Gilles Deleuze

Seminar on Cinema: The Movement-Image

Lecture 11, 02 March 1982

Transcribed by Sabine Mazé (Part 1, 1:09:12) and Jerôme Letourneur (Part 2, 1:11:15); additional transcription revisions and timestamp, Charles J. Stivale; additional transcript revisions provided by Graeme Thomson and Silvia Maglioni

Translation: Graeme Thomson and Silvia Maglioni

Part 1

Right, that's the end of nice weather! [*les beaux jours*] [*Deleuze speaks inaudibly with a student near him for about forty seconds*] … So what I did... I'll start with a quick clarification of... of the last session. During the last session, some of you had the desire to intervene, even if it was on very... on very specific points. I must say that for me it was highly stimulating because... because, in the end, I think you feel that what we're doing here this year... at the very least, I would like, I would be satisfied if it amounted only to a sort of attempt at classification where we could say, well, here we have such and such a type of image, such and such a predominance of image, such and such a type of cinema, such and such a style of director, and so on. So that would obviously allow for a method – and here I'm starting to dream – a method of working together that I think I would be reasonably happy with. Because as we move forward very slowly, I realize that what I thought I would be able to do in a single year was madness, since it will take me maybe two or even three years.

So, for next year, I was thinking – you know, dreaming like this – next year, well, I'll have to start on a new course because it seems the least we could do. But I'm saying to myself, I'll divide my hours in two: I'll do a new course for an hour or an hour and a half, and then for the other hour, it would consist of precisely this: if it were possible to form a small group – that's always been my dream, but since it seems it isn't possible, on account of the nature of Paris 8, to hold closed seminars – something I find quite scandalous – there should be a way of restricting our group somehow... and where we would be content, and where I myself would take up the categories that we had tried to establish this year, and then, thanks to those of you who really actively participated, we would rework them, we would look for examples. It struck me that last time the examples you gave me of "camera looks", for example, changed a lot of things for me; it led me to distribute things in a completely different way. And I'm sure that for all the categories we've already envisaged it would be... the distribution of examples would have an effect on the concepts themselves. So that would be very interesting, if we could already sketch it out, if we could already sketch it out this year, and then we'll see... But it seems to me that there are some possibilities there.

But anyway, let's continue because this time, this week, I'd really like to finish with the affection-image. And so, considering what we did last time, here's where we are: if I try to distinguish propositions, I would say, first proposition – by way of clarification – well, the close-up presents the face as such, it doesn't enlarge it; that's not... it's not the case. It doesn't enlarge it; it presents the face as such. But what does it mean to say the face as such? It means something very precise. It's the face insofar as it has undone its triple function, namely: its individuating function, its socializing function, its communicating function.

So, it's quite simple. We shouldn't say a close-up is an enlarged face: it suffices to say – because that's false, it's completely false – it suffices to say that the close-up is the face insofar as it has lost, and insofar as it is presented as losing, or as having lost, this triple function, of individuation, of

socialization, and of communication.

Second proposition: but then, what is such a face? What is a such a face, which is no longer... what is such a face, damn it... [*Deleuze reacts to noises at the back of the room*] What is such a face that is no longer individual, nor social, nor communicating? Our answer is that such a face expresses... such a face... [6:00]

Alain [*student sitting near Deleuze*]: Such a face... you said it twice, Gilles.

Deleuze: No, it's just that the door is bothering me.

Alain: Close the door, please. [*Laughter*]

Deleuze: Such a face expresses one or more affects, it expresses one or more affects.

Alain: You're trespassing on my domain, Gilles. It's German, it's German, right?

Deleuze: No, no, no, it's Latin.

Alain: You really think so? It's German. [*Laughter*]

Deleuze: It's German, you're right, it's German...

Alain: [*Talking to the other participants*] You have to help Gilles relax.

Deleuze: No, no, on the contrary, you have to help me tense up... [*Laughter*] If I'm too relaxed, I... I won't feel like working anymore.

Alain: No! You're joking, of course!

Deleuze: My problem is to tighten up. [*Laughter continues*] Well, here I am, completely relaxed, so I have nothing more to say...

Alain: Look, a guy from Vincennes, there, hi! We're here to work! We're relaxed! Relax, Max!

Deleuze: You see, everyone is relaxed, apart from me. It's a tragedy for me if I relax.

Alain: I'm being censored here! You'd better...

Deleuze: Wait, let me tighten things up a little! Yes... so... yes... I'm saying, such a face, what does it do? Such a face does only one thing: it expresses one or more affects. Well, that's fine. But to say one or more affects doesn't mean something general. Understand that we are already in the middle of a problem. I would say: it's the face in so far as it has lost its functions of individuation. Okay. And yet, the affect, or the affects, expressed by a close-up face aren't just any affects; one affect is not the same as another affect. So we must believe that there is a singularity – I use the word singularity so as not to simply replace the other word we just rejected – that there is a singularity of affects, which is not to be confused with individuality. What individuality? This individuality that the close-up face has precisely lost. So much so that it is entirely possible that the close-up face is itself without individuality even though it expresses affects that are in themselves perfectly singular. Indeed, the singularity of an affect is not to be confused with the personality of a person, nor with the individuality of a state of things.

So that what the face has rejected in the close-up is as much the personality of the person, or the individuality of the person, as the individuality of the state of things, the individuality of the state of things that we could call what? The individuality of a state of things, what would we call it? For example, this room, with its smoke, with each one of us...

Alain: With our solitude too...

Deleuze: With our solitude too... So, what would we call it? We call it the "here and now". The individuality of a person, for convenience we could call it... we could call it... we can call it a *duration*. In a way, the close-up face has nothing to do either with the individuality of a state of things or with the personality of a person.

On the other hand, why doesn't this face get mixed up with another? Obviously because two close-up faces don't express the same affects. It's in this sense that I said that we don't confuse close-ups of Marlene Dietrich and Greta Garbo. We don't confuse them. Are we sure this isn't because they each have such and such a personality? If I stretch things to the limit, in fact, the personality is never completely... completely unseated. Right. But I would add that it's not that which counts, it's because, at the limit, at the limit – you can make the correction yourselves – at the limit, the close-up face expresses perfectly singular affects. Now, our question – and, as you can see, it will not necessarily be an easy one – our question is: what should we call "the singularity of affects" insofar as it is completely different from the individuality of a state of things or of a person?

Third point. As we have seen, this affect that the close-up face expresses does not exist outside of its expression, it does not exist outside of its expression. In this sense, and here too I would like to make a distinction – it's important that all these distinctions work for you, they're not necessarily very rigorous – I would say in this sense, this time I would like to introduce a difference between affect and impulse.

Alain: I would also introduce another term, that of emotionality.

Deleuze: Okay, okay.

Alain: The emotionality of the... how shall I put it? Of the double.

Deleuze: Okay. You can speak about it later... The difference would be this: in affect, there would be the experience of something that in itself would be floating and that would therefore require some form of embodiment. What do I mean by some form of embodiment? We all go through, you know, we all have these experiences where something, for example in a place, something floats... and it seems, it seems a bit like a spirit that demands, that demands to be embodied, to be embodied in what? In a gesture, in a word, in an attitude, or even in a face.

The impulse is very different. The impulse is the affect in its being internalized, in its being internalized in a consciousness or in a person. It is actualized, whereas the affect, defined as a floating state requiring something to express it, to express it without actualizing it, is a different state. It's a bit... it's literally like something wandering, something wandering that seeks, that seeks expression. It can even be something so insistent, this unmoored thing that seeks an expression, that someone will take it upon themselves, someone will take it upon themselves all of a sudden, and everyone will think, "Ah yes, that's it, that's it!"

For example, a kind of atmosphere... like those times you walk into a room, and you say to yourself: "Hey, there's a violence in here..." That's what an affect is. There is violence in here, yet everyone is very calm, everyone is well-mannered, everyone is quiet. That's what we call an atmosphere in a sense, what I'm trying to call affect, everyone is calm, but that doesn't mean that violence isn't there.

Alain: Violence is...

Deleuze: You don't need to say it now, you can say it later! And then suddenly it can be expressed, it's expressed in a face, and we say, "Ah yes, that's it!" And then, at another level – which is not the same level – it will become actualized in the state of things, and people will start fighting!

So, in this sense, I would say that affect grasped as a floating state, before its actualization in a state of things, insofar as it simply requires an expression... that's what the affect-face relation is. Affect is the expressed that, literally speaking, doesn't exist. It's like a pure essence, the essence of the tragic, the essence of the comic, the essence of this or that. It does not exist outside of its expression, yet it differs from it, it differs from its expression exactly as the expressed differs from the expression.

Alain: I don't see that, Gilles...

Deleuze: You can speak later... It is in this sense that, being an expressed that does not exist outside of its expression, in itself it is truly an entity. It's what I was trying to say last time: a phantom. It

differs from its expression, but not through a real distinction. Its expression is the face. Therefore, it is the affect-face ensemble itself, insofar as the affect doesn't exist as a floating state, it doesn't exist outside of the face that expresses it… it is this affect-face ensemble that can be presented as the entity, or the phantom.

Last proposition to sum up... before you say something else Alain, you can speak later... This entity, face-affect, expression-expressed, what is its character? Its fundamental character is that, at this level, as we have seen it is *independent of the state of things*. There is indeed expression of the affect, but there is as yet no actualization in a state of things, in a here and now, and indeed, the intrinsic nature of the close-up face, as we have seen, is not at all to constitute partial objects. The nature of the close-up face is to extract what it presents – namely the face and thus the expressed affect – is *to extract the face and the affect from any reference to spatio-temporal coordinates*, that is, from any reference to a here and now... Yes? Yes?

A student: [*Inaudible question*]

Deleuze: Forgive me, I don't follow you very well; you say... you introduce the idea of semiotization, right? At the level of the close-up face...

The student: [*Clarification, again inaudible*]

Deleuze: Yes, yes, yes, yes... I would add – but I don't know if this corresponds to what you just said... You see why I'm so concerned – even abstractly since all this is once again a matter of classification – why I'm so concerned for the moment about making a distinction between an affect as expressed by a face – and don't confuse this with something else – and an affect as it will be actualized in a state of things. Why am I so concerned about making this distinction, knowing full well that in any film both states are present? It's because only the first state, in my view, forms part of what we could call ... as in a pure pole... in the end, *only the first state, namely the affect as expressed by a face, refers to the affection-image*. When an affect – and we shall see under what conditions – is no longer simply expressed by a face but is actualized in a state of things, then we're already in a completely different domain. And you can sense – and here I anticipate what is yet to come – that this will be precisely one of the fundamental poles of the action-image.

But trying to abstract as much as possible – while knowing that a film is necessarily made up of affection-images, perception-images, action-images – pushing my abstract poles as far as possible, I would obviously say that as soon as an affect is actualized, whether it be in impulses or in states of things, we are no longer in the domain of the supposedly pure affection-image. We are already in another domain, which is the domain of the action-image. Having said that, every film is continually creating linkages – and we have seen that this is an aspect of editing. One aspect of editing is precisely, in relation to a given film, to establish the direct proportions of these types of images and also of many other types that we have not yet seen.

