

## 6 The powers of the false

### I

Two regimes of the image can be contrasted point by point; an organic regime and a crystalline regime, or more generally a kinetic regime and a chronic regime. The first point concerns descriptions. A description which assumes the independence of its object will be called 'organic'. It is not a matter of knowing if the object is really independent, it is not a matter of knowing if these are exteriors or scenery. What counts is that, whether they are scenery or exteriors, the setting described is presented as independent of the description which the camera gives of it, and stands for a supposedly pre-existing reality. In contrast, what we will call a crystalline description stands for its object, replaces it, both creates and erases it – as Robbe-Grillet puts it – and constantly gives way to other descriptions which contradict, displace, or modify the preceding ones. It is now the description itself which constitutes the sole decomposed and multiplied object. We see it in a whole variety of areas, the flat views and flat tints of colour in the musical comedy, the 'anti-perspective frontal transparencies' of Syberberg. Sometimes we go from one regime to the other, as in *An Actor's Revenge* (Ichikawa) where a yellow fog blurs and passes across a painted canvas. But the difference is not between scenery and exteriors. Neo-realism and the new wave constantly filmed on location, in order to extract from it those pure descriptions which develop a creative and destructive function. In fact, organic descriptions which presuppose the independence of a setting serve to define sensory-motor situations, while crystalline descriptions, which constitute their own object, refer to purely optical and sound situations detached from their motor extension: this is a cinema of the seer and no longer of the agent [*de voyant, non plus d'actant*].

The second point is a consequence of the first, and concerns the relation between the real and the imaginary. In an organic description, the real that is assumed is recognizable by its continuity – even if it is interrupted – by the continuity shots which establish it and by the laws which determine successions, simultaneities and permanences: it is a regime of localizable

relations, actual linkages, legal, causal and logical connections. It is clear that this system includes the unreal, the recollection, the dream and the imaginary but as contrast. Thus the imaginary will appear in the forms of caprice and discontinuity, each image being in a state of disconnection with another into which it is transformed. This will be a second pole of existence, which will be defined by pure appearance to consciousness, and no longer by legal connections. Images of this type will be actualized in consciousness, in accordance with the needs of the present actual or the crises of the real. A film may be entirely made up of dream-images; these will retain their capacity for perpetual disconnection and change which contrasts them with real-images. The organic system will, therefore, consist of these two modes of existence as two poles in opposition to each other: linkages of actuals from the point of view of the real, and actualizations in consciousness from the point of view of the imaginary. The crystalline regime is completely different: the actual is cut off from its motor linkages, or the real from its legal connections, and the virtual, for its part, detaches itself from its actualizations, starts to be valid for itself. The two modes of existence are now combined in a circuit where the real and the imaginary, the actual and the virtual, chase after each other, exchange their roles and become indiscernible.<sup>1</sup> It is here that we may speak the most precisely of crystal-image: the coalescence of an actual image and its virtual image, the indiscernibility of two distinct images. Passages from one regime to the other, from the organic to the crystalline, can take place imperceptibly or there can be constant overlapping (Mankiewicz, for instance). There are none the less two regimes which differ in nature.

The third point no longer concerns description, but narration. Organic narration consists of the development of sensory-motor schemata as a result of which the characters react to situations or act in such a way as to disclose the situation. This is a truthful narration in the sense that it claims to be true, even in fiction. Such a regime is complex because it can produce interventions from breaks (ellipses), insertions of recollections and dreams, and above all because it implies a certain usage of speech as a development factor. However, we are not yet considering the specific nature of this factor. We simply note that the sensory-motor schema is concretely located in a 'hodological space' (Kurt Lewin), which is defined by a field of forces, oppositions and tensions between these forces, resolutions of these tensions

according to the distribution of goals, obstacles, means, detours. The corresponding abstract form is Euclidean space, because this is the setting in which tensions are resolved according to a principle of economy, according to the so-called laws of extremum, of minimum and maximum: for example, the simplest route, the most appropriate detour, the most effective speech, the minimum means for a maximum effect. This economy of narration, then, appears both in the concrete shape of the action-image and hodological space and in the abstract figure of the movement-image and Euclidean space. Movements and actions may present many obvious anomalies, breaks, insertions, superimpositions and decompositions; they none the less obey laws which are based on the distribution of *centres of forces* in space. We can say in general that time is the object of an indirect representation in so far as it is a consequence of action, is dependent on movement and is inferred from space. Hence, no matter how disordered it is, it remains in principle a chronological time.

Crystalline narration is quite different, since it implies a collapse of sensory-motor schemata. Sensory-motor situations have given way to pure optical and sound situations to which characters, who have become seers, cannot or will not react, so great is their need to 'see' properly what there is in the situation. This is the Dostoevskian condition as taken up by Kurosawa: in the most pressing situations, *The Idiot* feels the need to see the terms of a problem which is more profound than the situation, and even more pressing (the same is true for most of Kurosawa's films). But, in Ozu, in neo-realism and in the new wave, vision is no longer even a presupposition added to action, a preliminary which presents itself as a condition; it occupies all the room and takes the place of action. Thus movement can tend to zero, the character, or the shot itself, remain immobile: rediscovery of the fixed shot. But this is not what is important, because movement may also be exaggerated, be incessant, become a world movement, a Brownian movement, a trampling, a to-and-fro, a multiplicity of movements on different scales. What is important is that the anomalies of movement become the essential point instead of being accidental or contingent. This is the era of false continuity shots as inaugurated by Dreyer.<sup>2</sup> In other words crystalline narration will fracture the complementarity of a lived hodological space and a represented Euclidean space. Having lost its sensory-motor connections, concrete space ceases to be organized according to tensions and resolutions of tension, according to goals,

obstacles, means, or even detours. It can be said, from a perspective unconnected with cinema, but which is fully confirmed by it: 'Before hodological space, there is that overlapping of perspectives which does not allow the grasping of a given object because there are no dimensions in relation to which the unique set would be ordered. The *fluctuatio animi* which precedes resolute action is not hesitation between several objects or between several directions, but a mobile covering-up of sets which are incompatible, almost alike and yet disparate.'<sup>3</sup> It is here that a crystalline narration will extend crystalline descriptions, their repetitions and variations, through a crisis of action. But, at the same time as concrete space ceases to be hodological, abstract space ceases to be Euclidean, losing in turn the legal connections and laws of extremum which governed it. Of course, we realize the dangers of citing scientific propositions outside their own sphere. It is the danger of arbitrary metaphor or of forced application. But perhaps these dangers are averted if we restrict ourselves to taking from scientific operators a particular conceptualizable character which itself refers to non-scientific areas, and converges with science without applying it or making it a metaphor. It is in this sense that we can talk about Riemannian spaces in Bresson, in neo-realism, in the new wave and in the New York school, of quantum spaces in Robbe-Grillet, of probabilistic and topological spaces in Resnais, of crystallized spaces in Herzog and Tarkovsky. We say, for example, that there is Riemannian space when the connecting of parts is not predetermined but can take place in many ways: it is a space which is disconnected, purely optical, sound or even tactile (in the style of Bresson). There are also empty and amorphous spaces which lose their Euclidean co-ordinates, in the style of Ozu or Antonioni. There are crystallized spaces, when the landscapes become hallucinatory in a setting which now retains only crystalline seeds and crystallizable materials.

