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Abstract

Japanese cinemas that were produced under the umbrella term of New Wave marked a new regime of images that resonated with the political frustration of the student activists of the 1950s and 1960s. This thesis is a detailed exploration of the relationships between the cinematic form and narrative, and political representations of this time frame, and an appeal to the thinking power of cinema to look at the historical problematics of political and media representations of the Japanese student movements.
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“When he cannot think the unthinkable, he looks it into thinkability.”¹

“The body is no longer the obstacle that separates thought from itself, that which is has to overcome to reach thinking. It is on the contrary that which it plunges into or plunge into, in order to reach the unthought, that is life… [the body] forces us to think, and forces what is concealed from thought, life.”²

0. Introduction

In the opening sequence of Double Suicide (1969), the puppet master puts on his mask to prepare for the Bunraku play. The profile of his face is depicted by the camera in such way that his eyes pierce through the darkness imposed by black veil, staring intently at his puppet, Koharu, with an uncannily remarkable compassion, but his body that controls her according to the script will soon drive her into her ultimate death…

“What is cinema?” is in fact a question that is asking ‘what does the cinema theorize and how does it dream the dream that we ourselves are incapable of realizing?’ The duration of cinema differs from that of ours: in watching or making cinema, an unpredictable intrusion of temporality sometimes appears before us in the moving images flashing in front of us. The desire for the unpredictable flashes on the screen. This desire is constituted by that which is between the screen and us, and it demands for us the unrepresentable and even the unpredictable when the

situation we exist in becomes too unbearable. In this thesis, I look at the violent legacy of the Japanese student movements and its relations to cinema. Through a close look at the form of cinema, I will sketch a cinematic look that is free from the physical body that often is determined by the forces of geo-political discourses. In the present capitalist geo-political configuration, the real violence is not applied by the police batons but the relentless assaults of the frustration of the body on itself, so much so that the body does not accept its own capacity to act or think.

We look at three characters whose desire for the unpredictable is also too unbearable for them: one in Ozu, in the Post War era, Noriko, portrayed by Hara Setsuko, and two in the New Wave project, Jihei in *Double Suicide* (1969) and Motoki in *The Man who Left his Will on Film* (1970). I will argue that these characters are the synthesis of film form and history and that their desires are that of the look that has become astray. This is the look that notices its own incapacity: an impower. What is being theorized here by the impower of the filmmakers and the characters? How does the look of the filmmaker differ from that of his characters and what links these looks together? Perhaps it is an imminent moment of transformative possibility, because the film itself does not offer this moment but its imminent possibility, its visibility in an invisible form, presence in an absent form, and a voice submerged by background noise. I analyse these films intimately in an attempt to sketch out a way to examine that formal strategies in the Japanese New Wave project first appear as cinematic experiments but in fact are a desperate attempt to think the historical condition that is too powerful and unbearable. The senory-motor helplessness we experience in these film is quite literally the helplessness we experience
elsewhere. In short, I will argue that it is not the recording function of cinema that links the cinematic to history but this simple but often overlooked fact: cinema theorizes the form of a desire for the absolutely unpredictable within the film form. I therefore sketch here an image that is, precisely speaking, not an image: a leaking-image. It is the way in which history leaks directly into the film form, and the force of such leakage is so powerful that even narratives of the story – or vulgarly, the content of cinema – are relegated to passive roles. The narrative movement is driven by the interaction between film form and history, instead of the story itself.

This brings us to the notion of formal experimentations, and its relationships with realist politics. Oshima Nagisa’s experiments with film form, narratives and problematics of subjectivity crystalize into a testament of his status as a challenging thinker in Japanese and world cinema. In Death by Hanging (1968), for example, the filmmaker points to this unbearable frustration with history: “R was always already predetermined to commit [the crime].”3 Within the socio-economic configuration, the Zainichi-Korean body as a cultural construct is always already contained within it a narrative that ensures the racial, sexual and historical category of this body will be constructed a certain way in various forms of manifestations in the realm of representation. His ‘role’ has already been ‘written’. To problematize such an innate failure in representation, Oshima challenges the representation of the Japanese body through bold

---

experimentations with film forms. This marks a commonality in the New Wave project where the cinematic apparatus, the prime tool of representation, is compelled to represent unrepresentable, incommensurate with its own logic of production as a bourgeois commodity and marketability. An escape, if such thing is even possible, seems to be for the character to exist on a level beyond narratives projected by the film form. The protagonist in the experimental film about the student movements in the 1960s, *The Man who Left His Will on Film* (1970), propelled by his body’s movement across landscape, exists precisely in a zone beyond narratives. Oshima turns Motoki into cinema itself in the context of the difference between film as bringing history into the inside of the body, which is his usual thematic approach to film, and film as confrontation to reality and history, which is the film form and strategy that are associated with him and his New Wave contemporaries. Film form itself and cinema as an apparatus become the Oshimian political allegory of the historical forces clashing into each other, and in a film about political filmmaking, the fact that the protagonist’s phenomenological body is at once the film medium adds to the staggering complexity in Oshima’s independent production.

Part one appeals to Shinoda Masahiro’s 1969 formal experiment, *Double Suicide*, an adaptation of Chikamatsu Monzaemon’s famous *Bunraku* play, to sketch out some basic properties of cinema and the process in which in retelling a story the film medium reveals that film form interacts with narratives through an inevitable injecting of meanings of the original work. What could the cinematic possibly mean beyond formal experiment? How does the film form deal with a historical play and how does it open up new possibilities in the reading a
historical work? What is added to the story in formal intervention in experimenting with the film form, or metaphorical speaking, is there a ‘story-telling’ function in the film form? Can there be a filmic character that exists beyond film? These seemingly broader questions regarding aesthetics appear on film as *mise en scene*, the battle ground of looks and gazes in the creative process of an artist.