But for the moment, I will say that the affective image, such as it can be defined, is solely the face-affect complex, since the face itself does not actualize an affect – only the state of things does so – but limits itself, through the close-up, to expressing the affect. Once again, for the moment I completely leave aside the question: aren't there affective images of a nature different to that of the close-up face? It's clear that there are! [*Deleuze turns to Alain*] So, did you want to say something?

Alain: There's an important point, the relation with an individual who, as David Cooper would say, is completely paranoid, that is, beside himself. So, personally I don't agree... there can't be a fight in a calm, sealed atmosphere. You go in there, with all your aggression because you're paranoid, as David would say. Okay, so if you feel the aggression, where does it come from? That's the question, and I'm asking you this question: the question of the arrival of a loner in a group. It's a question I'm asking you; it's a problem that's been happening in France more and more since May 68. Gilles, I'm not joking.

Deleuze: Yes, I'm listening, I'm listening...

Alain: Well, you arrive in a group, people are smoking hash, well, right away, they have a whole ceremony of rejection, of repulsion, refusal to give you hash. You're not, as [Raymond] Devos would say, one of the average crowd... No, it's very important what I'm trying to say, but I can't express it, I would need Félix here to help me.

Deleuze: Yes...

Alain: He would understand the process of violence turned against oneself... [*Noise from the participants in the room*; *Alain seems to be addressing the participants*] Isn't that true? [*Someone answers him*].

Alain: What are you saying? [*Inaudible answer, but Alain continues*] No, but Gilles... how can you enter a group without being rejected? [*Alain speaks to the participants briefly, almost inaudible, laughs*] We live in psychiatric hospitals now... [*Alain continues to speak to the participants, half-joking, half-serious*] That's the problem, Gilles, how do you get into a group without being rejected? Gilles, you absolutely have to answer this question because you're the only captain on board here.

Deleuze: This isn't the only question, you understand? [*Laughs*] It's not the only question, because a question like the one you're asking, it seems to me that we can only answer it if we also make a list of apparently similar questions. Because entering a group without being rejected is one question, but leaving a group without being beaten up... [*Laughs*] that's also a very important question. At the moment, for example, there is always the question, and this has been the case since 1968, of how to get people to speak out. But there's a no less poignant question: how to get people to be quiet? Because it's not that easy, I mean, it's not just because I have this job where you have to talk, but in all jobs, it's like that. How do you manage to be quiet? That's also interesting, to be quiet. How do you manage to do it? It might be hard, but it's useful. So, in this sense I would say that the question of how to enter a group without being, without being frowned upon – bear with me, I'll respond to you in a minute – it's actually the problem in fact, one aspect of the problem of the horror film which is actually a very powerful thing, the horror film, it's a kind of cinema where you have a strong prevalence of affective images, of affection-images. Indeed, we'll have to talk about this, but ... it's the Frankenstein problem.

But you understand I find that this question cannot be posed if at the same time you don't also pose the opposite question. When I was with Félix at the La Borde Clinic,[1] I always told Félix, and I wasn't trying to be clever in saying this... I asked that there be vacuoles of silence at La Borde. It was always a question of people speaking up, they spoke up...

Alain: You know that's not possible at La Borde, Gilles.

Deleuze: But it's fundamental that people also have places where they can be quiet...

Alain: Ohhh, there was a club, Gilles...

Deleuze: ... it's fantastic that such a thing existed.

Alain: Oh, Gilles, listen to me, we had a club; nobody spoke apart from the caregivers.

Deleuze: Nobody spoke? Yes, but it's too one-sided, both the cared for and the caregivers should have to keep quiet. That's very important... How do you get out of a group? Groups generally don't let you go... So you see, when you pose your question, I would ask one that is just as poignant: how to get out, how to get away, how to be quiet?

Alain: It's a question of will, Gilles.

Deleuze: Not at all, to manage to be quiet, ah! That brings into play all the social and psychological determinations, everything, everything, everything! Being able to keep quiet is almost a matter of luck now... it's not easy, is it? It's not easy...

Alain: Gilles, you're able to keep quiet, you are capable of that in any case...

Deleuze: Ah no, you see, no, I'm not capable of doing that...

Alain: But you are called upon, you are called upon by the presence of the central committee.

Deleuze: Well, you see, everyone here is a man from the central committee

Alain: Except for me...

Deleuze: Each of us has someone who will come and say: "Come on, take the floor!" and it's not easy to say: "No, I have nothing to say". To be able to respond: "I have nothing to say"... is a great thing.

Alain: You have something to say, Gilles. And these little minxes have something to say.

Deleuze: So, you see... [*Some inaudible remarks from several students*]

Alain: She's beautiful too, isn't she?

Deleuze: Yes, yes ... So, there you go, and let's continue on the path of our sad fate...

Alain: So, you're not answering my question... you're not answering my question then, Gilles

Deleuze: Look, I expanded it with a complementary question... That's the best answer I can give. I would say that you won't find a solution to your problem if I can't find one to mine... See, things are improving.

Alain: Personally, without Félix, I'm completely lost.

Deleuze: Without Félix, *I'm* completely lost. [*Laughs*] I hope he is too! [*Laughs*]

Alain: He gave Gilles a fantastic riposte, he gave Gilles a fantastic riposte...

Deleuze: So... Well, I don't know where I am anymore...

Alain: The right to remain silent.

Deleuze: Oh, I wouldn't mind that, shall we stop?

Alain: If we stop, everyone will start speaking, and it won't work. There you have it. The opponents, the fanatics. That's the problem with the opposition. You're telling me you don't smell a coup d'état in the air?

Deleuze: Here?

Alain: No, not here.

Deleuze: A coup d'état, in France? I can't imagine a coup d'état... I no longer remember what I was saying just then... What I'm trying to say, in very vague terms... so yes, I was just making a kind of summary of where we'd got to. And I was saying, okay, so if the affects expressed by the face – you see how we're only dealing with their state of expression, for once we know that there will be other levels. All that, I would say, has its own singularity. What we have to try to understand is what this singularity of affect consists in. What is it? What is an affect considered as an expressed? That is, what is the entity of the affect, what I called the entity, the phantom?

Because right from the beginning, right from the beginning of our analysis of the affection-image, we've been turning around the following point: what is the affect as expressed by the face? It is, we would say, a quality, a quality or a power, a quality or a power or a "potentiality". And in what atmosphere does it occur? Here I would like you almost to abandon the rigor of these notions and try, as a sort of reverie... we'll see if it works later, we'll see where it takes us... this idea of quality or power, which means quality in "itself". It's not a question of a qualified object... a qualified object is when, for example, when I say "Ah yes, this thing, this object is red, this table is white..." but of white, red, and all sorts of other qualities. Or a power, a power is not at all the same as something that is actualized; a power can act upon something.

But a power is also a potentiality that is not yet actual, which as such is not yet actual. So, the face would be – when I speak of affect – it would be power-qualities insofar as they are not yet actualized – since when they come to be actualized, for once it will be in states of things or in individuals or in groups. But before – and in a way I use "before" in a purely logical sense – before being actualized, they express themselves, power-qualities express themselves and the face is precisely the expression of one or several of these power-qualities.

But what does their singularity consist in? It's not only "red" in general; it's this very red. It's not only "the terrifying" in general as a power; it's this particular "terrifying". So, shouldn't we be able to conceive of things like this? In fact, in the way we know them and the way we experience them, power-qualities are already actualized in states of things and persons. Such and such a person is terrifying, such and such a state of things is qualified by red. So there is a distribution of qualities and powers among things and among persons, and it is this that constitutes a here-and-now state of things.

Alain: [*He starts to ask a question, but Deleuze interrupts him*]

Deleuze: Ah, listen, I can't, I can't deal with this anymore. You have to listen to me, I am...

Alain: No, but I'm listening...

Deleuze: [*in a low voice*] You have to stop, otherwise I can't catch up... especially since what I'm saying is quite delicate.

The relations that exist between objects and persons within a state of things... let's call them real connections, real connections. They form a world of real relations and connections, relation of a thing with a person, relation of a person with something else and so on. So you have this whole world of real connections. And it's in this world of real connections that power-qualities are actualized. Okay. This state of things will be called "red", while another state of things will be called "terrifying". This person will be "terrifying" while that person will be "terrified". So it's this whole set that I call the set of real connections. What I mean is that here we have to distinguish another level, though both levels are completely immanent. It's not a matter of putting one of them in the sky, the two will penetrate each other completely and it's here that I discern *the world of virtual conjunctions*… [*Interruption of recording*] [39:44]

So, what I'm trying to say here is that the virtual connections, sorry the real connections, between things and persons, on the one hand, and the virtual conjunctions between affects on the other, will occur at exactly the same time; they will go on at the same time, at both levels, the two levels will continually interfere with one another. It's simply that sometimes the emphasis will be on virtual conjunction whereas at other times it will be on real connection.

I'll try to be clearer because it's... I mean, this isn't an idea that I'm proposing to you, it's a question of feeling. It's whether or not you are able to sense all of this, and I'm saying this because this is the way I sense it, but it has to work for you, otherwise you'll miss the point. What I'm trying to say is this: it's a bit like the warp and the weft... I mean, there too, you have distinctions that are not real distinctions. I'll give you an example: you have someone who is terrified – that's why... you have to consider my example of horror films, we'll have to speak more on the subject of horror films... we have someone who's terrified; I'll take him as a real person. Here we are in the realm of actuality, of actualization. His affect, the terror he experiences, is actualized, in his whole body. Insofar as this affect is actualized, in a real or supposedly real person, what does it refer to? It refers to an object, or to another person. This other object will be, for example, the knife that frightens the person, or it might be another person, the vampire who frightens the victim. Between the vampire, the knife, and the terrified person, you have a set of real connections.

Now, let's take the other point of view, though the two points of view are strictly coexistent. I no longer consider the person as actualizing a state of terror, which, being actualized, is a here-and-now state. I take the close-up face of the person as "terrorized", as "terrified". What we have now is

no longer the actualization stage, it's the expression stage. The face expresses an affect of terror... Now as we have just seen, this affect of terror referred to an object capable of producing it, whether it be the knife or the vampire. In that case we had the actualized aspect, but when you consider it as...... but when you consider it as an expressed affect, it no longer refers to the other person or the other object. *It refers to another affect*, namely, the vampire as affect, that is, this particular source of terror, the knife as affect, that is, that particular power, the power of plunging into a body.

So that at the same time you have a world of real connections which unite people and things, people and objects in a state of things – yes, the world of real connections would be precisely the whole set of people and objects united in a state of things. But at the same time as you have this world, it is... I wouldn't even say doubled, but penetrated by another world, the world of virtual conjunctions, namely *the virtual conjunctions between pure affects*, where there is no longer any real person, nor real object, but only affects that interpenetrate, and it is this interpenetration of affects that will constitute a singular essence.

