

# NOTE TO USERS

This reproduction is the best copy available.

**UMI**<sup>®</sup>



*Cinematic Politics*

Nasrin Himada

A Thesis

in

The Mel Hoppenheim School

of

Cinema

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Master of Arts (Film Studies) at  
Concordia University  
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

August 2008

©Nasrin Himada, 2008



Library and  
Archives Canada

Published Heritage  
Branch

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

Bibliothèque et  
Archives Canada

Direction du  
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

*Your file* *Votre référence*  
*ISBN: 978-0-494-45517-3*  
*Our file* *Notre référence*  
*ISBN: 978-0-494-45517-3*

**NOTICE:**

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

**AVIS:**

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

---

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

■ ■ ■  
**Canada**

## Acknowledgements

I would like to give much thanks to: Erin Manning for her encouragement and support through the writing of this thesis, and Julian Samuel for inspiring honesty and fearlessness.

## Table of Contents

Introduction	
<i>Cinematic Thought</i>	1
Chapter One	
<i>The Encounter with the Unthinkable</i>	3
Chapter Two	
<i>A Supernatural Shiver</i>	37
Chapter Three	
<i>Cinematic Politics</i>	69
Conclusion	
<i>How Does Cinema Activate Thought?</i>	93
Bibliography	96
Filmography	98

## Introduction: Cinematic Thought

What makes one act? How is thought an act? How is thought an act of resistance?

My thesis explores the concept of resistance; resistance as creative production, as an inventive force. Here, I experiment with the concepts of politics, force, resistance, image, and movement. I write about what these concepts mean and their relation to each other. I approach writing about film *differently*. I propose a new approach to cinema and resistance. I explore cinema not only as a tool for resistance but as thought. I ask: what is cinema as thought, or what is cinematic thought?

Politics, in this thesis, means *to activate* thought; to activate a certain creative force into play: how creativity becomes thought in the world. Force is what affects the body directly when confronted with something that moves the world *differently*. In this thesis, I discuss work that makes force felt. In my first chapter, “The Encounter with the Unthinkable”, I write about how it is that politics activates new thought. I ask: how is this political? How is this creative? What is thought’s relation with cinema? What is thought’s relation with politics? In chapter two, “A Supernatural Shiver”, I explore the ways in which affect affects thought and what is affect’s relation with resistance as thought? Affect comes from Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s work together. It is an important concept and plays an important role in my thesis. Affect is when a force is felt before it can be articulated, or defined to be as such. Affect makes felt movements of thought—thoughts-in-the-making. When “affected”, one feels the force of the weight of the image, and this can be felt in cinema, in painting, when listening to music, when reading a novel. Affect is sensation felt. Deleuze writes,

Innocent X screams, but he screams behind the curtain, not only as someone who can no longer be seen, but as someone who cannot see, who has nothing left to see, whose only remaining function is to render visible these invisible forces that are making him scream, these powers of the future. This is what is expressed in the phrase, “to scream at”—not to scream before or about, but to scream at death—which suggests this coupling of forces, the perceptible force of the scream and the imperceptible force that makes one scream (2003: 52).

In chapter three, I move toward thinking about imperceptible forces and movements that create or invent new images of thought. How do imperceptible forces make an image felt in the world? I use the example here of the Abu-Ghraib torture photographs and some of the questions I explore are: how is an image created? How does it manifest in the world? What kind of implications does an image have on thought? How does an image become an image of thought?



# 1 The Encounter with the Unthinkable

“The fictitious is never in things or in people, but in the impossible verisimilitude of what lies between them: encounters, the proximity of what is most distant, the absolute dissimulation in our very midst. Therefore, fiction consists not in showing the invisible, but in showing the extent to which the invisibility of the visible is invisible.”

Michel Foucault<sup>1</sup>

*Day Night Day Night* (2006) is a film that provokes a politics of the unknowable.

The first scene of *Day Night Day Night* begins with a close-up shot of a young woman’s profile. The background of the close-up shot is of a window on a bus. We hear the girl whisper. We struggle to listen to the words that are being said. The words are barely audible but if we listen carefully we can make them out. The sound is a whisper, a private prayer: we can *almost* hear the words, and if we listen we can *almost* make them out. The film has already drawn us in affectively by mere anticipation. The young woman is whispering the following in a prayer-like manner:

Everybody dies. Some fall from a window and die. Others die when an air conditioner falls from a window and hits them. Some people get hit by a car and die. Some are knifed, some are shot, some are strangled, some bleed to death with bare hands and die. Some people die when a neighbour is smoking and sets off a fire, some people just die from smoking. Some people die from lung cancer, stomach cancer. Some die from heart attacks, strokes. People get cirrhosis of the liver and die. Some freeze to death, some die from pneumonia. Some die from heat stroke, some from getting bit by mosquitoes. Some just die from throwing up. Some people get bit by dogs and die. Some fall off a horse and get trampled. Some are trampled to death by other people. Some get old and die. I’ve made up my mind. I have only one death. I want this death to be for you.

This opening shot sets the atmosphere of the film. The atmosphere is that of the *unknowable*. The initial prayer is designed so as to support this feeling of the unknowable that Julia Loktev, the filmmaker, is trying to contain throughout the film.

---

<sup>1</sup> Foucault, Michel. *Maurice Blanchot: The Thought from the Outside*. Trans. B. Massumi. New York: Zone Books, 1990. 24.

This girl wants to die. She remains unknown to us; and the reason for her wish to die is unknown to us and remains unknown to us through out the film. 1) When she prays we are not sure who she is praying to and we can barely hear what is being uttered, 2) the audience is not sure who she is and where she comes from, 3) we wonder about how she is going to die. This is how Loktev creates the atmosphere of the unknowable; she leads the viewer to ask questions but without the film giving any answers. We are drawn in, already asking questions; already in wonder. This film provokes a politics of thought that affects and that draw us into what is not yet known. Loktev never gives us any answers, or never gives us a story, about why this girl is becoming a suicide-bomber.

*Day Night Day Night* does not explain the event of the girl's decision, it explores it. Very quickly, as the film progresses, the viewer begins to realize that the narrative is not about the content, what is being said, but about *what comes to be felt*. It is about the relation between felt thought and decision. It creates an inexplicable feeling: the feeling of the unknowable that becomes the diagrammatic force of the film taking form<sup>2</sup>. The film is about what emerges out of the in-between of what is said and what comes to be felt: the inaudibility of thought in motion. This in-between is what affects the film's atmosphere with the unknowable; its rhythm, speed, colour and volume express the film's affective tonality. The in-between conditions the film's felt effect. *Day Night Day Night* is a film that puts into work the encounter with the in-between, the unknowable. Something is definitely felt but not yet known. This is an intensive film; it creates an intense process that puts into work the complex relation between what the viewer sees and what the protagonist is experiencing.

---

<sup>2</sup> For more a detailed reading on the relation between force and form see Erin Manning. *Relationescapes: Movement, Art, Philosophy*. Massachusetts: MIT Press, (in press).

*Day Night Day Night* is a film about a young woman who decides to become a suicide bomber. Her final destination is Times Square, New York City. The film follows her as she prepares for her final moments. The film focuses not on the “why” of her conviction but more on the “how” of her getting there. The film examines the ethics of a decision-taking<sup>3</sup> process without moralizing the issue of suicide bombing. The film moves away from situating the act itself in relation to a moral concern. The film is about the micropolitical act of the decision, of the girl taking the cut<sup>4</sup>. The film steers the viewer away from the pre-composed structure of linear time, with cause and effect reasoning, that is formed within the sensory-motor schema of a movement-image<sup>5</sup>. Loktev, by breaking down the sensory-motor schema, calls into question the image. The image, as Gilles Deleuze writes, when it ceases to be sensory-motor, brings life to thought in the image<sup>6</sup>. Thought becomes that which restores our belief in the world. The viewer is “confronted by something unthinkable in thought” (1989: 169). What constitutes the outside (an immanent, indeterminable space), according to Deleuze, is the unthought of thought. By breaking the sensory-motor schema the viewer is no longer concerned with an association (179). Loktev creates time in the image. The micromovements and microgestures captured by the camera in turn infect the image with the imperceptible movement of the intensity that is felt in the film. We are invited to

---

<sup>3</sup> Erin Manning writes “To ‘take’ a decision (Derrida’s concept) is what is at stake here. The process of decision-taking involves taking the risk that your decision might change the orientation of an event.” (2007: xvii).

<sup>4</sup> Manning writes: “To make a decision is a political event. It is a moment of responsibility, a tempered instance of reaching-out, a touching of that which I do not yet know, a touching of an other in a reciprocal engagement with the unknowable” (2007: 49).

<sup>5</sup> For further discussion on the movement-image see Gilles Deleuze *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.

<sup>6</sup> Gilles Deleuze. *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*. Trans. H. Tomlinson and R. Galeta. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.

compose with the image and are drawn into the movement of thought. We are affectively moved to think with the image. This is resistance at work.

The concept of the outside for Deleuze concerns force. Forces operate in the space of the outside<sup>7</sup>. The outside is an indeterminate space. Deleuze writes, “Thinking addresses itself to an outside that has no form” (87). This outside, or this non-stratified space, a smooth space, is what Deleuze refers to as resistance. Loktev creates an opening that gives potential for expression to become. She provides an opening onto the outside of thought, the unthought of thought. This brings forth the encounter with the unthinkable. She invents with cinema and invites us to invent with thought. This brings into play the ways in which we are given room to invent-*with* the potential of unthought; the unthought of thought. It is that outside indeterminable space that gives thought its force to invent new thoughts, *again*.

Deleuze explains that when the sensory-motor schema is broken “it is no longer time that depends on movement; it is aberrant movement that depends on time” (1987: 41). In Loktev’s film, we are not sutured within a time frame. Time here, as Deleuze writes, is “out of joint” (1989: 41). *Day Night Day Night* plays with the eventness of time<sup>8</sup>. First, the narrative of the film is contained within a specific time span, a day, a night, another day, and another night. To create this atmosphere of the unknowable Loktev does not provide any information that would allow the viewer to piece anything together through linear time narrative. There is a story but there is no content. Time is

---

<sup>7</sup> Gilles Deleuze. *Foucault*. Trans. S. Hand. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1988c. 87.

<sup>8</sup>Deleuze writes, “What aberrant movement reveals is time as everything, as ‘infinite opening,’ as anteriority over all normal movement defined by motivity; time has to be anterior to the controlled flow of every action, there must be ‘a birth of the world that is not completely restricted to the experience of our motivity’ and ‘the most distant recollection of image must be separated from all movement of bodies’ (1989: 37).

pushed to its limit. Loktev experiments with narrative. We can only know so much in so little time, and yet feel so much in time. Time, in this film, is duration<sup>9</sup>. The viewer is no longer able to make a cause and effect connection that would lead to a finality. There is no end to the image becoming thought. We are not experiencing a pre-established succession of images. The micropolitical act of the decision taking its cut each time is constantly shifting and cannot yet be determined; force takes precedence over form. The micropolitical is a movement of force toward a politics of the not yet known. Taking a decision is a force that affects. Affect is that which is felt but not yet known. A decision taking its cut is affective; it makes time, and time is intensive; it produces intensities. The micropolitical is time as duration. The micropolitical becomes that which is intensive, it makes time. A decision taking its cut is micropolitical. Decision makes time. Manning writes, "...*the political* refers to a category that distinguishes itself from *politics* (or policy) by alluding to the creative process of the enactment of politics" (2003: xviii). This *enactment of politics* is a making-time for the political.

Time is key in understanding the micropolitical. Time here is no longer subordinated to movement<sup>10</sup>. Time is felt first. In this manner, *Day Night Day Night*

---

<sup>9</sup> For a detailed reading of Bergson's concept of duration, see Deleuze (1988b): "duration is not merely lived experience; it is also experience enlarged or even gone beyond; it is already a condition of experience. For experience always gives us a composite of space and duration...The two combine, and into this combination space introduces the forms of its extrinsic distinctions or of its homogenous *and* discontinuous 'sections,' while duration contributes an internal succession that is both heterogeneous *and* continuous" (37).

<sup>10</sup> For a detailed discussion on time and movement see Deleuze (1989): "It is still necessary for movement to be normal: movement can only subordinate time, and make it into a number that indirectly measures it, if it fulfils conditions of normality. What we mean by normality is the existence of centres: centres for the revolution of movement itself, of equilibrium of forces, of gravity of moving bodies, and of observation for a viewer able to recognize or perceive the moving body, and to assign movement. A movement that avoids centring, in whatever way, is as such abnormal, aberrant. Now, aberrant movement calls into question the status of time as indirect representation or number of movement, because it evades the relationships of number. But, far from time itself being shaken, it rather finds this the moment to surface directly, to shake off its subordination in relation to movement and to reverse this subordination. Conversely, then, a direct

provokes a movement that is *extra*-ordinary. The film challenges the viewer's modes of perception in relation to how movement is usually seen or felt. The viewer is confronted with a new way of seeing and of thinking cinematic movement in terms of how time is experienced. Time is experienced micropolitically. The film foregrounds a movement that is a micromovement; it is real yet imperceptible; it is a movement that is on the cusp of becoming a thought but has not yet actualized into a thought. It is a movement that opens onto a field of potential where something new might emerge but as viewers we cannot determine what that is yet; as Deleuze writes: "something has become too strong in the image" (1989: 18). In Loktev's film what has become too strong in the image is expressed through the atmosphere of the unknowable. The force of the film is the encounter with the unknowable: the decision becoming-thought. *Day Night Day Night* is a time-image film. Time takes precedence over movement; it reveals aberrant movement. Time is felt first, directly. The film passes through two distinct time structures that eventually become indistinct; time that is linear-time in process, and time as duration, as micromovement.

The film does not follow the girl's motive, but her movement as it is making "an impact on the world"<sup>11</sup>. The camera becomes an extension of the girl's movements. The camera concentrates on her body as it moves in time and space. We follow her as she walks from one place to the next. We follow her as she brushes her teeth, as she combs her hair, as she washes her feet, as she dries her socks, as she eats her egg roll, as she paces, back and forth, in her hotel room etc. These are movements we, as an audience, can recognize on screen to be movements that we perceive and are able to identify.

---

presentation of time does not imply the halting of movement, but rather the promotion of aberrant movement (36).

<sup>11</sup>Day Night Day Night. Dir. Julia Loktev. Perf. Luisa Williams. IFC Entertainment, 2006.

However, other movements are at play here in the image. These movements are felt and not recognized as such on screen. They are imperceptible micromovements or microgestures that make felt the affect of the image. Deleuze writes, “we must not take ‘micro’ to mean a simple miniaturization of visible and articulable forms; instead it signifies another domain, a new type of relation, a dimension of thought that is irreducible to knowledge. ‘Micro’ therefore means mobile and non-localizable connection” (1988c: 74). For each image there is an affective tone that qualifies the movement as *eventness*; each image affects and in this way it creates its own qualitative tonality. Deleuze writes, “This kind of movement no longer depends on a moving body or an object which realizes it, nor on a spirit which reconstitutes it. It is the image which itself moves in itself” (1989: 156). Every image is movement: the cinematic image is automatic movement that has the potential to produce new thought through how it affects<sup>12</sup>.

*Day Night Day Night* consists of two parts: The Preparation, or The Plan, and Action. In Preparation, the shots are contained. The colours are de-saturated with a greyish blue tone. In this sequence the camera follows the girl very closely. The camera documents the girl preparing for her suicide-bombing mission. In this first part, the film is organized shot by shot in a uniform, composed, and contained manner. The shots are extremely geometric. They are tightly composed and are juxtaposed with sharp cutting techniques; this gives the image its intensity. These images unsettle us. Preparation takes

---

<sup>12</sup> For a more detailed discussion on movement and thought See Gilles Deleuze, “Thought and Cinema,” In *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989, 156-158. He writes, “Those who first made and thought about cinema began from a simple idea: cinema as industrial art achieves self-movement, automatic movement, it makes movement the immediate given of the image...it is only when movement becomes automatic that the artistic essence of the image is realized: *producing a shock to thought, communicating vibrations to the cortex, touching the nervous and cerebral system directly*” (156).

place mostly inside a hotel room. It is an enclosed space; this is heightened by the tightly confined images: composed, framed and tightly shot. In this sequence Loktev uses a lot of close-up shots. We are very close to the character's body, movement, skin, gestures, and sounds. Preparation does not only take place in a tightly enclosed space, it is also shot in close-ups which heighten its composition. The shots are confined by the tight framing of close-ups that focus in on the body or face: we feel as though we are moving along with the girl. The camera captures the micromovements and microgestures of the body becoming-suicide-bomber. The close-up shots are often focused on the face, eyes, hands, fingers, legs, feet, toenails. The perverse linear structure of the film is organized through the ways in which the micromovements and microgestures of the girl's moving body are captured within each shot. The film is strangely linear in terms of how the girl moves on screen; she is followed closely by the camera. The intense movement of the film, or power of the image, is created out of how these micromovements come into relation with each other. We see movement in parts. Literally, the film almost captures the muscle spasms of a body at work.

In one scene we see the protagonist preparing to take a bath. Sound plays an important role throughout the film and in this sequence it is immensely pronounced, sharp and cutting, and discomforting. Sound and image become inseparable producing an intensity that is felt all throughout the film. This particular sequence begins with the girl turning all the light fixtures in the room on and off, checking to see if they work. We then follow her into the bathroom and the camera cuts to show her checking the water tap in the bath; then a cut to a close-up of the girl scrubbing at her feet in the now filled bath. The sound is heightened and loud. The shot then cuts to a close-up of her scrubbing her



knee cap with a bar of soap, again the sound is very loud and unsettling. Then, another cut to a close-up shot of her leg, again similar scrubbing action matched with a strong sound bit: she is harshly scrubbing her leg clean with the white bar of soap. Another cut and a close-up shot of her elbow and arm bent upwards towards her, she is again scrubbing, and the sound of the scrubbing continues to be disruptive, uncomfortable, and cutting. And then another cut and a close-up shot of her scrubbing her wrists and then a cut to her scrubbing her hand, then a cut to her scrubbing her fingernails, then a cut and a close-up to her scrubbing her neck; again this scrubbing action is fast, harsh, and focused. Then again, we see a close-up of her scrubbing her underarms, and with the same harsh and distinct sound. After this succession of quick cuts and amalgamation of close-up shots, the camera cuts and rests on a close-up of the girl's face still sitting in the bathtub. The quick speed of the image slows down. This shot lasts for fifty-eight seconds.

After just having experienced quick cutting with a forceful focus into direct action joined by a heightened and pronounced sound we come to rest on her face. The diagrammatic force of the film is felt. The diagram is emergent in the sound-image interval that creates a time for the character which is not the film's 'linear' time. Such moments happen throughout the film: we feel time shifting as we move into the character's internal world. We feel the emergence of thought, her thought, where we feel a temporary break down in the world she is creating through her movements. The rhythm of feeling that comes through, at this point in the image, is a sense of being-on-the-edge; we are captured by a time we cannot quite understand yet can feel very strongly. This rhythm of feeling comes through in the image as that of a suspension in time; a subjective relapse.