In part 2 and 3, I therefore suggest that *mise en scene* originated from the filmmaker’s frustration in his encounter with the cinematic apparatus; cinematic *mise en scene* is in fact the look arises out of the frustration of the everyday life of an artist. More importantly, is there a difference between the artist’s frustration with the medium of creativity and the frustration in the everyday and political space? Is there, consequently, an absolute discontinuity between cinematic and political *mise en scene*? What seems like purely a struggle with aesthetics in part one will seem more and more like a struggle with both political and everyday life as we progress. Part two continues to tread the path of meta-cinema by arguing that the story added by the form to the original story is a direct and formal intervention of the disquiet of history and the multiplicity of time. The historical leaks into film form by means the filmmaker’s frustration and its creative manifestation actualized in the process of filmmaking. Like Shinoda’s meta-fictional treatment of *Double Suicide*, Oshima’s films synthesize the creative frustration of an artist into the film form and the inconsistent narrative structure. In Oshima, multiple incompeassible temporalities and political bodies are pounded into one production, or, one duration of time. It is therefore important to appeal to Gilles Deleuze’s concept of time-image, a direct representation
of time in both cinema and the body’s ability of think. Through Hara Setsuko’s famous character and various objects in the film, I sketch a way in which the film form directly affects how the body is depicted on film, regardless of the demand of the story. In this intrusion of time and history into the narratives and story, there is a dream-image that escapes the level of narratives, and appears in the cinematic body. Working within this context, part three tracks the problems in political representations that the student activists faced in the larger geo-political context propelled by effects of the American foreign policy and the hegemony in the Far-East and its manifestations in the disagreements between various political parties and the student activists, and the violence that appeared not only in actual protests but also in the everyday life. I stress that there does not need to be a discontinuity between the disagreements in the larger political context, for example between the JCP and the Zengakuren, and that of the smaller everyday context, the dispute in political theories and aesthetics between the students. Oshima’s *The Man* reveals a possibility to trespass this discontinuity and therefore projects a new mode of looking and a new mode of thinking, with the help of cinema and its construction of the body.

**0.1 The Cinematic Body**

We should clarify what cinematic body means in our context. In *Atomic Light (Shadow Optics)*, Akira Lippit concerns with post-war cinema, more precisely, films of the wounded bodies after the atomic atrocities. The book organizes the films discussed around the notions of visibility, invisibility and *aviduality*. The author begins with not cinema itself but the act of
archiving: be it official history or the cinematic productions, it is in itself an active destruction of that which is being archived. Making something visible is therefore rendering something (else) invisible, and that which is rendered invisible by the cinematic assemblage of images may still be discovered within the circuitry of cinema and body. The imperceptible shapes the film forms as much as it is rendered into the perceptible by the film forms. Therefore, the encountering between cinema and the body – the act of looking and sensing the image, sound and vibration - goes deeper than spectator as conscious perception. Various cinematic surfaces interact phenomenologically and ontologically with the body, forming a "phantasmatic geography of the subject, [stretching] across the metaphysical surface."4

Lippit’s ideas identify an important potential of cinema. For instance, the atomic victims’ bodies can be further understood through the various cinematic surfaces and the phenomenological existences constructed by narratives, beyond the national subject. This will also be my central point in part three of this paper, that the body can exist beyond the constrains of the geo-political configuration through cinema. The body’s suffering is not so much as depicted or recorded on film and by the narrative of the story, but has simultaneous movements alongside the moving image and the production of it. As a medium of visuality, cinema must be considered as a mode of avisuality – an order of sensual oscillation between the unseen and yet

---

to-be-seen, sprinting from a direct transposition of interiority and materiality of the outside. As Lippit writes:

    avisuality not as a form of invisibility, in the sense of an absent or negated visibility: not as the antithesis of the visible of as a specific mode of impossible, unimaginable visuality (emphasis added)…it determines an experience of seeing, a sense of the visual, without ever offering an image. [It is a] visuality without images, an unimaginable visuality, and images without visuality, avisuality.⁵

    Cinematic assemblage of images thus also offers the body that which is impossible to represent and that which is still in the unthought – a cinematic dreaming/fantasizing of the impossible - and therefore exceeds both the author and the audience at a singular juncture of time, their bodies’ being-here-and-now. The potentiality of pure optic and sonic senses, for me, exceeds intentionality of the author, authorship, and the subject matter – a notion which will be discussed in detail in part two. Deleuze says in the last page of Cinema 2 that “[a] theory of cinema is not ‘about’ cinema, but about the concepts that cinema gives rise to and which are themselves related to other concepts corresponding to other practices, the practice of concepts in general having no privilege over others, any more than one object has over others. It is at the level of the interference of many practices that things happen, beings, images, concepts, all the

⁵ Ibid, 32.
kinds of events.” My contention is that the engagement with cinema – from ‘merely watching’ (consuming) to ‘intellectual activity’ (interpreting) – ought to aim for an allowance to harness the potential power of thinking non-linearly. As I will explain in part three, viewing Oshima’s film this way will allow a fabulous insight to appear: the desire for the unpredictable is not the same as a desire for revolution. It is in fact a mode of looking that stays with the frustration that springs from the encountering with the unbearable. It is a possibility of the paradoxical actualizations of the unbearable frustration as the body’s actions by accepting the cinematic, by accepting another temporality of thinking that is disjoined from the body.