So, at this level the object no longer applies as an object, that is, as an object of perception. The object applies only as an affect. The person no longer applies as a person, that is, as an acting or feeling person with impulses; it applies only as a face-affect. So that, contrary to what many critics say, I would never make the slightest distinction between, for example, close-ups and extreme close-ups, I mean, between close-ups of faces and extreme close-ups of details, or between close-ups of faces and close-ups of objects. Why? Because, in any case, whatever the object of the close-up is, *the operation of the close-up consists in this: to extract a pure affect*.

Therefore, when you make a close-up of an object, when does it succeed and when does it fail? It's not difficult. Well, it's very difficult to do, but it's not so difficult to see why it succeeds or fails, as we saw last time with the examples taken from Eisenstein. A close-up of a face fails essentially when the close-up is not able to undo, to disconnect the face from its spatio-temporal coordinates. We already saw that. Whereas a close-up of an object... when does that fail? When the object remains an object instead of being reduced to a pure affect. It's very strange, the way the close-up reduces an object to an object-affect, it's not *my* affect. There are three types of affects, in the end there are always three types of affect, and it is this communication, this virtual conjunction of the three types of affect that will define the complex entity or singular essence that is expressed... which will define this expressed. What are these three types of affect? I would say, there are always affects of the type... it's so complicated... I can't say...

It's purely as a matter of convenience that we say that affects, once actualized, will refer to a person, for example, terrifying, or terrified... terrified. Affects that, when actualized will refer to another person, who this time would be the terrifying, if the first was the terrified. And thirdly, there are thing-affects... object-affects. The knife – and here I go back to an example I began with: the very beautiful close-ups of Pabst's *Pandora's Box*,[2] the face of Jack the Ripper, with its two successive affects: first horror, a horror that rises to an unbearable level, and then resignation. And then a close-up of the knife, he knows he won't be able to resist, that he's going to stab Lulu. But here, what makes the knife a possible close-up is that the knife itself is taken an affect.

What I mean is that there has to be a sufficient power in the image for the knife to be [49:00] seized as a power. A power of what? The power to plunge into a body, even before Jack the Ripper has seized the knife. And depending on the nature of the thing or the nature of the object, you don't have the same affects, which is where we see how singular it is.

I remember some years ago when we spoke about the affects of things and I said, for example, that the affect of the epée is very important in adventure films. The epée's affect is not at all the same as that of the saber. Indeed, the epée's affect is to pierce, to run through, while the saber's affect is the power to slash. So, it's not the same affect. When in cinema you have, there... in horror films, it seems to me, there's one director who has made some of the most beautiful close-ups of objects, Mario Brava. In the Italian school, they've been very successful in their close-ups... Bava, sorry, it's

Bava, Mario Bava.[3] The close-ups of objects, it is sometimes said, it's sometimes said that their function is to divert attention from something too easy. I don't think that's what it is; it's really a question of coaxing the object to emit its own affects, because there's no reason why it should only be people who emit affects.

So... understand that what I am trying to say in such a confused way, what I call the singular essence, the entity, is the combination of affects that always vary, and the close-up face will, in a certain way, express another aspect of the same entity, the same singular entity, the same singular essence. Take, for example, in a horror film... frightened face, terrified face, here we can conceive of three close-ups. But why is it that often this isn't what happens? Why are there not necessarily so many close-ups in horror films? That's a whole other problem; I'll stick to a case where there is a close-up. I take three close-ups: terrified face, terrifying face, object, object charged with affects. Understand, then, that the object charged with affects could be a crucifix, in the case of the vampire, it's charged with a double affect, since the object functions as a kind of distribution between the two. If I take my three affects, active affect, passive affect, thing-affect, the terrified, the terrifying and the object-affect, each time the exchanges are numerous since isn't it true that the crucifix will signal a reversal in terror? And then it's the vampire who becomes terrified.

In the terrified as the purely... in the terrified face as the purely expressed, when terror is purely expressed and not considered as actualized in the state of things, then we have a kind of virtual conjunction, that is, a connivance between the terrified and the terrifying, which isn't at all the same thing as the real connection that takes place in the realm of actualization between the character who causes fright and the character who is afraid. So at every moment, it's as if I had simultaneously a double world, on one hand the real connections of the state of things, on the other the virtual conjunctions of the affect. And I would say, when you have images where virtual conjunctions of affect predominate over real connections – and I remind you that the virtual conjunctions of affect can include the objects themselves, but the objects raised to the state of pure affects – at that moment you have the close-up face, and at the same time we have the feeling that this exceeds the close-up face, so how should we proceed?

So let's explore the specific case of the horror film. We all know, and it's often been said, that there are two major trends in horror cinema – there are of course many more, but let's start with the first two. There is a tendency, let's say, and each one has... – and this will allow us to consider, to recommence... I had mentioned this once, but far too perfunctorily – it will allow us to consider once again the problem of the producer-director relationship since the great trends in horror cinema seem to me to be exemplary in that, each one – and once again, here there are a lot more than two distinct lines – corresponds to a different production studio.

Everyone knows there was a first trend produced before the war by Universal and which resulted in some great masterpieces. How would we define this? It's a trend that derives from Expressionism, and it's a bit what certain authors refer to as "the Gothic trend", which is not a bad way of putting it since Expressionism is very much linked to a Gothic or pseudo-Gothic art. And what does this consist of? I would say it's quite simple, what this trend includes. It includes the great Expressionist horror films: Wegener, *The Golem,* Murnau's *Nosferatu, Waxworks...* and what else?[4]

And then, when the genre moves to America...

Alain: *Mabuse…*

Deleuze: *Mabuse*, I think that would actually be another case – no, when it goes to America, it's taken up by the great American directors of the pre-war period, namely James Whale with *Frankenstein* in 1931 and *The Bride of Frankenstein* in 1935. Well... the famous – and this is also pure Gothic, in fact, it's, it's Gothic horror as we say – the famous *White Zombie* of 1932, by Victor Halperin, H-a-l-p-e-r-i-n... Well, we'd better leave it at that, so as not to pile up too many examples.

Alain: [*He suggests another title, inaudible*] ... is it later?

Deleuze: No, no, but it's another trend... [*Brief exchange between Deleuze and Alain*] another thing entirely, totally different – so how could we try to define this Gothic tendency? Well, it's quite simple: in line with Expressionism or Neo-expressionism I would say that it's a kind of horror cinema. And why choose to focus on horror? It's because it's clearly a major affect – and by this I don't mean to say that it's especially privileged – more visible, yes... one that started up a whole genre, though we should also take into account more subtle, insidious affects.

But in the end, in terms of the horror film, what is going on in this Gothic trend represented by Whale and others? Naturally you have cemeteries, a well-known type of set design of moonlit cemeteries, deep crypts, high castles and so on. Very well, yes, we see that, and that it sometimes produces admirable set-pieces. But what is going on here? What we have, it seems to me, in terms of the overall mise en scène is a kind of attempt which goes very, very far in subordinating real connections that have to be as inconspicuous as possible, deforming them, literally shredding them, prolonging them, deforming them in such a way that they tend towards a point of endless conjunction. It's a matter of deforming all the real connections and making them tend towards an endlessly virtual point. Here we have the famous Expressionist lines and diagonals.

So what will this point of virtual conjunction be? It will be precisely *the composition of affects*, such that the kind of conjunction of affects, powers and qualities will apply as much as possible only to itself, and what remains of the real connections will be no more than sketched-out lines that have to be extended to arrive at the only thing that counts, namely these conjunctions of affects. Conjunctions of affects that will bring together passive affect, active affect and what I would call the witness affect – in this case what I call witness affect is the object-affect. So in this sense, the real connections will be completely crushed, even more than crushed, they will be redrawn, they will be completely stretched as required, and what we have then will be line breaks, or Expressionist linear deformations and so on, all of whose secrets the American directors will take up. That's the Gothic trend.

Alain: I have my German class.

Deleuze: Your German class, your German class.

Alain: I owe you some explanations, for the affects.

Deleuze: Yes, yes, in German.

Alain: And if you have time, I could speak about German cinema, and find some copies of films, and make a presentation of *Dr. Mabuse*, of *Metropolis*, and ... well, I think that would be enough, *Mabuse* and *Metropolis*.

Deleuze: Yes, um, but we'll have to see them elsewhere, because you see, here, everyone has an affectation of not wanting to watch films. We don't watch movies anymore. It's over. We don't go to the movies anymore. Never again. No more cinema. [*Deleuze starts to laugh*] ... Ah, la, la.

Alain: Is it true, you don't go to the movies anymore? [*Various answers*] Well, okay, I'm leaving because I feel infested with enemies...

Deleuze: But no!

Alain: ...except for our Japanese comrades!

Deleuze: Ah, the Japanese comrades have seen everything. [*Laughter*]

Alain: [*on his way out*] So, goodbye, ladies and gentlemen... My German class...

Deleuze: [*to someone near him*] Ok What time is it now?

Student: Half past eleven.

Alain: *Raum*, Gilles, *Raum* is space, it's the room.

Deleuze: Yes, it's space, yes, but it's not just any space, right?

Alain: Space is not determined by walls, right?

Deleuze: No, I don't know, it's not an atmospheric space, it's a space...

Alain: [*Inaudible comments on the space*]

Deleuze: it is a space where the atmospheric colors...

Alain: I have class...

Deleuze: Obviously, you have to go. You have to run.

Alain: Break time's at noon. I won't be back with a sandwich. [*Laughs*]

Deleuze: Oh well, okay, okay...

Alain: It's locked.

Deleuze: No, push, pull, pull, pull hard like you are... No, the other way... [*laughter*] He's locked us in, the terror is mounting. [*Laughter*] No, but you are a good vampire.

Alain: Do you always need to make fun? [*Laughs*]

Deleuze: No, wait, wait... You come back to see me later. You don't have time; the German language is waiting for you. [*Laughter*]

Alain: Bye, Gilles... Alain, eh?

Deleuze: What?

Alain: My name is Alain.

Deleuze: Yes, bye, Alain!

Alain: If she's there, I'm staying.

Deleuze: But no, you understand, because if you get up again, I'll lose the thread again. I've already been losing it for a while now...

Alain: You have to get lost to find yourself again.

Deleuze: Yes, but in my case, I can't find anything. [*Laughs*]

Alain: Bye!

Deleuze: Bye! You may laugh, but it's exhausting, because I can't do two things at once, it's killing me. Here he is again! [*Students laugh loudly*] It's pure panic, it's true, because I think... [*Pause*] Yeah, right!

And then we have the other trend, the other trend which seems very, very odd to me, the other main trend in horror cinema. This would be a studio trend that corresponds... it's again a pre-war trend, and the production company in this case would be RKO[5] which in fact set out to bringing a whole new dimension to the horror film, and I think that the great, the great director representing this trend is Tourneur, Jacques Tourneur.[6] And Jacques Tourneur insists enormously on this, and especially... though it might seems to go against the direction I'm heading, you'll see that, on the contrary, if you have the patience to wait, it completely corresponds with the path I'm seeking.