The cinematic image of *Day Night Day Night*, is becoming-thought. Loktev plays with the effects of speed and rest in motion. The film functions through how the image creates movement, and how the movement creates image. This propels an intensity that is felt first. Loktev invents. For example, the image described above suggests that the girl is thinking about what she is doing. We see her in a long sequence vigorously washing herself in the bath. After quick movements and quick cuts in the shot we see her dunk her head into the water for a few seconds, then she comes out exhaling for breath. The camera stays still and close to her face without any movement. We see her out of joint with time. We see her just staring into space; a still movement. The shot is at rest. But rather than resettling us into the interiority of the already said world of this girl's subjective self, of the "why" question of her decision, we instead are left unsettled. We wonder. The shot lasts for a long time but then it cuts to another action. These moments of break-down, or relapses, rests in motion, enter into relation with the force of the super linear audio-image. It is not just the girl who breaks down, the image, the thought in motion, also breaks down and something new emerges. Time is out of joint. There is a rupture in the perfectly uniform and composed shots where everything is held together through the girl's determined action; walking, washing, eating, sleeping etc. When the image breaks down—a still movement that evokes thought-in-the-making—it releases, as Deleuze and Guattari write, "blocks of sensation"<sup>13</sup>. Her thoughts while perceptible to the viewer remain silent, unknown, unenunciated, but they are felt.

The young woman does not have a name, she is ethnically ambiguous, and the viewer is not informed of her background: where she comes from, what she does for a

---

<sup>13</sup> See Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. *What is Philosophy?* Trans. H. Tomlinson and G. Burchell. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

living etc. These concerns are not what produce the film's felt affect. The character is positioned within worlds that pre-exist; i.e. New Jersey, New York City, bus terminal, restaurant, hotel room. While filming in these pre-established worlds of bus shelters, restaurants, hotel rooms, and toilet stalls, Loktev creates another time structure in the film whereby the character worlds<sup>14</sup>. The questions that we are provoked to ask become part of the complexity that is associated with the relation of the in-between, that is the relation between the known (world) and the unknown (a worlding) that become part of how *Day Night* creates its atmosphere of the unknowable. This relation of the in-between is what I will refer to as the interval. The interval is significant in terms of the film's diagrammatic force. The interval is that which builds the film's diagram. It gives it its force<sup>15</sup>. It is duration and emergence.

In *Cinema 2: The Time-Image* Deleuze writes,

The question is no longer: does cinema give us the illusion of the world? But: how does cinema restore our belief in the world? This irrational point is the *unsummonable* of Welles, the *inexplicable* of Robbe-Grillet, the *undecidable* of Resnais, the *impossible* of Marguerite Duras, or again what might be called the *incommensurable* of Godard (between two things) (1989: 181-182).

Deleuze describes the diagram of each filmmaker calling attention to the ways in which these filmmakers "restore our belief in the world". In *Day Night Day Night* Loktev restores our belief in the world through what is not yet known: the unknowable. This feeling of the unknowable is expressed through how she constructs the film in an ultra linear setting. The film is a super-linear time-image film. This is linear time that has been pushed to its limit. First, the time frame of the film is set and takes place in two days and two nights. Simultaneously, there is another structure that is working within a perverse

---

<sup>14</sup> See Erin Manning *Politics of Touch: Sense, Movement, Sovereignty*. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 2007.

<sup>15</sup> Erin Manning. "From Biopolitics to the Biogram, or, How Leni Riefenstahl Moves through Fascism." In *Relationshscapes: Movement, Art, Philosophy*. Massachusetts: MIT Press, (in press).

linear time frame. This time structure is working on a micro level. The super linear structure of the film creates intensity where time is seen as the force of the image: an immanent movement becoming-with the film's spiralling thought.

Loktev creates techniques that open up the potential for new thought to emerge. This is thought from the outside, the unthought of thought, and this thought from the outside is a thought of resistance<sup>16</sup>. Thought from the outside is not an outside as much as a more-than, or a *witness* of the ineffable in experience. Movements of thought emerge from the creation of new modes of perception. They are properly emergent (they were not there before) and they affect contagion of how they come to exist in the world. I follow from here with a concept I refer to as affective resistance. Affective resistance is when the outside of thought is becoming thought that is felt. The concept of the outside, for Deleuze, is what constitutes the whole. It is the unknowable space of indeterminable forces that is immanently material and active. Loktev's film pushes thought to its limit. It provokes a resistance that is affective. The techniques that she produces through the relation between camera shots, sound design, colour schemes, and speed, all intertwine to create an intensity that is felt throughout the viewing of the film. This is how the diagram<sup>17</sup> is formed; through the force of intensity in the cinematic image. The

---

<sup>16</sup> See Gilles Deleuze, "Thought and Cinema," In *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989, 156-158. See also Michel Foucault (1987): "A thought that stands outside subjectivity, setting its limits as though from without, articulating its end, making its dispersion shine forth, taking in only invincible absence; and that at the same time stands at the threshold of all positivity, not in order to grasp its foundation or justification but in order to regain the space of its unfolding, the void serving as its site, the distance in which it is constituted and into which its immediate certainties slip the moment they are glimpsed—a thought that, in relation to the interiority of our philosophical reflection and the positivity of our knowledge, constitutes what in a word we might call 'the thought from the outside'" (16).

<sup>17</sup> For more detail on the concept of the diagram see Gilles Deleuze (2003): "The diagram must not eat away at the entire painting; it must remain limited in space and time. It must remain operative and controlled. The violent methods must not be given free rein, and the necessary catastrophe must not submerge the whole. The diagram is a possibility of fact—it is not the Fact itself. Not all the figurative

techniques create a force. This force is felt through how the image affects. The diagram is not an actual pattern. It is the affective force of the image. It is what makes an image stand out. The use of the different cinematic techniques creates new cinematic expressions that cannot be articulated into an identifiable form of thought. The diagram makes force resonate; the movement of the image becomes a movement *of thought*. This movement of thought is thought from the outside.

The interval moves movement; what is felt is the interval at work, this interval at work drives the force of another interval creating an emergence; initiating a micropolitics of decision. Manning writes, “To think politically is to become aware of the surfaces that connect intervals between worlds...The interval is not non-space-time. The interval is a quality of space-time that wanders between surfaces that seem hermetic” (2007: 113). The movement felt, in *Day Night Day Night*, is the interval at work. Loktev creates this felt movement through camera techniques, sound design, colour, and speed. She uses these techniques to enliven the intensity of the microgestures and the micromovements of the girl. The camera shots are almost always in close-up, we see her face in close-up, we see her eating a candy-apply in close-up, we see her walking and the camera is up close on her profile as she walks, the camera is up close as she brushes her teeth; the camera is in close-up on her hands as she cuts her nails, as she washes her hair etc. The soundtrack is also strangely noticeable. The sound consists of the sounds the girl makes as she moves, as she is in movement. It is very sharp, cutting, and loud when, for example, she cuts her nails, or brushes her teeth. The sound is over pronounced and sharp. The colour moves from being extremely de-saturated—in dull blues and greys—to saturated reds,

---

gives have to disappear; and above all, a new figuration, that of the Figure, should emerge from the diagram and make the sensation clear and precise” (89).

yellows, and blues. This colour change expresses the intensity of the girl's movements as she nears the final destination. The micromovements and microgestures—as their effect is brought forth through these techniques—change how the duration is felt in the image. This change occurs in the image through how the interval works to diagram the image. The intensity is intensive through how the interval propels the diagrammatic force of the image. This intensive affect opens onto a spacetime that expresses the processual becoming of the decision constantly taking its cut. Time shifts the continuum. The affect is felt through the micromovements that are in constant motion. The micromovements and microgestures felt in movement is how the interval works the image. This brings the thought of the image close to, what Deleuze refers to, as the non-stratified, the outside of thought. As Deleuze exclaims, “To think is to reach the non-stratified” (1988c: 87).

Loktev desubjectifies the suicide-bomber; she de-personalizes the girl so as to not turn her into the subject of the film and/or of the actual event even though this is the girl we have been following. This girl has no name and the viewer is not provided with any information in regards to her background; where she comes from, what she does for a living, etc. Loktev gives no clues as to the purpose of her choosing to die this way. She strays away from ever giving the girl an identity even though the camera follows her every move. She remains unknown to us. We get to be with her, follow her, move with her, but we do not know her. And yet there is a strange sense of feeling with her. Loktev heightens the intensity of this effect through how the camera maintains focus on the microgestural of the girl's movement taking each step. These subjective relapses bring us closer to the unknowable of the event's eventness: the event of her becoming-suicide bomber. We are not positioned to sympathize with the character, and yet, we are not

made to condemn her for the action she is about to take. What we feel is our own body move, affectively, through the (force) becoming-decision of the girl becoming suicide-bomber. This is preparation.

*Day Night Day Night* renders imperceptible movement perceptible. The rendering perceptible of the imperceptive is the film's diagram. What is felt is not the diagram itself, but its force. Deleuze writes,

It is still from the outside that a force affects, or is affected by, others. The power to affect or be affected is carried out in a variable ways, depending on the forces involved in the relation. The diagram, as the fixed form of a set of relations between forces, never exhausts force, which can enter into other relations and compositions. The diagram stems from the outside but the outside does not merge with any diagram, and continues instead to draw new ones. In this way the outside is always an opening on to a future: nothing ends, since nothing has begun, but everything is transformed (1988c: 89).

A relationality out of which the becoming-bodies (girl-spectator) are composed does not empathize with the girl's experience. Our feeling-with is itself a becoming-intensive of the image. The affect of the image is intensive because of the forces that come into relation with each other; this affect transforms the image as it is always in relation with the audience who is being affected and who in turn affect the image. We feel the imperceptible force of the image at work; its affect. As viewers, and participants in the process, we are pulled into two distinct time zones that come into relation with each other. We see the girl preparing; she is putting her plan into action. We see her physically and actively preparing for the suicide-bombing attack. This is one kind of preparatory work but then we experience another kind of preparatory work, one that is more virtual, one that is felt more than it is understood to be as such. According to Deleuze, "this preparatory work is invisible and silent, yet extremely intense" (2003:81); this is force (virtual) at play with other forces, becoming-actual becoming virtual. It is the

diagram. The diagrammatic force of the film “is like the emergence of another world” (82); it is what makes-*felt* the imperceptible movements that make up the event of the becoming-suicide bomber so intensely real. The diagram brings into life the preparatory work of the director that gives the force of the image its moving affect. This is decision becoming action: a becoming-thought. This invisible preparatory work is how the decision takes its cut; each time a force affects and is affected by other forces a potential opens up, a decision takes its cut. A decision taking its cut opens up potential. It is an imperceptible movement that emerges from the outside of thought. Manning writes,

Potentiality, as the insertion of difference in a moment of certainty, is one way of speaking of the divergence between normativity and the interruption of accepted norms. I read potentiality as that which exposes difference in systems that appear to be organized and unchanging. I do not seek to place actuality and potentiality in opposition, however. The passage from potentiality to actuality need not be ascertained as an elimination of potential. Rather, this passage can be theorized as potentiality itself, for potentiality resides within every interaction: potentiality is called forth every time language exceeds its syntax, every time an other exceeds my reach, every time I sense more than I comprehend (2007: 6).

Potentiality emerges out of the micromovement of the decision taking its cut. The decision taking its cut is affect felt in the becoming-*with* every step the girl takes. A decision taking its cut is always in the unknown; it is a politics of a means without an end<sup>18</sup>. The camera captures, with the tightly framed close-up shot, the microgestures and micromovements of the girl in action. This becomes a series of events that produce the work’s intensity. This enhances the film’s virtual movement, it renders perceptible imperceptible movement. This is affect. We are affectively taking a decision with the protagonist. The viewer is affectively drawn into her process, her movement, and her

---

<sup>18</sup> Erin Manning. *Politics of Touch: Sense, Movement, Sovereignty*. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 2007.6.



body. We encounter the unthinkable and the intolerable<sup>19</sup>; becoming-*with* the unknown of felt thought. But we never empathize with her or condemn her. We are always becoming-*with* how the image affects.

*Day Night Day Night* was filmed in a way where, as Loktev states, “I do a lot of preparation so that something could be discovered on the spot, in the moment of shooting”. This is a different kind of preparation. She builds a structure that leaves an opening to the potential for new movements to emerge. This allows for “irrational, involuntary, accidental, free, random” (Deleuze, 2003:82) happenings. This kind of preparatory work, while contained and controlled within the shot in linear time and space, in structure and composition, is also open to emergence; another spacetime. This potentiality calls forth the outside of thought. There is *openness* in the image that releases the imperceptible movement of a body becoming with time: intensive duration. It is the interval at work. It is, as Deleuze writes, “an intense and intensive body” (2003: 39). The becoming body of the suicide-bomber is a body that is not disciplined. It is not formed, it is *forming*. It is not a pre-existing subject; but attests to new modes of subjectivation. It is fuelled by forces of expression. This becoming body is an incorporeal but immanently material body; immanently material as it emerges out of unformed compositions. It emerges from virtual planes of immanence that activate a molecular-becoming enforcing a new relation to emerge each time. What this body can do is unknown because it shifts into other planes/milieus each time. The girl’s body becoming-suicide-bomber shifts trajectories with every decision she takes. This decision is the durational intensity of thought in motion; of the decision taking its cut. It always changes direction. The film

---

<sup>19</sup> Gilles Deleuze. *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*. Trans. H. Tomlinson and R. Galeta. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1989.

foregrounds this immanent materiality through its consistent focus on the girl's body and how it moves. We follow her trajectory. She creates her own duration and direction. In one scene, the girl has just arrived in New York City. We watch her descend from the bus. We watch her slowly walk through the bus station and then outside onto the loud streets of New York City. We watch her watch everything around her; we see her look up at the high rise, we see her look toward a pretzel vendor. We also hear what she hears; an amalgamation of the different sound of different languages being spoken by people on the street. We continue to watch her move in the street. She walks and the camera walks with her, behind her, in front of her, facing her. We see her go in to a shop. We follow her from behind. We see her buy a candy apple and we follow. We see her continue on the street. She stops. The camera stops. She asks for directions to Times Square. She continues, we continue. She notices a toy vendor. There is toy dog that jumps and barks. She stops to look at it. We stop with her; suddenly, a still movement. She is entranced by the toy dog. Our focus is on it too. She crouches down to pet it. We watch her do this. The shot is still and time is suddenly suspended. The movement shifts the continuum.

The effect produced is of thought felt. Affect. The girl's decision-taking process is felt. Deleuze calls this rhythm. This is not measured rhythm or cadence. It is a relation, rather, between difference and repetition: between the rhythm and the refrain. Deleuze writes, "For it is never a matter of this or that character, this or that object possessing rhythm. On the contrary, rhythms and rhythms alone become characters, become objects. Rhythms are the only characters, the only Figures" (2003: xxxii). Rhythm is intensity. In *Day Night Day Night* the force of the rhythm that appears in the image is an intensive one. Loktev is constantly creating a body without organs through how she creates

different territories. This is not simply a new body that is being created each time, but a new political event. If the ground or territory is always shifting/changing there is always potential for new forces to keep creating and inventing new ways to take a decision, to live, to invent. Decision, as that which cuts, creates a new field of potentialities because it is always moving toward what is not yet known. This movement toward what is not yet known initiates a practice of encounter with difference; where one is always at risk. Thought is at risk. Movement persists: this is a micropolitics of difference. The girl is determined to ground herself through how she is constantly ungrounded. She organizes herself into her process. The girl's decision-taking constantly leads her to something new, and changes her ground leading her to constantly create new refrains, new territories of expression, new processes that stabilize and destabilize her grounding. The refrain repeats only to create a new process, a new territory; again. And yet: at the same time that she territorializes a space, she deterritorializes. Her trajectory is always toward what is not yet known. Her movement is always shifting, changing, and inventing. For example, we always see her move from one place to the next; from the bus station to the hotel, in the hotel; from bed, to window, to bathroom, to bed, to the floor; from hotel to the car, from the car to the bus, from the bus to the bus station, from the bus station, to downtown New York City. It is almost as if there is no chance for reterritorialization. She moves too quickly for it to ever be captured by the activity of an already set world. Her movement changes often and fast yet the film is very slow because of how intensely we follow her up close. The speed of the film, as it moves between rest and motion, is carefully controlled so that the viewer feels the intensity of time.

*Day Night Day Night* foregrounds a multiplicity of time. Loktev does this through intense cutting. The camera cuts quickly from one shot to the next. For example, as mentioned in the above described bathtub sequence in the hotel room. The girl invents with the becoming-decision of time taking space. The camera works with speed through how it cuts from one intense close-up shot to the next, foregrounding the girl's movement and action. Loktev works with inventive uses of the camera that in turn creates new ways of feeling the speed and movement of the image. She stays close. In part two of the film, *Action*, Loktev frees the camera and lets it move chaotically into space, but in order to structure the shot she remains close to the girl. The constraint changes; it is no longer situated within the internal, the inside enclosed space of the hotel room. The structure frees itself only to resituate itself within the girl's movement; a microgestural movement. The cutting is still dominant but the speed changes. The shots focus on the girl's movement longer as she explores the streets of New York City.

In *Preparation*, the sound is quiet but piercing; creating an internal space and heightening its confinement. Silence induces in the image a sound that is piercing, strong, and cutting. It is specific to what is being shown, it gives the image its sound but it also becomes the soundtrack. The diagrammatic force of the film deterritorializes the image through sound-image compositions that create intensive affects. In *Action*, the sound further enhances the chaos of New York City's street life. It is more specific and localized. We hear different languages, people talking and yelling, crowds gathering, traffic, and police whistles. The sound here is used to convey the intensity of the cityscape. What we hear is the sound of the big city in the background. And then Loktev creates another kind of sound-image where at certain parts of the film the loudness of the

city fades into a quiet background and at the same time that it fades a new sound emerges, enhancing the micro-soundscape of the girl's movement. Both of these sound durations play off of each other enhancing the suspense of the happening that is not yet known. In Action, sound becomes that which initiates a new spacetime each time the sound fades (the big sounds of the city) and a different sound comes into the image (the sound of her chewing on the candy-apple, or the sound of her breathing). This creates a new image, a new eventness of time that expresses the girl's movement in decision. In this film the image is not separate from the sound and the sound is not separate from the image. It is an audio-vision experience. The micromovements that make up the microgestures are also sound movements that make soundgestures; when she clips her nails, when she scrubs her arms in the bath, she takes deep breaths that rupture the image, she prays and that stirs the image, she whispers and that envelopes the image. All these movements affect.

Deleuze and Guattari write,

[...] the refrain is a prism, a crystal of space-time. It acts upon that which surrounds it, sound or light, extracting from various vibrations or decompositions, projections, or transformations. The refrain also has a catalytic function: not only to increase the speed of the exchanges and reactions in that which surrounds it, but also to assure indirect interactions between elements devoid of so-called natural affinity, and thereby to form organized masses (1987: 348).