\footnotesize{Deleuze, 280.}
1. A Disruptive Synthesis: Basic Cinematic Properties as Engaged by Formalist Interventions

…there are certain subjects within that world which may be termed “cinematic” because they seem to exert a peculiar attraction on the [cinema]. It is as if the medium were predestined (and eager) to exhibit them.⁷

Masahiro Shinoda’s 1969 *Double Suicide*, adapted from Chikamatsu Monzaemon’s 1720 puppet play, *Shinju Ten no Amijima*, is an appropriation of the various mediums that have adapted the play, incorporating multiple levels of narratives from different mediums – namely, abstract painting, puppet theatre, and elements of kabuki, modern theatre and various stage elements. Each of these mediums is allowed to have a thread of narrative within the film, supplementing and influencing one another. Shinoda’s New Wave masterpiece can therefore be seen as a form of disruptive synthesis of these levels of narratives and an explicit cinematic analysis of the theatrical form of bunraku. In the following pages, I will explore the effect of one level of narratives has on another, and the narrative possibilities opened up by Shinoda’s treatment of mediums. Specifically, I suggest that the director’s deconstructive mode of adapting allows him to foreground the aesthetic strategies and the artifices of the cinematic apparatus. Furthermore, I will read the protagonist, Jihei, as a character of the radical student movements in

the context of sensory-motor helplessness within a historical condition that is too unbearable. As I will argue, the protagonist leaps out of the story within the process of the adaptation, and despite the fact that he will fail to realize a true alternative possibility, it is important to see what the cinematic form is able to flash a new possibility to both the audience and him. His failure will come to haunt us in the detail discussion of Oshima and the student movements. For now, I will tackle the self-reflexive mode of adaptation – the filmic analysis of the bunraku form and the film form – and how it becomes part of the story itself, giving us new possibility to think the image of the past, present and future. Through Shinoda’s film, we will see that cinema is first and foremost the medium of time, and that its optical capacity that captures material reality takes secondary importance to the image of time that flashes its presence.

Chikamatsu’s Amijima, widely considered one of the playwright’s best love-suicide plays, tells the story of the paper merchant, Jihei, and his fatalistic pursuit of the famous prostitute, Koharu. The story ends with the incompetent merchant and the prostitute committing lovers’ double suicide, a theme that is not uncommon in traditional Japanese theatre in the Edo period. Chikamatsu wrote this specific play for the Bunraku puppet theatre, but it was not uncommon for Kabuki and other media of performance to borrow from each other at the time – an intertextual process which Shinoda tries to incorporate into his adaptation. Vital to the story is Jihei’s wife, Osan, played by the same actress who portraits Koharu, Iwashita Shima, the director’s wife. The narrative trope, a double-suicide, usually occurs when the characters
involved lost what constitutes their subjectivities within the socio-economical paradigm – that is, when they have lost both the material means to sustain their lives and social status. The very first dialogue between Koharu and Jihei informs the audience that the merchant lacks the economic means to redeem the prostitute, and therefore the consummation of their love is deferred into the infinite future. Pointing to an impossibility, the time of this deferral is marked by the written promises from Jihei. Narratologically speaking, time is marked by the signs of money, or the lack thereof, and the imminent and inevitable destination of future seems to be a lover’s suicide. The drive of the narrative is money and its end is death.

1.1 The Synthesis of Mediums (by the Cinema):

Besides what is in the story, significant elements of the story are time and how time is experienced through the domestic space, public space, and the landscape through which the lovers traverse to their final destination of death. This theme of the narrative is pertinent to the nature of the cinematic apparatus. For cinema is a duration which allows the constitutional process of continuity of the movement to ‘take place’; if there is to be physical movements on film, there is usually an accompanying conceptual space. This conceptual space need not be a real location: in this film the first two acts are shot on experimental stages, incorporating elements from abstract painting/calligraphy, puppet theatre, and modern theatre. Careful attention must be paid to how Osan, Jihei’s wife, is depicted by this cinematic synthesis of multiple mediums. Osan is the backbone of Jihei’s family, and her on-screen presence, her
figure, is often superimposed onto the background paintings and the theatrical stage, forming a symbolic and pictorial whole: the architectural space of Jihei’s home is marked with the two large paint strokes signifying the ceiling beams or lintels, while a post of the theatrical stage represents a real supporting structure of the house. Osan is seen constantly moving underneath this large horizontal stroke (the ceiling beam) – in other words, without her figure acting as part of the structural integrity of the architecture, the house crumples. In fact, when she starts to move, the static film camera reveals the leaking of ink from the large paint stroke, indexing a post, dripping down the wall. In short, her dramatic presence on film weaves the mediums of abstract painting, bunraku, theatrical space, and cinematic mise en scène into a whole that showcases the nature of cinema itself.

Cinema is a temporary destination of the momentum generated by the encounter of an individual will of projecting a consciousness, and the technical properties of the cinematic apparatus. The production of cinema, the very process of assembling images, constitutes itself as a kind of liminal space where regimes of images are dissolved into new forms of thoughts. In the context of this film, Shinoda’s insistence of letting the images of the narrative possibilities of other mediums pass through this film is not uncommon among his New Wave comrades. The consensus of the New Wave movement in Japan is that what needs to be brought to space contemplation is the “processes by which film is made.” The intended effect is “to draw attention of aesthetic strategies to foreground the fact that film is something that is shaped by its material
conditions, something that is meticulously organized around aesthetic choices.” What the New Wave filmmakers set out to tackle was what Kracauer calls “blind spots of the mind,” which the new cinema functions to render it visible. The significance of Shinoda’s treatment therefore lies not merely in the synthesis of multiple mediums but also its deconstruction of this process of synthesis.