Here it's not a question of close-ups of terrifying things, not at all, not at all. It's not about that. Moreover, the big scenes take place in shadow; he was adamant on this point. Of course, shadows also played a role in Expressionism, but we'll see, that it certainly wasn't the same. Here, everything is in shadow. Jacques Tourneur often explained that what he wanted in horror scenes was for the people, for the characters to be in blue-black, for the atmosphere to be dark or for the scene to be seen only through shadows, and even then through shadows that were blurred. For example, in *Cat*

People, one of Tourneur's masterpieces, he shows the attack in the pool, the attack by the panther in the swimming pool, he shows this exclusively through an extremely mobile play of shadows. This is not at all like the Gothic shadow... you see that the Gothic shadow, on the contrary, is a linear shadow that literally compels all the real connections to adopt an extremely sharp linearity. Here instead, what we have is an anti-Expressionist treatment of shadows.

And what would this correspond to, this taste for shadows in Jacques Tourneur's films, where the horror scenes are always in shadow? He also did this in *The Leopard Man... Cat People* was from 1943 I think... and *The Leopard Man* too was 1943. Then he made a film about zombies *(I Walked with a Zombie)* whose French title was *Vaudou*. It's as if, this time, the real connections have been kept. A maximum number of real connections are preserved. At the same time virtual conjunctions, monstrous conjunctions, will be made, but they will be made in the form of shadows, to the point a doubt remains as to whether it is a question of hallucination or else something supernatural? You see how what we have here is the opposite of the Gothic trend.

And furthermore, not only will there be perpetual equivocation between the line of monstrous virtual conjunctions and the line of subsisting real connections, but there will be a constant coming and going between the two, we will pass from the real connections to the shadow conjunctions, and from the shadow conjunctions back to the real connections. But in what form? For example, the voodoo witch in *I Walked with a Zombie* who in the end turns out to be the missionary's widow, or *The Leopard Man* who was simply a neurotic. You see how we constantly jump from one line to the other and then jump back from that line to the first... It takes things in a completely different direction.

So what can I... You'll tell me that this isn't the whole story, that there's a lot more going on in the horror film. Indeed, there are many other things, but in my view, and I say this because we can't... I can't really address this until later... in my view, what was new about the situation after the war, something which is very, very important, took off both in the Gothic direction and in the Tourneur direction. And what novelty did these two lines bring about? They brought about a conversion, which is to say, a passage from a primacy of affection-images to a primacy of images of a completely different type, which are precisely those images we haven't yet studied, a conversion to a certain type of images that we call action-images… [*Interruption of the recording*] [1:10:30]

Part 2

… And, if you like, on the side – to push my classification further – on the side of the Gothic, the expressionist Gothic, you'll have a kind of fantastic Neo-Gothic trend which in a very different way will be represented by [Terence] Fisher.[7]

What would be a cinema image... I'll take an example, then, well, well... a cinema-image in... a great cinematic image in Fisher's films, well, it would have to be *Dracula*. So what would it mean to trace the history of a cinema image? I just want to take this example very quickly... Fisher, in *The Brides of Dracula...* Fisher shows us Dracula being crucified, with nails, big nails... stakes. He is crucified, right on the ground, exactly where the shadow falls of a windmill's sails as the mill burns. It's a splendid image... I would say it's an affection-image, even if it's not a close-up of a face but – I'll anticipate what I want to say later – it's a strong image, a strong affective image, all the stronger because it accords with all the laws of Expressionism regarding spiritual will, we have an identification, Fisher proposes an identification, a deliberately scandalous identification, of Dracula with Christ.

You see what I call object-affects. The nails used to crucify him, the sails of the mill that form a cross (like this), that's typical of object-affects, no? It's the death of Dracula. Now, it goes without saying that this belongs to the Gothic trend, but what would be the history of an image like this? The history an image of this type is that, in a Frankenstein film, in Whale's *The Bride of*

Frankenstein, you already have the theme of... this time it's Frankenstein who is presented as a kind of Christ. He is shown as a kind of Christ, an there's a whole esoteric theme that's very curious, namely Frankenstein's creator himself, that is to say Dr. Frankenstein, who is the creator, who is God, along with the creator's assistant, who is the devil, and then Frankenstein, who is the creature or the Christ. And it ends… it too ends with a burning mill. Now, you see how in Fisher several elements that were scattered, beginning with the analogy between Frankenstein's creature and Christ, and then the flaming mill, will be reunited in a type of image that has become famous, which is in fact the crucifixion of Dracula this time on the shadow of the windmill's sails.

Okay, so there we have it. So, what is going on in Fisher? It seems that we have a whole resurgence of the Gothic trend, that is, a sacrifice of the real connections to the benefit of the supernatural element of virtual conjunctions. There's a whole resurgence of the Gothic, a neo-Gothic, but completely transformed, both in terms of the color image and because the whole scenario is embedded in a system of action-images. Well, let's suppose... but since we don't yet know what constitutes the action-image, I... I'm getting ahead of myself.

In the other case, meanwhile, the Tourneur approach, what we have is almost an evolution that seems to me very, very similar, and that more and more will be the Tourneur formula, that is to say, to maintain real connections while doubling them with virtual conjunctions, under such conditions that one jumps from the real connections to the shadow conjunctions and then goes back from the shadow conjunctions to the real connections. This second formula of horror, it seems to me, will also be taken up after the war. It will be taken up especially by a very great director who is, I think, as important a figure as Terence Fisher in post-war horror cinema, and that is John Gilling[8] where, in the end, the supernatural has no consistency in itself since the line of monstrous conjunctions only exists to reactivate the line of real connections, and the line of real connections is only there to activate the line of conjunctions, with a constant hesitation between the two.

What is this exactly? Was it a hallucination? Was it really supernatural? What… well... what's very interesting here, it seems to me, is that, again, the real novelty of Gilling is to conduct the same operation as Fisher does but from the other side, that is to say, he makes a conversion from this cinema of affection to the action-image element. And it's in this way that it will come to constitute cinema of impulses, a cinema where the impulse will become the fundamental phenomenon, which was not at all the case with the affection-image, the way I'm considering it now – but I'm going much too quickly here.

What is very interesting, it seems to me, is that the same studio, Warner Bros, the third major studio which emerged and had its main successes after the war, would bring together the two post-war approaches, the Fisher approach and the Gilling approach. Gilling, moreover, wrote scripts for Fisher. There we would see some very curious exchanges. But this isn't what I wanted to talk about. What I'm getting at is precisely... I would say... I'm trying to respond, after this ... you mustn't give it much weight ... once again it's a kind of reverie where I was... anyway it's something I need to do. Those of you who don't find it useful, can just forget it. But those among you for whom it might make sense at a certain moment, just think about the conclusion I'd be able to reach if I only could find a better way of stating it.

And this conclusion that I would attain if I could find a better way of putting it was, or would be, precisely this, namely, to respond to the question: what is an affect? What is an affect considered as a singular entity or essence? I would say that an affect is either a power two contraries have in common – for example, terrifying/terrified – or a quality shared by the vampire and his victim, or a quality common to two dissimilar entities, to two differences, such as Jack the Ripper and the knife. In other words, an affect considered as a singular essence is simply a power-quality since, in the end, every quality from a certain point of view is a power, just as every power from another point of view is a quality, it is a power-quality. We simply found it necessary already to make a distinction between two levels of this power-quality. If I summarize what we've just covered, we have two levels. At a first level, the power-quality must be considered as actualized or actualizable in a

determined state of things, a state of things that includes real objects and persons, or which are presented as real: the power-quality as actualized in a determined state of things.

I would say – and you'll see what I'm getting at now by way of preparation for everything we still have to cover – I would say, I can't treat this in terms of the affection-image because what we have here is already the action-image... that's already what it refers to. This state of the power-quality, insofar as it is actualized in a determined state of things, already refers to the action-image. Why is this? Well, I don't know; I'd like you to try to sense it. I'll tell you when we get to the action-image. Because it defines – yes, it's quite simple – it defines a situation, a situation with spatio-temporal coordinates, and it is within the framework of a situation thus determined that we can say there is action. So a power-quality as actualized in a determined state of affairs, meaning in a set of real connections, already refers to the third type of movement-image, namely the action-image.

But at a deeper level, there is another state of the power-quality. This is the power-quality as expressed by or on one of the faces. And the power-quality as expressed by or on one of the faces is precisely what defines the affection-image or at least one type of affection-image.

So there it is. Of course, everything I've just explained regarding horror cinema is simply that, naturally, you always have a minimum number of real connections, or even a maximum number of real connections, which is to say that affection-images always exist in conjunction with action-images. Well, we're fine with that. But in my effort to abstract the affection-image as such – an image that you will never find in its pure state in any film... in my effort to emphasize this abstraction, I would say that it's only in drawing out the concept of power-quality and already distinguishing between the two levels – its actualization in states of things and its expression on a face – that you can grasp this first type of affection-image, which is to say: the close-up face.

Because at this point, we come to a whole other problem. But I'd like to... I'd like to finish with this quickly before... I feel we're getting somewhere... So you understand, I'll say it again: we're off, we can't stop, because, well, be aware that we're going to have to move away from power-quality as such. It is singular, you see how it forms a singular essence as it is expressed by and on a face, and this singular essence should in no way be confused with – here at least I'm sticking to some of my knitting – should in no way be confused with the individuality of the person. Even though it's clearly inseparable, the individuality of a person can only come into play at the level of actualization in a state of things.

But in any case, it doesn't play a role in the affection-image. The only individuating factor in the affection-image is the singularity of the affect, and what is the singularity of the affect? It is the composition of the complex entity: passive-affect, active-affect, witness-affect. Do you understand? So, we can no longer stop, why? Because I've distinguished two levels! The power-quality is actualized in a state of things. Okay. But at a deeper level, the power-quality isn't even actualized. It's no longer a question of whether it's actualized or not: that's no longer the point. So, that's clear. So what is our concern then? I would say that at a deeper level we want to consider the power-quality only insofar as it is expressed by or on a face. This is the close-up affection-image. Good.

There is, however, yet another level, and after all why shouldn't there be? Why couldn't this complex entity, this singular entity, why couldn't the power-quality be shown for itself? It wouldn't even need a face, it could be shown for itself. And this would create another type of affection-image, since, right from the beginning, we've sensed that affection-images cannot be reduced to the close-up, that they cannot be reduced to the face. Power-qualities that would be exposed, that would therefore be objects of an exposure, what would that imply? It will then be necessary to multiply our distinctions, since we will have to be able to distinguish the actualization of the power-quality in a state of things, which is to say, in a system of real connections.