One example of how the refrain works in the image is of the girl eating, at certain points during Action; the sound of her chewing becomes the focus of the image. It is the refrain of part two in the film. This sound is of the girl chewing throughout her time in the city, as she walks toward Times Square. We see her and hear her eating a pretzel, a candy apple, pudding. This sound movement disrupts, or shifts the order of the image

(the linear movement of the trajectory toward Times Square); this relation of territorialisation and deterritorialization occurs when the sound of the city is drowned out by her chewing, and at times, by her breathing always to re-emerge again differently. This relation becomes a relation between repetition and difference; rhythm and refrain. This is her walk to her potential death; the unknown-ability of death.

Loktev's technique creates rhythm. A micropolitical rhythm co-creates with the intense movement of the girl becoming-suicide bomber. The film focuses on microgestures. Part one and part two of the film create the film's rhythmic effect through the various ways in which the microgestures are shown, heard, controlled, moved, situated, shot and animated. Loktev and her crew make felt the diagrammatic effect of the unknowable. The affect of the unknowable is created and recreated. Form becomes mutational<sup>20</sup>. The image is constantly unsettling. For example, part one is mostly filmed inside, the shots are closed, and tightly composed and framed. They are ordered and controlled. Part two is the action taking its place. Part one is brought into contact with part two; the contained schematic plan has burst into the chaos of the city. The camera is not as controlled, and the girl's movements change, she's engulfed by the sounds and the sights of the city. The internal has come into contact with the external world. The isolated effect of the first part of the film, the organization and the schematic aspect of the plan, comes into full play with the outside world uncontrolled and spontaneous. Rhythm is mutational. Erin Manning writes that the diagram "transforms what a body can do" (2009: 7). In *Day Night Day Night* the diagrammatic force of the unknowable not only transforms what a body can do. It transforms what an image can do. The diagrammatic

---

<sup>20</sup> For more a detailed reading on form and force see Manning, Erin. *Relationescapes: Movement, Art, Philosophy*. Massachusetts: MIT Press, (in press).

force creates an opening onto which intensity is felt through the becoming body of the suicide-bomber. The becoming-intense of the image is the becoming-decision of thought. Loktev takes our breath away, holds it, and lets it come back. We can breathe freely. But this comes with a gasp, so it becomes a new kind of breathing. We are always being drawn in and shaken up by the image's force. The image suspends time so that we are caught in the becoming-intense of the movement of thought. We are able to breathe, invent, and create with the moving image that has become an image of thought. It is the thought of the outside. It is resistance. It is invention. And it restores our belief in the world. It is felt thought felt again, felt anew. Thought of the outside is felt thought becoming thought. This is innovation (technique for thought) and it is research becoming creation.

As mentioned before, *Day Night Day Night* is a linear film. This bears repeating since the linearity of the film works as the platform for space-time to morph: spacetime. The intense linearity of the events passing induces in the image a microlinearity; it is a becoming intense of a super-linear narrative. We are extremely close to the character and her movements; so close we could almost see the veins underneath her skin. It is not a conventional narrative film and even though the time and space is super-linear it still breaks down the sensory-motor schema of the filmic structure. The narrative that we follow is based on affect not content. There is no story to follow only movement. This film is experimental, challenging, and non-conventional, yet it is extremely linear. But it is because Loktev chooses to be close in detail with the character, with the space, with the time of the shot, with the movement of the camera and body as they make up each others' movements. The film is about the movements of the character that takes a decision each

time she moves, and we are with her moving, we see her movement moving through preparation and action. There is an intense rhythm. Her movement toward taking a decision each time (micromovement) creates rhythm, and in turn, rhythm creates the trajectory of the movement; of how the girl is taking her decision.

Loktev is so detailed in composition that it creates something else, something that becomes a more-than what is seen on the screen. This is affect: intensity and force. The movement that is felt and that moves beyond the frame is the becoming-with the thought of the image, the intensity of the image, how the unknown is felt. The intensive force of the image is becoming thought (the unknowable of the movement of decision). For example, in one shot we follow the character as she runs into a restaurant washroom; this is after she failed at pressing the button that would have detonated the bomb in her backpack. She walks into the washroom, finds a stall, locks the door, pulls her pants down, we see that she has urinated all over herself, and proceeds to wipe her clothes and legs with toilet paper. This whole time the camera is extremely close to the girl as she is doing all these things in a tiny bathroom stall. She sits on the toilet and pulls the backpack close to her. The camera inches closer to her face, the frame is tight and composed around her as she holds the backpack in the foreground. The camera gets close to her face, again the frame is very contained and arranged precisely so that we are only facing her, we cannot look anywhere else. This way of using the camera so as to not have our eyes avert to other directions creates an intention in the image. The intention is to keep looking at the girl, to feel with the girl, to know the intensity of how one comes to taking a decision toward the unknown. This rhythmic force in the image is a constant movement that is always becoming. The audience is a becoming-body in movement. It is



a becoming-intense with the suicide-bomber who is always becoming-body<sup>21</sup>. This becoming-body is created through the micromovements that make up the super-linear atmosphere. The micromovements and microgestures of the girl in-action are constantly deterritorializing as they territorialize the body of the becoming-suicide bomber. She is never grounded in decision because she is always moving toward what is not yet known. This becoming-body is not made up of parts or sections that can be differentiated one from the other. The becoming-body is made up of movements that are indistinct. This body is always in movement, and always altering the spacetime of the felt event.

This movement is felt through how the becoming-body is creating an event. The spacetime of the event is constantly being altered because of the many different micromovements that move the decision into place. Every micromovement or microgesture that comes into relation with other movements/gestures creates a micropolitical act. The micropolitical act in this way becomes about how movement changes space. The microgestures are intensely affective because the movement is constantly being altered and the space is always changing. There is a constant deterritorialization within the constant reterritorialization of the linearity of the image—the intense linearity of the image shifts movement. And then there is a reterritorialization (the image as it settles back to linear movement) that creates the territorialisation of a new image—the shift that occurs in the movement of the image produces a shift in perception creating a new spacetime. This is rhythm of the diagram at work. This produces the virtual aspect of the movement that is constantly becoming-body with the suicide bomber. Rhythm is what initiates the in-between, the virtual movement that

---

<sup>21</sup> For a more detailed reading on the becoming-body see Erin Manning, *Relationescapes: Movement, Art, Philosophy*. Massachusetts: MIT Press, (in press).

composes-*with* felt thought. It is the affective intensity that gives the diagram its force. It produces the unknowable through how it manifests itself as the interval, the emergence, the in-between of movement moving. The image cannot be contained within the frame. There is always something happening beyond the envelope of the image-frame-screen: this rhythm affects. There is something happening in-between the movement moving that affect felt thought in motion. As Manning writes, “rhythm propels movement, causing a change of direction...matter becoming force before it becomes form” (2009: 17). In *Day Night Day Night* the rhythm is created out of the in-between of the knowable and the unknowable. It is a moving interval that provokes the in-between of a happening on screen. Manning states, “The interval is virtual, incorporeal. Yet it has substance: it is palpable” (2009: 15). It produces an immanent movement; a movement that provokes a becoming-body of the not yet suicide-bomber. It is a movement that is intense, affective, and micropolitical.

*Day Night Day Night* is made up of cuts. The speed of rest on which the camera holds this duration in place is in this instance what becomes an inflection, a sort of shift in the continuum. This is felt. It alters the movement. The interval is unseen, subtle and suspends time. As Manning writes, “The time of the interval is of the not-yet” (2009: 7). There is little dialogue in this film so what is expressed is expressed through the microgestures of the body in movement and through the microlinearity of the moving image. This constant cutting of the (moving) image produces the immanent movement of intense affects that in turn work to further the unknowable of the film’s rhythmic force. It is the cutting that cuts, both literally in terms of the editing and virtually in terms of the interval. The intensity that is provoked in this film is an immanent movement that is a

virtual movement that is on the verge of actualizing. Something is about to happen but the viewer is unaware of what it could be yet, or of what it could mean. It is felt but unknown. It is a content-less story; and yet it creates thought.

The rhythmic force of the diagram functions as the threshold of the in-between<sup>22</sup>. This force gives the film its intensive affects. Affect initiates an opening onto which new thoughts can emerge. This is resistance because it taps into thought from the outside. Affective resistance is a lingering effect that is always on the verge of becoming thought. It is emergence. What Loktev shows is the intense transformation of a body that is always in movement, physically and virtually. It is a body always becoming more than one. It is what persists. The mutation of the body is what persists. If the mutation of the body is what persists then what Loktev shows us is how it persists; with the movement of decision that is always taking its cut. What makes the body cut? This intense feeling is still left unarticulated even after I leave the theatre. It is powerful. The diagrammatic force of the film affects. This is power; thought of the outside. As Manning states, “affects are variations of power (*puissance*)” (2007: 145). Affect forces an intensity to emerge; an intensity that is unknown and cannot be articulated. It is a constant deterritorialized experience that is constantly working to (re)territorialize. It is rhythm. The diagram is the rhythm becoming power because it affects. Rhythm is what propels difference to emerge out of the processual node of experience. Rhythm precedes movement<sup>23</sup>; movement persists. Power in this sense becomes about difference in repetition: rhythm and refrain. Affect affects thoughts-in-the-making. How is difference manifested in this becoming-decision of suicide-bomber? How does that become power?

---

<sup>22</sup> Manning, Erin. *Relationescapes: Movement, Art, Philosophy*. Massachusetts: MIT Press, (in press).

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid*, 8.

What kind of power is this and how does it constitute a micropolitics of resistance, or does it?

Deleuze writes, “An exercise of power shows up as an affect, since force defines itself by its very power to affect other forces to be affected by other forces” (1988c: 71). Power for Deleuze is affect; what affects and what is affected. In this situation, the question that persists is: what makes this person want to do what she is about to do? However, in Loktev this question is approached in a different way. Loktev asks, how does this person do what she is about to do but without announcing or enunciating her actions to be as such? How does she move affectively? Loktev does not assign any logical meaning to the girl’s actions but infects them instead with an intensity that is of a becoming decision, the intensity shifts once the meaning is put into place. The image is affectively charged with intense physical and immaterial gestural action that ultimately changes the course of the time of the event. It is durational force that initiates the intense changeability of the effect. Loktev through the rhythmical speed of camera movement, as it interjects with the cutting and close-up shots, creates an intensive event. She creates a body-without-organs, a body that is always becoming with every cut it makes. Cut, power, violence, resistance, thought of the outside: this is political. We are drawn into the film affectively. We are provoked to think through affect. We are affectively being moved to think with the image. We know that the images we see are spectacular and yet we are uncomfortable. We are not made to identify with her, but we’re with her in a way that makes us feel slightly unsettled. There is a tension here that lies in the image between a movement that is a provocation toward thought and affect; it is an immanent

movement that creates a violent intensity that is felt first. Here resistance is key. Power takes on a new meaning when it is in relation to affect.

How is rhythm difference? What is difference? What is difference in the image<sup>24</sup>? Deleuze and Guattari write, "...[r]hythm is the Unequal or the Incommensurable that is always undergoing transcoding. Meter is dogmatic, but rhythm is critical; it ties together critical moments, or ties itself together in passing from one milieu to another. It does not operate in a homogenous space-time, but by heterogeneous blocks. It changes direction" (1987: 313). Deleuze and Guattari state that rhythm functions in the in-between "it is located between two milieus, or between two intermilieus, on the fence, between night and day, at dusk, *twilight* or *Zweitlicht*, Haecceity" (1987:314).

*Day Night Day Night* is a film about territories; always creating new ground for thought. Its diagram is rhythmic. The rhythm, in which movement persists, is established through the intercutting of sound and image in the film through the working of the microgestural. As described above, in Preparation this intercutting of sound with image, and image with sound, work to give the moving image its force. In the second part this works differently. In Action, everything shifts. The camera is spontaneous and chaotic in its movement; it's as if it had been set free. The colours are intensely saturated, with reds, blues, and yellows. The movement of the camera as it appears seems to be on a continuum, a constant movement forward toward the unknown. In this section of the film everything is shot outside, it becomes about the external space of Time Square, New York City, rather than the internal space of the hotel room we saw in the first section. The

---

<sup>24</sup> The word image in this paper has two distinct yet related meanings: first, I refer to the image of thought and, second, the moving image, the cinematic image. They are also connected and come together in some instances where I refer to the image of thought as that which comes to life through relations with the moving image, where one becomes part of the other, in that instance I refer to the image as affective resistance.

colour, sound, and speed of the image become part of how the rhythm grounds difference in the film. It is constantly changing direction and is always functioning out of a repetition that becomes productive in its effects.

The first part of the film is the territorializing activity of that which becomes preparation. In the second section it is the territorializing activity of that which becomes action. The movement of the image persists through a rhythm that constantly territorializes. It brings to light intensities that stratify the action into determinate spatial and temporal forms that force the preparatory work into becoming-with the decision of becoming-action. In Preparation, the film focuses on the gestural: the micromovements of the girl as she moves through the space. As mentioned above, the movement through space is heightened by the intense editing movements of the camera at work. In one segment, the young woman is unable to fall asleep; we see her toss and turn, toss and turn. Then she gets out of bed, turns the light on, there is a cut to her against the headboard of the bed on the left side of the screen, she's intensely chewing on an egg roll. She sits back and chews, swallows, and takes a bite; this action is repeated multiple times during the scene, the young woman as she stares off into space is intently focused on the process of eating the egg roll. This ritual becomes one of the signature moments throughout the film where we see the girl return to this act over and over again in Action. Eating does not become part of the banalities of everyday life that the young girl uses to feel grounded in her decision taking, it grounds her momentarily each time but always with a difference, it orders her into a structure that she has created for her becoming-body with suicide-bombing and it becomes that which the girl returns to: the refrain. She keeps eating the refrain: repetition with a difference. As Manning writes, "To repeat is to

act, to live the interval” (2009: 17). With each bite, each step, each gesture, the young protagonist is becoming-body.

Deleuze writes, “Something in the world forces us to think. This something is an object not of recognition but of a fundamental *encounter*. What is encountered may be Socrates, a temple or a demon. It may be grasped in a range of affective tones: wonder, love, hatred, suffering. In whichever tone, its primary characteristic is that it can only be sensed” (1994: 139). Here, I want to ask: how do we sense/think with cinema? Loktev’s *Day Night Day Night* provides an opening onto which a viewer is affectively moved to compose with the cinematic image. The film provokes an encounter with the unknowable. To compose with the encounter of the unknowable, in Loktev’s film, is to move toward a politics of decision, a politics that is initiated by the unknown-ability of a body moving with thought.

A body moving with thought is a body that is moving in preacceleration<sup>25</sup>. As Manning writes, “This coming-together proposes a combination of form-forces where preacceleration potentially finds a passage. The passage flows not in a pre-inscribed direction: this is an intensive flow. Preacceleration: a movement of the not-yet that composes the more-than-one that is my body. Call it incipient action” (2009: 1). Manning’s concept, preacceleration, provides an opening onto how to think a politics of decision that is felt first before it can be inscribed into a logic of pre-composed meaning. This decision, while it can be inscribed into a striated space of cause and effect logic, is also felt through intensity; a decision with no content that provokes the becoming-content of decision thought. Hence, the becoming-suicide bomber is always becoming-intense through the refrain. Through her action of eating, a habit finds her. She organizes the

---

<sup>25</sup>Manning, Erin. *Relationescapes: Movement, Art, Philosophy*. Massachusetts: MIT Press, (in press).

intensive flow of a decision becoming thought through the organization of her microgestures as they move toward grounding her. This decision-taking is a movement that composes with “an intensive flow”<sup>26</sup>; a decision that is becoming-thought through how the interval emerges, and through this emergence the decision is affecting the spacetime of a body that is always already becoming-suicide-bomber. A thought has her.

A decision becoming-thought is what can be expressed as the preacceleration of a body becoming. Manning writes, “What this means is that both my body and the ‘space’ is alive with potential movement that escape their envelopes. Matter-form thus prolongs infinitely. This infinity is virtual potential, a potential which propels displacements that are not in-themselves movement: the movement remains virtual, preaccelerated” (2009: 3). Something is always happening at the threshold of the decision becoming-thought. With every shift, or as Manning writes, “displacement”, a new spacetime of the body taking its place creates a more-than its own body. It is always a new political event. It has shifted already in difference. Thus, a micropolitics of difference in Loktev’s film is what can be described as the becoming-body, or the body without organs, that is moving toward a politics of decision; a preaccelerated movement that provokes the becoming-thought of decision. Movement always shifts politics.

Loktev’s film creates a new cinematic image: the viewer is already destabilized. There is no prescribed space or time. We move *with* the image becoming thought. The spacetime of the event on screen becomes the spacetime of our relation to the eventness of the screening. We are no longer situated within a spacetime event that prescribes an already known spacetime occurrence. We are pulled into the intensive flow of a moving image that is already becoming-body. Loktev breaks through the time barrier of the film

---

<sup>26</sup> Manning, Erin. *Relationescapes: Movement, Art, Philosophy*. Massachusetts: MIT Press, (in press).



itself. We are able to see micropolitically. We invent with the felt thought that is already at work through the micropolitical movement of the microgestural. The film is constantly creating with a micropolitics of thought that becomes a micropolitics of difference each time the girl returns. We work with the intensive flow of that decision becoming thought. How?

Brian Massumi writes,

Intensity is an immanent affirmation of a process, in its own terms. This is not a stated affirmation. It's an activity. It's when a process tends to the limit of what only it can do. It's not mystical to call that self-affirming "life." If you like Latin, you can join Spinoza and call it *conatus*. You can call it many names. The important thing once again is that in each instance you ask and answer "how." Then it becomes a technical question. A technical question of *ontogenesis*, or of the self-production of being in becoming" (2007: 24).

The "how" that Loktev proposes is situated within the spacetime of a decision becoming thought through the processual event of a potential suicide bombing in Times Square. I am not just asking "how is this going to happen?" or "how is this event structured as such?" I am no longer asking such questions. I now ask "how?" because of the intensity of the moving image's force. This "how" is felt. My felt thoughts are in motion; they are being affected and are affecting the film's force and intensity. "How?" is the question that is turned onto me. I am no longer asking: what is it that a film can do, but what is it that this felt-thought can do and how does it do it? From *Day Night Day Night* the question is: what is it that this image of the unknowable can do for a politics that is yet to come?

I am inventing with spacetime politics, or aesthetic politics, as Massumi writes, "Aesthetic politics is an exploratory politics of invention, unbound, unsubordinated to external finalities. It is the suspensive aspect of it that gives it its freedom" (2007: 79).

The event of taking a decision in Loktev's film becomes a spacetime politics of what is not yet known. The event of the suicide bombing has not yet taken place. Time is suspended. This suspension holds itself in place within how it unravels through the microgestural of the girl's immanent movement; rest and speed<sup>27</sup>. Time is suspended and I feel the microgestural movement of the girl. A movement that is unlocalizable, unknowable, and aberrant.

Julia Kristeva, in her book *Revolt, She Said* explains what revolt means to her as a concept. She writes, it is that which "expresses a fundamental version of freedom; not freedom to change or to succeed; but freedom to revolt, to call things into question" (2002: 12). I would like to situate this "calling into question" as a political event. It is to invent, and to invent again *is* to think thought. This is affective resistance. It is that which draws me into, not just calling things into question, but that provokes me to ask the question again in a new way, a question that keeps inventing itself; through repetition and in difference. This applies to cinema: how does cinema invent itself again? Julia Loktev asks the question in a new way. Her film on suicide bombing provokes new thought. She invents a new politics of decision. She creates a movement of thought through the microgestural process of decision becoming thought. Her cinema is a cinema of affective resistance because she invents. She invents new modes of perception that move me toward asking the question about suicide bombing in a different way. How does this constitute a new politics? How do I think about politics of decision through affect in relation to the molecular when it comes to the political?

