

Transcript of Part Ten (by Andy Elliot, 2007)

Finally, in this last lecture I have left all of the question mark to be discussed. There are not that many things to assert, but there are question marks, uncertainties about the direction that not necessarily cinema, but the direction that cinematography is going to take; or if you want, more radically, the direction that society is going to go, driven by cinematography. So you have normally three perspectives about this: (1) people who approach cinema and make a prediction grounded on social science, physical science, or natural science, (2) people who from the media sector, from other, non-cinema media who make a prediction about the future of cinema and (3) those working in cinema who have a view about that. It is interesting to see that even when people from the first and second groups reach an agreement about the possibilities for the futures in technical, technological terms, in consequences in terms of knowledge, the group of people working in cinema itself all have quite an opposite view. There is quite a debate among people working in cinema: there is a long way to go until this last category of people can reach an agreement about that.

In my view what is important are three things.

The first is the lost time. One of the consequences of the dominance of cinema in our society is that we have lost time, time is no longer important, and that makes us reversible, people who are living in the present, but also in the past or future simultaneously. This is an idea to take on board. Normally this idea of losing time was connected with science fiction or films dealing with SF, from a cinematographical point of view, I think this is not science fiction any more. We aren't talking about time-travelling here, we are talking about the loss of a universal escape from time. And that brings us to the point of this

course, which is that this loss of time put us into relation with space.

The other point I would like to mention in terms of the future in terms of cinematography is the idea of as I call it 'wired to the projector'. What I think is that people *think cinematographically* more and more. Not only that people use films to see, or perceive things; but they organise their knowledge in a cinematographical way. And this is quite radical and a relatively new phenomenon, within the last 15 to 20 years. And that is why I say 'wired to the projector' because I believe that there is no way back from this situation.

Finally, the other aspect I think should be considered for the future to have another perspective of what can happen with cinema, is that we increasingly come across the idea that the more we travel, the less we move. The perfect example is this beautiful book by Jules Verne in which there is this submarine which is travelling constantly, but because you are in an enclosed environment, you don't realise that you are moving. So the mobility is so excessive, it's so fast, that in the end we are not moving any more. We are like people who are fixed in one place, who don't move any more around. The idea of travelling has disappeared. We translate ourselves from place to place, but we don't travel any more. The meaning of travel is not connected with something physical, and that creates a problem. Especially if you think that travelling was always so important in cinema, not only because it has some techniques which were indicated as travelling, or some methodologists who were considering it as a metaphor of travelling, but because cinema was associated with the idea of imaginary travelling, all the time. So the question to consider is that if we have lost this idea of travelling, what is going to be next? So these were the three points I would like to pick up, and as I said this is a very very open area, and there is a great deal of literature, and quite a lot of question marks.

So my recommended reading for this is again the book by Kevin Robbins in which he basically discusses this; then I have some other suggestions, about Deleuze and the idea of cinematography, coming from the Raessens; Baudrillard is an author who has been discussing this problem at some length; Dominique Chateau *Cinéma et philosophie*, Chapter 5 is interesting; Gorz has a book called *L'immatériel* which is

interesting because he analyses the idea of knowledge, value and capital, and tries to explain how that is connected with cinematography. Then, from the book I already mentioned before, *Cinema and Science*, there are a couple of articles which I think are very interesting; then Deleuze and Guattari, *What is Philosophy?* I think the conclusion is useful; from Régis Debray, *Life and Death of Images*, which I don't think has been translated, part 3 could be interesting; *L'image hors-l'image*, Chapter 7 and the conclusion, then from Gervereau, I think we have already used that; and Martin Jay again, chapter 10. All of them in one way or another have discussed issues which they believe can give you a picture of what we can expect from cinematography in the future, and how they can affect us.

So that was basically the short discussion I was planning to give today. One final remark is that you need to produce an essay, well, a bibliographical work first and then an essay. My suggestion is that you do the recommended reading which is not that much, then you do some extra reading following your instincts, pleasure or intellectual interests, then you decide the area in which you would like to do your essay. My advice is to be as specific as possible, the more specific the better, which is why I asked you to choose a film to produce the essay, because I think that having a film is like having an anchor and a film will force you to keep focussed in a single element and you can produce the essay. But we will discuss this subject in the supervision.

Recommend Reading

Kevin Robbins, 'Will Images Move Us Still?' in Kevin Robbins, *Into the Image. Culture and Politics in the Field of Vision* (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 147-168.

Suggested Reading

Joost Raessens, 'Deleuze et la modernité cinématographique' in O. Fahle and L. Engell (eds.), *Le cinéma selon Deleuze* (Weimar: Universität Weimar/Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, 1997), pp. 268-283.

Jean Baudrillard, *La Pacte de lucidité ou l'intelligence du Mal* (Paris: Galilée, 2004), Chapters 5 and 6.

Dominique Chateau, *Cinéma et philosophie* (Paris: Nathan, 2003), Chapter 5.

André Gorz, *L'immatériel. Connaissance, valeur et capital* (Paris: Galilée, 2003), Chapter 2.

Denis Guedj, 'Les fictions scientifiques au cinéma' in Alexis Martinet (coord.), *Le cinéma et la science* (Paris: CNRS, 1994), pp. 218-223.

Jacques Jouhaneau, 'De la réalité scientifique au réalisme cinématographique' in Alexis Martinet (coord.), *Le cinéma et la science* (Paris: CNRS, 1994), pp. 224-247.

Gilles Deleuze/Felix Guattari, *Qu'est-ce que la Philosophie?* (Paris: Minuit, 1991), 'Conclusion'.

Régis Debray, *Vie et mort de l'image* (Paris: Gallimard, 1992), Part III.

Frédéric Neyrat, *L'image hors-l'image* (Paris: Leo Scheer, 2003), Chapter VII and Conclusion.

Laurent Gervereau, *Histoire du visuel au XXe siècle* (Paris: Seuil, 2003), Part III and Conclusion.

Martin Jay, *Downcast Eyes. The Denigration of Vision in Twentieth Century French Thought* (Berkeley: California University Press, 1994), Chapter Ten.