A second degree: the expression of the power-quality in a face or in a close-up, and then the exposure for itself of the power-quality. This is what it would be, we feel that this would be necessary. It would be like a third state; there would be three states of the power-quality. The

exposure, for itself... and why do I need this so much? Because it is... and I repeat... it's constant, and again it's a pole, perhaps the deepest pole, of the affection-image. So what would this consist in?... [*Interruption of the recording*] [1:26:08]

... what appears to be space-time – since space-time is part of the spatio-temporal coordinates... Unless – and this is already part of what some of you brought to the table... one of you a while back said something very quickly... Pascal Auger[9], because it was a notion of his, and he told me in passing he was interested in forming a concept of "any-space-whatever", because it seemed to him to correspond to certain things happening in experimental cinema and that the notion of any-space-whatever would fit quite well with one of our possible lines of development – I'm not saying it would be the natural development – but it would very much be in accord with the idea we started with at the very beginning, the idea that there could be no cinema other than when movement was related to any-instant-whatever and that, as a consequence, in a kind of development of the theme of any-instant-whatever, we could very well end up with any-space-whatever. And then it struck me, as it did you, [*Deleuze speaks to Pascal Auger*] … I don't know in what direction you intend to take this notion, but I said to myself that this was a notion we'd find extremely useful.

And I think there is indeed a certain type of image in cinema, particularly in modern cinema, which is very striking... because what does it consist in? It consists in constituting an any-space-whatever. I insist on this idea. Keep it in mind, eh, I mean, keep in mind this odd expression "any-space-whatever". I mean, any-space-whatever is good for us since it meets all our requirements, although it's space-time, it's any-space-time-whatever. The practical question would be – but I'll leave this aside for the moment, since first I have to make something of a theoretical commentary – the practical question would be, how is it obtained? How does one constitute an any-space-whatever? That's very interesting because I think contemporary cinema provides many responses as to the question of what constitutes an any-space-whatever.

And what would that mean? Let's suppose, well... we'll keep the practical aspect for the end, it's better that way. Let's start by pushing the theoretical side: what would it be, this any-space-whatever? It's not that difficult, well… what is it opposed to? It's opposed to any determined space. In this sense, any-space-whatever is not at all opposed to the idea of being torn from all spatio-temporal coordinates. The any-space-whatever, an any-space-whatever may be perfectly defined, but it is not "here and now". Or even if it is "here and now", it isn't because we relate it to the categories of the "here and now" that it can be considered any-space-whatever. It possesses another... another spatiality, another mode of spatialization. It really is any-space-whatever and not such and such a space in which a given state of things is established. It is therefore a space devoid of any state of things. Is it an empty space? Maybe, it might be an empty space, but not necessarily. Good.

Let's go on. Any-space-whatever. Okay, let's accept that it doesn't contradict the laws of the affective image, it doesn't contradict the laws of the affection-image, since we've seen that the laws of the affection-image implied being torn from all spatio-temporal coordinates. But any-space-whatever doesn't have any spatio-temporal coordinates. It is a space, but it is a undetermined space that doesn't involve any state of things. So, what do we have here? What is this space? Can you feel it? We already have the solution: any-space-whatever is precisely a space that exposes power-quality for and in-itself. In other words, any-space-whatever is inseparable from a simple potentialization. And this is why it is not an actualized space: it is a pure potentialization of space.

A potentialization of space. What does this mean? It means a space where, as long as it is empty, providing it is empty, anything can happen, anything can happen, but what? Something, any event whatsoever can happen there, whether it arrives from outside or inside. You see that this was already... and after all, there's no harm in saying that a filmmaker like Sternberg was already completely on this path, because Sternberg's white spaces, his superimpositions of whites, perfectly define any-space-whatever where anything can happen both from outside and in. From inside in the form of metamorphosis. The metamorphosis of the heroine in the white space retained only the

close-up face, the metamorphosis of the empress, for example. And at the same time anything could happen from the outside, and here again we have the element of white space in Sternberg's work, which can be pierced by a knife-stab coming from the outside. Okay. And in fact, Sternberg is perhaps the first – well, not the first, I take that back – is one of those who, in a cinema already relatively advanced in years, carried out, thanks to these techniques of... of white on white, a fundamental potentialization of space. Through his different kinds of veils, he already constitutes any-space-whatevers, which are very different from determined spaces, from spaces denoting states of things, well.

But we must go further, that is to say, any-space-whatever would be a space potentialized in such a way that it would expose a pure power-quality, and this would be precisely the final aspect of the affection-image. So that our question would be, or would become, in order to try to grasp in more practical terms... what am I saying here? What do I mean by a power-quality that would present itself, but that would be neither actualized nor expressed? It would be exposed in any-space-whatever, since any-space-whatever is inexpressive: it's not a face. And if Sternberg still has a need for the close-up face, it would be in any-space-whatever devoid of all faciality, or even in empty spaces where we would simply have a remarkable potentialization. And it is this potentialization of the space that would make any-space-whatever a pure presentation, a pure display of the power-quality for itself. You see? And for us this would constitute a completely new type of affection-image.

Well, well... that's what it is! That's exactly what it is. I would say there are three practical ways to achieve this – if I dare, if I dare to speak in practical terms... well, but I'm not giving you recipes, I'm describing practices. The first way to raise a space to any-space-whatever – you see my problem? In what we have left to cover, it should become completely obvious to you that while it's possible to raise a space to any-space-whatever, this space must at the same time be potentialized in such a way that it permits a power-quality to be exposed for itself... Yes? [*A student wants to ask a question*] In a minute. [*The student agrees*].

I would say that there is a quite classical way – well not so classical really – which is to fill a space with shadows... to fill a space with shadows. And here, we have to see to what point things are intermingled, because we have to see under what conditions. To fill a space with shadows, who was it that discovered this? Once again – and we can never pay them sufficient homage – it was one of the discoveries of Expressionism... But you see how... I would just say – and I don't want to limit things by saying this – everything is perfect, I can't stop repeating, everything is perfect. It's not that people remain at one level, they remain at the level they require – everything is perfect in relation to what they propose to do. Yet we can still see the limit in this. It is that, on the surface, at least – many things are limited. I take some celebrated cases, Murnau[10] for example, the shadow of Nosferatu, the extraordinary shadow of Nosferatu leaning over the victim's bed.

Or, an even more famous case, again in Murnau, are the shadows, which are quite common in relation to what is generally called the Gothic, those very spearheaded shadows, the knife-like shadows, penetrating shadows, pointed shadows... those pointed shadows. Another famous example is in Murnau's *Tabu*, when the shadow of the priest advances so that falls over the lovers embracing in the hut: a splendid image! I would say, let's try to think in abstract terms. Don't consider this space – it's a determined space, the hut where the lovers are – or, even in the Gothic, in horror cinema, in the castle of *Nosferatu*, for example, or in the sleepy little plague-stricken town, what we have is still a qualified space, a Gothic space... So, it's a Gothic space that is particularly conducive to a flight towards affects, towards conjunctions, towards virtual conjunctions, and yet the Gothic space is still a qualified space.

And then a new condition is that the shadow, especially in Murnau, announces something that is going to happen. That is to say, it has a very precise affective role, it is the affect of menace, it is the menace-affect. It announces something that is going to happen, that is, something that is going to happen in the real state of things, the actual state of things. And, indeed, the shadow of the priest

announces the curse, and things will end very badly for the two lovers. The silhouette of Nosferatu's shadow announces the bite of the vampire. So in all respects, what we have here, if you like, is a very touching moment, where to populate a space with shadows marks the first step in constituting any-space-whatever, but it's still only a first step because, in fact, this any-space-whatever is still entangled in the real coordinates of this or that state of things, and the shadow can only act in anticipation of what is going to occur in the state of things.

So you see how it's not pure, but there is something beginning to emerge, hence something new that no longer refers to the usual shadow technique. The film that represents the cutting edge of expressionist shadow is [Arthur] Robison's film – oh, what's the title? [*Deleuze consults his notes*]... *Warning Shadows*, *Warning Shadows, Warning Shadows,* 1923. R-o-b-i-s-o-n... he's an American director who worked in Germany, who was raised in Germany, and who is considered fully a part of the so-called Expressionist school.[11] But what is it about *Warning Shadows* that makes it such a unique film? Not that it's more beautiful than Murnau, but it goes in a direction that will be very difficult to repeat. It's something that could only be made once and not more than once. You'll see the link we're making to the construction of any-space-whatever.

It's a film entirely animated by shadows, but let's see under what conditions and in what context. First of all, the film's subject concerns a shadow-player who brings together three real characters – a husband, a wife and the wife's lover – and projects shadows for them in a way that gives them to understand the excesses they might indulge in, the imprudences they are in danger of committing, and so on. That is to say, what we have is no longer an announcement, the shadow no longer plays the role of announcement, the shadow is no longer the index of a future that will be actualized, like the shadow of Nosferatu who will, indeed, bite his victim, or like the shadow of the priest in *Tabu*, who will indeed curse the lovers. It's a shadow in the conditional tense whose role is to prevent the thing from happening. The shadow-player makes his shadow-play to ensure that the thing doesn't happen, to ensure that it isn't actualized in a state of things. This is the first dimension of the film, which stretches far beyond what is in any case a very interesting plot.

And then the second thing, which is more a sophisticated aspect: the whole film will show what is happening, as if it were real, but here it is a conditional real. The film will show a whole series of shadow plays that do not correspond to any real state of things, as shadows normally do. And two images have become particularly famous, in this film by Robison, namely, a first image which shows the shadow of a woman who is... who, who... a woman who is clearly striking coquettish poses, and around her we see men... who are, literally groping her, groping her. Okay. The following image shows the supposed reality, which isn't like this at all. In fact, the woman was looking at herself in the mirror, making flirtatious faces. And behind her, a short distance away, was the circle of her admirers who were making those kinds of gestures, and the projection of the shadows gave the impression that the admirers' gestures were actually touching the woman, whereas, in the real state of things, this was not the case. Second example, a splendid image where two hands appear to be embracing at the level of their shadows, the shadows are embracing while the hands themselves are not.

You see, I just want to say that Robison's film seems to me to be particularly interesting in this respect, meaning from the point of view of its technique, its use of shadows... So, how, once again the question is how can we potentialize a space, that is, how can we constitute an any-space-whatever. The first response was: the use of shadow in Expressionism. Objection: Oh, yes, but that's still very partial, because in spite of everything, the expressionist space remains qualified – for example, the Gothic space – and its potentialization still refers to an actualization, since it announces what is going to happen, what is going to be actualized in the state of things.

Response to the objection: yes, okay, that was a very timid beginning. But, in response to the objection, Robison's film goes a step further in tackling the problem of how to create a space by populating it with shadows. Because this time the shadows no longer refer to something that is going to happen. The whole domain of actualization is as though averted, the shadows exist for

themselves, fill a space for themselves, and from that point on, we are one step closer to the formation of any-space-whatever. And indeed, there is an increase in potentialization from which the image benefits.

Third level concerning shadows – I'm not going back to it, I just want to mention it again because we need to look at it – is the case of Jacques Tourneur's horror movies where, in fact, all the affective conjunctions, the virtual conjunctions, occur in full force, meaning that the real space is doubled by a potential any-space-whatever, an any-space-whatever where potentialization occurs. So that would be it, the first level, the first attempts to constitute any-space-whatever.