---

<sup>27</sup> Deleuze writes: "How does Spinoza define a body? A body, of whatever kind, is defined by Spinoza in two simultaneous ways. In the first place, a body, however small it may be, is composed of an infinite number of particles; it is the relations of motion and rest, of speeds and slownesses between particles, that define a body. Secondly, a body affects other bodies, or is affected by other bodies; it is this capacity for affecting and being affected that also defines a body in its individuality" (1988a: 123).

## 2 A Supernatural Shiver<sup>28</sup>

“Bodies are technologies of movement, of transposition. Bodies do not take us home.”

Erin Manning<sup>29</sup>

“*Whence a body always goes as far as it can, in passion as in action; and what a body can do is its right.*”

Gilles Deleuze<sup>30</sup>

“A body does not coincide with its present. It coincides with its *potential*. The potential is the future-past contemporary with every body’s change.”

Brian Massumi<sup>31</sup>

### Preface: How to Ask

*Point of departure.* How do we think the political? What is it that we want changed in politics today? What do we hope for? What kind of change? How do we understand change to be? Is a revolution still possible today? What does this revolution look like? What do we want it to change? How does it create change? How does change create? What is the relation here between creativity and change?

---

<sup>28</sup> This title comes from a line delivered by one of the characters in Ingmar Bergman’s *Fanny and Alexander* (1982). The character, Gustav Ekdahl gives a speech to his family at his daughter’s christening. This is at the end of the film. He says, “Damn it all, people must be intelligible! Otherwise we don’t dare to love them or speak ill of them. We must be able to grasp the world and reality. So we can complain of their monotony with a clear conscience. Don’t be sad, dear splendid artists. Actors and Actresses we need you all the same. It is you who must give us our supernatural shiver, or better yet our inner most diversion.” I thought this character articulated well the relation between how art affects and how in this way art is necessary to life. In this paper, a supernatural shiver is close to how affect is explored in this paper; the feeling felt before it can be articulated.

<sup>29</sup> Erin Manning. *Politics of Touch: Sense, Movement, Sovereignty*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007. 142.

<sup>30</sup> Gilles Deleuze. *Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza*. Trans. M. Joughin. New York: Zone Books, 1992. 258.

<sup>31</sup> Brian Massumi. *Parables of the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. Durham: Duke UP, 2002. 200.

The political is a force of movement toward the unfolding of potential whereby something tweaks the unfolding of a happening happening. A new force emerges out of a relational movement, the coming-into contact with forces that affect other forces. The political makes room for the potential of emergence to emerge. The political (as a creative force) is a politics that sparks the move toward activating a relation, inventing new practices, techniques, concepts, thoughts that enable constraints for the potential for something new *to emerge*. For there to be the potential for emergence there have to be new practices formed that make possible new ways of thinking relationally—to compose *with* difference, the unknowing of movement moving, to take a risk. How do practices of creativity—in terms of creating new techniques, concepts, and thought—open up the potential for new modes of relational practices that push the boundary of what the political can do?

The political is relational<sup>32</sup>. To *emerge* is a movement toward the unfolding of force into other forces. Relation sparks a new force. Emergence is an opening, and what emerges is the force of the creative in-between of relational politics. It is the felt formation of thought at work<sup>33</sup>. Relational politics inspires change in thought practices; initiating a pull toward experimentation. It invents new techniques that create relational movements that are always changing direction, depending on the relation. This coming-

---

<sup>32</sup> For a more detailed discussion on relational politics see Erin Manning in *Relationscapes: Movement, Art, Philosophy*. Massachusetts: MIT Press, (in press): “Move the relations. Populate the interval. Explore its activity of thought. Articulate the in-between. Make it think again. Thought is of the relation, active in the movement-toward of the work’s taking form. The work’s taking form is the pulling out of a concept from the activity of feeling that propels work. Lodged neither in the human nor in the object, thought propels creativity as the activity of the in-between that makes relation felt, activating the ‘how’ of the creation, inciting inquiry, curiosity, play...Relation is the incipient activating force through which the work-world nexus can be thought.”

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

together in relation opens up the potential for new modes of perception<sup>34</sup> to emerge. This coming-together (relational politics) brings forth the activity between change and creativity. The political—or potential for emergence—brings to the fore new micropolitical spatial formations. It is a building toward a new politics that recomposes the relation between how change manifests in the world (how it worlds), how creativity creates (in relation), and how thought is thought (new modes of perception).

To invent is to ask. How do we practice the political? How do we invent with emergent politics? I say: a revolution is not possible today if we think of it as an end result, as a finality, as a politics of opposition. But then how does change change? How does change keep itself open for emergence? How does the revolution go on and come back again in re-emergence? How does it return? How do we build a relation between invention (to ask questions), revolution (one that is yet-to-come), and resistance (thought's outside)? What is resistance if it's not a fight-*against* but a working *across* milieus? What is resistance if it's an involution<sup>35</sup> toward creative activation<sup>36</sup>? What are the constraints and conditions for inventing thought/asking questions? How do we keep inventing thought? What is power in all of this and how does it change form?

---

<sup>34</sup> New modes of perception create new modes of creative practice initiating new thought.

<sup>35</sup> The concept of involution is a concept from Deleuze and Guattari's work in *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*: "If there is originality in neoevolutionism, it is attributable in part to phenomena of this kind in which evolution does not go from something less differentiated, in which it ceases to be a hereditary filiative evolution, becoming communicative or contagious. Accordingly, the term we would prefer of this form of evolution between heterogeneous terms is 'involution,' on the condition that involution is in no way confused with regression. Becoming is involutory, involution is creative. To regress is to move in the direction of something less differentiated. But to involve is to form a block that runs its own line 'between' the terms in play and beneath assignable relations" (1987: 238-239).

<sup>36</sup> The concept of creativity is not limited to positive production, but as activation; activating a potential that can also mean negative destruction.

## 1 Resistance and Cinema

Resistance is thought's outside, or thought from the outside<sup>37</sup>. Giorgio Agamben writes, "The *outside* is not another space that resides beyond a determinate space, but rather, it is the passage, the exteriority that gives it access—in a word, it is its face, its *eidos*" (1993: 68). If we think of the outside as a passage, as a working across the worlding of movement, then how do we think thought? Thought's outside, or the outside of thought is something already underway. It is already moving with determinable factors but it cannot be determined in relation to an identifiable form. The outside of thought is a force (potential) that is suspended in time. It is on the verge of its activation. It is an invisible threshold, an invisible line that moves in-between indeterminable forces and determinable constituents. As Agamben writes, "The threshold is not, in this sense, another thing with respect to the limit; it is, so to speak, the experience of the limit itself, the experience of being-*within an outside*" (1993: 68). As Deleuze reminds, we must not confuse the outside with exteriority; it is not a concept that belongs to an already defined set, or a dichotomy that establishes the connection between what is inside and what is outside or what is an exterior and interior. He states,

We must distinguish between exteriority and the outside. Exteriority is still a form, as in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*—even two forms which are exterior to one another, since knowledge is made from the two environments of light and language, seeing and speaking. But the outside concerns force: if force is always in relation with other forces, forces necessarily refer to an irreducible outside which no longer even has any form and is made up of distances that cannot be broken down through which one acts upon another or is acted upon by another. It is always from the outside that a force confers on others or receives from others the variable position to be found only at a particular distance or in a particular relation. There is therefore an emergence of forces which remains distinct from

---

<sup>37</sup> Foucault, Michel. *Maurice Blanchot: The Thought from the Outside*. Trans. B. Massumi. New York: Zone Books, 1987, pp. 24.

the history of forms, since it operates in a different dimension. It is *an outside which is farther away* than any external world and even any form of exteriority, which henceforth becomes infinitely close (1988c:86).

The outside of thought provokes a politics of invention. This is resistance at work. Deleuze states above that the emergence of forces is distinct from the history of forms because it operates in a different dimension. This dimension is an outside which operates in a different space and time. The concept of the outside calls forth a re-thinking of space and time. Space and time in this sphere of thought are inseparable; spacetime. Spacetime here conceived is duration; an intensive force that propels potential affective happenings. Rhythm is created out of the forces that come into relation with other forces. These forces, as they come into relation, create their own durational event. There is no sense of a linear continuum as that of past-present-future. These distinct time zones collide; the present becomes the future past. Thought of the outside may be key to thinking how creative practice can initiate a different spacetime for the present.

*Resistance comes first. Resistance is the outside of thought.* Resistance is that indeterminate space where the potential to create techniques can initiate new spacetime events. This new spacetime event can produce new thought practices that further the working-with a becoming-multiple. This is a becoming-multiple that spirals into a becoming-change: these in turn create new spacetime practices; creating potential for emergence. Michel Foucault was quoted in an interview explaining what resistance meant for him. He said “Resistance was conceptualized only in terms of negation. Nevertheless, as you see it, resistance is not solely a negation but a creative process. To create and recreate, to transform the situation, to participate actively in the process, that is to

resist.”<sup>38</sup> Resistance invents. Resistance is the learning how to experiment with relational politics. Forces that come-together ignite a new relation, a new movement toward a potential thought, and a relation is created that brings into the world a new force; another outside. Relational politics is a practice of experimentation that creates what has not yet been thought. Deleuze states,

‘When the outside collapses and attracts interiority’, the interior presupposes a beginning and an end, an origin and a destination that can coincide and incorporate ‘everything’. But when there are only environments and whatever lies between them, when words and things are opened up by the environment without ever coinciding, there is liberation of forces which come from the outside and exist only in a mixed-up state of agitation, modification and mutation. In truth they are dice-throws, for thinking involves throwing the dice (1988c: 87).

The forces of the outside constitute the political, the potential for thought.

Resistance is this thought’s outside. Resistance is affective. It acts on the body first; *affectively*. This affect, acting on the body first, is micropolitical. It is felt before it is understood to be as such, this is resistance infolding out of the in-between, where there is potential for a creative act to be actualized. Resistance is already underway initiating a force toward inventing thought. Resistance is already rolling with the worlding of movement; forces in relation with other forces tweak the world.

“...the final word on power is that *resistance comes first*” (emphasis in original, Deleuze 1988c: 89). Resistance comes first because it operates in a direct relation with the outside<sup>39</sup>. It brings into effect how thought is felt. Thought felt is resistance. Thought felt is thought from the outside. Resistance is how affect affects. Thought from the outside is how affect affects. Here, I would like to make a link with cinema. How is

---

<sup>38</sup> In Maurizio Lazzarato’s article “From Biopower to Biopolitics” published in *Pli: The Warwick Journal of Philosophy*, [http://www.warwick.ac.uk/philosophy/pli\\_journal/vol\\_13.html](http://www.warwick.ac.uk/philosophy/pli_journal/vol_13.html).

<sup>39</sup> Gilles Deleuze. *Foucault*. Trans. S. Hand. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1988c, pp. 89.



resistance felt in cinema? What is cinema's link with thought? *Cinema is affective*. This is what makes cinema an audiovision of resistance. Thought as resistance is a kind of capture that does not leave one in a passive position. Thought activates the body. It is an affective movement that moves the micropolitical body toward invention, toward a new politics of resistance.

I would like to situate resistance here as thought-in-the-making. Here, thought has not yet been appropriated into a stratified spatial structure; i.e. folded into content or into a politics of representation. My question is: what happens to the thinking of the political—and in particular, to the thinking of the politics of Palestine—when Palestinian cinema is conceived as a cinema of resistance, a cinema of thought? What happens when art is thought of as a springboard not for the representation of a people but for the invention of a people? The creative act, or resistance, in this sense becomes a collective act that initiates a collective subjectivity, a community-to-come. I would like to explore how thought as resistance and its practice in marking-time breaks through identity politics and invents a collective processual body. In this case, I would like to situate the Palestinian body within a collective body. The Palestinian body will not be referred to here as a subjective body, but a body that is becoming collective through relational politics. I would like to use the example of Elia Suleiman's film *Divine Intervention* (2002) to illustrate how the film's techniques create new modes of subjectivation and how they provoke a politics of resistance.

## 2 Elia Suleiman's *Divine Intervention*

*Expression comes first*<sup>40</sup>. Here, I draw on Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's concept of micropolitics. The concept of micropolitics allows me to define resistance in relation to creativity, thought, and invention. This does not necessarily mean that resistance is always positive, productive, or constructive; it can also create destruction and death. Resistance is inventive. Resistance will be discussed in relation to a micropolitics of invention. Micropolitics will be discussed in relation to a politics that is not yet formed, it will relate to a politics that is always in the making, and it will be a politics that is always becoming. This politics involves the multiple, the potential, and the virtual; the becoming-singular of thought felt. Such thought-in-the-making (or thought from the outside) produces new forms of subjectivation. This calls forth a politics that is affective. Such a politics affects the body first. A micropolitics of resistance is a politics that is always on the cusp of inventing new collective bodies; a potential collective<sup>41</sup>. This involves a micropolitical body; one that is always in movement. A micropolitical body is not a merely a human body, it is a spacetime event that affects and that is affected by non-localisable forces and indeterminate forms. It creates a body without organs. These are bodies that become with time. These are processual bodies in movement that are always in relation with forces that affect. These forces create new spatial formations; new bodies to come. A politics of resistance calls forth a collective body that always affects and is affected when *in relation*. It is a body that is becoming with how it invents.

---

<sup>40</sup> Brian Massumi in "Introduction: Like a Thought." in *A Shock to Thought: Expressions After Deleuze and Guattari*. Ed. Brian Massumi. London;New York: Routledge, 2002. xxvii.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid, xxvii.

What is a micropolitical body? A micropolitical body is a body that is not yet composed<sup>42</sup>. It is a body that is always being created and recreated depending on the forces it comes into contact with. In terms of the Palestinian body, for example, it is a body that invents under severe occupational circumstances that are never stable, it invents with movement and space that are restricted (the wall, checkpoints, Israeli settlements being built and acting as watch posts), and it invents with time that is controlled (curfews, house demolitions). These forces ignite the creative act that becomes actualized; potential for new forces of expression. A micropolitical body is a body that is always encountering resistance. This is a body that is always in-the-making. This is a body that is always inventing itself under a constant change in conditions. What happens when resistance is thought of not as an act of negation but rather as a creative process that is always in the process of invention? What can a micropolitical body do?

The body is a spacetime event that is always politically engaged through how it is affected and how it affects. Deleuze writes,

You will not define a body (or a mind) by its form, nor by its organs or functions, and neither will you define it as a substance or a subject. Every reader of Spinoza knows that for him bodies and minds are not substances or subjects, but modes. It is not enough, however, merely to think this theoretically. For, concretely, a mode is a complex relation of speed and slowness, in the body but also in thought, and it is a capacity for affecting or being affected, pertaining to the body or to thought (1988a: 123-124).

---

<sup>42</sup> Deleuze and Guattari write: "A BwO is made in such a way that it can be occupied, populated only by intensities. Only intensities pass and circulate. Sill, the BwO is not a scene, a place, or even a support upon which something comes to pass. It has nothing to do with phantasy, there is nothing to interpret. The BwO causes intensities to pass; it produces and distributes them in a *spatium* that is itself intensive, lacking extension. It is not space, nor is it in space; it is matter that occupied space to a given degree—to the degree corresponding to the intensities produced. It is nonstratified, unformed, intense matter, the matrix of intensity, intensity=0; but there is nothing negative about the zero, there are no negative or opposite intensities. Matter equals energy. Production of the real as an intensive magnitude starting at zero" (1987: 153).

Affects are felt first before they can be articulated. They are thoughts-in-the-making; thoughts-in-the-making produce bodies without organs; intensive spacetime events. A BwO is always becoming in relation to other spacetime events, other bodies, thoughts, and tendencies. Affect sparks the move toward a micropolitics of thought<sup>43</sup>. As mentioned in “The Encounter with the Unthinkable”, power for Foucault constitutes relations between forces (Deleuze 1988c: 70). These forces are activated through affect, or “an exercise of power shows up as an affect, since force defines itself by its very power to affect other forces (to which it is related) and to be affected by other forces” (1988c: 71). Resistance has a new meaning when we re-define what power is. If power is exercised through affect then power becomes that which opens up potential for emergence. This potential for new forces to emerge leads to new forms of enunciation and creation, new formations of bodies and thoughts. For example, cinema creates power or power relations through affect, which in turn create new modes of subjectivation; through how it affects and how it is affected. Cinema produces affect through movement that is indivisible. This movement is an immanent movement, not a displacement; it is an imperceptible movement that affects. Cinema is an affective experience; it is movement<sup>44</sup>. It is affective because it hits the body first, directly. This affect is felt

---

<sup>43</sup> I have to be careful here and mention that resistance, as an inventive politics, is not one that I claim to also be always productive. For example look at what happens when resistance becomes inventive and takes on suicide bombing or other acts of severe violence. That is another question on the whole that will also be explored in my project later on. Resistance is powerful, precisely when it is contextualized as a non-moralizing creative force. I think this is important to think about in terms of Hany Abu-Assad’s film *Paradise Now* (2005).

<sup>44</sup> Deleuze explains movement in terms of the movement-image: “Movement is a translation in space. Now each time there is a translation of parts in space, there is also a qualitative change in a whole. Bergson gave numerous examples of this in *Matter and Memory*. An animal moves, but this is for a purpose: to feed, migrate, etc. It might be said that movement presupposes a difference of potential, and aims to fill it. If I consider parts or places abstractly—A and B—I cannot understand the movement which goes from one to the other. But imagine I am starving at A, and at B there is something to eat. When I have reached B and had something to eat, what has changed is not only my state, but the state of the whole which encompassed

before we realize it is a feeling it; i.e. we notice goose bumps, or our heart palpitates in the becoming image of rhythm. Affect affects the nervous system directly and it does this in the world. We feel our body's movement move. This affective force produces cinematic bodies in movement. Cinematic bodies are intensive forces. They are invisible, imperceptible. They are not human bodies. Deleuze explains,

[...] cinema does not give us the presence of the body and cannot give us it, this is perhaps also because it sets itself a different objective; it spreads an 'experimental night' or a white space over us; it works with 'dancing seeds' and a 'luminous dust'; it affects the visible with a fundamental disturbance, and the world with a suspension, which contradicts all natural perception. What it produces in this way is the genesis of an 'unknown body' which we have in the back of our heads, like the unthought of thought, the birth of the visible which is still hidden from view (1989: 201).