Furthermore, “[cinema] insists on rendering visible what is commonly drowned in inner agitation”.

This is a film about cinema and its great conflicts with various other mediums; this film only exists insofar as the dialectical friction between the mediums – script (writing), puppet play (motions of mechanism), Kabuki (motions of bodies), modern theatre (motions of bodies and thought), and cinema – is incorporated into the production. The multiple layers of forms are transformed as the content, the story, of this cinematic production. Cinematic apparatus has the ability to convey themes of everyday life through props and mise en scene: the objects exist as themselves, waiting to be captured on film. This effect of the mise en scene melts with the properties of Chikamatsu’s stylistic choices of writing: the employment of straightforward dialogue, and the sense of actual speech in his play. The mise en scene of Double Suicide – the arrangement of shot composition, sets, props, actors, costumes, and lighting – must struggle to

---

9 Kracauer, 53.
10 Cazdyn, 58.
accommodate the sometimes disruptive synthesis; it maneuverers through not only the actual space of the set but also the conceptual spaces formed by other mediums of story-telling injected into the cinematic narratives. This struggle in film form acts as a means of narration, “contributing a kind of cinematic commentary or description, inscribing into the scene significance that goes beyond the in articulate conscious of characters.”\textsuperscript{12} For Laura Mulvey, this is a kind of “extra-diegetic mode of address.” That is, the synthesis of the mediums through a self-reflective mode of cinematic production “[reaches] out to the spectator who is prepared to find meaning through cinematic style.”\textsuperscript{13} In this context, this is how the style and theme of the original writing is first appropriated by Shinoda’s \textit{mise en scene}.

\textbf{1.2 The End of Act II: the Destructive Interval}

The film consists of three acts: act I and II set in the pleasure district and Jihei household respectively, and act III is the lovers’ journey toward the site of double suicide mentioned in the telephone conversation between the director and the screen writer – it is the only location shooting in the film. Crucial to my discussion of the film is the transition between act II and III: the interval between possibility of life and certainty of death. The entirety of act II takes place in the paper merchant’s household/store, where the cinematic stage makes no effort in distinguishing the public and the private as both the store front and the living quarters are


\textsuperscript{13} Ibid, 147.
incorporated into one stage space optimized for the camera. The nature of the *mise en scene* of this film akin to art house film in that it serves conceptualization on the meta-film level rather than classical verisimilitude. The household/storefront is constructed as a stage of a modern play: the floor panels are made of not tatami mats but abstract calligraphies and painting by the famed calligrapher, Shinoda Toko, walls are represented by folding screens, and some integral structures of the house are indexed by paintings or figures of a character or the puppeteers. The filmmakers also make no effort in concealing the electric cables for props – the fiction film is turned inside out as the means of productions becomes props of the narratives. Within such a (meta-)filmic space, the narrative makes clear Jihei’s situation. Jihei is caught inside a complex web of tradition, interpersonal and intrapersonal relationships, *ninjo* and *giri*, while his obsession with the prostitute has crumpled his paper business and the relationships to his family. Upon realizing Jihei’s transgression, his father-in-law takes away his family and the dowry, effectively strips away any financial means and possibility of recuperation. Death is imminent and certain. On this stage, Jihei stands dejected as his wife begs him to act while the menacing black figures of puppeteers stand by around the house, acting as part of the pictorial whole of the structure of the house. Significantly, an abrupt cut to a medium shot depicting the head puppeteer, whose face is visible, and the two children, reveals that the protagonist is being closely examined by other characters of the film level, including the head puppeteer as a filmic character. Depicted in a high angle shot incorporating Jihei’s figure and the abstract paint brushes, he lets out a devastating cry, and the puppeteers surround him in an attempt to calm his anger. They soon
submit to the desperate emotive state of their puppet and knee down. The performance here is staggering for the theatrical movements of the puppeteers convey not the narrative need of the story but the meta-fictional disruptive synthesis conducted by the Shinoda and Takemitsu Toru, the veteran composer of the New Wave cinema. The sensationaly jarring sound track and effects by Takemitsu are just as invasive as the film form itself. Sound effect and soundtrack are usually indistinguishable in *Double Suicide*, as what is usually putative diegetic sounds are indexed by Takemitsu’s modernist aesthetic. The soundtrack marks not only the changing turbulence of the interiority of the characters but also affects the viewer directly: Jihei moves on to destroy various props and the stage itself. In a pan shot, he rushes from left to right and throws his papers into the air. These simultaneous violent motions of camera, human actor, and papers are met with a sudden freeze frame, and the diegetic sound is silenced by Takemitsu’s haunting music. Motions are met with immobility. Cinema encounters photography. Voice becomes noise. ‘Reality’ illustrated by classical continuity is confronted by an abstraction. Instances are replaced by an interval. Here, motions do not disappear into thin air, because of the law of physics dictates that for every force there is a counterforce, but where did it go? And, if the force of this action-image is without a receiving counterpart on film, what is it acting upon?