So what would the second way be? I see a second level – but here again you might be able to see many more – what is this second level? I would say... my first answer was that the early means to constitute any-space-whatever, meaning to potentialize space, lay in the use of shadow, the shadow image. You see how our image-categories multiply: at this point the affection-image is no longer the face-image. From this point of view, the affection-image is now the shadow-image, and indeed, the affective force of the great Expressionist shadows is fundamental, really fundamental here.

But then I would say, what about the second way? Well, it's strange, the second way is... I'd say it's the color-image – we had to wait for the advent of color, and here I'm going to very quickly because otherwise we'll get bogged down in this... I could also have decided to devote one or two sessions to the color-image, but now I'm only going to look at it from a very narrow angle that will allow me to go very, quickly... It must be said that color, in certain cases, not all cases, but certain forms of color-cinema have the direct effect of potentializing a space, that is, of establishing any-space-whatever... Not just any space, because in the end, there are several forms of color in the cinema image. But I'll stick to two in particular. The first I'll call surface-color. Surface-color is very curious because, if you like, it's a treatment of color that would be the equivalent of the uniform tint in painting, it's those large flat areas of color, the large flat areas of uniform, vivid color, the large flat areas of vivid, uniform color.

Now, what is the origin – you see how this would lead us... it would lead us somehow to say things I'm a bit ashamed of, since I have only scant knowledge – what is the origin of this use of surface-color in cinema? I have the impression – and I'm pretty sure about this... its origins are in the musical. It was the musical, the musical that allowed itself – and this is precisely why it required color – it was the musical that established the use of large, vivid, uniform flat tints, and this was – I think it was a very, very fundamental cinematic gesture, and it's a type of affective-image that is extremely... but this time, it's no longer images of horror but images of a sweetness, a tenderness but one that's very intense, there can be images of tenderness and yet have a very intense affectivity. So that's what surface-color is all about.

Now if we think, for example, it can be, it may have its place in the musical, but... but... let's make a big leap: the use for example, Godard's use of large uniform tints of color. Okay. We'll see why and what the sense of these large uniform tints is. But I would also say that there's another value of color, another affective value of color, no longer surface-color, but what we could call, or what psychologists have called in relation to something other than cinema, a type of color we could call atmospheric color, atmospheric color meaning color that isn't localized as such but that merges with the atmosphere. Or if you prefer, we could say: a dominant color that permeates all else, all the other colours, everything. The same way we speak about Picasso's blue period, we could also talk about a film in blue... which doesn't mean that everything will be blue. No! Well, what would this be?

So, it's... I'd like to distinguish the great poles of the uniform tint we see in contemporary cinema. I think one of the masters of the great uniform tint is indeed Godard, but there are surely others. One of the masters of the dominant color, I think... I don't know, I think... and it must be, perhaps one of the... However, I remember a B-movie whose title I don't recall, which was a film in blue, very, very strange.[12] I don't remember the title, I don't know what it was about, but it was, well, it was very

strange, very strange. But... I believe one of the great masters of atmospheric color is Antonioni... In particular the great work of atmospheric color – just as you could say the great work of the uniform tint, is perhaps *Contempt*[13] – the great act of atmospheric color is *Red Desert*.[14] Okay, but that's another type of color.

You'll notice that in both cases the color cannot be located, it's not on an object. It's either a surface-color or an atmosphere-color because the color... after all what is the color that qualifies an object? It pertains to an actual state of things, for example such and such an object is red and so on... well, this is all... But why is it still cinema? Why is it a third kind of color? Because it's a movement-color. In what way does... in what way does color pertain to cinema? It pertains to cinema in three forms. There are three types of color-image in cinema: surface-color, or large uniform tints, atmospheric or dominant color, and movement-color, meaning, blushing, becoming pale, fading, yellowing and so on. So much so that a color that qualifies an object functions in cinema only as movement-color, while movement-color itself, it seems to me, even when not expressed as such, has as its conditions, the two great affective uses of color... the two great affective uses of color, namely surface-color and atmosphere-color.

So, in what way does this potentialize a space? Take the space of the musical; it's completely potentialized by large uniform tints. A Godard space, or rather – I have the impression this is the case of the garage in *Weekend* – the red, that famous red, why does it potentialize a space? Godard says this, but someone making a musical, if he was very intelligent, would say the same thing, and maybe it's already been said. When someone – I don't remember who – said to Godard: "Oh dear, it's full of blood!", he replied: "It's not blood, you sap, its red." But what does it mean to say it's not blood, it's red. Well, it's a typical Godard formula, "it's not blood, it's red". Here too, this could be interpreted too quickly as a cinematic *clin d'oeil*, meaning that all this is just cinema. Don't bother me, it's cinema...

But it also means something completely different. It's like when a colour is used as a surface or as an atmosphere: what happens then? Well, it carries out a potentialization of space, which is to say that it is itself a power-quality existing for its own sake. A power-quality that exists for its own sake. So what does it do? What does a power-quality do? *It absorbs strictly all that it can absorb*, all that it can absorb. What prevents it from absorbing everything? It's that it's not the Whole, there will be another power-quality which, on its part, will absorb all that it can absorb.

Now, what does Godard mean when he says, "It's not blood, it's red"? He means: by making this use of surface-color, of red, I will make red absorb everything it can, among other things blood. But let's not privilege blood, let's not privilege blood, which is still a state of things and an object, in relation to the power-quality that we call red. Okay, red is blood, but it's also something else; everything that red can absorb will then take on the affective charge of this uniform tint, of this uniform image, this surface-image.[15]

So, I appear to be talking about Godard, but it's not necessarily just Godard. Who it was that also said this, wonderfully it seems to me, and yet who started shooting in black and white is Agnès Varda[16]. It's Agnès Varda. When she started, shooting in black and white – and I think this is a very strong statement – Agnès Varda was always saying how it's not a question of making... it's not a question of making what is commonly known as a symbolic use of color. It's not a question of saying, red is a symbol of blood. No one has ever done that, no one except for... It's not a question of saying green is... is a symbol of hope, no. But that green as a surface-color absorbs all that it can absorb, and we can't tell in advance what that will be. We'll know it in advance only if we compare it with what another color can absorb, for example its complementary color.

And Agnès Varda begins with her dualism – because in order to understand something we have to begin with the simplest dualisms – she sets off with her black-white dualism. And what can white absorb? And she makes magnificent whites, and in my view, this is experimental cinema, but in what sense? Of course, she had her own little idea about what white absorbs, but she didn't

necessarily know everything. She didn't know everything in advance; the film had to be made so that she could learn a lot about the absorbent power of white, which is to say its affective value. And there we see how white absorbs, perhaps, one specific thing, light. Yes, white absorbs light; it is indeed, as Goethe said, it is the "minimum cloudiness", white is the minimum cloudiness of light; the rest is worse.[17] So white absorbs light; what else does it absorb? Well, it absorbs... the white of a sheet, of a sheet, the white of a sheet, well, this reminds us a bit of Sternberg, but Agnès Varda has another view of the sheet. It's the whitened sheet, it's the sheet whitened through the work of women, and women take a lot of time, a lot of time and a lot of work to whiten sheets as best they can.

And in her admirable first film,[18] white absorbs the light, yes? Ah yes, but it also absorbs women's work or one aspect – let's not exaggerate – one aspect of women's work. And what else does it absorb? One mustn't think that women's work is just preserving youth and beauty. It's hard, washing a sheet, it's hard, always whiter, a whiter white, yes, always a whiter white... and what is all this? And it absorbs light, and it absorbs women's work, or part of women's work, and why shouldn't it also absorb death? Death, death. But we can't just talk about death, death is too general a word, since we're concerned with affects that are singular essences. What death? Is there a white death? There is white work, the work of women, okay, white work. Is there a white death? Yes, there is a white death, yes, according to Agnès Varda there is a white death. And white death is the death that consists in dissolving in the light. So, the vampire has a white death: he has a black life but a white death. Right? Okay. White as a uniform tint will absorb... it will be a diabolical surface... it will absorb everything it can absorb as in the trick where Godard, I don't remember in what film, shows someone painting a wall all in blue, a vast uniform tint, and on the wall there's a small painting and he, he paints, he paints over the painting, I don't remember what film it is…[19] but it's typical: the surface-color will absorb everything it can absorb, even if its contrasting or complementary surface-color or another surface-color... because the "black" in Agnès Varda's first film will do the same thing: it will absorb everything it can absorb, and this will be the work of men, and it will be the night, and it will be... it will be something, it will be a black death.[20]

So, it's not simply a question of contrasts. One could refine it ad infinitum, but you see how in a certain sense the color-image, when what we have is a surface-color or atmosphere-color, has this absorbing function that, starting from a real space, a qualified space, will constitute or cause to arise an any-space-whatever. And Antonioni's space in *Red Desert*, and Godard's space in all kinds of films, is typically an any-space-whatever that will be extracted from the qualified space by, among other things, this use of the color image.

Please be patient, because I would like to finish very quickly so you can tell me what you think about all this. And I would say: isn't there yet another way? As we've seen, a first way to potentialize space, or to constitute any-space-whatever, is the shadow; the second way is color, whether it's a question of surface-color or atmosphere-color; the third way, which is certainly the most mysterious, is... like a kind of direct constitution, a direct constitution of any-space-whatever, which would no longer function... it could include shadows and color, as we'll see, but here these will be some kind of... some kind of magic. Because it's not enough to empty out a space to obtain it... they would be emptied spaces, emptied spaces. But they would have to be spaces emptied... what? Who's calling me now? Yes?

A student: Can you relate this to... [*Inaudible*]

Deleuze: I can just announce what we'll be doing in the future. I can say that formally, a definition of power-quality, independent of cinema, as a possible philosophical concept... I'll look at that next time, drawing on some philosophers. We have to... it doesn't matter, does it. Second question: can the power-quality be defined independently of any-space-whatever or independently of its indifference to spatio-temporal coordinates, which amounts to the same thing? My answer would be no. So, for you who... I can see what you're concerned about... was Kant able to? Obviously not. Kant could never have done this because, for him, all sensation, all affection, was subordinate to

space-time. So, he wouldn't have been able to. Okay, I'll finish this third point quickly. What time is it?

Student: Half past.

Deleuze: So, as I was saying, how do you constitute direct empty spaces, even if colors come into play, though secondarily, even if shadows come into play, though secondarily? I cite in order... yes, these are things that are happening now. It seems to me that, a very interesting achievement, in this sense – I'm not saying it's completely successful – is in the German school, the current German school. What have they achieved that's so amazing? It's the city-images, city-images that are at the same time desert-images, the desert-city. They have to be images of a city – so this would refer to a qualified space – but oddly enough, as a city, what you have is actually a desert. They're not two separate things.

So who has managed to do this? I would say Fassbinder, Fassbinder, very often... and Jacques Schmid, in *Shadow of Angels*...[21] [*A student says:* Daniel] yes Daniel, sorry, Daniel Schmid, in *Shadow of Angels* who created that... very beautiful deserted city space and, though for him it was only of secondary importance, that's the reason I'm just mentioning him... you'll see why – then there's Wenders, for whom even crowded cities are deserts. So the desert-cities you find in contemporary German cinema are something very interesting, and why do I add Wenders? Because they all have something in common, which they constantly insist on.