This affective force produces "unknown bodies", new thoughts, thoughts from the outside. This force is an immanent movement that is constituted within the moving image and that moves outside of the frame. In cinema, movement produces affect because forces are coming into relation with other forces that are producing a cinematic rhythm. These forces are unlocalisable and indeterminable. But they exist; we feel their trace. For Deleuze and Foucault this defines power. Power is not subjective: it is pre-personal. Power (or affective forces) is how the world makes movement visible; how affect affects thoughts-in-the-making that become thoughts in the world. These power relations or forces constitute an exercise of the non-stratified (1988c: 73). They are thought's outside; thought's outside is a non-stratified space. Affect activates these forces that in turn incite, provoke, and produce thoughts-in-the-making that in turn

---

B, A, and all that was between them...Movement always relates to a change, migration to a seasonal variation. And this is equally true of bodies: the fall of a body presupposes another one which attracts it, and expresses a change in the whole which encompasses them both. If we think of pure atoms, their movement, which testify to a reciprocal action of all the parts of the substance, necessarily express modifications, disturbances, changes of energy in the whole. What Bergson discovers beyond translation is vibration, radiation" (1986: 8).

activate other forces. The body is captured, created and recreated through out the spacetime of the film event. Cinema does not produce power (in terms of content), it produces affects (in terms of forces); it ignites bodies without organs<sup>45</sup>. An event unfolds.

An event unfolds for me in Suleiman's film. An event is a strange occurrence, a shift in movement. It is a shift in the continuum that makes movement felt. The micropolitics of cinema appear as events. They are lines of active flight (affective tendencies) that activate a force in the movement's unfolding of the image<sup>46</sup>. This is emergence. The image escapes a "grid-locked"<sup>47</sup> system; one, in Suleiman's case, that is bound to the language of representation. In *Divine Intervention*, the image unfolds and releases lines of flight (tendencies) that activate a micropolitics of thought. The force taking form in this image is the unfolding of this potential escape; openings onto thought's outside, immanent images, new modes of perception. This disturbs the image and re-constitutes the politics of the image. It no longer can be identified according to a model that "corresponds and conforms."<sup>48</sup> Something escapes the image. This is the image's force. The affective force in the image does not represent the plight of a people, or the struggle of a people. It invents a people, a collective.

---

<sup>45</sup> The body without organs is a concept that comes from Antonin Artaud that Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari take up in their work on the body. It is a non-composed body. See also n. 17.

<sup>46</sup> Gilles Deleuze writes: "Godard has a nice saying: not a just image, just an image. Philosophers ought also to say 'not the just ideas, just ideas and bear this out in their activity. Because the just ideas are always those that conform to accepted meanings or established precepts, they're always ideas that confirm something, even if it's something in the future, even if it's the future of the revolution. While 'just ideas' is a becoming-present, a stammering of ideas, and can only be expressed in the form of questions that tend to confound any answers. Or you can present some simple thing that disrupts all the arguments" (1995: 38-39).

<sup>47</sup> Brian Massumi. *Parables of the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. Durham: Duke UP, 2002a.

<sup>48</sup> Brian Massumi in "Introduction: Like a Thought." in *A Shock to Thought: Expression after Deleuze and Guattari*. ed. Brian Massumi. London; New York: Routledge, 2002b. xv.

My engagement with the film will inform the techniques I create that will initiate a writing of the cinematic. By writing cinematically I mean to move beyond the language of representation. Writing cinematically means writing with the unfolding of what affects. It initiates a becoming-thought of the political. It creates the political anew; it is a politics that experiments. It is a thought-to-come. But first, I must ask, again: what is the cinematic? And how does it constitute a politics? This will be a question I repeat throughout this paper as a way to experiment with the “how” of my approach. Again, does and can cinema constitute a politics that is yet-to-come? What do I mean by this? First, once again, I will begin with writing cinema cinematically. This means that my attempt here is to evoke the felt thought of cinema’s affect as it unfolds into my writing-at-work. I aim to produce thoughts in motion that unfold out of the affective engagement with cinema and its felt forces that open up potential for creativity. This is a movement that is in/of the image that is more-than the movement of the projector; an immanent movement, an immanent image. I want to put cinema’s affect into work and write its unfolding of events that have captured me and that I have captured. I want to invent with cinema and engage with its politics—this is not about content (a film) but about perception, how movement affects perception, and how new modes of perception produce affective forces—I aim to create a new political practice that brings to the fore the writing process and its engagement with cinema. Here, writing becomes about resistance. I want to invent new political thoughts cinematically and creatively. Thought is resistance. Writing is resistance. Writing is a becoming-formation of thought’s resistance; thought’s outside.

*I begin with the end.* A scene haunts me from Elia Suleiman's *Divine Intervention* (2002). I return to it. The scene is at the end of the film. It is a medium-shot focused on a pressure cooker in a kitchen. In the foreground we see the kitchen table's edge. In the background we see the counter with the stove. The stove is in the middle of the shot. The pressure-cooker is on the stove. We hear that it is about to go off. The shot is cut and now there is another medium shot. We see the main character, ES, is sitting with his mother on a couch that is placed at the end of the kitchen table, the point of view shot from the scene before is of them staring at the pressure-cooker. The mother turns to ES and says, "Ok son, that's enough, stop it now." ES is dead-pan and continues to stare at the pressure-cooker. The scene cuts once more and the shot is again a medium-shot of the pressure-cooker on top of the stove from the POV of ES and his Mother. We still hear the sound of it. This lasts for twenty seconds. The scene is still. The pressure-cooker continues to sound off its warning and the scene ends. It is an excruciating twenty seconds putting into effect a forceful expression: The inexplicability of thought felt-in-action, suspended time. This shot is affective, political<sup>49</sup>, and strong in its colouring of an image: an image of thought<sup>50</sup>. This shot brings a thought to life. This example highlights

---

<sup>49</sup> In this paper I use the concept of the political, when it is in relation to art practice, not as a description of the content at hand, but as a concept that puts forth the idea that art is always in *formation*. It creates techniques that do something different in a way that does not stabilize the effect but moves beyond it. These techniques create an opening, the potential for emergence.

<sup>50</sup> See Gilles Deleuze in *Difference and Repetition* (1994). Deleuze writes, "Something in the world forces us to think. This something is an object not of recognition but of a fundamental *encounter*. What is encountered may be Socrates, a temple or a demon. It may be grasped in a range of affective tones: wonder, love, hatred, suffering. In whichever tone, its primary characteristic is that it can only be sensed. In this sense, it's opposed to recognition. In recognition, the sensible is not at all that which can only be sensed, but that which bears directly upon the senses in an object which can be recalled, imagined or conceived." (139). I use it here also in relation to Deleuze's concept of series in which, the type/genre is in the image itself; what is in the image, what is acting together to create the affective force, also creates difference that spirals into new thought formations; escape and capture.



cinema's ability to express the political cinematically<sup>51</sup>. This scene affects without saying much. What we feel is an intensity that cannot be articulated. This scene strongly presents the force of the political and how it can be felt without content. It creates potential for emergence in how it affects.

From the beginning, we follow the film as it attempts to convey the politics of Palestine through the interweaving of two stories: ES's return to Palestine to visit his dying father, and his love affair with a woman who lives in Ramallah, across the checkpoint. They are unable to pursue this relationship elsewhere than at the checkpoint that separates them, so it unfolds at the border. The scene at the end of the film, described above, brings the film's effect all in the twenty second still shot of the pressure-cooker. The ending gives the film its ultimate affective force. This scene is politically charged. It puts into relation these two experiences without giving much content or description. The viewer makes the connections through the image's silent effect juxtaposed with the sound of the pressure-cooker about to go off. The active relations or connections made give the image, give this shot, a force of resistance; thought's outside. There is potential for something to emerge out of the felt force of the image: this makes it political. The shot is infused with a becoming-thought of resistance. As viewers we capture a thought infolding out of the image's force. Resistance is micropolitical in this image. It releases affect. The tension between the silence and the alarming sound produces an intensity that enunciates the tension felt in ES's character. This tension is felt. ES has not uttered a

---

<sup>51</sup> The cinematic does not only reference the visual; the cinematic is sensation, amodal happenings. But sensation is not just in reference to flesh, or how flesh moves, Sensation reveals becomings or bodies without organs. Deleuze and Guattari write, "Flesh is not sensation, although it is involved in revealing it...But what constitutes sensation is the becoming animal or plant, which wells up like a flayed beast or peeled fruit beneath the bands of pink in the most graceful, delicate nude, Venus in the mirror; or which suddenly emerges in the fusion, firing, or casting of broken tones, like the zone of indiscernibility of beast and man. Perhaps it would be an interference or chaos, were there not a second element to make the flesh hold fast. Flesh is only the thermometer of a becoming" (1994: 178-179).

word through out the film; his inability to speak, to utter a statement, or to give his force of expression speech ignites a powerful affect. His silence as it unfolds alongside other characters—as we see them express hostility, anger, physical violence, frustration—produces an affective tone that induces the image with a felt thought; this suggests that resistance is silent. What can Palestinians say? Silence holds the film together. It keeps it intact. This image does not conclude a thought; it is not hopelessness that we feel or pessimism because of the silence felt. The thought is a thought-in-the-making. The intensity felt with the image’s unfolding is a becoming-thought; the potential emergence of thought-in-action. What we feel is silence. The image is affected by the strong sense of silence in the film. It affects; and something from the affect of silence escapes the image. It tweaks it. Silence is no longer articulated as that which is associated with the unsaid. It moves with the force of expression; allowing for an emergence of thought. Silence here is technique-inducing thought. It becomes a micropolitical act of resistance; moving with thought’s intensive becomings releasing “unheard-of becomings” (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987: 44). Silence brings to the fore unheard of acts of resistance. It is micropolitical. It invents with expression.

Unheard-of becomings in the image’s silent effect releases a becoming of a peopling<sup>52</sup>. The Palestinian figure spirals into a multiplicity of a people. The Palestinian figure is no longer an individual, a man or a woman. It is no longer a figure that represents a certain characteristic. The Palestinian figure is always forming with expression. The Palestinian body unfolds out of expression; on its way to becoming an act of thought. As Brian Massumi writes, “Expression is abroad in the world—where the

---

<sup>52</sup> Deleuze and Guattari in “Becoming-intense, Becoming-animal...” in *A Thousand Plateaus*. Trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1987. 241-46.

potential is for what may become. It is non-local, scattered across myriad struggles over what manner of life-defining nets will capture and contain that potential in reproducible articulations, or actual functions” (2002b, xxi). Suleiman captures the Palestinian figure in this film as a complex force of sensation that lives with the complex force of State occupation. Sensation is felt in the characters’ movement on screen. This also produces intensities that affect how the image moves. The Palestinians, in this film, are not a people in terms of their nationality, religion, or ethnicity. They people in terms of how they activate difference with resistance while the occupation occupies movement. They are a multiplicity that evokes singularities. Suleiman cinematically invents a new world. He creates a new Figure<sup>53</sup>. The Palestinians in this film are becoming-Palestinian under occupation. They are becoming-Palestinian in *relation*. The film composes, through how the various Palestinian characters interact with each other, an intensive field of relational forces; the image creates an intensive relational movement. *Divine Intervention*, through filmic technique, creates an image that initiates an unfolding of expression through becoming-relation (forces affecting and being affected by other forces). Suleiman does this through his construction of tableaux. The images are constructed and pieced together through the film’s structure which is made up of tableau-like shots. Each shot is its own image<sup>54</sup>; Suleiman constructs the story out of these tableau-like shots. They are scenes that follow a certain order in one section and appear again but not necessarily in the same order in another section. When the shots/tableaus are repeated more action is ensued

---

<sup>53</sup> The concept of the Figure comes from Deleuze in Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation (2003): “Bacon’s Figures seem to be one of the most marvellous responses in the history of painting to the question, How can one make invisible forces visible? This is the primary function of the Figures” (49).

<sup>54</sup> What I mean here is that the image is not necessarily a scene or a shot, it can be a scene or an entire shot but it can also be something that becomes notable or remarkable within a scene or a shot, it is an affective tonality, a qualitative variation.

within the shot, something different happens, there is an addition, not in the sense of adding another element or characteristic into the image itself that was not seen before in the previous image, but in the sense of repetition. We see the same image again and again but something feels different about it this time. It feels as if the image kept moving even while it was off-screen. In this instant, the sequence then shows a variation in time; the image keeps becoming something else, the image has changed and it has a different rhythm to it. We feel that time had passed.

For example, Suleiman introduces us to his family's neighbourhood. In one tableau, a medium-long shot sets the scene. We see a woman sweeping the concrete steps of the garden. We are looking at her backyard that is divided into two levels, a top and a bottom. She is carrying a plastic grey bucket and sweeps the dust from the steps into it. She turns around, descends the step to the bottom level of her backyard. She moves towards a fire pit that has been placed in the middle of the yard. She dumps the contents out of the bucket onto the fire pit. She moves forward and picks up a few pieces of scrap wood and puts them into the fire pit; she moves up to the foreground again, picks up another couple of pieces. Moves back and throws them onto the pile in the fire pit. Then cut; thirty seconds. Next scene: the protagonist's father is standing by his car smoking a cigarette face looking down. This is a medium shot. He looks up and then cut; fifteen seconds. We have already seen him before in the beginning of the film driving his car through his neighbourhood, he is waving to the people he sees on the street. As he waves he whispers a profanity of sorts.

Next scene: A medium close-up of a figure in a welding mask. Two men stand in the background next to each other. They are both wearing identical white shirts and dark

sunglasses. They are watching him work. We see the smoke rise and sparks fly from the welding machine the figure with the mask is handling. We hear the sound of it, very loud and clear. The figure stops, turns off the machine, looks up removes the eye gear from the mask and turns his head to the right. He lifts the entire mask off of his face. It is the father from the scene before. The shot cuts to a medium-long shot onto a young man who is approaching the three men; he is walking towards the garage that all three men are standing in. One of them says, "Watch he won't say a sentence without the word six in it." The man stops and says, "I wanted to stop by and say hi," then a cut to the men looking at him. The father says, "Hello". There is a cut again to the young man, he asks "and how are the guys?" The two men in the identical white shirts and glasses say "we're getting by." A cut to the young man again, he takes out of his shirt pocket a pack of cigarettes and offers a cigarette to the men, he extends his arm toward them with the pack. There is a cut back to the three men in the garage; the father has continued to work, and the two identical men lift their arms to show that they are already smoking. There are cigarettes in each of the men's hands. Both their arms slowly come down again in a synchronized movement, and then there is a cut again to the young man. "Ok." He puts his pack back in his pocket turns around and walks away. There is a cut to the three men. Throughout this scene as the father continues to work we hear the sound of the welding machine. The father now stops again, briefly turns off the machine, lifts his mask again and watches as the young man walks away. He turns back to his work, puts the protective mask back on and turns on the machine. The other two men continue to watch him. There is a cut; the young man is walking back towards them. As he stops the sound of the machine turns off. He says, by the way, "Yesterday around 6 I had 66 shekels on me, I

saw a friend we played cards and I had a full series on me, won 600 shekels and got out.”

There is a cut to the men staring at him; medium shot from the POV of the young man.

One of the men in the white shirts asks, “What is a full series?” There is a cut and the young man replies “that’s when you get 6666, four sixes,” the young man immediately turns around and walks away; and then a cut to all three men staring after him; this shot is a medium close-up from where the young man was standing. The scene ends: two minutes and two seconds.

Next tableau: a cut to three construction men fixing a driveway. At this point we have seen this driveway twice before: in one previous scene a car is easing into it so as to avoid the hole in the ground; the second time, a man gets arrested by the police and they lead him to the car parked outside on this driveway. Now, the third time: a different scene of three men trying to fix the driveway. The shot is of the driveway as it leads upwards into the house complex. One of the men is shovelling, the other measuring the road, and the third looking through a construction meter. A policeman is on the right leaning against a wall watching. It is a medium still shot. The men keep working. The man who is measuring the hole is situated in the foreground of the shot. He walks around the hole in the ground, hands the policeman the one end of the measuring tape, and measures from the wall where the policeman is standing by the hole in the ground, where he stands.

Then he walks over to the hole, hands the other end to the other construction worker who is standing right in front of the hole, the other man backs out off screen holding onto the measuring tape and proceeds to measure the distance from the hole to the opposite side of where the policeman stands. As he backs out holding the measuring tape he is now off screen. The construction worker who is standing in front of the hole holds the other end.

As the other man backs out off screen the other construction worker lets go his side of the measuring tape. The scene ends: forty seconds.

Fourth tableau: a medium shot again of the driveway. This time the shot is taken from the other side, where the driveway is seen leading onto a street. We see a man approaching from the street walking towards the driveway. He is walking in a very determined/aggressive kind of way; fast and brisk. He veers to the left, off screen. He walks back on screen from the left. Camera stays still. He has some kind of tool in his hand. He walks toward the hole that the construction workers were trying to fix. He starts hammering at it destroying the temporary cover of the hole in the ground. He is determined, focused, and violent, but silent. He keeps hammering into the concrete making the hole bigger. This is the same man that we saw being arrested earlier. He walks off screen again to the left and walks back on screen with a measuring tape in his hand. He measures the hole he just made then walks forward toward the foreground/driveway and walks off screen. The scene last for one minute and ten seconds. A cut: another tableau begins.

We have already seen this twice before. This is the same angle of shot, a medium-close up of a front of a house. The foreground is of the street where the house is located; diagonal from the house is a garden. We see the same man walk out with a garbage bag in hand. He walks toward the garden and throws the garbage bag into it. He slowly walks back to his house. The scene ends; twenty-two seconds.

Next tableau: we are back with the woman in her backyard. At this moment the pile of garbage in the fire pit is much bigger. The woman walks around the garden picking up various things, branches, pieces of a broken chair, other garbage that is lying

around the yard. We see her in the beginning of the scene walking out of the right hand corner toward the fire pit picks something up on the way and drops it on top of the pile in the pit and then empties her bucket. She walks forward, picks up a broken window frame, walks upwards toward the left hand corner of the screen. She picks up some branches and then walks toward the fire pit and drops them on top. She continues to do this, walking from one corner of the garden back to the pit, then to another corner back again to the pit. The pile of junk in the fire is getting bigger. This tableau is one minute and two seconds long. The scene cuts back to another familiar shot.

We are back in front of a familiar house. A man, we have seen him before, walks out of his house holding a garbage bag in his right hand. He walks out of his house towards his neighbour's garden and throws the bag across over to the garden. This time there is something new. As the nameless man (as these are all nameless characters) throws the bag the shot cuts into the neighbour's garden; and we see that there is a big pile of garbage bags. It is assumed at this point that he has been doing this for awhile. The shot cuts again and we see him walk slowly back to his house. Scene ends: the tableau lasts for twenty-two seconds.