Now what characterizes these spaces is that their nature cannot be explained in a simply spatial way. They imply non-localizable relations. These are direct presentations of time. We no longer have an indirect image of time which derives from movement, but a direct time-image from which movement derives. We no longer have a chronological time which can be overturned by movements which are contingently abnormal; we have a chronic non-chronological time which produces movements necessarily 'abnormal', essentially 'false'. It can also be said that montage

tends to disappear in favour of the sequence shot, with or without depth. But this is not true in principle, and montage remains in most cases the essential cinematographic act. It simply changes its sense: instead of composing movement-images in such a way that an indirect image of time emerges from them, it decomposes the relations in a direct time-image in such a way that all the possible movements emerge from it. It is not recollections or dreams which determine these chronic relations. Recollection- or dream-images are on the way to actualization in sensory-motor schemata, and presuppose their broadening or weakening, but not their breaking in favour of something else. If time appears directly, it is in *de-actualized peaks of present*; it is in *virtual sheets of past*. The indirect image of time is constructed in the organic regime in accordance with sensory-motor situations, but the two direct time-images appear in the crystalline system in consequence of pure optical and sound situations.

A fourth point, more complex or more general, follows on from this. If we take the history of thought, we see that time has always put the notion of truth into crisis. Not that truth varies depending on the epoch. It is not the simple empirical content, it is the form or rather the pure force of time which puts truth into crisis. Since antiquity this crisis has burst out in the paradox of 'contingent futures'. If it is *true* that a naval battle *may* take place tomorrow, how are we to avoid one of the true following consequences: either the impossible proceeds from the possible (since, if the battle takes place, it is no longer possible that it may not take place), or the past is not necessarily true (since the battle could not have taken place).<sup>4</sup> It is easy to regard this paradox as a sophism. It none the less shows the difficulty of conceiving a direct relation between truth and the form of time, and obliges us to keep the true away from the existent, in the eternal or in what imitates the eternal. We have to wait for Leibniz to get the most ingenious, but also the strangest and most convoluted, solution to this paradox. Leibniz says that the naval battle may or may not take place, but that this is not in the same world: it takes place in one world and does not take place in a different world, and these two worlds are possible, but are not 'compossible' with each other.<sup>5</sup> He is thus obliged to forge the wonderful notion of impossibility (very different from contradiction) in order to resolve the paradox while saving truth: according to him, it is not the impossible, but only the impossible that proceeds from the possible; and the past may be true without being necessarily true.

But the crisis of truth thus enjoys a pause rather than a solution. For nothing prevents us from affirming that impossibles belong to the same world, that impossible worlds belong to the same universe: 'Fang, for example, has a secret; a stranger calls at his door . . . Fang can kill the intruder, the intruder can kill Fang, they can both escape, they can both die, and so forth . . . you arrive at this house, but in one of the possible pasts you are my enemy, in another, my friend . . .'<sup>6</sup> This is Borges's reply to Leibniz: the straight line as force of time, as labyrinth of time, is also the line which forks and keeps on forking, passing through *impossible presents*, returning to *not-necessarily true pasts*.

A new status of narration follows from this: narration ceases to be truthful, that is, to claim to be true, and becomes fundamentally falsifying. This is not at all a case of 'each has its own truth', a variability of content. It is a power of the false which replaces and supersedes the form of the true, because it poses the simultaneity of impossible presents, or the coexistence of not-necessarily true pasts. Crystalline description was already reaching the indiscernibility of the real and the imaginary, but the falsifying narration which corresponds to it goes a step further and poses inexplicable differences to the present and alternatives which are undecidable between true and false to the past. The truthful man dies, every model of truth collapses, in favour of the new narration. We have not mentioned the author who is essential in this regard: it is Nietzsche, who, under the name of 'will to power', substitutes the power of the false for the form of the true, and resolves the crisis of truth, wanting to settle it once and for all, but, in opposition to Leibniz, in favour of the false and its artistic, creative power . . .

From the novel to the cinema, Robbe-Grillet's work testifies to the power of the false as principle of production of images. This is not a simple principle of reflection or becoming aware: 'Beware! this is cinema'. It is a source of inspiration. The images must be produced in such a way that the past is not necessarily true, or that the impossible comes from the possible. When Robbe-Grillet appeals to the detail which falsifies in the image (for instance, *The Man Who Lies* should not have the same suit and tie several years later), we see that the power of the false is also the most general principle that determines all the relationships in the direct time-image. In one world, two characters know each other, in another world they don't know each other, in another one the first knows the second, in another, finally, the second knows the

first. Or two characters betray each other, only the first betrays the second, neither betrays, the first and second are the same person who betrays himself under two different names: contrary to what Leibniz believed, all these worlds belong to the same universe and constitute modifications of the same story. Narration is no longer a truthful narration which is linked to real (sensory-motor) descriptions. Description becomes its own object and narration becomes temporal *and* falsifying at exactly the same time. The formation of the crystal, the force of time and the power of the false are strictly complementary, and constantly imply each other as the new co-ordinates of the image. There is no value-judgement here, because this new regime – no less than the old one – throws up its ready-made formulas, its set procedures, its laboured and empty applications, its failures, its conventional and 'second-hand' examples offered to us as masterpieces. What is interesting is the new status of the image, this new type of narration-description in so far as it initially inspires very different great authors.<sup>7</sup> All this could be summed up by saying that the forger becomes *the* character of the cinema: not the criminal, the cowboy, the psycho-social man, the historical hero, the holder of power, etc., as in the action-image, but the forger pure and simple, to the detriment of all action. The forger could previously exist in a determinate form, liar or traitor, but he now assumes an unlimited figure which permeates the whole film. He is simultaneously the man of pure descriptions and the maker of the crystal-image, the indiscernibility of the real and the imaginary; he passes into the crystal, and makes the direct time-image visible; he provokes undecidable alternatives and inexplicable differences between the true and the false, and thereby imposes a power of the false as adequate to time, in contrast to any form of the true which would control time. *The Man Who Lies* is one of Robbe-Grillet's finest films: this is not a localized liar, but an unlocalizable and chronic forger in paradoxical spaces. We would also say that *Stavisky* is not just one film among others in Resnais' work: even if it is not the most important, it contains the secret of the others, a bit like Henry James's 'The Figure in the Carpet'. We might also select from Godard a film which is even more minor yet crucial, because it presents in a systematic and concise way what will be the constant inspiration for all his work, a power of the false which Godard was able to impose as a new style and which moves from pure descriptions to falsifying narration from the point of view of a

direct time-image: we mean *Le grand escroc*, a free interpretation of an episode in Herman Melville's great novel.<sup>8</sup> *The Man Who Lies* and *Stavisky* would also be like *Le grand escroc*; they would together form the simplified, overblown, provocative, badly received, 'badly viewed and reviewed' manifesto of the new cinema.

Truthful narration is developed organically, according to legal connections in space and chronological relations in time. Of course, the elsewhere may be close to the here, and the former to the present; but this variability of places and moments does not call the relations and connections into question. They rather determine its terms or elements, so that narration implies an inquiry or testimonies which connect it to the true. The investigator and witnesses may even take on an autonomous and explicit shape, as in literally 'judicial' films. But, whether explicitly or not, narration always refers to a *system of judgement*: even when acquittal takes place due to the benefit of the doubt, or when the guilty is so only because of fate. Falsifying narration, by contrast, frees itself from this system; it shatters the system of judgement because the power of the false (not error or doubt) affects the investigator and the witness as much as the person presumed guilty. 'In *Stavisky* the testimonies come from the very living of the character who refutes them. Then, within these testimonies, other witnesses appear, who are already talking about a dead man.'<sup>9</sup> The point is that the elements themselves are constantly changing with the relations of time into which they enter, and the terms with their connections. Narration is constantly being completely modified, in each of its episodes, not according to subjective variations, but as a consequence of disconnected places and de-chronologized moments. There is a fundamental reason for this new situation: contrary to the form of the true which is unifying and tends to the identification of a character (his discovery or simply his coherence), the power of the false cannot be separated from an irreducible multiplicity. 'I is another' [*Je est un autre*] has replaced Ego = Ego.