We will have to look at this scene for the second time from a more formal perspective. This freeze frame encompasses the synthesis and its disintegration, and it reveals a link between a spiritual substance before all mediums of storytelling and the body. The end of act II
exemplifies and elucidates the simultaneous process of synthesis and deconstruction of Shinoda’s treatment and the capacity of cinema to render intervals and changes visible. Narratively speaking, at this point, the complex web of *ninjo* and *giri*, the basis of a subject’s existence in this dramatic context, are obliterated, and the protagonists now have nowhere to go but to commit suicide. The camera pans to examine the domestic space created by the theatrical level, and Jihei lets out a devastating cry and goes on to destroy his home, the conceptual space created by the theatrical stage. The inner forces of the frustration of the desolated character manifested in movements are so violent that the theatrical stage housing the character is at risk of losing its physical integrity. Here, the paper merchant is not only destroying the objects that signify his historical subjectivity, but also the liminal space of the theatrical level. He is quite literally throwing himself out of the mediums of narratives which constitute his existence. We discover a spiritual/automatic content (Jihei) that is before all levels of mediums of story-telling – a kind of ‘pre-image’ of a character - and it can be revealed, discovered or created by the act of writing (novel, prose, script), the act of performing the writing (theatre, dance, puppet), and the act of producing a film. In other words, this content is an image that cannot be crystallized without the abovementioned mediums, and yet, in Shinoda’s film, its perfect expression is to destroy the very mediums that bring it into the visible world. He exists only for his obsolescence; he must then destroy all that hosts his existence. Chikamatsu’s fatalism and Jihei’s obsolescent

---

14 Also, oral story telling.
existence is transposed onto the process of assembling narratives, to the very production of this
cinematic assemblage, and to the attention paid to aesthetic strategies by the New Wave project.
The form expresses what would otherwise be expressed by the narrative. One can perhaps say
that Shinoda’s cinematic experiment that draws out Jihei’s fatalism makes this film an accurate
adaptation of the original play.

It is not surprising that the level of cinema is not safe from Jihei’s wrath either. After the
puppeteers are subdued by Jihei’s frustration, the merchant throws his paper, symbol of his
status, violently. The freeze frame occurs here: where the act of destruction is carried out by the
unrestrainable movement. This stark contrast between movement and motionlessness is where
the cinematic level of time and space – which are what establish the cinematic character of Jihei
– are deconstructed, and their formation through aesthetic choices are brought forth to our
attention. It is the interval that forms the character’s cinematic body, and his cinematic body
depends upon the cinematic bodies of the viewers. In “the Establishment of Physical Existence,”
Siegfried Kracauer argues that when “characters or parts of them abruptly [cease] to move…[it]
produces a shock effect, as if all of a sudden we found ourselves in a vacuum. The immediate
consequence is that we acutely realize the significance of movement as an integral element of the
external world as well as film”\(^{15}\). This applies to character movements as well as freeze frame,
because “[e]ven though the moving images on screen come to a standstill, the thrust of their

\(^{15}\) Kracauer, 44.
movement is too powerful to be discontinued simultaneously….the suspended movement nevertheless perpetuates itself by changing from outer motion into inner motion”\textsuperscript{16}. We are now moving with Jihei, with the original content, neither on cinematic level nor the theatrical level, because the momentum of this content initiated by the actor persists even after the film freezes. When the film resumes, it is too late, the puppeteers, whose symbolic power of control is granted by the cinematic level, can no longer control the protagonist; they are reduced to passive viewers watching alongside the audience. The movements of the puppeteers are subordinated by the time duration experienced by Jihei, by the interiority/content we have just detected.

The moment the cinematic level is deconstructed is the moment where the logic of production, the way in which the images need to be assembled, flashes its vulnerable presence – its very aesthetic strategy of production is brought forth to the realm of visible. To borrow Mulvey’s words again, this moment can be considered as a “use of \textit{mise en scene} within the terms of a displacement of emotion from character to cinematic language”\textsuperscript{17}. The conflict between movement and motionlessness on the cinematic level, is put into an interplay with the disruptive synthesizing process of other levels of narratives; the clash of the presence and absence of intense movements is also clashing into other mediums generating a dialectical image that is the haunting presence of the puppeteers. The puppeteers are non-existent in writing,

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid,44.
\textsuperscript{17} Mulvey, 147.
narratively. Their presences are extra-diegetic in a Bunraku play. They are, however, within the cinematic narratives, serving as, literally, the *embodiments* of fatal inevitability, serving as Shinoda’s expression of Chikamatsu’s sensibility, and the themes of control, death, economy, historical subject, and so on. Their physical movements, gestures and figures on the cinematic level exist also on the meta-fictional level of the adapted works. The optical presence of their black figures, the physical forces movement-images, now expresses what was in historical literary theories and interpretations. What might be allegorical on other mediums are now indisputably physical bodies on the cinematic screen. In the opening scene, we see the older master puppeteer putting on mask, whose chilling gaze breaks the cinematic fourth wall at various key points in the film. In the telephone conversation the director, Shinoda, dresses up as a puppeteer and is depicted as a menacing black figure, speaks with the script writer as if the death of the pair is the absolute destination.

The movements and the voices of the puppets on the cinematic screen are therefore that of external agents. Jihei and Koharu escape to the outskirt of the city and consummate their love for the last time in a grave yard, and from this point on, the theatrical stages are removed from the film. The film is now on location - a stark contrast with the constructed nature of theatrical stages, props, and abstract paintings. Despite the fact that the theatrical levels are physically removed, the cinematic level allows the puppeteers to follow the main characters into location shooting. The puppeteers created by cinematic narratives maintain their status as agents of the
fatal inevitability of the script. What is significant here is the fact that the cinematic narrative treats the puppeteers as invisible agents, who are capable of intervening, physically on film and narratives on all levels. The lead puppeteer, whom we see in the opening scene getting ready for the play, is present throughout the whole film, manipulating, controlling, and eavesdropping on the characters. His face can be seen on film just as in an actual *bunraku* play. However, he seems to have an uncanny compassion for Koharu – a stark contrast to the nature of *bunraku*, where the puppets are the actualizations of the craft of the mater puppeteers. Through a reversed anthropomorphic treatment, the cinematic narrative turned the puppeteers’ symbolic qualities into physical actions. Action-image is charged with narratological importance, and is simultaneously an affection-image. This transfiguration of the puppeteers from stagehands to plot devices is the result of the fabulation of the film - a synthesis of their actual, historical theatrical functions and the formation of the narrative at the cinematic level. They are dialectic images emerged out of the liminal space generated by the disruptive synthesis of the mediums incorporated on film: they are modes of looking. Here, the head puppeteer’s facial expression points to not only the sheer emotion of a character, but also the specific modes of production and forms of other mediums.