Suleiman is very detailed in his construction of the tableaux. The sequence described above is in the first twenty-two minutes of the film. Suleiman introduces us to the neighbourhood through random acts of living situations but that feel a bit peculiar, the woman with the fire pit in the backyard, the garbage in the garden, the hole in the driveway etc. This feeling, a felt strangeness or peculiarity of the image, is what I will refer to as an event. This strangeness brings into effect the unfolding of an event, a



singularity<sup>55</sup> of the image becoming with time; a duration. This event shifts the trajectory of the image. For example, we do not see, in succession, the neighbour throwing his garbage in his neighbour's garden. These shots are interspersed throughout the film until in a final scene, his neighbour confronts him. As described above, we see the man walk out of his house with a garbage bag; he walks over to his neighbour's garden and throws the garbage in there, walks back. The next scene is of a different story, but later we come back to this man again, and he repeats the same action, then another story, a different scene each with their own durational aspect. They are events that meet in the in-between; and that produce their own rhythmic force. They affect how the image is seen. These shots come into succession with other scenes, other stories, just as described above. The strange felt feeling of the event unfolding in one scene carries over to the next scene (unrelated in terms of order of narrative but still in an order on its own), and the strangeness felt in that scene, as it has already come in relation with the other strangeness of the past scene collide, and add onto the strangeness felt. They create a new strangeness together, creating a new image, a new force, a new thought. The same story/shot appear and return with a new twist to them, a differential relation. It no longer is what it seemed like it was going to be. The strangeness continues but on a trajectory that constantly shifts. It shifts the politics of the image. It induces the following scenes/shots with new intensities, variations, and forces.

The technique Suleiman uses in the sequence described above plays with order: the order of the movement of events taking place. The event/image in the shot is

---

<sup>55</sup> I use the concept of singularity here not to mean a specific instance but to try and explain how an image can release a felt difference; provoking a process that gives way to potential for emergence, for something new to be thought. It is difference that is felt virtually. It is on the verge of becoming actual, it moves the threshold.

established through how the order is constructed; how the scene of the event is situated in relation to itself as a scene in itself, through detail in choreography, and how that affects its relation to the scene before and the scene after, through the image's effect in the sequence. Suleiman constructs an order in the shot, and with the shot, through detail in movement and the choreography of movement. It is a very structured scene, very contained movement. This specific movement that is contained within the shot also escapes the shot. The shots consist of how the choreography of movement of the shot itself is worked out through its relation with the order of the movement of the entire sequence. The movement is composed through carefully choreographed movements of the character's body, of the camera position, and the location/space, within the film narrative. The movement of the character's body in the shot, the way the camera is still and in its freeze-frame position, and the order of the movement in the shot (from one point to another point, for example the carefully slow movement of the man walking out of his house toward his neighbours backyard), all come together to unleash an image/event that is at work; it creates an intensive affect. As exemplified above with the woman walking around slowly, deliberately, in a choreographed manner that also seems improvisational, around her backyard collecting waste. She walks in a movement all her own, from one point in the backyard to another, and then from another point to another, and then back to the fire pit.

The precise movement of the body creating the space also creates something else that is felt within the movement of the image; the image is intensified through how the movement is choreographed. The actual movement of the body (for example the woman's body as she walks) comes into relation with the becoming-imperceptible of

movement (the rhythm that is already felt by the image as it unfolds on the screen, and as it has been unfolding); and this is further intensified through the choreographed physical movement that is contained within the scene (how she walks, where she walks, when she stops, how she stands, how she turns around and walks again etc). The imperceptible movement is a virtual movement in Suleiman's image. Suleiman, through his careful construction of the tableaux, and through his choreographed movements the body and of the camera, brings to the surface of the image an invisible effect: the rhythm of the image.

The Palestinian body is becoming-image in the film, creating events as the body creates space through movement. For example, we see this again through one tableau of the man, who destroys the driveway, he steps into the frame, after having been arrested, walks directly back to the right and out of the frame, comes back in with a hammer, and proceeds to destroy the driveway. As we watch him move within the frame, how his body enters the frame, how he is walking, how he exists, how he comes back, and his movement creates the image of this particular scene. This spirals into an intensive affect. The affect that is brought forth in film is one of a felt difference. It is not a stable body representing a Palestinian with a stable nationality. It is a moving body, creating its spatial specificity. It is always in-formation depending on its movement and it is always shifting trajectory.

The Palestinian body is an event; a singularity (provoking a process toward the spiralling of difference) that unfolds creating spacetimes of resistance, with each image that unfolds out of the disordered succession. Suleiman does something here with the order of the shots, the sequence, the succession of images; he creates an order that shifts

in each sequence, so the succession is always out of order, out of joint. There is no order in the sense of logic, as in 1 and then 2, and then 3 etc. The order is that of an in-between, a folding-in-upon itself. The shots always come in between other shots that have nothing to do with the last shot seen, in linear terms. Their relation creates an image of force. As, described above, one scene or story is inserted in-between other scenes and other stories. This may seem chaotic, but there is an order to the film as well, a rhythm. In one interview Suleiman explains,

I never really come to a film through the structure. I simply jot down notes and build a story through them. Then I compose a tableau. When I get a tableau that stands by itself, it becomes an image. Later, when you shoot, there are a lot of ever-present possibilities. I write a very precisely structured script, but then I leave that work alone and start the process again. I want to avoid archiving images. I always want to make the creative process continue and not simply shoot what I've written on the set. Also, something else happens through the montage. In terms of narrative structure, it's because I see them in poetic montage (Suleiman in Dabashi 2006: 36).

Suleiman creates an interesting succession of scenes that may seem as if they are out of order with each other, from one scene to the next, but that end up creating a different kind of order, creating the film's narrative in a different way. The narrative of the film is created out of the in-between; the film's effect is produced out of this structure of what happens in the in-between of the tableau/images that have been put into order, shot by shot. He creates an order that is not based on how the content flows, in terms of linear time or logic of continuity. The narrative of the stories here is not based on content, in terms of cause and effect reasoning. Rather, he creates an order that brings to the fore an imperceptible order of time, one that is felt affectively, as a durational event; an experiment with space and time. He uses the body and the space of the scene to

experiment with narrative storytelling<sup>56</sup>. There is a narrative but it is presented through affect, or as he describes above a poetic montage. This I will call an affective montage, where the cut is felt in the in-between of the image becoming; where the intensive affect changes direction to another spacetime. For example in one scene a few Israeli soldiers are practicing target shooting. There are targets set up to be these human size boards that represent a figure wearing a keffiyeh that is wrapped around the head, only the eyes can be seen. Suddenly, a live figure appears from one and steps out from behind one of the boards, again the keffiyeh is wrapped around the head and only the eyes can be seen. This figure proceeds to fight the soldiers in a scene that has been choreographed almost like a dance. The figure flips, flies, kicks, etc. In one swooping gesture, this Palestinian ninja flies up into the sky, one soldier remains, the keffiyeh slowly unravels from the figure's head and reveals the figure to be ES's lover, the woman he has been seeing at the checkpoint. She lifts her arm to reveal a grenade in her hand. The Israeli soldier looks up at her; she swoops quickly back down to the ground and drops the grenade. Instead of an explosion we see a Palestinian flag spreading out over the ground the Israeli soldier is standing on. And then silence for a few seconds and a cut. Once again, Suleiman engages the audience through affect. He uses the body and its movement to create space and this produces an affective engagement with the image.

The Palestinian ninja takes over the space and creates an entirely new dynamic force. She creates the space and produces an intensive atmosphere that liberates a

---

<sup>56</sup> This is an important point because Suleiman makes time felt in how he experiments with this traditional sort of speech-act. One example of this is how the film is almost always silent. Storytelling and oral narrative is a form of resistance to the Palestinian people. I think Suleiman really tries to experiment with this how to tell the Palestinian story but without telling it how it is expected to be told, through the setting-in of linear time, rather he tells the story in a different way, in silence. He experiments with the idea of narrative as it is linked to time and resistance through affect and force.

productive process. At the end of the scene, even though it is completely fictional, the Israeli soldier stands alone on Palestinian territory. Suleiman plays with power here. The image releases intensive forces that affirm the becoming life of Palestine. These intensive forces produce productive processes. What I mean is that these release affective forces that invent with time and space. Suleiman deals specifically with creative resistance. Suleiman invents with resistance: how to create techniques that deal with the ever oppressive Palestinian situation. Power, in this film, is really about affect. Suleiman affects the audience with the forces of inventive politics. The ninja sequence is affective in a very inventive way because it liberates the sensation (of resistance) into a new mode of productivity. Suleiman engages the audience to experiment with an affective resistance. This opens up potential for new thought because he creates techniques that produce inventive politics; a resistance to-come. In this film power is not represented through how the Palestinians are oppressed under state occupation, rather, power is used as affect in the film. Power in this film is affect, how forces affect and are affected by other forces. This affect comes out of how he deals with the succession and order of the shots/tableaus as they are being seen, as well as, how the body and space are used to created different kinds of relational movements within the scene/shot.

In one scene in *Divine Intervention*, we actually see him prepare this for the film. We see him create the film's order of sequences in the film. There is a shot of him at his parent's house soon after he arrives in Nazareth. We see him stand by a wall full of yellow sticky notes that have been placed one after the other in rows and columns. He takes one out of a row, and replaces it with another one on the second row of sticky notes. We see him experiment with the structure of the narrative of the film that we are

watching. Here, we see him literally create the structure of the film that we are watching. We see him in his moment of creative resistance, creating new spacetimes, and new modes of perception that give way to an emergent politics.

The relation between the order of movement created within the sequence and the order of movement created within the shot also creates the specific strangeness that is felt. It stirs the shot with an image: an affect that infects the situation with a difference, a new event. Suleiman does this through order and detail of the order of movement, but also through choreography of movement. In the above mentioned example, Suleiman constructs a scene through choreographed movements of the body at work. The body is the focus of the shot. The body spirals the image into affect. It releases new affects each time because the body is always in movement, and this movement moves with the time/duration of the shot. We are not introduced to characters/subjects; we are introduced to their movements. The body in the shot or scene is not disconnected to the space of where it is moving in. As in the example above of the tableaux, the body that is moving in the space is also creating the space. Suleiman does this for example in how we are not introduced to a space. We are not introduced to a city, or a neighbourhood in terms of its spatial coordinates, geography, or location. We are introduced to its movements. What we watch are people moving, which is interesting considering the restriction imposed on Palestinians in terms of their ability to move. For example, as described in the above scene, what we see is the woman walking from one corner of her backyard to another corner, picking up some branches, she walks to the fire pit throws the branches in there, walks to another corner picks something else up, puts it back down walks another couple of feet picks up a pile of leaves, walks to back to the fire pit, throws the leaves in there,

walks again to another corner etc. We are just watching her do this for a certain amount of time. We watch her body move and create the space that is around her. The camera is positioned almost always at a medium-close-up, sometimes, medium-long shot. We are never that close to the body in the shot, but the focus in the shot is on the body moving, on the character's physical body moving; creating the rhythm of the space.

We are constantly watching a body move in the shot. The way the body moves in the shot, and the way that the shot is positioned creates a dynamic space; an immanent movement is unleashed and it is felt. The body moves spacetime, and the camera becomes a tool in which it captures not only the physicality of the scene, but the virtual affect of the immanent movement as it unfolds in the shot/scene; we feel the intense durational aspect of how the movement in the space creates rhythm. The choreography that is created in the shot, through order of movement, and detail of movement, creates an image. The physical human body at work is in relation to the space that is being shot, and this creates a movement on the spot, a movement that unfolds as we watch. The immanent movement that unfolds induces the image with the strangeness, the event, a particularity that emerges; something in the image escapes. What escapes is a micropolitical body, a movement in-formation. It changes the space.

*Divine Intervention* is about relational politics. Relation is micropolitical. The relations between sequences, shots, and movements are heightened, and what persists is this relation of forces that come into relation with other forces created by other relations. Suleiman focuses on multiple becomings of a community under occupation through this relational politics that produce new spacetime. The spacetime politics in the film invent micropolitical acts of resistance that provoke affects. Relational politics in this sense



provoke a process of emergent politics. Suleiman does not represent a people in the image; he produces affects. He peoples. His cinema is relational. ES activates the film's multiple movements. He creates a bordering<sup>57</sup>. This border is transversal, it is virtual. It evokes the movement of a not-yet<sup>58</sup>. It always changes directions. In the film, the bordering creates an invisible threshold. This threshold is a movement that initiates an always reaching-toward<sup>59</sup>. The threshold is the outside of thought. It is a virtual formation-in-process; a becoming multiplicity of a people who activate their own living situation and create a new one.

Living under occupation is a constant becoming-singularity with the unfolding of difference; and this affects. Singularity here also pertains to what becomes anomalous. According to Deleuze and Guattari, "the anomalous is neither an individual nor a species; it has only affects, it has neither familiar or subjectified feelings, nor specific or significant characteristics" (1987: 244). Bodies affect other bodies. The anomalous is always creating a body without organs, and a body without organs is always creating an anomaly, a singularity that emerges out of the unfolding of expression, out of the unfolding of resistance. It is a micropolitical body; a body that moves with transversal lines of flight. It creates other micropolitical events that move a world into *formation*. This is creative.

Brian Massumi writes, "It is basically a pragmatic question of how one *performatively* contributes to the stretch of expression in the world—or conversely prolongs its capture. This is fundamentally a *creative* problem" (2002b, xxii). Palestinian

---

<sup>57</sup> Deleuze and Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1987. 245.

<sup>58</sup> Erin Manning. *Politics of Touch: Sense, Movement, Sovereignty*. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 2007. xxii.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid*, xxii.

resistance is a creative resistance that is not always productive or positive. This is a resistance without a moralizing effect. It is a creative politics that is always on the verge of becoming. And the question of “how one performatively contributes to the stretch of expression in the world” becomes a question of technique. How do we create techniques that are always undoing themselves? How do we create techniques that experiment with relational politics: a politics that allows for the potential of emergence? Suleiman gave Palestinian politics a new force. He invented with new techniques that bring forth the complex relation between resistance, time, and the multiple/collective. He showed us how resistance is creation. Expression is potential to create. It is also, as Massumi writes, “an ethical endeavour, since it is to ally oneself with change: for an ethics of emergence” (2002b, xxii). How do we infect the world with emergent politics? This is micropolitical.

What is the relation between the micropolitical and the political? How do micropolitical acts of resistance change our relation to the political world that is already forming? How do we in relation to art, creation, and resistance think the political as an emergence? This isn't about changing the world. This is about creating new ones. This is about creating techniques that enable new practices of resistance that open up onto emergence, onto micropolitics. This is creative politics. It takes time.

### 3 Cinematic Politics

“What we have to accept as a given at this point is the idea that significant political activity (as well as aesthetic activity) can take place on the level of intellectual theory, even though this may result in a comparatively rarefied practice. This obviously involves a broadening of the commonly held idea that politics is a pragmatic activity directed toward social manipulation. And here Godard’s distinction between ‘making a political film’ and ‘making a film politically’ is of crucial importance.”

Martin Walsh<sup>60</sup>

“The meaning of ethics becomes clear only when one understands that the good is not, and cannot be, a good thing or possibility beside or above every bad thing or possibility, that the authentic and the true are not real predicates of an object perfectly analogous (even if opposed) to the false and the inauthentic.”

Giorgio Agamben<sup>61</sup>

*Standard Operating Procedure* (2008) is the new documentary film directed by Errol Morris. The film is about the infamous Abu-Ghraib photographs that were released in the Fall of 2003 to news agencies around the world. *SOP* explores, in detail, the content of the shocking photographs taken by U.S. soldiers in Abu-Ghraib prison, in Iraq, of Iraqi men who are shown being tortured by American soldiers. Morris interviews five of the seven soldiers who were involved in the taking of the photographs. These soldiers were also seen in the photographs and they participated in what were perceived to be (by various media journalists, and the international community) criminal acts/abuse/torture toward Iraqi men. The film “investigates”<sup>62</sup> the content of the photographs and attempts

---

<sup>60</sup> Walsh, Martin. “Political Formations in the Cinema of Jean-Marie Straub.” In *The Brechtian Aspect of Radical Cinema*. Ed. Keith Griffiths. London: BFI Publishing, 1981. 41.

<sup>61</sup> Agamben, Giorgio. *The Coming Community*. Trans. Michael Hardt. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.13.

<sup>62</sup> Morris repeatedly states in numerous interviews that *SOP* is a film that *investigates* what had occurred in Abu-Ghraib at the time the photographs were taken in 2004. His insistence and adamant focus on the investigative aspect of the film, in terms of it revealing details about the incidences in the photographs, creates a complex relation between how the film is supposed to be watched—objectively as an investigative report—and what the audience sees—affectively exposed to acts of torture. The film creates a complex relation between what comes to be object and what comes to be the subject of the film. I want to refrain from, first, making a distinction between what is the object and what is the subject in the film, and instead point to how the object and subject become indiscernible in the film through the different scenes and sequences presented. The object-subject dichotomy breaks with conventional modes of representation

to grasp the details of what occurred outside of what is seen in the photographs. Morris wants to reveal the stories from the soldiers' point of view. These soldiers were labelled by George W. Bush, Donald Rumsfeld, and Condoleezza Rice, including people like Rush Limbaugh as the "seven bad apples" of the American military. The film gives screen space for the "five (out of the seven) bad apples" to speak about their time in Abu-Ghraib prison. The soldiers, through interviews conducted by Morris, proceed to discuss in detail what happened when the infamous photographs were taken. They explain to the camera, speaking from their point of view, what had happened and what they experienced<sup>63</sup> at that time in Abu-Ghraib prison: describing the events that occurred before, during, and after the photographs were taken.

The film is, as Morris describes, a non-fiction horror film. The re-enactments are extremely graphic, the soundtrack is haunting, chilling, and dramatic, the use of the photographs in the film is daunting, terrifying, and violent<sup>64</sup>—they are repeatedly fully exposed to screen size, or almost to screen size, throughout the film along with a dramatic sound score and sound effects—but most of all the film is horrific because of what the audience sees in the photographs. The horror effect is amplified because of how the photographs come to be represented through the horror genre. This horror effect, however, is never addressed in the film, and because it is never addressed it becomes

---

(since it is difficult to define these moments in the film) and become interchangeable. This challenges modes of viewing practices and illustrates how different modes of perception transfigure the ways in which this film is watched—in terms of how the film is constantly being transformed through the ways in which these categories of signification are constantly altered.

<sup>63</sup> Each soldier interviewed recounts their version of the story for each of the photographs that Morris shows on screen in his film.

<sup>64</sup> What I mean by violent here is how the exposure of the photographs, in the film, becomes excessive. The audience is confronted with extreme, excess violence that is depicted in the photographs—and the showing of that violence in a manner that has no limits, that is excessive, and that is repeated creates a violence in itself that becomes affective. The audience is pulled into the force of that affect and within that affective-pull there is potential in that instant to be transformed by it, by the violence that is creating the force of the image.

problematic in terms of how the viewer watches the film, from what distance, and from what position. For example, we see many of the Iraqi men in “stress”<sup>65</sup> positions, men being beaten, men being humiliated, pointed at, laughed at, prodded at, etc. The photographs are violent in content (what is seen in the photographs is abuse of power and severe physical violence done onto Iraqi men by American soldiers), but as soon as the photographs are projected onto a screen and are used as the enablers of the film’s own content then the effect changes. The audience is no longer just exposed to the photographs as objects of investigation, or as evidence of proof of the torture that occurred in Abu-Ghraib prison. The photographs are being watched in a specific site: this is a film that is taking place in a theatre-like setting, one pays for a ticket, goes in to sit down, the lights go out, the film begins, and the film plays for an hour and a half. This site is contained. The viewing process is already creating a distance between what is happening here, as the audience is seated back in a dark theatre, compared to what is happening over there, the screen as it portrays images of a far-away war. Exploring the ways in which the photographs are being presented on screen and the way they are used in the film—their purpose in how Morris wants to build an argument—brings me to the focus of this paper. A violent force is felt in the film and this force affects the atmosphere that is already violently intense via the content of the photographs—the images of war and torture. This felt violence is amplified because of the contained setting. The audience is being exposed to these images of war and torture in a theatre setting, and in this case are experiencing this effect in the context of a closed-in environment.