Here you'll see the connection with horror, though these aren't horror films. These filmmakers have no interest in horror movies. Or rather there's something they think is deeper than this, what they call a cinema of fear, and fear is indeed the fundamental affect connected with these empty or emptied-out spaces. Wenders is constantly making statements in this sense... It doesn't mean he's afraid, it's the affect of fear insofar as it can be overcome, fought, or else one can be overcome by it. It's a story with fear as a protagonist ... it's fear that becomes the main affect here. Which raises the whole problem of what it will combine with? What singular essence will it form? And this would be my first example.

The second example I want to mention, though I really know very little about it, so I'm only mentioning it for the record, and it's up to you to... it's something I only know about through some texts... rather brief articles, I believe, by Narboni[22] regarding Straub, what Narboni, I believe, refers to as hollowed-out spaces, or empty or emptied out spaces, in the cinema of Straub,[23] which, if I'm not mistaken, according to the articles I've read by Narboni, are outdoor spaces, spaces in natural settings... So here we would have a sort of... what kind of image would this be? Those of you who know Straub's films well, you should look at them again...

Third approach, following on from this – and I'd like to stop here, and then it will be up to you to take up the baton in these matters – it's something that has really struck me, and that I know a little better, and that I think I can sense a little better, and this is the very peculiar role that unfinished apartments have taken in modern cinema – especially the cinema of the Nouvelle Vague. We could almost make a cinema concept out of this: unfinished apartments – and I think that in Canadian cinema too there are some very interesting examples – unfinished apartments that will really tend to tear from real space, from the space of real connections, an any-space-whatever. What are unfinished apartments? Well, again, I'm referring to Godard because he was a genius at playing with this... because you understand what this implies? I mean, these aren't simply examples I'm giving you here. I'm really talking about the essence of how empty spaces are formed, I mean any-spaces-whatever. Because, in an unfinished apartment, the actors are freer, they have more possibilities to play with, and the affects that will be expressed, will be of a very, very peculiar type. It's not just a fancy set, the unfinished apartment.

Firstly, it allows for very peculiar angles and shot setups, and it permits various camera movements. Think, for example, of an actor in a Godard film, who is standing in front of an unfinished door: the door is there, but the panels of the door are missing. So, in the same scene – if I remember well, it's

a scene from *Contempt* – sometimes he opens the door as if it were complete, sometimes he goes through, without opening it, sometimes he opens it and then goes through, and so on. Here you have all possibilities, all potentialities. A space such as an unfinished apartment is a space potentialized to the maximum, and not only from the point of view of the exterior, that is, the events that can occur there, since anything can enter an unfinished apartment, but also from the point of view of the "interior", in quotation marks, meaning the affects, the affects that will be played out there.

And one of the domestic disputes in *Contempt*, the long scene, takes place in such an unfinished apartment, and I think that here we have a very, very important example of the constitution of an any-space-whatever, but let me add in parenthesis – and this goes without saying – that at least two methods can co-exist very easily here, namely the unfinished apartment and the large uniform tint, the surface-color, which is of course what Godard creates most of the time. And here, you'll find many other filmmakers who've tried to... but for me, it's Godard who has drawn the greatest degree of potentialization from the unfinished apartment, both in terms of events and in terms of affects. In *Pierrot le fou* too, you have a number of indeterminate spaces, unfinished apartments that are extremely...

For those of you who are interested in this point, I'd like to compare this with a type of apartment which is also of great interest to me, but which is nothing like Godard's unfinished apartments, apartments under construction, I'm speaking about Resnais's apartments, the apartments in the films of Resnais,[24] which are also very peculiar, in terms of the constitution of any-space-whatever. Listen, I'll take just one case – the revolving apartment in *Muriel*.[25] Clearly here too it's a fundamental element and not just a fancy set. This apartment is crucial for the whole mise en scène. Here as you will remember, the heroine runs a kind of antique business from the apartment, where the furniture is always moving from room to room, things disappear and then reappear, all of which is extremely important. It's the equivalent of... but it isn't the same thing as an unfinished apartment, this time it's an apartment... we'd have to find another adjective to qualify the apartment in *Muriel*, which is such an important element of the film.

So in this respect, I would say: you see how the approximation of any-spaces-whatever, that is to say, the potentialization of spaces, *occurs* first of all through shadows, then through surface-colors and then atmosphere-colors, and then through what are direct any-spaces-whatever. And in all three cases what you have is the exposition of one or more power-qualities for themselves. And in order to bring everything together, I want to point out to you, and I'll reread it very quickly... Of course, it has a precedent, but who is it that first sketched out this idea of any-space-whatever? There's no doubt about it, this idea of any-space-whatever came from Pascale Auger... I think it was you who first thought of this, wasn't it? It's Auger, right? And you took the notion from... what gave you the idea, was experimental cinema, wasn't it?

Pascal Auger: [*Inaudible remarks*].

Deleuze: It's in Michael Snow? It's Snow, isn't it? Yes? [*Pascal Auger answers, inaudible*] That's it. That's it. [*Interruption of the recording*] [2:12:46]

… So, page 37… I'll just read you the summary quickly... Here it is, the film is called *Wavelength*.[26] "Throughout there is an exploration"... obviously it's not exactly funny, I mean, we're not going back to the same problem in the way Godard takes it up, but what would it be? It doesn't matter. Here, I'll read from the text: "Throughout there is an exploration of the room, a long studio, as a field of space, subject to the arbitrary events of the outside world so long as the zoom is recessive enough to see the windows and thereby the street." That is to say, in the closed room the camera starts from the opposite wall, the wall opposite the windows that overlook the street, and the film will last the time the zoom takes and will end when the camera arrives. But At what? At the opposite wall, the wall with the windows, where it will frame an engraving with a representation of water. And the film will end on this image of the water. It will have crossed the whole space, you'll see how it potentializes all the way through its movement and through the movement of the zoom.

"Throughout there is an exploration of the room, a long studio, as a field of space, subject to the arbitrary events of the outside world so long as the zoom is recessive enough to see the windows and thereby the street. The room, during the day, at night, on different film stock for color tone, with filters…" – and so you see how this use of color, atmosphere-color or uniform tint-color... but let's leave this aside for the moment, it's not essential – "with filters, and even occasionally in negative is gradually closing up its space as the zoom nears the back wall and the final image of a photograph upon it – a photograph of waves. This is the story..." and here the author of the article, P. Adams Sitney says it's "the story of the diminishing area of pure potentiality. The insight of space, and implicitly cinema, as potential is an axiom of the structural film."[27]

He goes on: "So we have always the room as the realm of possibility." – Here what he really means is potentiality – "Polar to this is a series of events whose actuality is emphasized by an interruption of the sine-wave blasting soundtrack with simple synchronized sound. The order of the events is progressive and interrelated..." – while the camera moves towards the facing wall, right? – "a bookcase is moved into the room..." – so, we have a small event – *"two girls are listening to the radio; so far we are early in the film, the cine-morning, the action appears random; midway through a man climbs the stairs (so we hear)..."* – so this is happening off-screen – "a man climbs the stairs (so we hear) and staggers onto the floor, but the lens has already crossed half the room and he is only glimpsed, the image passes over him." – An event that is happening in an unfinished room, unfurnished, unfinished. They've just brought in a bookcase, then a guy arrives, falls, so... "Late in the film, it's evening, one of the radio girls returns, goes to the telephone, which being at the back wall is in full view..." – the camera has advanced but has not yet reached the facing wall where there is a telephone... "And in a dramatic moment of acting unusual in the avant-garde cinema calls a man, Richard, to tell him there is a dead body in the room. She insists he does not look drunk but dead and says she will meet him downstairs. She leaves. The call makes a story of the previously random events…" – meaning potential – "Had the film ended here, actuality in the potent image of death would have satisfied all the potential energy built up before; but Snow prefers a deeper vision. What we see is a visual echo, a ghost..."

This is of great interest to me – you see the shadow coming back there. It's not the most important element thing, okay, but just as there was color to potentialize the space, here we have shadow and ghost. "What we see is a visual echo, a ghost in negative superimposition of the girl making the phone call, and the zoom continues, as the sound grows shriller, into the final image of the static sea pinned to the wall..." – meaning, when the camera has completed its trajectory. Okay.

What does this mean? It's what I was telling you, I resume... It seems to me a very, very similar structure, despite the difference in style, it seems to me a structure analogous to that of Marguerite Duras's *Agatha*[28] where, in fact, what is going on exactly? Here again we have the typical situation of an empty space, a space that is potentialized, deserted, where the camera will begin from one end and will gradually move towards the window. And what is beyond the window? It's no longer an etching on the wall representing water; it's the actual sea, it's the beach and the sea. And the camera will traverse this empty space, and while it carries out all this potentialization of space, that is to say, the constitution of any-space-whatever, we have the sound-image which tells the story of the incestuous love affair, and everything will end.

Everything began, if you like, after the story's end, after the story, since it's recounted in the past tense, but when we plunge, when we are as though thrown onto the beach and into the sea, we will reach the before-any-story, what we called "the pre-human landscape". And it will go "from after humanity" to "before humanity", through this advance and the traversal of what? What can only be a potentialized space. So, I'd say that we now have this second aspect of the affection-image in our grasp, , although we'd find many others if we began listing them, but I'd like to... I have to conclude this today because time is short.

So we've seen the affection-image, in its first mode of presentation, which was the close-up or the face, with all its variations. I would say, all its variations, since there are several poles of the face, or

we even saw that the face could also not be a face – it might be a part of the body or an object, or an object-affect or what have you – and this first great dimension of the image of affection consisted, it seemed to us, in the power-quality as expressed, as opposed to the power-quality as actualized in a determined space.

Then, the second dimension of the affection-image was the power-quality as exposed in an any-space-whatever, as opposed, once again, to being actualized in a determined space... as exposed in an any-space-whatever, charged with constructing the images of that any-space-whatever space, either through shadows or through the treatment of colour treatment, whether surface-color or atmosphere-color, or through a direct potentialization of empty spaces.

So now I'm done with the affection-image. For next week, if you don't mind, I'd like you to think about some examples and get started with what you would like to add yourselves, even if this means us having to rework some things... so we can start off anew and move on. [*End of the session*] [2:21:48]

Notes

[1] La Borde Clinic was founded by Jean Oury in 1953 near the town of Cour-Cheverny in the Loire Valley of France. It became one of the key experimental centres of Institutional Psychotherapy, proposed as a radical alternative to psychiatric treatment and hospitalization. Practice at La Borde was based on the idea that in order to heal patients (referred to as residents) also the institution itself had to be healed and included a rotation of roles and functions between staff (many of them volunteers) and residents who were permitted to come and go as they pleased and who participated in communal meetings. From the mid 1950s Félix Guattari worked at La Borde with Oury, eventually developing the concept of schizoanalysis that would be a fundamental part of his long-running collaboration with Deleuze. A number of La Borde's residents frequently attended Deleuze's seminars.