The way in which the scene of suicide is depicted thus gains critical importance if the puppeteers’ movements announce the theatricality and the process of assemblage of image in this film. Jihei kills Koharu and then hangs himself on a *tori* overlooking the city, with the help of the
puppeteers. That they are symbolically the forces in which “social roles and socially defined habits exert an ideological force on the individual”\(^\text{18}\) becomes detectable as pure cinematic physical energy, action-images. The infinite deferral of Jihei and Koharu’s love now has a physical enforcer – the black figures of puppeteers. The critique of the state – the dominant perception of time, and the system that allowed police violence to be inflicted on the student body - launched by Shinoda (and his New Wave comrades) is brought forth through the threshold of synthesis, and is now the menacing figures traced in light, projected on the screen, existing completely in the realm of the visible. Subsequently, are they tragic witnesses following the puppets, or are they the enforcers of the fate commanded by the written script? In either case, aesthetically, their bodily movements no longer merely transfer the dynamic energy of bodily movement into the puppet in order to perform the standard function of the \textit{bunraku} play. The spontaneity and physical force of the bodies in black clad are intercepted by the cinematic level, synthesising into the fatalistic appearance of the characters of the cinema – which uses this deadly semblance and movements of the black figures to tell the story that was on paper. Consequently, the obvious question arises out of the destructive interval: is Jihei committing suicide or is he being murdered? If the answer is the latter, then by whom? By the invisible historical forces, turned into visible dramatic agents? Perhaps the Shinto \textit{Torii} – symbol of the

\(^{18}\) Desser, 178.
Japanese nation—where Jihei is hanged/hanged himself can provide some clue to this implicit frustration with the economic and political conditions in which Shinoda and Jihei lived.

1.3 The Escape, Future, Possibility

Let us go back to the beginning of act III: immediately after Jihei had destroyed his home, when the puppeteers lost control of him. We see the head puppeteer walking back and forth, and we infer from his body movements that he senses something is wrong because events are not unfolding in accordance to the script. We see Jihei again, and this time he has something to hide, seemingly from an invisible gaze of a disembodied character. In the middle of the night, he tells the inn keeper not wake Koharu up as he is going to Kyoto on a business trip. In other words, he is setting up the illusion that everything will be back to normal tomorrow morning, and Koharu will return to the brothel to be redeemed by another rich merchant. He is acting for an audience and he is writing a script. This audience is not us, the film spectators, but the inn keeper, his brother (who is carrying Jihei’s son hoping to prevent him from committing suicide), and staggeringly, the head puppeteer, whom Jihei as a puppet should not be able to see or know. The synthesis of the multiple layers of narratives from different mediums is that which allows Jihei to stage this distraction, a moment of exception, and a possibility to escape from his fate.

Throughout the film, the head puppeteer sits within the same dramatic space as the characters, monitoring, eavesdropping, and intervening at key plot points. Given that his movement was subordinated to the time experienced by Jihei only a while back, his
discombobulated movement only makes sense. Nevertheless, this is still a significant transgression, a subversion of the cinematic crafts of Shinoda’s film. If Shinoda’s New Wave adaptation is a subversion of the dominant paradigm of cinematic production, this moment of exception we are experiencing is a subversion of the subversion. Throughout the film, no matter how disruptive a moment of synthesis has been, no verisimilitude on any given medium is ever broken – except here. Here, Jihei’s image is cut off from the real world, floating outside of even cinema as an autonomous, spiritual content. But Shinoda is by no means undermining his own authority: this is a moment where image of possibilities of future flash its presence within the disruptive process of synthesis, taking form of a narrative ambiguity in verisimilitude. After exiting the inn, Jihei hides behind a wall and waits for not only his family but also the head puppeteer to leave. The head puppeteer follows his family assuming that he will be able to find Koharu there, the false destination speculated by Jihei’s family. This is when the puppeteers no longer process their symbolic and physical power over Jihei and Koharu, and their escape from fate seems like a possibility for a brief moment. They run, but the thoughts of *ninjo and giri* come back into the mind of Koharu, and she losses her ability to move. Poetically, her sensory-motor-schemata is lost at the moment when the original story resumes, where the drive of the narrative turns the cogs of cinematic images once again. The head puppeteer, following Jihei’s family, notices the scenery and stages that he is moving through are different from the text he has been reciting for years. He appeals to the script, to Chikamatsu himself, and turns around to give
chase to the lovers. Thus the possibilities of a different future are shut down: the double suicide shall be commenced.