The power of the false exists only from the perspective of a series of powers, always referring to each other and passing into one another. So that investigators, witnesses and innocent or guilty heroes will participate in the same power of the false the degrees of which they will embody, at each stage of the narration. Even 'the truthful man ends up realizing that he has never stopped lying' as Nietzsche said. The forger will thus be inseparable from a chain of forgers into whom he metamorphoses.

There is no unique forger, and, if the forger reveals something, it is the existence behind him of another forger, if only the state as in the financial operations in *Stavisky* or in *Le grand escroc*. The truthful man will form part of the chain, at one end like the artist, at the other end, the nth power of the false. And the only content of narration will be the presentation of these forgers, their sliding from one to the other, their metamorphoses into each other. In literature and philosophy, the two greatest texts to have developed such chains of forgers or such series of powers are the last book of *Zarathustra*, in Nietzsche, and Melville's novel, *The Confidence Man*. The former presents the 'multiple cry' of the higher man who passes through the divine, the two kings, the man with the leeches, the sorcerer, the last pope, the ugliest man, the voluntary beggar and the shadow: they are all forgers. The latter presents a series of forgers which includes a dumb albino, a legless negro, a man in mourning, a man in grey, a man in a cap, a man with an account book, a herbal doctor, up to the cosmopolitan with the colourful clothes, the great hypnotist, the 'metaphysical scoundrel', each metamorphosing into the other, all confronting 'truthful men' who are no less false than they are.<sup>10</sup> Godard outlines a similar series whose characters will be the representatives of *cinéma-vérité*, the policeman, the confidence man himself and finally the author, the portrait of the artist in a fez. *Last Year in Marienbad* only connected the hypnotized woman (the truthful woman?) to the hypnotist provided that it revealed, behind, yet another hypnotist. Or the series in *Muriel*, all forgers in some respect. Robbe-Grillet's series develop in the style of *Trans-Europe Express*: Elias, the man of the false, connects with Eva, the double agent, from the perspective of the gangster Frank who presupposes an organization, itself connecting with Jean and Marc, the author and his critic, who pass over into Commissioner Lorentz . . . Such a construction seems common to some very different films and very independent authors. We might mention Hugo Santiago's film *The Others*, in which Borges and Casares collaborated: after the death of his son, the bookseller metamorphoses into a series of forgers, the magician, the man with the wand, the man in the mirror, and the son himself, who constitute the whole narration, whilst the camera jumps from point to point to carry out pure descriptions (the empty observatory). Everywhere it is the metamorphoses of the false which replace the form of the true.

This is the essential point: how the new regime of the image

(the direct time-image) works with pure crystalline optical and sound descriptions, and falsifying, purely chronic narrations. Description stops presupposing a reality and narration stops referring to a form of the true at one and the same time: hence Agnès Varda's *Documenteur*, where the documentary describes situations which are now only optical and of sound (walls, the city), for a story which now invokes only the abolition of the true, following the disconnected gestures of the heroine. Undoubtedly each great author has his own way of conceiving description, narration and their relationships.<sup>11</sup> The visual and the spoken also enter into new relations each time. For, as we shall see, a third element now intervenes, which is the story, distinct from description and narration. But, to remain with these two instances, we must propose that they form the framework which, after the new wave, is indispensable. The neo-realist resolution still retained a reference to a form of the true, although it profoundly renewed it, and certain authors were freed from it in their development (Fellini, and even Visconti). But the new wave deliberately broke with the form of the true to replace it by the powers of life, cinematographic powers considered to be more profound. If we look for the inheritance of the new wave or the influence of Godard in certain recent films, we immediately see characteristics which are sufficient to define its most obvious aspect. Bergala and Limosin's *Faux-fuyants* tells the story of a man in a car who accidentally runs over another man and makes off, then makes enquiries and enters into closer and closer relation with the daughter of his victim without us knowing what he wants. But the narration does not develop organically, it is rather as if the offence of making off was sliding along a chain, metamorphosing each time, following the characters like so many forgers each of whom comes up with an excuse [*opère un faux-fuyant*] for his own purposes (we can count eight in all), until the offence is reversed, and the original witness in turn becomes the offender whom a final offence of flight will leave to die in the snow, whilst the circuit is completed by a telephone call which reports this death to the first character. Now, such a falsifying narration appears to be intercut with strange scenes whose sole function is pure description; the man telephones the girl, who is baby-sitting, simply for her to describe the flat where she is; then he asks the girl to come and watch him, for no reason, when there is strictly nothing to see, when he is preparing to go into the cinema with a girlfriend; and the girl will repay him this 'politeness', asking him to be there

when she in turn is simply out walking with a girlfriend. Doillon's *La pirate* proceeds quite differently, but on the same basis: the film presents us with a passion between three characters who want to be 'judged', but who simply fall under the purely descriptive gaze of a little girl, and into the plot of a detective who wonders which story he will be able to draw from it. Passion becomes the essential element of this cinema because, as against action, it ties falsifying narration to pure descriptions.

If there is a unity to the new German cinema – Wenders, Fassbinder, Schmid, Schroeter, or Schlöndorff – it is also here, as a result of the war, in the constantly variable link between these elements: spaces reduced to their own descriptions (city-deserts or places which are constantly being destroyed), direct presentations of an oppressive, useless and unsummonable time which haunt the characters; and, from one pole to the other, the powers of the false which weave a narration, in so far as they take effect in 'false movements'. The German passion has become fear, but fear is also man's final reason, his nobility announcing something new, the creation which comes from fear as a noble passion. If we were looking for an example not to sum up all the others, but among others, it would be precisely Schlöndorff's *Circle of Deceit* in a devastated and divided Beirut, a man from a different past, caught in a chain of forgers, blankly watching the movement of a windscreen wiper.

Semiology of a linguistic inspiration, semiocritique, has addressed the problem of falsifying narrations as part of rich and complex studies of the 'dysnarrative'.<sup>12</sup> But, since it identified the cinematographic image with an utterance, and every sequence with a narration in general, the differences between narrations could come only from language processes which constituted an intellectual structure underlying the images. What constituted this structure was the syntagm and the paradigm, which were both complementary, but under conditions which meant that the second remained weak and undetermined while the first alone was decisive in traditional narration (Christian Metz). Hence, it only needs the paradigm to become crucial to the structural order, or the structure to become 'serial', for narration to lose the accumulative, homogeneous and identifiable character that it owed to the primacy of the syntagm. 'Grand syntagmatics' is overtaken, the Great Lady is dead, subverted, and the minor elements eat away at her or make her multiply. New syntagms may arise (for example, the 'projective syntagms' of Chateau and

Jost), but they show the change in predominance. The cinema is always narrative, and more and more narrative, but it is dysnarrative in so far as narration is affected by repetitions, permutations and transformations which are explicable in detail by the new structure. However, a pure semiotics is unable to follow in the tracks of this semiology, because there is no narration (nor description) which is as 'given' of images. The diversity of narrations cannot be explained by the avatars of the signifier, by the states of a linguistic structure which is assumed to underlie images in general. It relates only to perceptible forms of images and to corresponding sensory signs which presuppose no narration but from which derives one narration rather than another. Perceptible types cannot be replaced by the processes of language. It is in this sense that falsifying narration depends directly on the time-image, on opsigns and chronosigns, whilst traditional narration relates to forms of the movement-image and sensory-motor signs.

