinema.

Lisa Trahair teaches in the School of the Arts and Media at the University of New South Wales. She is author of *The Comedy of Philosophy: Sense and Nonsense in Early Cinematic Slapstick* (SUNY, 2007). She has published essays on film in numerous journals, including *Screen*, *Angelaki*, *New Formations*, *Senses of Cinema*, *Film-Philosophy* and *South Atlantic Quarterly*. Essays relating to the film-philosophy project have been published in *The Philosophy of Radical Equality: Jacques Rancière and the Contemporary Scene*, edited by Alison Ross and Jean-Philippe Deranty and *Film, Theory and Philosophy: The Key Thinkers*, edited by Felicity Colman. In 2012 she co-edited with Lisabeth During a special issue of *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities* on *Belief in Cinema* which revisits themes from André Bazin and in 2013 co-edited with Robert Sinnerbrink a collection of essays on 'Thinking Cinematically before Deleuze' for *Screening the Past*. She is currently editing a special issue of *SubStance* on 'Film and/as Ethics', also with Robert Sinnerbrink, and working on a co-authored book on cinematic thinking with Robert Sinnerbrink and Gregory Flaxman (Edinburgh UP, 2016).

Saige Walton, 'Movement Image, Time Image or Fold? *Bastards* (2013) as Baroque Dark Matter'

saige.Walton@unisa.edu.au

In Deleuze's cinema philosophy, cinema does not put only images in motion it moves the mind/spirit. This paper will bring Deleuze's concept of the baroque fold into dialogue with the cinema books to read Claire Denis' *Bastards* (2013) as an affiliate of the fold and as a reprisal of baroque dark matter.

While *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque* (1993) is not devoted to film as such, its rewards for thinking cinematically are now starting to be explored. In her book, *Surface: Matters of Aesthetics, Materiality and Media* (2014), for instance, Giuliana Bruno proposes that the fold might offer us a conceptual bridge between Deleuze's movement-image and the time-image. This is because the fold harbors "the potential to incorporate the flow and texture of time in the unreeling of inner space" and finds its textured parallel on-screen (15).

Taking inspiration from Bruno's claim that the fold can be connected to the cinema books, this paper returns to Deleuze's own engagements with the baroque in *The Fold*. Deleuze does not just offer us a texturology of the image as Bruno claims but more specifically a "Baroque conception of matter" wherein "dark matter modulates with colours and forms that act as forces" (1993: 115, 159).

Concentrating my analyses on *Bastards*, I examine how the film's organization of light, shadow, colour, materiality and movement reverberate with the fold. In *Bastards*, baroque dark matter is everywhere. It occurs at a literal, atmospheric and conceptual level that simultaneously weighs bodies and form downward to stimulate sensory thinking.

Saige Walton is Lecturer in Screen Studies at the University of South Australia and a member of the Hawke Research Institute. Her first monograph - *Baroque Flesh: Film and the Art of Entanglement* - is forthcoming from the Film and Media Series of Amsterdam University Press in Fall 2016.

R. A. Younis, Philosophy, 'Cinema the Symbolic Order of the Vanishing World (On Kant, Nietzsche, Heidegger)'

raymond.younis@nd.edu.au

Deleuze's reflections on philosophy, and in turn, "cinema", are thought provoking to say the least. In this paper I will argue that his understanding and appropriation of a number of key philosophers associated - not surprisingly - with modernity (Kant, Nietzsche, Heidegger), are not only a little provocative; they are quite problematic, in epistemological, ethical and aesthetic terms. I will illustrate this claim in three

ways: with reference to his characterization of the history of philosophy in terms of power (rather than reflective thinking, knowledge or the love of wisdom, and other such things); his characterization of Kant's transcendental philosophy and the ways in which subtleties and complexities in Kant's project are forgotten, erased and/or overlooked; his affirmation of Nietzsche's philosophy as a representation of reality in terms (exclusively, it would seem) of force (even as the manifest tensions, antinomies and contradictions in Nietzsche's thinking seem to vanish before our eyes); and his reading of Heidegger in the context of repression and intimidation (even as Heidegger's – insistent and repeated, though doubly ironic, one might say – call to meditative thinking seems to have vanished from the order of discourse, the image and the sign). I will also outline the ways in which this way of reading and characterizing philosophy and its history extends its shadow, so to speak, over Deleuze's mature understanding of cinema, time, motion and the image.

Ray Younis was educated at the University of Sydney and the University of Oxford. He has held teaching positions at Oxford, the University of Sydney, UNSW and University of Notre Dame (Sydney), among others. He has held senior academic managerial positions at the University of Sydney (Vice Principal & Academic Director, Wesley College), CQU (Sydney Campus: Head of Academic Programs and Dean, among others), Curtin University Sydney (Director of Teaching and Learning) and UND (Sydney). He is also an Associate Professor (Adjunct) at CQU and has contributed over 50 articles to books and scholarly journals (and collections). His interests include contemporary philosophy and meta-philosophy; his other interests include red wine, reading and writing, travel, (amateur) photography and film (often in that order!)