For Jihei (the spiritual content), if there is any hope of escaping the destiny and his final destination, then it comes from the film’s deconstruction of the various layers of narratives incorporated in film. It is derived from, namely, transmogrification of literary devices and the subsequent interpretations at various historical junctures into physical figures of the filmic character: a crucial idea to my discussions of Oshima’s films and the student movements. The puppeteer lost control until he recites passages from the script - cinema clashes with the text. The message here is thus clear: the future of the puppets (Jihei/Osan/Koharu) has already been determined – and their present colonized - but through the clashing into each other of the multiple narratives, synthesized by the cinematic apparatus, time flashes its images of future potential and alternatives. As Gilles Deleuze writes in *Cinema 2*: “…thought, as power which has not always existed, is born from an outside more distant than any external world, and as power which does not yet exist, confronts an inside, an unthinkable or unthought, deeper than any internal world.”19 The failed attempt at escape has some redeeming qualities here, albeit in the negative sense: Jihei’s escape is a past that will only come into being in an alternative future, but it nevertheless confronts and affects the permanent destination of the multiple narratives, the fatal death. The nascent and virtual escape is on the same level as Jihei’s character content – on

19 Deleuze, 278.
the level zero before the production of any specific medium. Within only thought, in the outside more distant than any outside world, cinema clashes with other levels of optical realities and points to an impossible visuality – avisuality. The escape scene enables us to think about the future precisely because of Shinoda’s disruptive synthesis of multiple levels of narratives from different mediums. The subversion and the possibility of undercutting the mode of presentation of the authority, of the state, lies within the avisual image of the medium itself.
2. The Leaking-Image I: Time-Image, Film Form, Author and History

“We do not remember, we rewrite memory much as history is rewritten.”

– Chris Marker’s Sans Soleil.

“Maybe by connecting meaningless shots he wanted to make the sense of image more visible.”
“Well, creating meaning by paradox is morally bankrupt.”

– a debate between two students in The Man who Left his Will on film.

2.1 Discursive Body and Visibility:

In the time frame of the films discussed in this paper, the Anti-Security Treaty Movement, its derivative student movements, and farmer and labour movements in Japan, went into full swing. The defeat in World War II, the reversal of the emperor’s divinity, the atomic bombing, economic and strategic necessities demanded by the Korean War, and the new living conditions in small but functional spaces ascertained an image of the national body and a narrative of the discursive body that was positively deterministic, as it was detectable in the emerging image of the hygienic, democratic/capitalistic, aesthetic bodies. The official overarching narrative of the body is undeniably cinematic in its functioning of rendering certain memory visible and invisible, a framing in motion – a mise en scene of the politico-economic configuration. For Yoshikuni Igarashi, the author of Bodies of Memory: Narratives of War in
Postwar Japanese Culture, 1945 -1970, the body as the discursively constructed body becomes “the central site for the reconfiguration of Japan’s national image.” While our attention primarily focuses on the body constructed by the cinematic form, it is also important to note that the cinematic form itself absorbs the cultural, historical raw materials - just as the historical literary devices and interpretations are synthesized by cinema into images of movements, rhythms, and figures (i.e., the black figures of the puppeteers). Cinematic body and the discursive body are not oppositions but exist as a dialectical pair, mutually constituting. The discursive body remembers selectively in accordance to an ideological construct just as the cinematic body renders visible certain things in congruence with the contingencies at the moment of production. Two significant instances – the 1964 Tokyo Olympics and, more prudent in continuing the discussion at present, the student movements centred around Zengakuren – attest to the conjunctures of cinematic form and history.

Igarashi documents the body as the site of remembering and the site of the striking loss of the traces of the difficulty of performing the act of remembering: an absent absence or an invisibility of the invisible. “The point where the loss itself was lost.” While my concern with the body is less with memory than visuality, his work is useful as he clearly lays out the political and material condition that contributed to the construction of the body. The material condition,
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the everlasting effect of the uni-linear developmental theory in international politics, the
derivative internal politics and its effect on everyday life, set the unending movement of erasure
in motion within the conjuncture of the body and flows of history. Prime Minister Kishi
Nobusuke of the Liberal Democratic Party emerged as a figure that injected these forces into the
everyday life. While some sections that gave the US virtually complete control of Japan’s
internal affair of the 1951 treaty were removed under his administration, and despite the
administration’s effort to distant itself from the legacy of the Occupations, Japan found itself
internalizing the political and economic logic of the realization of US hegemony within the geo-
economic necessities in the immediate Post-War and early Cold War era.22 Voices of the
Socialist and the Communist Parties in the diet, and the noise of students, expressed concerns of
US strategic planning setting Japan once again into the path of war. The Occupation’s earlier
move to remove the pre-war Peace Preservation Law and the freeing of the pre-war communist
party members was soon followed by the actualizations of the reverse course.23 A direct result of
the reverse course himself, Kishi and the Liberal Democratic Party found themselves stand
before various forms of opposition.24 The Socialist Party, whose members consisted of mostly
the Left thinkers and communists imprisoned by the Japanese Empire and freed by the
Occupation, staged sit-ins as delay tactics. Their attempts to delay the revised Security Treaty in

22 Igarashi, 132 -134
23 Steinhoff, Patricia G., “Japan: Student Activism in an Emerging Democracy,” in Student Activism in Asia: between Protest and Powerlessness, ed. Meredith L. Weiss et al.(Minneapolis : University of Minnesota, 2012), 57 - 59
24 Kishi himself was a Class A war criminal, but the shift in the international political arena allowed Kishi to be released.
the Diet was met with Kishi calling five hundred police to remove them from the entrance of the House on May 19, 1960.\textsuperscript{25} Ironically, even with government actions in realizing its economically driven agendas, the state suffers from a selective amnesia of the past.