## 2

Orson Welles is the first: he isolates a direct time-image and makes the image go over to the power of the false. These two aspects are undoubtedly closely linked, but recent writers have attached increasing importance to the second, which culminates in *It's All True*. There is a Nietzscheanism in Welles, as if Welles were retracing the main points of Nietzsche's critique of truth: the 'true world' does not exist, and, if it did, would be inaccessible, impossible to describe, and, if it could be described, would be useless, superfluous. The true world implies a 'truthful man', a man who wants the truth, but such a man has strange motives, as if he were hiding another man in him, a revenge: Othello wants the truth, but out of jealousy, or, worse, out of revenge for being black, and Vargas, the epitome of the truthful man, for a long time seems indifferent to the fate of his wife, engrossed in the archives in amassing proofs against his enemy. The truthful man in the end wants nothing other than to judge life; he holds up a superior value, the good, in the name of which he will be able to judge, he is craving to judge, he sees in life an evil, a fault which is to be atoned for: the moral origin of the notion of truth. In the Nietzschean fashion, Welles has constantly battled against the

system of judgement: there is no value superior to life, life is not to be judged or justified, it is innocent, it has 'the innocence' of becoming', beyond good and evil . . .<sup>13</sup>

This problem of judgement is no less familiar to the cinema than to the theatre, and has undergone a complex evolution. Since expressionism, it is the struggle between good and evil, as between light and darkness, that constitutes the metaphysics of the true (find truth in light and atonement). But Lang's position is already unique because he creates a human rather than Faustian dimension of evil, whether in the shape of a hypnotic genius (Mabuse), or of irresistible impulse (*M*). This time the question of truth, that is, of tribunal and judgement, will reveal its full ambiguity: *M* can be tried by a court of thieves which is hardly motivated by truth. And the evolution accelerates when Lang moves to America and finds there a genre of literally judicial films whose assumptions he will renew. It is not simply a matter of pointing out the difficulty of reaching the true, taking into account the shortcomings of the investigation and of those who judge (this will again be the case in Lumet's *Twelve Angry Men*). In Lang, and also in Preminger, it is the very possibility of judging which is called into question. For Lang, it is as if there is no truth any more, but only appearances. The American Lang becomes the greatest film-maker of appearances, of false images (hence the evolution of the Mabuses). Everything is appearance, and yet this novel state transforms rather than suppresses the system of judgement. In fact appearance is what betrays itself; the great moments in Lang are those where a character betrays himself. Appearances betray themselves, not because they would give way to a more profound truth, but simply because they reveal themselves as non-true; the character makes a blunder, he knows the visitor's first name (*Beyond a Reasonable Doubt*) or he knows German (*Hangmen Die Too*). In these conditions, it remains possible to make new appearances arise, in the light of which the first ones will be judicable and judged. The resistance fighters, for instance, will bring out false witnesses who will get the traitor who knew German condemned by the Gestapo. The system of judgement thus undergoes a great transformation, because it moves within the conditions which determine the relations on which appearances depend: Lang invents a Protagoras-style relativism where judgement expresses the 'best' point of view, that is, the relation under which appearances have a chance of being turned around to the benefit of an individual or of a

humanity of higher value (judgement as 'revenge', or displacement of appearances). Ultimately, we can understand the encounter between Lang and Brecht and the misunderstandings of this encounter. For, in Lang as in Brecht, judgement can no longer be directly exercised in the image, but passes to the side of the viewer, to which the conditions of possibility of judging the image itself are given. What in Brecht rested on a reality of contradictions, in Lang, in contrast, rests on a relativity of appearances.<sup>14</sup> In both of them, the system of judgement, if it undergoes a crisis, is none the less saved and transformed. Things are very different in Welles (even though he made a 'Langian', but disowned, film: *The Stranger*, where the character betrays himself). In Welles, the system of judgement becomes definitively impossible, even and especially for the viewer. The ransacking of the judge's office in *The Lady from Shanghai*, and especially the infinite sham of judgement in *The Trial*, will be evidence of this new impossibility. Welles constantly constructs characters who are unjudicable and who have not to be judged, who evade any possible judgement. If the ideal of truth crumbles, the relations of appearance will no longer be sufficient to maintain the possibility of judgement. In Nietzsche's phrase, 'with the real world we have also abolished the apparent world'.<sup>15\*</sup>

What remains? There remain bodies, which are forces, nothing but forces. But force no longer refers to a centre, any more than it confronts a setting or obstacles. It only confronts other forces, it refers to other forces, that it affects or that affect it. Power (what Nietzsche calls 'will to power' and Welles, 'character') is this power to affect and be affected, this relation between one force and others. This power is always fulfilled, and this relation is necessarily carried out, even if in a variable manner according to the forces which are present.<sup>16</sup> We already sense that short, cut-up and piecemeal montage, and the long sequence shot serve the same purpose. The one presents bodies in a successive way, each of which exercises its force or experiences that of another: 'each shot shows a blow, a counter-blow, a blow received, a blow struck'.<sup>17</sup> The other presents in a simultaneous way a relation of forces in its variability, in its instability, its proliferation of centres and multiplication of vectors (the scene of the questioning in *Touch of Evil*).<sup>18</sup> In both cases, there is the shock of forces, in the image or of the images between themselves. Sometimes a short montage reproduces a sequence shot, through cutting, as in the battle in *Chimes at Midnight*, or a sequence shot produces a short

montage, through constant reframing, as in *Touch of Evil*. We have seen how Resnais rediscovered this complementarity, by other means.

Is this to say that, in life, everything is a matter of forces? Yes, if it is understood that the relation of forces is not quantitative, but necessarily implies certain 'qualities'. There are forces which are now able to respond to others only in a single, uniform and invariable way: the scorpion in *Mr Arkadin* knows only how to sting, and stings the frog that carries him over the water, even if it means death by drowning. Variability thus survives in the relation of forces, since the scorpion's sting turns against itself, when it is directed in this case at the frog. None the less, the scorpion is the type of a force which no longer knows how to metamorphose itself according to the variations of what it can affect and what it can be affected by. Bannister is a big scorpion who knows only how to sting. Arkadin knows only how to kill, and Quinlan how to fix the evidence. This is a type of exhausted force, even when it has remained quantitatively very large, and it can only destroy and kill, before destroying itself, and perhaps in order to kill itself. It is here that it rediscovers a centre, but one which coincides with death. No matter how large it is, it is exhausted because it no longer knows how to transform itself. It is thus descending, decadent and degenerate: it represents impotence in bodies, that is, that precise point where the 'will to power' is nothing but a will-to-dominate, a being for death, which thirsts for its own death, as long as it can pass through that of others. Welles multiples the list of these all-powerful impotents: Bannister and his artificial limbs, Quinlan and his cane; Arkadin and his helplessness when he no longer has an aeroplane; Iago, the impotent *par excellence*.<sup>19</sup> These are men of revenge: not in the same way, however, as the truthful man who claimed to judge life in the name of higher values. They, on the contrary, take themselves to be *higher men*, these are higher men who claim to judge life by their own standards, by their own authority. But is this not the same spirit of revenge in two forms: Vargas, the truthful man who invokes the laws for judging, but also his double, Quinlan, who gives himself the right to judge without law; Othello, the man of duty and virtue, but also his double, Iago, who takes revenge by nature and perversion? It is what Nietzsche called the stages of nihilism, the spirit of revenge in various shapes. Behind the truthful man, who judges life from the perspective of supposedly higher values, there is the sick man,

'the man sick with himself', who judges life from the perspective of his sickness, his degeneration and his exhaustion. And this is perhaps better than the truthful man, because a life of sickness is still life, it contrasts life with death, rather than contrasting it with 'higher values' . . . Nietzsche said: behind the truthful man, who judges life, there is the sick man, sick with life itself. And Welles adds: behind the frog, the epitome of the truthful animal, there is the scorpion, the animal sick with itself. The first is an idiot and the second is a bastard.<sup>20</sup> They are, however, complementary as two figures of nihilism, two figures of the will to power.