---

<sup>65</sup> The Military Intelligence interviewed in the film repeatedly use the term “stress” position to indicate the way an Iraqi man is made to stand or how he is handcuffed in various ways that stress him out. This has been significant in terms of how the U.S. military/government defines certain acts either as torture or stress. If the acts are categorized as stress then they are considered acceptable according to the U.S. government.

In many of his interviews on the subject of this film Morris mentions that his film is an apolitical film. In the New Yorker conference held on October 5<sup>th</sup> 2007 Morris discusses *SOP* (at this point it has not yet been released),

Perhaps I am being disingenuous when I say that I wanted it to be apolitical because properly speaking it can't be apolitical because I have political views about this but to the extent that it was possible for me to do so I wanted it to be apolitical, I wanted to learn something, I wanted to listen to what these people had to say, I wanted to investigate what actually had happened in this place. Independent of my feelings about this war, I find war, I am not disclosing anything at all that will be surprising, I find the war repellent for many many many reasons. But independent of those views I tried to investigate and tried to examine what was going on<sup>66</sup>.

This statement that describes the film as apolitical brings to the fore several issues. First, what is the difference between what comes to be political and what comes to be apolitical? Second, is the difference, for Morris, between what is political and apolitical have to do with disguising his own views/opinions on the subject of war and torture? Third, is Morris trying to seem objective when it comes to the making of the film? Fourth, if Morris defines his film as apolitical then how is the film made to be seen? Finally, to what extent did Morris's own apolitical approach form the way the photographs were used in the film? Morris's approach has an enormous effect on how the photographs are presented in the film: how they are used aesthetically (in terms of how they affect the rhythm and atmosphere of the film if Morris wants it to remain apolitical), strategically (how Morris is organizing his argument around the problems of photography through the way he is aesthetically presenting the photographs apolitically), and politically (what does the investigation reveal through the aesthetic and strategic presentation of the photographs even if they are meant to be seen outside of any political

---

<sup>66</sup> "Errol Morris." *The New Yorker Festival*. 2007. The New Yorker Magazine. 5 October 2007. <http://www.newyorker.com/online/video/festival/2007/MorrisGourevitch>.

context, and again what does political mean here?). Morris's shameless approach to the way he presents the photographs in the film (apolitically) creates a violence that is intensive—a violence that informs a process in production. It is intensive because it only exists once the audience comes together into the cinema to watch the film. The audience, who watch as the graphic photographs are presented one by one in repetitive form, come into contact with a violence that is not only physical and graphic in detail, but one that is also affective—this encounter induces a felt movement. This violence is felt first and then articulated into a felt (e) motion, perhaps shock, but at first is only felt by the body. This felt (e) motion in the body is also responding to other felt (e) motions of other bodies in the audience. This relation is what I will refer to as an affective intensity of a becoming-collective. This affect is created because the audience, as a composite group, has to be there to watch, to see, to engage in this event of an image unfolding. This audience is a becoming-pack<sup>67</sup> that is becoming with the image's force of relational violence<sup>68</sup>.

This violence can be described as the force of the relation; it is an affective movement between the film's intention in its own effect (to feel fear), and how one is affected by that intention (how the audience responds affectively to the film itself as a moving image that goes beyond what is meant to be felt as fear). This relation between

---

<sup>67</sup> Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari. "Becoming-Animal, Becoming-Intense..." in *A Thousand Plateaus*. Trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1987, pp. 243.

<sup>68</sup> I am using the concept of violence in this instance as a qualitative term. Here I am exploring the ways in which an audience who come together in the cinema produce a violence that is relational. This violence not only affects the audience as viewers but also the viewers affect the way the violence is already being established on screen. Morris puts the audience in a situation where they can recognize that the Iraqi men are the other. Morris here assumes the audience is white and non-Iraqi, and because the audience is put in this position they become part of that violence Morris re-creates in his film. This violence is intensive in that it re-produces the categories of us vs. them, setting up a dichotomy here between who is the other and who is the non-other. And again in this film the Iraqi men, who are already being treated as other by the American soldiers, re-become other in this film, and the audience is drawn into this way of seeing. I am not suggesting that the audience is passive or unable to see that this is happening in the film, but that the violent effect of the photographs and how they are placed on the screen creates a way of seeing that is already pre-established in Morris's film.

these two types of violence (content-based violence, and affective violence) creates the potential for different bodies without organs to emerge (for different subjectivities to take-place). In turn, these moving bodies without organs (as they are experiencing this film together) also produce an affective violence that is infolding out through the film's intended effect in durational time—they create a violence that is felt in variation and that is becoming a spacetime event each time the violence is felt differently. This violent force (or relational affect) is always affecting and being affected by the singular spacetime event; and a new cinematic image emerges each time. The film's effect is being transformed, it changes, and its change affects, and it produces new bodies in movement, and therefore new images. Each time a body is moved by what they are seeing they are creating a new way of seeing; a new mode of perception that brings forth a relational force. This relational force is affective, and is continuously being transformed by the relation an audience has with what is being shown on screen—the image is becoming-other as it is being affected by the movement of the film's own effect—and by the relation the viewers in the audience are having with each other (they are creating a temporary community). This relation between the two types of violence, content and affect, creates relational forces, and these relational forces create different experiential events that are spacetime events: singularities. This brings me to what I call a cinematic politics.

As underlined throughout this thesis, I situate cinematic politics as that moment of resistance that gives thought its outside. Gilles Deleuze writes, "Thought finds itself taken over by the exteriority of a 'belief', outside any interiority of a mode of knowledge" (1989: 175). Cinematic politics works beyond the already bound system of



knowledge that is presented in the Film Studies discipline. Here cinematic politics works to open up potential for thought that brings to the fore key concepts such as that of image, thought, movement, and politics. This potential for thought, that cinematic politics inspires, is what I call a becoming-image. Cinematic politics create new ways of seeing and form new images of thought that are always *becoming*. Cinematic images offer new modes for thinking thought. The cinematic affects and affect can alter how one sees. A new image can destabilize ways of seeing. Cinematic politics bring forth new modes of perception in an effort to impel new modes of thinking thought. In this way, an image of thought is also a singularity. Singularities are events. Here, I ask: how does cinema create conditions for thinking thought/feeling thought? What happens when the experience of a genre are confused? Once recognizing that the images up on screen are images of torture, of a specific kind of violence something else begins to happen. There is an unfolding of an intensive force that is a force on the threshold of becoming; this force perishes and returns. This changes the space and time of the experiential viewing event and creates a multiplicity of complex perceptual relations. Cinematic politics is an affective movement that produces different bodies without organs. There is an intensity that is produced in the relational interval between the audience and the film as it is being seen; affects affect bodies in movement; a new image is created, a thought in motion. A resonant field is being composed with an audience (an audience that is never a body-in-common) as they engage with a violence that affects (this affect/feeling is rarely clear on site); this becomes political. This violence affects the durational eventness of time on screen because the audience become a collective of moving bodies without organs—a collective-body that affects and that is affected.

The viewer is immediately put to task; she has to face a kind of violence that she is far away from and that she can stay far away from. These photographs show physical and psychological violence done onto Iraqi men. She is watching from a safe distance, untouched, yet unknowingly being affected by it as she sits and watches. These photographs show abuse of power, they show American soldiers using methods of control over Iraqi men, controlling their bodies, treating the Iraqi men violently, and abusively. The effect is strong precisely because of the content of the photographs, what is being shown in the photographs and what is being said about the photographs by the soldiers who were involved at that time. They are describing events of torture. However, what becomes intensely strong in the unfolding of the film's intensity is the ways in which the image (or singularity), of the film, creates itself differently each time the audience is made to look again. The shock shocks again. This is done by how the film focuses on the content of the photographs, what they show/what we can see, and this focus forms the construction of the narrative of the film. Morris asks specific questions about what is happening in each photograph he presents on screen.

For example, in one photograph we see a soldier, Lynndie England, holding a leash that is attached to an Iraqi man's neck and the Iraqi man is lying on the floor. Morris asks each of the soldiers interviewed specific question about the photograph. Each soldier tells her/his side of the story: where were they standing, what they saw from where they were standing, who gave the orders or instructions at that time, what happened when England was told to hold the leash; why was the other soldier, Megan Ambuhl, who was seen in the photograph cropped out when the photograph was released to the media etc.. The answers to all these questions are edited together in a certain order

that structures the narrative of that specific photograph; framing the perspective of that sequence in a certain way.

The story of that photograph, as Morris tells it, is that England was given orders by another high ranking officer, who she was having an affair with, to tie a noose around the Iraqi man's neck (the Iraqi man was told to keep lying down on the floor) and to just hold it so a photograph can be taken. According to all the soldiers interviewed, the Iraqi man was never hurt either during or after the photograph was taken. Also, and again according to the soldiers, the whole scenario that went on in the jail at that time was constructed so that a photograph can be taken. In this light, as the details of the photograph were conveyed to Morris by England and others, reveals, for Morris, that what looked like S&M torture practices, as they were described by the media, were most definitely not. Morris, for this photograph, re-invents the narrative that was predominant in all media news. The photograph, at the time of its release, instantly became headline news. Part of the shock that ensued was around the politics of sexuality and gender. The question that became very popular instantly was: how can a woman be capable of such violence? One of the main reasons why the question of gender was suddenly the focus of the news was because a major torture practice, in the form of what looked like S & M sexual play, was going on at Abu-Ghraib and that England, a female soldier, was instigating the whole torture scene. This sequence, constructed by Morris, tends to a certain effect. This poses a problem. Morris re-affirms, as he *invents*, a narrative that promotes a politics of war that further excludes Iraqis, and that further dismisses the violence that is done unto them by the soldiers themselves.

The narrative of *SOP* is further heightened by the aesthetics used to create the intensity of the film. Morris borrows technical conventions that are used mostly in the horror film genre; and the use of this specific genre constitutes an effect that is mostly associated with the horror film: this effect is fear. Shock, fear, shock again, resistance; thought from the outside. Morris is situating the audience within the confines of a strictly bound structure—an investigative report-style of filmmaking, accentuated in linear-time narrative, all presented through the conventions of the horror film genre that induces fear in the audience. This relation between the content of the film, the narrative structure, and the use of the aesthetics brings to question the relation not only between how are ethics created through how the aesthetics are performed and vice versa, but also how does a content-driven-narrative that runs on a conventional time-frame—i.e., it is a linear narrative—produce another kind of narrative, a time-image narrative; a complex spacetime event<sup>69</sup>. I will argue that this leaves for openings, gaps, affective movements that change how the film is seen, and how the film creates an image of the outside. The questions I will explore are: what is an image<sup>70</sup>? What does this image do? And how is this image cinematic? These questions will be an opening onto what comes to be an exploration of thought in relation to how a politics of cinema become a politics of thought; a politics of the outside. This politics of thought will also be explored through what I will be referring to, and as I have already mentioned above, as cinematic politics.

---

<sup>69</sup> Please see chapter two in this thesis, “The Supernatural Shiver”, for a further exploration of spacetime.

<sup>70</sup> The way that I will be using this concept “image” will be in accordance with the concept of thought, how does the image on the screen become an image of thought. Gilles Deleuze explores this idea in his book *Difference and Repetition* (1994). I will also, when referring to the word ‘photograph’ will refer to it as a photographic image, or just simply as photograph. And when I refer to the word ‘image’, I will be referring to the image of thought.

The audience, as a temporary community, a becoming-collective, produce an intensity that is felt in relation. This relation is outside time—or in the non-linear-time of the interval. This relation takes place virtually, in the in-between. It is not an actualized phenomena but a tonality. The relation is felt time, a duration. This relation is a becoming-event. First, a distance is set in between the audience and the screen. A becoming-other of the filmic image unravels in the experience of seeing. This is established between the audience and the photographs on the screen. The photographs are on the screen and this creates a distance that creates that which is already Other. The distance is established through the invisible border between the audience and the screen itself. The border is enhanced by the framing of the screen. We are just experiencing the photographs from afar, on the screen. A border is sensed already, and established between audience and screen. In addition, the film's double framing (photograph frame within screen frame) also allows for a way to identify the screen as such, as a screen; that what we are looking at is far away from where we are sitting. The distance is also established by the ways in which the horror genre is used to further induce a felt affect that helps soften the reality of which the events we are witnessing did actually happen. There is a complex voyeurism that is induced by the documentary genre. There is a certain type of seeing that is set-in when we are confronted by events that actually occurred. There is a certain voyeurism associated when watching documentary film that deals with 'real' events. The audience is instantly placed in a situation where they will Other. In this situation, the Othering is heightened because the audience's experience of looking at the photographs is seen through a double frame. A distance is established by this double frame positioning the Iraqi men as Other, and the American soldiers are those

who we identify with. The double frame creates a double distance that establishes focus and perspective. However, I will argue later that as this is taking effect something else is happening; the audience resists this temptation because the violence of the image is too strong.

In Morris's film, the Iraqi men on screen, who are seen in the photographs, become distant objects<sup>71</sup> (the soldiers' stories invent, create, and affect the way the narrative is constructed and told). The violence done to the Iraqi men affects the audience at a safe distance because of the double frame. The Iraqi men that are seen in the film are treated as that which we are different from. The soldiers also position the Iraqi men as that which they are different from. There is a (problematic) connection here between the audience and the soldiers that Morris wants to establish in the film. Morris wants to expose the stories that took place at the time the photographs were taken. Revealing this content however, relies on establishing a certain relation between how the Iraqi men are seen in the film and from where they are being seen, from what position. The Iraqi men become part of Morris's narrative but only as objects in relation to a subject (the soldiers). Here, the object is the Other, different from the American soldiers. The narrative is told from the soldiers' point of view. Morris structures the interviews with his questions and this constructs the way the stories are told; and because we are watching the photographs unfold through a double frame, and because we are only exposed to the soldiers' stories of what has occurred during that time in Abu-Ghraib

---

<sup>71</sup> The Iraqi men in the photographs tend to disappear into the photographic image because of how the photographs come to be used in the film, as evidence. The Iraqi men become distant objects in a photographic image that has been constructed. They become items that inform the photographic image of the picture. The Iraqi men become a characteristic to the object at hand, that tend to the photograph's value as evidence.

prison, the Iraqi men tend to not only take on the position of the object as Other but also disappear completely from the narrative.

Morris is known for pushing the boundaries in documentary film by having challenged the aesthetics associated with cinema-verité. He is known for his work in *The Thin Blue Line* (1988) that helped re-open the case of a wrongly convicted murderer, and he has interviewed one of the most controversial and influential figures in world politics, former U.S. Secretary of State Robert S. MacNamara (*The Fog of War*, 2003). Morris's *SOP*, once again, takes on a controversial topic by using the photographs from Abu-Ghraib prison to be the main focus of his new film. At first viewing I was compelled to ask whether Morris's film will change or transform the politics of the U.S. government and its position on torture when it comes to the 'war on terror'; is film active here in relation to change and change in politics today? But as I write now about the film, I am interested in linking the concept of the image to thought; and now I ask: how does this film, in its oeuvre of creative practice, produce images of thought? What do these images of thought do in relation to ethics and politics? What I mean here by politics is how do images provide incentive for creating new ideas, new images, new thought, and how does this new creative potential inspire new modes of perception in artistic practice? How do ethical relations of artistic practice form the involution of thoughts to come? Here I would like to expand on this concept of the image of thought and its relation with thought from the outside and violence.

For Morris, *SOP* has two main points; one, it attempts to shed light on the events that occurred in those photographs taken by the U.S. soldiers of Iraqi prisoners. The questions posed by Morris about the photographs are answered by the soldiers who took

the photographs—Sabrina Harman, and Lynndie England—and by the soldiers who participated in the orchestrating of events (or who just witnessed them)—Megan Ambuhl, Javal Davis, and Jeremy Sivits. Morris’s intention was to have the audience sympathize with the soldiers’ experience, and also to give the photographs a context. His main concern was to show how the media at the time the photographs were released distorted the reality of what had actually occurred at Abu-Ghraib. Morris’s second main point was to explore the issues surrounding photography itself as a medium of documentation. Morris states in an interview that he is interested in “the irony of images, and the way photography both conveys and distorts truth.”<sup>72</sup> Morris states, “These images seem to show you Abu Ghraib, but they don’t really, they show you a glimpse, but certainly not the entire place.”<sup>73</sup>

To illustrate his point on photography Morris does not shy away from showing the audience the photographs multiple times over through out the film. He states in an interview, “There’s this strange phenomenon. You look at a photograph, and you think you have a veridical piece of reality. And you see these famous photographs, these infamous photographs that came out of Abu-Ghraib and you think, ‘This is despicable, blah, blah, blah,’ and you look no further. I believe that no one did look much further.”<sup>74</sup> Morris’s investigative-style of filmmaking does indeed look further and reveal to the audience the complex nexus of power that is associated with a place like Abu-Ghraib prison. Morris explores—through the photographs taken, through the interviews conducted with the soldiers, through the intense re-enactment of scenes from the

---

<sup>72</sup> Geoffrey Macnab. “Return to Abu Ghraib.” *The Guardian*, February 19 2008. <http://film.guardian.co.uk/interview/interviewpages/0,,2257971,00.html>

<sup>73</sup> Ibid.

<sup>74</sup> Michael Meyer. “Recovering Reality: Errol Morris on Abu Ghraib.” *Columbia Journalism Review*, April 2008. [http://www.cjr.org/q\\_and\\_a/recovering\\_reality.php](http://www.cjr.org/q_and_a/recovering_reality.php)



photographs and other stories told by the soldiers—issues surrounding documentation, (in relation to photography), and power (in terms of hierarchy, knowledge, expression). This film does not stop short at the problem of photography even if Morris intended it to. Indeed, it is important to look much further and to give the photographs' context in terms of description and detail producing in-depth witness accounts by the soldiers themselves through his interviews with them, but I ask, what does this investigation do and what does it say about the image of violence Morris reproduces? What is the relation here with film and photography when it comes to presenting these violent images of the Abu-Ghraib events? What is the film doing? How does this relation between the violence presented in the photographs and the way the photographs are presented in the film create a new image of violence? It seems that the reason for looking deeper into the history behind these photographs—how they were taken, what the context was, who took the photographs, why did they take the photographs, when were the photographs taken, where exactly were they taken—is to explore the significance of photography and how it played a role in this momentous event; this became an international scandal. However, Morris' investigation raises questions that move beyond that framework of thought.