[2] *Pandora's Box* (1929) is a German silent Expressionist film directed by Georg Wilhelm Pabst, starring Louise Brooks, Fritz Kortner, and Francis Lederer. Based on Frank Wedekind's plays *Erdgeist* (1895) and *Die Büchse der Pandora* (1904) the film follows Lulu, a seductive, thoughtless young woman whose raw sexuality and uninhibited nature bring ruin to herself and those who love her.

[3] Mario Bava (1914-1980) was an Italian director and special effects designer considered by many to be the master of the Italian horror film as well as one of the founding figures of the *giallo* genre (a term that in English has taken on a much more specific cinematographic meaning, referring to stylized, fetishistic psychological, horror-tinged thrillers, than it has in Italian, where it mainly refers to crime novels or films). Among his most renowned films are *The Whip and the Body* (1963), *Blood and Black Lace* (1964) and *A Bay of Blood* (1970).

[4] *The Golem* (1920, dir. Paul Weneger and Carl Boese) based on the novel by Gustav Meyrink; *Nosferatu: A Symphony of Horror* (1922, dir. F.W. Murnau); *Waxworks* (1924, dir. Paul Leni). Three key films of the German Expressionist canon.

[5] RKO was an American film production and distribution company (in its original incarnation RKO Radio Pictures, a subsidiary of Radio-Keith-Orpheum). RKO was one of the Big Five Studios of Hollywood's Golden Age, together with Warner Brothers, Fox, MGM and Paramount.

[6] Jacques Tourneur (1904-1977) was a French film director who worked primarily in Hollywood and who is best known for the classic film noir *Out of the Past* (1947) as well as a series of low-budget horror films he made for RKO Studios, including *Cat People* (1942), *I Walked with a Zombie* (1943) and *The Leopard Man* (1943). Deleuze gets slightly confused with dates regarding these three films.

[7] Terrence Fisher (1904 - 1980) was an English film director responsible for many of the classic horror films made by Hammer Studios in the 1950s and 60s including *The Curse of Frankenstein* (1957), *Dracula* (1958), *The Mummy* (1959) and *The Curse of the Werewolf* (1961).

[8] John Gilling (1912 – 1984) was an English film director and screenwriter, known for his horror movies, especially those he made for Hammer Films, including *The Shadow of the Cat* (1961), *The Plague of the Zombies* (1966), *The Reptile* (1966) and *The Mummy's Shroud* (1967).

[9] Pascal Auger, to whom Deleuze attributes the notion of "any-space-whatever" in *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image*, remains a figure of some controversy and mystery in Deleuzian scholarship. Auger appears never to have published an article elaborating the concept, which was subsequently misattributed to the anthropologist Marc Augé on the basis of his superficially similar idea, the "non-place", although this idea, developed in a 1992 book, *Non-lieux, introduction à une anthropologie de la surmodernité*, appeared much later than the Deleuzian "any-space-whatever". See the profile of Pascal Auger on this site (under key name search).

[10] F.W. Murnau (1888-1931) was a director of the German Expressionist school. Among his most famous films are Nosferatu (1922), The Last Laugh (1924), Faust (1926) Sunrise (1927), the first film Murnau made after moving to

Hollywood and Tabu: A Story of the South Seas (1931), his last film, completed shortly before his death.

[11] Arthur Robison (1883-1935) was a German-American director, born in Chicago but raised in Berlin, who became part of the German Expressionist school. He only made three films, the first of which was *Warning Shadows* (1923), followed by *The Informer* (1929) and *The Student of Prague* (1935).

[12] Possibly the film Deleuze is referring to in this case is Jean Pierre Melville's last film, *Un Flic* (Eng. *Dirty Money*, 1972), a noirish detective thriller starring Alain Delon, Catherine Deneuve and Richard Crenna, which features distinctly blue tinted cinematography throughout (the work of Walter Wottitz).

[13] Contempt (Orig. *Le Mépris*, 1963) is Jean Luc Godard's film adaptation of Alberto Moravia's novel *Il Disprezzo*, starring Michel Piccoli, Brigitte Bardot, Jack Palance and, playing himself, Fritz Lang. The film which recounts the story of a scriptwriter (Piccoli)'s humiliation by a Hollywood producer and the resulting contempt of his girlfriend (Bardot) is an allegory of the asymmetries of power between director, producer and writer in the film business, as well as capitalism's contempt for art. It is almost entirely set in the villa of Curzio Malaparte on the island of Capri.

[14] *Red Desert* (Orig. *Deserto Rosso*, 1964) was Michelangelo Antonioni's first film in color. Starring Monica Vitti and Richard Harris, and set against the industrial landscape of Northern Italy, it follows the neurotic wanderings of a bourgeois factory manager's wife following an automobile accident.

[15] See Gilles Deleuze, *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image*, Trans, Hugh Tomlinson & Barabara Habberjam, London: The Athlone Press 1986, p. 118.

[16] Agnès Varda (1928-2019) was a Belgian-born French film director, screenwriter, photographer, and artist. The only woman director associated with the Nouvelle Vague, she remained part of a parallel left-bank group of filmmakers that included Alain Resnais, Chris Marker and her husband Jacques Demy. Her pioneering work, addressing feminist concerns and mixing fiction, documentary and experimental approaches was influential in the overall development of Nouvelle Vague aesthetics. Among her most well-known films are *La Pointe Courte* (1955), *Cléo from 5 to 7* (1962), *Le Bonheur* (1965), *Vagabond* (Orig. *Sans toit ni loi*, 1985) and *The Gleaners and I* (Orig. *Les glaneurs et la glaneuse*, 2000).

[17] Ibid. p.93. Deleuze is referring to a passage in Goethe's *Theory of Colours* where he dubs white "the fortuitously opaque flash of pure transparency".

[18] Deleuze refers here to Varda's debut feature *La Pointe Courte* (1954) starring Philippe Loiret and Sylvia Monfort. The film alternates between documentary style images showing life in a fishing village and fictional scenes recounting the shifting relationship of a couple (she is Parisian while he is a native of the village, the Pointe Courte of the title).

[19] The film whose title Deleuze cannot recall here is *Tout Va Bien* (1972), starring Yves Montand and Jane Fonda, which Godard made with Jean Pierre Gorin and which marked the end of their collective adventure in overtly political filmmaking as the Dziga Vertov Group.

[20] G. Deleuze, op.cit. p. 118.

[21] *Shadow of Angels* (Orig. *Schatten der Engel*, 1976) is a Swiss drama film directed by Daniel Schmid from a play by Rainer Werner Fassbinder, *Garbage, the City and Death* and starring Ingrid Caven and Fassbinder himself.

[22] Jean Narboni (b. 1937) is a critic and former editor of Cahiers du Cinema, who appears in a minor role in Godard's 1966 film, *Deux ou trois choses que je sais d'elle*. A teacher of cinema at Vincennes from 1971, he was intellectually close to Deleuze.

[23] The cinema of Straub, with which Deleuze was unfamiliar at the time of his seminars on the Movement-Image, refers in fact to the films of the duo Jean-Marie Straub (b. 1933) and Danièle Huillet (1936-2006), regarded by many critics as among the most important and radical European filmmakers of the post-war era. Many of their films, based on close, against-the-grain readings of texts from German, French and Italian literature by mainly non-professional actors, are set in natural landscapes of buried or forgotten historical significance. Among their most celebrated works are *Chronicle of Anna Magdalena Bach* (1968), *Othon* (1970), *Moses and Aaron* (1975), *Too Early/Too Late* (1982), *Class Relations* (1984), *The Death of Empedocles* (1987) and *Sicilia* (1999).

[24] Alain Resnais (1920-2010) was a film director initially associated with the left-bank group, Nouveau cinema, that preceded and in some sense rivalled the Cahiers du cinema affiliated filmmakers of the Nouvelle Vague and that loosely grouped together figures such as Chris Marker, Marguerite Duras, Alain Robbe- Grillet and Agnes Varda. Among Resnais' most important films are *Hiroshima Mon Amour* (1959 - scripted by Duras), *Night and Fog* (Orig. *Nuit et brouillard*, 1959), *Last Year at Marienbad* (Orig. *L'Annee dernière a Marienbad*, 1961 - scripted by Robbe-Grillet) *Muriel* (Orig. *Muriel, ou le temps d'un retour*, 1963), *Je t'aime, Je t'aime* (1968), *Providence* (1977) and *L'amour à mort* (1984).

[25] *Muriel* (Orig. *Muriel ou le Temps d'un retour*, 1963) stars Delphine Seyrig, Jean-Pierre Kérien and Jean-Baptiste Thierrée. In fragmented non-chronological order, it tells the story of a middle-aged widow who runs an antique business from her apartment in Boulogne-sur-Mer where she lives with her stepson, who has recently returned from military service in the Algerian War and who is haunted by the memory of torturing an Algerian girl called Muriel.

[26] Michael Snow (b. 1928) is a Canadian artist whose work spans a variety of media including film, installation, photography and music. He is best known for a series of films made in the 1960s that are considered pioneering works in the development of the aesthetics of structural film. These include *New York Eye and Ear Control* (1964), *Wavelength* (1967) consisting of a single zoom shoot in a loft apartment and *The Central Region* (1971) for which Snow devised a special tripod-like device that permitted a robot-controlled camera to rotate and pan through 360 degrees as it filmed a

rocky Canadian landscape.

[27] See P. Adams Sitney, "Structural Film" in *Experimental Cinema: The Film Reader* (Wheeler Winston Dixon and Gwendolyn Audrey Foster eds.), Oxon, New York: Routledge 2002, pp.230-231. Snow himself describes the film as follows: "The film is a continuous zoom which takes 45 minutes to go from its widest field to its smallest and final field. It was shot with a fixed camera from one end of an 80-foot loft, shooting the other end, a row of windows and the street. This, the setting and the action which takes place there are cosmically equivalent. The room (and the zoom) are interrupted by 4 human events including a death. The sound on these occasions is sync sound, music and speech, occurring simultaneously with an electronic sound, a sine wave, which goes from its lowest (50 cycles per second) note to its highest (12000 c.p.s.) in 40 minutes. It is a total glissando while the film is a crescendo and a dispersed spectrum which attempts to utilize the gifts of both prophecy and memory which only film and music have to offer." See "On Wavelength" in M. Snow, *The Collected Writings of Michael Snow*, Ontario, Wilfrid Laurier University Press 1994, pp. 38-46.

[28] *Agatha and the Unlimited Readings* (Orig. *Agatha et les lectures illimitées*, 1981) is a film by Marguerite Duras, based on her own play *Agatha*, with Bulle Ogier in a non-speaking role. Shot in a deserted coastal hotel in northern France, the film recounts through two off screen voices the childhood memories and the birth of an incestuous love between a sister and brother. The film takes its name from a character in Robert Musil's novel *The Man Without Qualities*, the sister of the protagonist Ulrich who nurses a similar incestuous passion.