Does this not amount to restoring a system of judgement? Welles constantly says of Quinlan, Arkadin, etc., that he 'detests them morally' (even if he does not detest them 'humanly', according to the amount of *Life* they have kept).<sup>21</sup> But it is not a matter of judging life in the name of a higher authority which would be the good, the true; it is a matter, on the contrary, of evaluating every being, every action and passion, even every value, in relation to the life which they involve. Affect as immanent evaluation, instead of judgement as transcendent value: 'I love or I hate' instead of 'I judge'. Nietzsche, who had already substituted affect for judgement, warned his readers: beyond good and evil does not in the least mean *beyond the good and the bad*. This bad is exhausted and degenerating life, all the more terrible, and apt to multiply itself. But the good is outpouring, ascending life, the kind which knows how to transform itself, to metamorphose itself according to the forces it encounters, and which forms a constantly larger force with them, always increasing the power to live, always opening new 'possibilities'. Of course there is no more truth in one life than in the other; there is only becoming, and becoming is the power of the false of life, the will to power. But there is good and bad, that is, noble and base. According to physicists, noble energy is the kind which is capable of transforming itself, while the base kind can no longer do so. There is will to power on both sides, but the latter is nothing more than will-to-dominate in the exhausted becoming of life, while the former is artistic will or 'virtue which gives', the creation of new possibilities, in the outpouring becoming. The so-called higher men are base or bad. But the good has only one name; it is 'generosity', and this is the trait by which Welles defines his favourite character, Falstaff; it is also the trait which we suppose is dominant in Don Quixote's eternal project. If becoming is the power of the false, then the good, the generous, the noble is what

raises the false to the nth power or the will to power to the level of artistic becoming. Falstaff and Don Quixote may appear to be braggarts or to be pitiful, history having passed them by; they are experts in metamorphoses of life; they oppose becoming to history. Incommensurable to any judgement, they have the innocence of becoming.<sup>22</sup> And it is clear that becoming is always innocent, even in crime, even in the exhausted life in so far as it is still a becoming. But only the good allows itself to be exhausted by life rather than exhausting it, always putting itself at the service of what is reborn from life, what metamorphoses and creates. Out of becoming it makes a Being, so protean, instead of despatching it into non-being, from the height of a uniform and fixed being. There are two states of life which are in opposition at the heart of immanent becoming, and not one instance which would claim to be superior to becoming, whether in order to judge life, or to appropriate it, and in any event to exhaust it. What Welles sees in Falstaff and Don Quixote is the 'goodness' of life in itself, a strange goodness which carries the living being to creation. It is in this sense that we can talk about an authentic or a spontaneous Nietzscheanism in Welles.

Nevertheless, in becoming, the earth has lost all centre, not only in itself, but in that it no longer has a centre around which to turn. Bodies no longer have centres except that of their death when they are exhausted and return to the earth to dissolve there. Force no longer has a centre precisely because it is inseparable from its relation to other forces: so, as Didier Goldschmidt said, short shots constantly topple to right and left and the sequence shot likewise throws up a jumble of vanishing centres (the opening of *Touch of Evil*). Weights have lost the centres of equilibrium around which they were distributed; masses have lost the centres of gravity around which they were ordered, forces have lost the dynamic centres around which they organize space; movements themselves have lost the centres of revolution around which they develop. There is here, in Welles, a mutation which is as much cinematographic as metaphysical. For what contrasts with the ideal of truth is not movement: movement remains perfectly consistent with the true while it presents invariants, point of gravity of the moving body, privileged points through which it passes and point of fixity in relation to which it moves. This is why the movement-image, in its very essence, is answerable to the effect of truth which it invokes while movement preserves its centres. And this is what we have been trying to say

from the beginning of this study: a cinematographic mutation occurs when aberrations of movement take on their independence; that is, when the moving bodies and movements lose their invariants. There then occurs a reversal where movement ceases to demand the true and where time ceases to be subordinate to movement: both at once. *Movement which is fundamentally decentred becomes false movement, and time which is fundamentally liberated becomes power of the false which is now brought into effect in false movement* (Arkadin always already there). Welles seems to be the first to have opened this breach, where neo-realism and the new wave were to be introduced with completely different methods. Welles, through his conception of bodies, forces and movement, constructs a world which has lost all motor centre or 'configuration'; the earth.

Nevertheless we have seen that Welles's cinema kept some essential centres (and it is on this very point that Resnais parts company from Welles). But what we have to evaluate here is the radical change to which Welles subjected the very notion of centre. The question of depth of field already took up in a new way a transformation of painting in the seventeenth century. It is possible that Welles's cinema has been able to re-create, for the use of our modern world, a transformation of thought which originally took place in that distant century. If we follow an important analysis by Michel Serres, the seventeenth century was not the 'classical' age of the ideal of the true, but the baroque age *par excellence* which was inseparable from what is called classical and where truth passed through a definitive crisis. It was no longer a question of knowing where the centre was, the sun or the earth, because the primary question became 'Is there a centre or not at all?' All the centres, of gravity, equilibrium, force, revolution, in short, of configuration, were collapsing. It was at that point that a restoration of centres undoubtedly occurred, but at the price of a profound change, of a great evolution of the sciences and the arts. On the one hand, the centre became *purely optical*; the point became point of view. This 'perspectivism' was *not* defined by variation of external points of view on a supposedly invariable object (the ideal of the true would be preserved). Here, on the contrary, the point of view was constant, but always internal to the different objects which were henceforth presented as the metamorphosis of one and the same thing in the process of becoming. This was *projective geometry*, which lodged the eye at the apex of the cone and gave us 'projections' as variable as the

sectional planes, circle, ellipse, hyperbola, point and straight lines, the object itself, at the limit, being only the connection of its own projections, the collection or series of its own metamorphoses. Perspectives and projections – these are neither truth nor appearance.

However, this new perspective does not yet give us the means of establishing a true progression in the figures so described, or of spacing out the volumes on the flat sections. Thus we must, on the other hand, link it to the *theory of shadows*, which is, as it were, the inverse of the projective: the luminous source now occupies the apex of the cone, the body projected is the opaque and the projections are produced by reliefs or bands of shadow.<sup>23</sup> These are the two aspects which form an 'architecture of vision'. We see them particularly in Welles's art; and they give us the final reason for the complementarity between short montage and the sequence shot. Short montage presents flat and flattened images which are so many perspectives and projections, in the strong sense, and which express the metamorphoses of an immanent thing or being. Hence the appearance of a succession of 'numbers' which often marks Welles's films; for example, the different witnesses to the past in *Mr Arkadin* could be considered as a series of projections of Arkadin himself, who is simultaneously what is projected on to each plane and the commanding point of view according to which we pass from one projection to the next; similarly in *The Trial* all the characters, policemen, colleagues, student, concierge, lawyer, little girls, painter and priest, constitute the projective series of a single instance which does not exist outside its metamorphoses. But, from the other aspect, the sequence shot with depth of field powerfully emphasizes volumes and reliefs, the bands of shadow from which bodies emerge and into which they return, oppositions and combinations of light and dark, violent stripes which affect bodies when they are in a see-through space (*The Lady from Shanghai*, *The Trial*; a whole neo-expressionism which has rid itself both of its moral assumptions and the ideal of the true).<sup>24</sup> One might say that Welles subjected the notion of centre to a double transformation which established the new cinema: the centre ceased to be sensory-motor and, on the one hand, became optical, determining a new regime of description; on the other hand, at the same time, it became luminous, determining a new progression of narration. The descriptive or projective, and the narrative or gloomy . . .