The objective of the film, for Morris, is to explore photography itself as a medium, what it does, what it can do, what it has done. However, Morris' objective diminishes another aspect of the 'photographic problem', how to deal with the violence at hand that is presented in the photographs? From here, I ask: who are we looking at in the photographs? How do you look at the Iraqi men being tortured on screen? How does the double frame establish a certain way of seeing? Who do we see? How do we see? These questions are not explored in the film. Instead, the film inspires questions that specifically

deal with the problematic of ethics as they inform aesthetics and aesthetics as they form certain ethics. What is it to create an image? What does this image do? How does it create a new aesthetic ethic and a new ethical aesthetic? Is it important to show images of graphic violence? What does this showing of graphic violence reveal? How does it change thought?

Morris ignores the Iraqi men who are in the photographs. The Iraqi victims involved in the torture and that are portrayed in the photographs are barely mentioned in the film. He re-positions the Iraqi men as Other. The exploration and investigation into the photographic apparatus is the focus of the film, but the viewer is also confronted with the victims who were involved in those photographs. It is not easy to look, but the conditions that are set up by the film, and the cinematic-site, make it so we always look. How can I (not) keep looking? How am I, as a viewer, implicated in this event that reproduces violence against the victims involved via positioning the Iraqi men as Other? How do I in turn create a distance between me and the screen so that I make it easier to look and to separate myself from this violence? How does the audience Other?

Morris states,

It's taking a photograph and providing context for it any way you can. Talking to the people who took the photographs. There are literally thousands upon thousands of Abu Ghraib photographs; you can just spread them out on a table in a big pile. Then it's a matter of recovering a narrative from that big pile—ordering the photographs, contextualizing the photographs, trying to understand what they are photographs of.<sup>75</sup>

Morris does indeed weave a narrative but he never takes into consideration that this is his own constructed narrative. He provides screen space and time for the soldiers and allows for their narrative to take place in the film. Morris, in many of his interviews,

---

<sup>75</sup> Errol Morris. "The Most Curious Thing." May 19 2008. <http://morris.blogs.nytimes.com/tag/abu-ghraib/>.

fails to take responsibility for his own work and fails explore the film's ethical problems in terms of how the photographs were used in the making of his work. In retrospect, the film presents a lot more issues and problems than just the question of photography he wanted to explore. In this way, the film produces a different kind of political atmosphere than originally intended. It inspires the audience to ask, to demand more than what Morris intended on giving. It creates openings.

I ask: how can Morris make a film about the torture of Iraqis without ever once mentioning them, naming them, involving them in the story/narrative he invents? Morris focuses on the photographs themselves as objects of investigation. This almost becomes impossible considering the amount of violent photographs the audience is made to look at; our attention shifts once confronted with the violence. This creates openings throughout the film. These openings (or tweaks) within the film create the potential for the viewer to resist the image she is forced to see. I soon begin to realise that the film is not about the torture of Iraqi men. This causes a new kind of resistance, a different kind of opening to thought.

Morris creates a distance through the double frame and by focusing only on the soldiers' stories. Yet this does not alleviate from the violence of the photographs, which continues to be felt intensely in the watching. Morris underestimates the affective impact the violence in the photographs would have on the audience. This violence provides an uneasiness that shifts the audience's perspective away from the stories being told and into the impossibility of looking again. The audience finds itself in a position to resist even while it finds itself giving in, looking again. What do we see when we look at the photographs? We see the bodies of Iraqi men. We see Iraqi men being tortured multiple

times over. Morris's film creates a cinematic tension between how the photographs are seen in the film—through the soldier's eyes—and the audience's own affective reactions to the photographs. At the same, the film's main question, did what we think happened happen, forms a way of participating in the growing relation between the site of the audience as an affective grouping within the cinematic space and the photographs presented to them. This relation establishes a complex intermixing between what is seen as object and what is seen as subject: a cinematic problem.

Morris wants the audience to feel how it felt for the soldiers being there and does not take into account the other bodies seen in the photographs, the bodies of Iraqi men being tortured. The Iraqi men are never talked about. This gap creates an opening that destabilizes the initial effect of the filmic image as it unfolds in time. Strangely, what Morris can ignore (the torture of Iraqis) is exactly what draws us in and makes us recoil. We see another film; the affective confusion of experiencing what we should not be seeing. The film's affective engagement with the violence shown creates a destabilizing effect. The object-subject relation shifts and is constantly shifting because the audience is watching this film from multiple positions. The violent intensity creates a body that is becoming more-than; that is in excess of itself; it is a body that is always in resistance. In this way, the object-subject relation becomes more complex and indiscernible; the relation changes each time the image shifts. The body without organs is always a *becoming* body without organs.

Morris is correct when he states that the film is apolitical, but not in the way he announces it. His film is apolitical because it doesn't dare to ask dangerous questions. It keeps away from asking dangerous questions because the film re-constitutes images of

war within the politics of the already constituted 'war on terror'. The complex politics of occupation, torture, war, and the treatment of Iraqis in Iraq by U.S. soldiers were completely ignored by Morris. He maintains his focus on whether photography exposes the "truth" or covers it up. Using the horror genre that informs his aesthetics he, again, deters from any political<sup>76</sup> engagement with the photographs being shown. The use of these aesthetics is to initiate fear. Morris creates an atmosphere of fear in the film. Here, the documentary genre plays into the politics of this fear. For example, during one of the interviews the frame cuts into a re-enactment scene. In one shot we see a soldier speaking of an event that occurred with one of the Iraqi men where a live dog was brought close to the Iraqi man's face. The dog was barking uncontrollably and the Iraqi man was masked, he had a hood over his face so he could not see that the dog was on a leash being held back by another soldier. This is a known tactic used in torture during incarceration by military intelligence officers. The story is already full of violence and horror, and yet Morris uses the technique of re-enactment to propel the horror further. The re-enactment is of an army dog barking uncontrollably and loudly. The point of view of the camera is of a close up on the dog's head as it barks. We see the dog from a low angle shot, as the Iraqi man would have seen it, or not seen it but felt it because he was masked. The bark of the dog is loud and offensive. Sound effects are used to heighten the noise and the effect of the dog and its bark. The camera gets closer and we see the dog's fangs and

---

<sup>76</sup> The film is sensationalist, and by this I mean it is leading you somewhere in terms of how one should feel when watching the film. The film guides the viewer in terms of how to think. In this way I would state that its politics is of an apolitical kind. The audience is captivated by the horror that affects the image with fear. What the audience instantly feels is shock and fear; at first instant we are drawn into a cinematic atmosphere where there is no openness for new thought, but because of the shock and fear element presented in the photographs and played with through the aesthetics of the film an openness is created, an escape.

saliva protrude out of its mouth. This is a violent and an intimidating sequence that creates horror in the image which, in effect, becomes fear.

Phil Arthur states, "We aren't prompted to contemplate the Iraq Occupation's signature scandal as the product of a mercenary chain of executive decisions, cultural attitudes, venalities, and personal pathologies; we are, as it were, let off the hook. It's only a movie."<sup>77</sup> As is exemplified well by the horror film, one experiences fear in this context as a source for entertainment, it is only a movie. Morris only deals with, or thinks that he is only dealing with, the 'problem' of photography, as he also entertains, creating the constraints for the production of fear in the process. Fear is distancing; especially fear of becoming-other. The subjects at hand in this case study are the soldiers involved, the ones we can identify with, the ones who took the pictures and invented the scenarios of torture. Morris strongly outlines this relation between who is the object and who is the subject of the film's narrative; the subject speaks about the object that is presented to them as evidence against them. The photographs are the objects of study; the soldiers become the subjects of the film, however, this tends to shift at times depending on the audience and how they perceive the images before them. As the audience, we find out who took what photographs and what happened outside the frame of those photographs; it becomes a straight forward investigation and analysis. However, the film does have openings that give potential to new thought and this is because the audience is confronted by a violence without a context. The photographs are examined and analysed only in relation to the moment they were taken. Morris does not put the photographs into the context of the 'war on terror.' This both creates an opening to thought and makes the experience violent. The experience of watching a documentary film that is also a horror

---

<sup>77</sup>Paul Arthur. "The Horror." *Artforum*. April 2008. <http://arforum.com/imprint/id=19738>.

film raises some questions concerning the seeing, looking, participating, and experiencing the images at hand. The audience is made to look through a specific lens. Also, this raises some concerns about the politics and ethics involved in making a film about these photographs. The object-subject relation becomes more complex because of the audience's own participation in how it affects the image and how they become affected. In this sense, the film is political. It asks us to ask. The film is political when its violence affects us, when it alters what a body can do. Cinematic bodies move affectively with the watching, unfolding in time and space. This processual unfolding of time and space envelops me in an intensive violence; a violence that leads me to the unknown of thought felt.

The Iraqi men are ignored in Morris's narrative but they are also incredibly present in the photographs as a force of immediate intensity: we are made to see their bodies—naked, mutilated, bloody, and dirty, in humiliating positions— multiple times over. Because of this direct violence done to the Iraqi men, the film inspires the following questions that are raised in accordance with issues surrounding the relation between ethics and aesthetics: How does an image become political? How do we approach the politics of ethics and aesthetics when it comes to creating an image? How does the image speak to cinema? How does *SOP* transform the politics of the image? Is this film a dangerous film?

Giorgio Agamben writes, "What the State cannot tolerate in any way[...] is that the singularities form a community without affirming an identity, that humans co-belong without any representable condition of belonging (even in the form of a simple presupposition)" (1993: 86). An audience in the cinema become a coming community.

This is a community established by singularities with no condition of belonging. Morris's *SOP* is a dangerous film and at the same time it is not. *SOP* is a dangerous film because it draws the audience in to look onto an Other. The audience is offered a viewing position. At the same time the film is not dangerous because of this very viewing position. The film makes the connections for the audience. It leads them to see a certain way (the Iraqi as Other, the American soldiers as subjects of life), to feel a certain way (fear), and to even think a certain way (to sympathize with the soldiers). Morris's film does articulate a moral message but this has nothing to do with whether what the soldiers did was right or wrong. Morris's film creates a specific American narrative where the subject is given power to give life<sup>78</sup>, again (outside of the actual war on terror, re-implementing this power through affect). The soldiers play the role of the American subject. The film situates the audience to believe in the ultimate American subject, in the soldiers who are fighting for the 'war on terror'. The question Morris is asking is: could these American soldiers commit such crimes that go against "our" American values? Morris wants to re-situate these subjects in the context of how the photographs were taken. Morris's film is about re-articulating the importance of America's position as the ultimate subject of the "war on terror", as subjects who give life. Positioning the audience in relation to the American soldiers, as those who Other and give life, is what becomes dangerous in the film because of how the violence is felt affectively. Morris's film draws the audience in to sympathize with the soldiers, themselves as subjects of power, through how the photographs come to be seen in the film. In this context, Morris situates the soldiers as

---

<sup>78</sup> In this paper, power is what affects and what is affected by other forces. In Morris's film the subject (soldiers' testimony or stories) affects the image with a narrative that upholds American subjectivity over the Iraqi people. The way that Morris builds the narrative of the film is through how the Iraqi people become the objects that form the subjects of life into how the Americans take space and make time.



subjects of power; and this affects the image with another intense violence. In this case, *SOP* is dangerous because the audience is drawn in affectively through the violence in the photographs that they are exposed to without ever having the ground for that affect worked out for them. The audience is left to its own devices feeling more than it can fathom; but along side the soldiers' narrative.

The audience cannot be identified as such: it is a temporary community without any pre-condition of belonging. Morris forms the audience's identity through his filmic strategies. The audience becomes part of the reproduction and re-articulation of who again becomes the subject of this story. The violence done against Iraqi men in the photographs is completely dismissed. As the audience forms around this realization, something else begins to appear: what is at stake is that torture, physical harm and abuse was used against Iraqi men by Americans, and that the international community saw them doing it, saw Americans do this. At an affective level, we begin to realize that the Iraqi men are not worth watching. They are not our concern. Our concern is with the American soldiers. This is the affective violence of Morris's film. The audience become implicated in a discourse that is violently affective and, as such, completely unresolved. This violent discourse re-creates racist images of Iraqis, of Arabs, and of non-American bodies. The subject-object position in the film re-constitutes racist politics through its Othering of Iraqi men. These are bodies who don't speak, and whose pain and suffering is made only to be looked at, and only in the context of America's self-justification of its 'war on terror.'

In this way, the becoming-communities of the audience carry potential for resistance. A film like Morris's *SOP* allows for a resistance to begin to be felt. This

beginning to be felt is the affective tonality that reverberates not in the film itself, but in its collective enunciation—its watching. Different intensive forces are coming into relation with each other providing openings onto which resistance has potential for moving toward thought.

## Conclusion: How Does Cinema Activate Thought?

*Unwinding.* Cinema can activate change in many different kinds of ways. It depends on how it affects; how its forces are felt. There is magic when image and sound come together to produce something new. David Gordon Green is a filmmaker who does this well. His use of sound unrolls the potential of an image already felt before it is seen: for example, in the beginning of *George Washington* (2000) we feel right away the sound as it comes-to with the shot, beginning to appear before us on screen from the darkness but not knowing what came first the *feltness* of sound or the appearance of the image, and then instantly a sound- image; something else is felt. This sound-image instigates an image of thought never seen before, never felt before, never thought before. Something new appears in the world. A new felt thought from how an image affects.

*A belief in the world* is when something in the world forces us to think the unthinkable<sup>79</sup>. The trajectory changes in how we are used to walking in the world. Something shifts. We trip-up. Godard does this with his intercutting of the different images of the Palestinian resistance with different speech-acts in *Ici et ailleurs* (1976), in the ways he works with revolution-becoming-image. Bergman does this with colour and space in *Fanny and Alexander* (1982), exploring how movement forms space creating apparitions. We are faced with something imperceptible in thought, in movement, in image, in the world. Félix Guattari writes,

The new aesthetic paradigm has ethico-political implications because to speak of creation is to speak of the responsibilities of the creative instance with regard to the thing created, inflection of the state of things, bifurcation beyond pre-

---

<sup>79</sup> Gilles Deleuze. *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*. Trans. H. Tomlinson and R. Galeta. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP. 1989.168.

established schemas, once again taking into account the fate of alterity in its extreme modalities. But this ethical choice no longer emanates from a transcendent enunciation, a code of law or a unique and all-powerful god. The genesis of enunciation is itself caught up in the movement of processual creation (1995: 107).

*To experiment.* How do we experiment? In this thesis I wanted to experiment with the practice of writing. What kind of techniques in writing could I create that would propel new thought in cinema? How would I engage with cinematic enunciations that would produce new political enunciations in how to think anew political resistance? How does cinema become for thought? How does cinema become for politics? What happens to cinema when cinema is no longer strictly about film-as-narrative but about perception, movement, force?

Thinking cinematically opens up potential for how to think change in the world. The cinematic can be a way of experimenting with the potential of what is not yet perception/image, what is not yet thought, what is not yet a force; this is the outside of thought, the unthinkable in thought. Deleuze states,

Maurice Blanchot was able to give the fundamental question of what makes us think, what forces us to think, back to Artaud: what forces us to think is the 'inpower [impouvoir] of thought', the figure of nothingness, the inexistence of a whole which could be thought. What Blanchot diagnoses everywhere in literature is particularly clear in cinema: on the one hand the presence of an unthinkable in thought, which would be both its source and barrier; on the other hand the presence to infinity of another thinker in the thinker, who shatters every monologue of a thinking self. It is true that bad cinema (and sometimes good) limits itself to a dream state induced in the viewer, or – as has been the subject of frequent analysis—to an imaginary participation. But the essence of cinema—which is not the majority of films—has thought as its higher purpose, nothing but thought and its functioning (1989: 168).

If the essence of cinema is thought and its functioning then how does thought function in cinema? This is the question that has formed my exploration in writing about

cinema. This exploration of thought has led to me to new questions concerning the biopolitics of resistance. My thesis ends with an exploration of micropolitical acts of cinematic experience; techniques provoking political thought. The shift to questions of the biopolitical opens up potential to engage with a new political paradigm: what I call cinematic politics. What is cinema's role in how perception functions beyond film? How do cinematic images create images of war, images of fear, images of power? How do these images reinstate racism? How do they affect how we move in the world? How do art and activism challenge these images? How do these images challenge art and activism? What kind of images are these and how do they affect today's politics? How do they function in the way we think, see, feel the 'war on terror' as it unfolds?

Cinematic politics offers a new vocabulary for how to think change and resistance. If we think cinematic politics in relation to affect, movement, force, something happens in our approach to thought. There is potential to activate thought from the outside. How do we think from the outside? How do we create from the outside of thought? How do we show politics to be the invisibility of the visible as invisible<sup>80</sup>? What happens to politics then? How does resistance change?

---

<sup>80</sup> Foucault, Michel. *Maurice Blanchot: The Thought from the Outside*. Trans. Brian Massumi. New York: Zone Books, 1987.24.

## Bibliography:

- Agamben, Giorgio. *The Coming Community*. Trans. Michael Hardt. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1993.
- Dabashi, Hamid, ed. *Dreams of a Nation: On Palestinian Cinema*. New York: Verso, 2006.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy*. Trans. Robert Hurley. San Francisco: City Lights Books, 1988a.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Bergsonism*. Trans. H. Tomlinson and B. Habberjam. New York: Zone Books, 1988b.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Foucault*. Trans. Seán Hand. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1988c.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza*. Trans. M. Joughin. New York: Zone Books, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Difference and Repetition*. Trans. Paul Patton. New York: Columbia UP, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Negotiations, 1972-1990*. Trans. M. Joughin. New York: Columbia UP, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation*. Trans. Daniel Smith. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 2003.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *What is Philosophy?* Trans. H. Tomlinson and G. Burchell. New York: Columbia UP, 1994.
- Guattari, Félix. *Chaosmosis: An Ethico-Aesthetic Paradigm*. Trans. P. Bains and J. Pefanis. Indianapolis: Indiana UP, 1995.

Foucault, Michel. *Maurice Blanchot: The Thought from the Outside*. Trans. Brian Massumi. New York: Zone Books, 1987.

Kristeva, Julia. *Revolt, She Said*. Trans. Brian O'Keefe; ed. Sylvère Lotringer. Cambridge, Mass; London: Semiotext(e), 2002.

Erin Manning. *Relationescapes: Movement, Art, Philosophy*. Massachusetts: MIT Press, (in press).

\_\_\_\_\_. *Politics of Touch: Sense, Movement, Sovereignty*. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Ephemeral Territories: Representing Nation, Home, and Identity in Canada*. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 2003.

Massumi, Brian. *Parables of the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation*. Durham, NC; Duke UP, 2002a.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Introduction: Like a Thought." in *A Shock to Thought: Expressions after Deleuze and Guattari*. ed. Brian Massumi. London; New York: Routledge, 2002b.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Thinking-Feeling of What Happens." in *Interact or Die!* Eds. J. Brouwer and A. Mulder. Rotterdam: V2\_Publishing-NAi Uitgevers, 2007.

Walsh, Martin. *The Brechtian Aspect of Radical Cinema*. Ed. Keith Griffiths. London: BFI Press, 1981.

## Filmography:

Day Night Day Night. Dir. Julia Loktev. Perf. Luisa Williams. IFC Entertainment, 2006.

Divine Intervention. Dir. Elia Suleiman. Perf. Elia Suleiman. Arab Film Distribution (USA), 2000.

Standard Operating Procedure. Dir. Errol Morris. Sony Film Classics, 2008.