By raising the false to power, life freed itself of appearances as well as truth: neither true nor false, an undecidable alternative, but power of the false, decisive will. It is Welles who, beginning with *The Lady from Shanghai*, imposes one single character, the forger. But the forger exists only in a series of forgers who are his metamorphoses, because the power itself exists only in the form of a series of powers which are its exponents. There is always a character destined to betray the other (Welles stresses that the prince *must* betray Falstaff, Menzies must betray Quinlan), because the other is already a traitor, and betrayal is the link between forgers throughout the series. Since Welles has a strong personality, we forget that his constant theme, precisely as a result of this personality, is to be a person no longer, in the manner of Virginia Woolf's Mrs Dalloway.<sup>25</sup> A becoming, an irreducible multiplicity, characters or forms are now valid only as transformations of each other. And this is the diabolical trio of *The Lady from Shanghai*, the strange relay-characters of Mr Arkadin, the chain which unites those in *Touch of Evil*, the unlimited transformation for those of *The Trial*, the journey of the false which constantly passes through the king, his son and Falstaff, all three imposters and usurpers in some way, culminating in the scene where the roles are exchanged. It is finally the great series in *It's All True*, which is the manifesto for all of Welles's work, and his reflection on cinema. F for Falstaff, but above all *F for fake*. Welles certainly has a conscious affinity with Herman Melville, even more important than his less conscious affinity with Nietzsche. It is in *It's All True* that Welles constructs a series of forgers as extensive and perfect as that in Melville's *The Confidence Man*, Welles scrupulously playing the role of the cosmopolitan hypnotist. This great series of Welles, the story that is continually being modified, may be summed up as follows: 1. 'presentation of Oja Kadar, whom all men turn to look at in the street'; 2. 'presentation of Welles as conjuror'; 3. presentation of the journalist, author of a book about a forger of paintings, but also of false memoirs of Hughes, the millionaire forger with a multiplicity of doubles, concerning whom we do not know if he has himself harmed the journalist; 4. conversation or exchange between the journalist and the forger of paintings; 5. intervention of Welles who assures us that, for an hour, the viewer will neither see nor hear anything else false; 6. Welles recounts his life, and reflects on man in front of Chartres Cathedral; 7. Oja Kadar's affair with Picasso at the end of which Welles arrives to

say that the hour has passed and the affair was invented in every respect.<sup>26</sup>

Nevertheless, everything is not equivalent to everything else, and all the forgers are not all so to the same degree or with the same power. The truthful man forms part of them, like the frog, Vargas, or Othello, and Welles in front of Chartres Cathedral: for he invokes a true world, but the true world itself implies the truthful man. In itself, it is an *inaccessible and useless* world. Like the cathedral, its only quality is to have been made by men. Thus it is not hidden by appearances; it is it, on the contrary, which hides appearances and provides them with an alibi. Behind the truthful man there is the forger, the scorpion, and the one constantly refers back to the other. The expert in truth gives approval to Van Megeeren's false Vermeers precisely because the forger has created them by reference to the expert's own criteria. In short, the forger cannot be reduced to a simple copier, nor to a liar, because what is false is not simply a copy, but already the model. Should we not say, then, that the artist, even Vermeer, even Picasso, is a forger, since he makes a model with appearances, even if the next artist gives the model back to appearances in order to make a new model? Where does the 'bad' relation of Elmer the forger of Picasso end and the 'good' relation of Picasso and Velázquez begin? From the truthful man to the artist, the chain of forgers is long. This is obviously why it is so difficult to define 'the' forger, because we do not take into account his multiplicity, his ubiquity, and because we are content to refer to a historical and ultimately chronological time. But everything is changed in the perspective of time as becoming. What we can criticize in the forgers, as well as in the truthful man, is their exaggerated taste for *form*: they have neither the sense nor the power of metamorphosis; they reveal an impoverishment of the vital force [*élan vital*], of an already exhausted life. The difference between the forger, the expert and Vermeer is that the first two barely know how to change. Only the creative artist takes the power of the false to a degree which is realized, not in form, but in transformation. There is no longer either truth or appearance. There is no longer either invariable form or variable point of view on to a form. There is a point of view which belongs so much to the thing that the thing is constantly being transformed in a becoming identical to point of view. Metamorphosis of the true. What the artist is, is *creator of truth*, because truth is not to be achieved, formed, or reproduced; it has to be created. There is no

other truth than the creation of the New: creativity, emergence, what Melville called 'shape' in contrast to 'form'. Art is the continual production of *shapes*, reliefs and projections. The truthful man and the forger form part of the same chain, but, in the end, it is not they who are projected, elevated, or excavated; it is the artist, creator of the true, in the very place where the false attains its final power: goodness, generosity. Nietzsche drew up a list of the characters of the 'will to power': the truthful man, then all the forgers who presuppose him and that he presupposes, the long, exhausted cohort of 'superior men', but, still behind, the new man, Zarathustra, the artist or outpouring life.<sup>27</sup> There is only a slim chance, so great is the capacity of nihilism to overcome it, for exhausted life to get control of the New from its birth, and for completed forms to ossify metamorphosis and to reconstitute models and copies. The power of the false is delicate, allowing itself to be recaptured by frogs and scorpions. But it is the only chance for art or life, the Nietzschean, Melvillian, Bergsonian, Wellesian chance... Kamler's *Chronopolis* shows that the elements of time require an extraordinary encounter with man in order to produce something new.

## 3

There would be still a third instance beyond description and narration: the story [*récit*]. If we attempt a provisional definition, as we have done for the other instances, still without taking into account the special importance of the talkie factor, we believe that the story in general concerns the subject-object relationship and the development of this relationship (whilst narration concerned the development of the sensory-motor schema). The model of truth thus finds its full expression, not in the sensory-motor connection, but in the 'adequation' of the subject and the object. We must, however, specify what the subject and the object are in the conditions of the cinema. According to convention, what the camera 'sees' is called objective, and what the character sees is called subjective. Such a convention has a place only in the cinema, not in the theatre. Now it is essential that the camera sees the character himself: it is one and the same character who sometimes sees and sometimes is seen. But it is also the same camera which gives us the character seen and what the character

sees. We may, then, consider the story as the development of two kinds of images, objective and subjective, their complex relation which can go as far as antagonism, but which ought to find resolution in an identity of the type Ego = Ego; identity of the character seen and who sees, but equally well identity of the camera/film-maker who sees the character and is what the character sees. This identity passes through many trials which specifically represent the false (confusion between two characters seen, for example, in Hitchcock, or confusion in what the character sees, for example, in Ford), but ends up affirming itself for itself by constituting the True, even if the character has to die because of it. We might say that the film begins with the distinction between the two kinds of images, and ends with their identification, their identity recognized. The variations are infinite, because both the distinction and the synthetic identity can be established in all kinds of ways. The basic conditions of cinema are none the less here, from the point of view of the *veracity* of every possible story.<sup>28</sup>

The distinction between the objective and the subjective, but also their identification, are brought into question in another kind of story. Here again, the American Lang was the great forerunner of a critique of veracity in the story.<sup>29</sup> And the critique was taken up and extended by Welles, starting with *Citizen Kane*, where the distinction between the two kinds of images tends to vanish in what the witnesses have seen, without its being possible to agree on an identity for the character ('no trespassing'), nor even an identity for the film-maker, about which Welles always had doubts, which he was to push to the limit in *It's All True*. Pasolini, for his part, drew out the consequences of this new situation in what he called 'cinema of poetry', in contrast to the so-called cinema of prose. In the cinema of poetry, the distinction between what the character saw subjectively and what the camera saw objectively vanished, not in favour of one or the other, but because the camera assumed a subjective presence, acquired an internal vision, which entered into a relation of *simulation* ('mimesis') with the character's way of seeing. It is here, according to our earlier discussion, that Pasolini discovered how to go beyond the two elements of the traditional story, the objective, indirect story from the camera's point of view and the subjective, direct story from the character's point of view, to achieve the very special form of a 'free indirect discourse', of a 'free, indirect subjective'. A contamination of the two kinds of image was

established, so that bizarre visions of the camera (alternation of different lenses, zoom, extraordinary angles, abnormal movements, halts . . .) expressed the singular visions of the character, and the latter were expressed in the former, but by bringing the whole to the power of the false. The story no longer refers to an ideal of the true which constitutes its veracity, but becomes a 'pseudo-story', a poem, a story which simulates or rather a simulation of the story.<sup>30</sup> Objective and subjective images lose their distinction, but also their identification, in favour of a new circuit where they are wholly replaced, or contaminate each other, or are decomposed and recomposed. Pasolini brings his analysis to bear on Antonioni, Bertolucci and Godard, but the origin of this transformation of the story is perhaps in Lang and Welles (the study of *The Immortal Story* would be important here).

We would like to consider an aspect of this new type of story, as it appears in a quite different area. If we go to the forms which for a long time challenged fiction, we see that the cinema of reality sometimes claimed objectively to show us real settings, situations and characters, and sometimes claimed subjectively to show the ways of seeing of these characters themselves, the way in which they themselves saw their situation, their setting, their problems. In short, there was the documentary or ethnographic pole, and the investigation or reportage pole. These two poles inspired masterpieces and in any case intermingled (Flaherty on one hand, and on the other Grierson and Leacock). But, in challenging fiction, if this cinema discovered new paths, it also preserved and sublimated an ideal of truth *which was dependent on cinematographic fiction itself*: there was what the camera sees, what the character sees, the possible antagonism and necessary resolution of the two. And the character himself retained or acquired a kind of identity in so far as he was seen or saw. And the camera/film-maker also had his identity, as ethnologist or reporter. It was very important to challenge the established fictions in favour of a reality that cinema could capture or discover. But fiction was being abandoned in favour of the real, whilst retaining a model of truth which presupposed fiction and was a consequence of it. What Nietzsche had shown, that the ideal of the true was the most profound fiction, at the heart of the real, had not yet been discovered by the cinema. The veracity of the story continued to be grounded in fiction. When the ideal or model of the true was applied to the real, it began to change many things, since the camera was being directed to a pre-existing real, but, in another

sense, nothing had changed in the conditions of the story: the objective and the subjective were displaced, not transformed; identities were defined in a different way, but remained defined; the story remained truthful, really-truthful instead of fictionally-truthful. But the veracity of the story had not stopped being a fiction.

The break is not between fiction and reality, but in the new mode of story which affects both of them. A change occurred around the 1960s, in quite independent places, in the direct cinema of Cassavetes and Shirley Clarke, in the 'cinema of the lived' of Pierre Perrault, in the 'cinéma-vérité' of Jean Rouch. Thus, when Perrault criticizes all fiction, it is in the sense that it forms a model of pre-established truth, which necessarily expresses the dominant ideas or the point of view of the colonizer, even when it is forged by the film's author. Fiction is inseparable from a 'reverence' which presents it as true, in religion, in society, in cinema, in the systems of images. Never has Nietzsche's dictum, 'suppress your reverences', been so well understood as by Perrault. When Perrault is addressing his real characters of Quebec, it is not simply to eliminate fiction but to free it from the model of truth which penetrates it, and on the contrary to rediscover the pure and simple *story-telling function* which is opposed to this model. What is opposed to fiction is not the real; it is not the truth which is always that of the masters or colonizers; it is the story-telling function of the poor, in so far as it gives the false the power which makes it into a memory, a legend, a monster. Hence the white dolphin of *Pour la suite du monde*, the caribou of *Le pays de la terre sans arbres* and above all the luminous beast, the Dionysus of *La bête lumineuse*. What cinema must grasp is not the identity of a character, whether real or fictional, through his objective and subjective aspects. It is the becoming of the real character when he himself starts to 'make fiction', when he enters into 'the flagrant offence of making up legends' and so contributes to the invention of his people. The character is inseparable from a before and an after, but he reunites these in the passage from one state to the other. He himself becomes another, when he begins to tell stories without ever being fictional. And the film-maker for his part becomes another when there are 'interposed', in this way, real characters, who wholly replace his own fictions by their own story-telling. Both communicate in the invention of a people. I interposed on behalf of Alexis (*Le règne du jour*), and the whole of Quebec, in order to get to know who I was,

'in such a way that to speak to myself I just have to let them speak'.<sup>31</sup> This is the simulation of a story, the legend and its metamorphosis, free indirect discourse of Quebec, a discourse with a thousand heads 'little by little'. Thus the cinema can call itself *cinéma-vérité*, all the more because it will have destroyed every model of the true so as to become creator and producer of truth: this will not be a cinema of truth but the truth of cinema.

This is the sense intended by Jean Rouch when he spoke of 'cinéma-vérité'. Just like Perrault, with reporting investigations, Rouch had begun with ethnographic films. The evolution of the two authors would be difficult to explain if we restricted ourselves to pointing out the impossibility of achieving a raw real; everybody has always known that the camera has an active effect on situations, and that characters react to the presence of the camera, and it hardly troubled Flaherty or Leacock, who already saw only false problems in it. In Rouch and Perrault, the novelty has other sources. It begins to be clearly expressed in Rouch in *Les maîtres fous*, when the characters in the ritual, possessed, drunk, foaming and in trances, are first shown in their daily reality where they are waiters, navvies and labourers, as they become again after the ceremony. What they were before . . . Conversely, in *Moi un Noir*, there are real characters who are shown through the roles of their story-telling, Dorothy Lamour the little prostitute, Lemmy Caution the unemployed man from Treichville, even if they themselves then comment on and correct the function that they have released.<sup>32</sup> In *Jaguar*, the three characters, especially the 'gallant', share out roles which they are made to confront like so many legendary powers, by the realities of their journey – the encounter with the fetishists, the organization of work, the making of gold ingots which they lock away and which are useless, the flying visit to the central market, finally the invention of their little business under a title which replaces a ready-made formula with a figure capable of making legends: 'little by little the bird makes his . . . bonnet'. And they will return to their country, like ancestors, full of exploits and lies where the least incident becomes power. There is always passage from one state to another at the heart of the character, as when the hunter baptizes a lion the American, or when the travellers in *Cocorico Monsieur Poulet* encounter the female devil. To restrict ourselves to these masterpieces, we notice in the first place that the character has ceased to be real or fictional, in so far as he has ceased to be seen objectively or to see subjectively: it is a character who goes over

crossings and frontiers because he invents as a real character, and becomes all the more real because he has been better at inventing. *Dionysos* is a great synthesis by Rouch: the image of industrial society which brings together a Hungarian mechanic, an Ivory Coast riveter, a West Indian metalworker, a Turkish carpenter, a German woman mechanic, plunges into a before that is Dionysian haunted by the three maenads, the white, the black and the yellow, but this before is also an after, like the post-industrial horizon where one worker has become a flautist, another a tambourine player, cellist, soprano, forming the Dionysian cortège which reaches the forest of Meudon. The 'ciné-trance' and its music are a temporalization of the image which never stays in the present, continually crossing the limit in both directions, all driven by a teacher who turns out to be a forger, nothing but a forger, the power of the false of Dionysus himself. If the real-fictional alternative is so completely surpassed it is because the camera instead of marking out a fictional or real present, constantly reattaches the character to the before and after which constitute a direct time-image. The character must first of all be real if he is to affirm fiction as a power and not as a model: he has to start to tell stories in order to affirm himself all the more as real and not fictional. The character is continually becoming another, and is no longer separable from this becoming which merges with a people.

But what we are saying about the character is also valid in the second place, and in particular, for the film-maker himself. He too becomes another, in so far as he takes real characters as intercessors and replaces his fictions by their own story-telling, but, conversely, gives these story-tellings the shape of legends, carrying out their 'making into legend'. Rouch makes his own free indirect discourse at the same time as his characters make that of Africa. Perrault makes his own free indirect discourse at the sametime as his characters make that of Quebec. There is undoubtedly a big difference in situation between Perrault and Rouch, a difference which is not simply personal but cinematographic and formal. For Perrault, the concern is to belong to his dominated people, and to rediscover a lost and repressed collective identity. For Rouch, it is a matter of getting out of his dominant civilization and reaching the premises of another identity. Hence the possibility of misunderstandings between the two authors. Nevertheless each one as a film-maker sets off with the same slender material, camera on the shoulder and

synchronized tape-recorder; they must become others, with their characters, at the same time as their characters must become others themselves. The famous formula, 'what is suitable for the documentary is that one knows who one is and whom one is filming', ceases to be valid. The Ego = Ego form of identity (or its degenerate form, them = them) ceases to be valid for the characters and for the film-maker, in the real as well as in the fiction. What allows itself to be glimpsed instead, by profound degrees, is Rimbaud's 'I is another' [*Je est un autre*]: Godard said this in relation to Rouch; not only for the characters themselves, but for the film-maker who 'white just like Rimbaud, himself declares that *I is another*', that is, *me a black*.<sup>33</sup> When Rimbaud exclaims, 'I am of inferior race for all eternity . . . I am a beast, a negro . . .', it is in the course of passing through a whole series of forgers, 'Merchant you are a negro, magistrate you are a negro, general you are a negro, mangy old emperor you are a negro . . .', up to that highest power of the false which means that a black must himself become black, through his white roles, whilst the white here finds a chance of becoming black too ('I can be saved . . .'). And, for his part, Perrault has no less a need to become another so as to join his own people. This is no longer *Birth of a Nation*, but constitution or reconstitution of a people, where the film-maker and his characters become others together and the one through the other, a collectivity which gradually wins from place to place, from person to person, from intercessor to intercessor. I am a caribou, an original . . . 'I is another' is the formation of a story which simulates, of a simulation of a story or of a story of simulation which deposes the form of the truthful story. Poetry is what Pasolini held up against prose, but which can be found in the place that he did not look for it, in the domain of a cinema presented as direct.<sup>34</sup>

In Shirley Clarke or Cassavetes, an analogous phenomenon occurs, once again with many differences. It is as if the three great themes were turning and forming their combinations; the character is continually passing the frontier between the real and the fictional (the power of the false, the story-telling function), the film-maker has to reach what the character was 'before' and will be 'after'; he has to bring together the before and the after in the incessant passage from one state to the other (the direct time-image); the becoming of the film-maker and of his character already belongs to a people, to a community, to a minority whose expression they practise and set free (free, indirect discourse).

With Shirley Clarke's *The Connexion*, the levels of organization mingle, because the roles of drug-addicts refer to pre-existing characters who themselves refer *alternatively* to their role. And in *A Portrait of Jason* it is the passage which must be grasped in all its possible 'distances', in relation to the character and to his roles, but always internal distances, as if the white camera had slid into the great black forger; the 'I is another' of Shirley Clarke consists in this: that the film that she wanted to make about herself became the one she made about Jason. What has to be filmed is the frontier, on condition that this is equally crossed by the film-maker in one direction and by the real character in the opposite direction: time is necessary here; a certain time is necessary which constitutes an integral part of the film.<sup>35</sup> This is what Cassavetes was already saying in *Shadows* and then *Faces*; what constitutes part of the film is interesting oneself in the people more than in the film, in the 'human problems' more than in the 'problems of *mise-en-scène*', so that the people do not pass over to the side of the camera without the camera having passed over to the side of the people. In *Shadows* it is the two white Negroes who constitute the frontier, and its perpetual crossing in a double reality which is no longer distinguishable from the film. The frontier can be grasped only in flight, when we no longer know where it passes, between the white and the black, but also between the film and the non-film; it is characteristic of film to be always outside its marks, breaking with 'the right distance', always overflowing 'the reserved zone' where we would have liked to hold it in space and time.<sup>36</sup>

We will see how Godard draws a generalized method of the image from this; where something ends, where something else begins, what a frontier is and how to see it, but through crossing and displacing it endlessly. In *Masculin féminin*, the fictional interview with the characters and the real interview with the actors mix together so that they seem to be speaking to each other, and to speak for themselves, by speaking to the film-maker.<sup>37</sup> The method can be developed only where the camera is constantly reaching a before or an after in the characters which constitute the real, at the very point where story-telling is set in motion. 'To know what they were before being placed in the *picture*, and after . . .'<sup>38</sup> *France tour détour deux enfants* already makes use of this as a principle; 'Him before, and the story after, or him after and the story before.' Godard, who has often acknowledged his debt to Rouch, increasingly emphasizes this point: the image has to

include the before and the after; it thus has to bring together in this way the conditions of a new, direct time-image, instead of being in the present 'as in bad films'. It is under these conditions of the time-image that the same transformation involves the cinema of fiction and the cinema of reality and blurs their differences; in the same movement, descriptions become pure, purely optical and sound, narrations falsifying and stories, simulations. The whole cinema becomes a free, indirect discourse, operating in reality. The forger and his power, the film-maker and his character, or the reverse, since they only exist through this community which allows them to say 'we, creators of truth'. This is a third time-image, distinct from those we saw in the previous chapter. The two earlier ones essentially concerned the *order of time*, that is, the coexistence of relations or the simultaneity of the elements internal to time. The third concerns the *series of time*, which brings together the before and the after in a becoming, instead of separating them; its paradox is to introduce an enduring interval in the moment itself.<sup>39</sup> The three time-images all break with indirect representation, but also shatter the empirical continuation of time, the chronological succession, the separation of the before and the after. They are thus connected with each other and interpenetrate (Welles, Resnais, Godard, Robbe-Grillet), but allow the distinction of their signs to subsist in a particular work.