For the Left, the internalization of the US strategic and economic logic was a return for Japan to the course of invading its neighbours once again, and they scrutinized the revised-Treaty accordingly. Roughly ten years prior to the conflict between the protesters in front of the Diet and Kishi’s police force, various political organizations and labour unions were gaining nascent momentum. The student organizations set in motion since the 1910s in various and radically different forms were attracted to the struggle and in turn adapted a form in which the Japanese Communist Party took the role of mentor both ideologically and practically.\textsuperscript{26} The different ways in which the artist’s frustration is actualized within the context of a protest and the situation of filmmaking can be seen in a juxtaposition between Oshima’s involvement with the radical movements prior to obtaining a job as a filmmaker and the thematic concerns of his corpus. This difference grants us an opportunity to see the process in which an antecedent frustration springs from the artist is actualized in a political situation and an artistic space of realization. Oshima Nagisa was a participant in the early 50s during the interactive years of Zengakuren and the JCP as a student in Kyoto University. Until the mid-50s, he participated in

\textsuperscript{25} Igarashi, 135.
numerous spectacular activities: among them were the 1951 March in protesting a local labour union’s celebration of the anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution - after which students went on to stone the Socialist Party members who supported the Security Treaty - and the 1955 confrontation with the police at the Tachikawa Air Base.27 Again, at Tachikawa, the strategic logic of the US hegemony was realized as a penetrative force in the everyday realm when both countries agreed to lengthen the runway for new and larger jets, and the subsequent land survey prompted the oppositions to insist that the runway was nothing more than an accommodation to American strategic need for the containment of red communism.28 When the renewal of the Security Treaty was in nascent motion in the mid-50s, Oshima had secured the title of assistant director at Shochiku while the clashes between the unionist and students continued. The duration leading up to the May 19th 1960 incident, the activities persisted as the frustration intensified in the youth and the Left, and the sympathy from the public grew as the interactions and convergences of the various groups gain visibility in media and everyday situations. According to Igarashi, the state took a preemptive stance: “anticipating the political turmoil in the process of revising the Security Treaty, Kishi’s government introduced the Police Duties Performance Law Bill to the Diet. The Police Bill would have legitimized preventive measures by the police in their search, interrogation and arrest.” The preventive element in the bill would soon be realized as physical forces that extend the economic and strategic logic of US hegemony and Japan’s
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capitalist development. Comparable to the ambivalence of Jihei’s suicide, the question to ask here is: was the loss of memory Igarashi speaks of a mere forgetting, or was it a murderous head trauma forced onto the body?

2.2 The Student Body

The body constructed by such a political climate is propelled by the discursive narratives to render the legacy of the war and the effects of capital invisible even in the private, everyday sphere – a body that would find itself contradicting its gestures, its pulses and rhythms, resulting in resistance its own ‘destiny’. The frustration of the body springs from the friction between the body that is turning invisible by the state discourse and its natural pulses that demand to be seen. The student movement is one such resistance. Shinoda’s *Double Suicide* in this context thus retains its political and allegorical effect on the issues of subjectivity – as a formalist practice that speaks to the multiplicity, and fragile and easily manipulatable boundaries of the “I.” Contrary to the subjectivity debate of *Kindai Bungaku* explained by Victor Koschmann that an author’s subjectivity needs to be free from the work that depicts the lives of the people, and the naturalist literary movement earlier in the century, cinema’s thinking power taps into a historical crisis of the body through a linkage that resembles allegorical constructions by employing formalist manipulations. This allegorical construction in itself becomes the subject matter – or, vulgarly, the content – of Oshima’s *The Man who Left his Will on Film*, or the

---

Japanese title, *The Secret Whisper of the Post Tokyo War*. “Tokyo War” is of course the violent clashes between the students and the police, and the “secret” points to the invisibility and the forgetting, and the “whisper” projects the image of the communicative silent speech, the inactivity, and the traces and the possibilities of overcoming the forgetting.

“War” and “whisper”: this is the rhythm of the violent exchanges and silent convergences. There are moments of intense public activity and inactivity, as well as consensus and disagreement in the student movements. The students regarded the movements as a failure because they failed to stop the renewal of the security treaty the first time. There are failures and successes, but the question is not an “either/or” but this: what does it mean to fail successfully? Historical narrative tends to document the public and the intense, but what happens in the intervals? Is the lack of activity apolitical? It can indeed be said that there are two relatively more intense moments surrounding the renewal of the ANPO treaty in 1960 and at the end of the decade, but the moments of relative inactivity in between the former and the latter also speak to both moments. While Oshima’s 1970 film depicts the intense movements from roughly 1968 to 70, where the New Left groups occupied the centre of attention, it encompasses the struggling formulation of the body in between the moments of intensities. It condenses time durations into directly representable time-images. It also allegorizes his experiences from a decade before and his own corpus of films, bracketing together film history and the history of student movements.

---

30 東京戦争戦後秘話
Appealing to Deleuze’s film philosophy, I will soon sketch how the way in which time appears on film can relate to the larger context of history, and zero in on the auteur and his creative frustration within the historical context and how it becomes the characters, narratives and so on.

The moments of relative inactivity were less visible in the public imagination, but the meditation within the Post-War national context engrained in daily activities was nevertheless extending directly into actions of the everyday. The post-war momentum was nurtured by “the legalization of the Left, the far-reaching civil liberties protections of the new constitution, and the restructuring of the education system.”31 The impoverished students were provided with supplies, affordable books, dormitories and protection from police on campus. However, the failure to stop the revised ANPO marked the beginning of the dwindling Zengakuren-JCP harmony. Significantly, the JCP’s theorizing of the student body’s roles – the elite students who would presumably assume bureaucratic positions should stand between the state and labour, and thus as a mere arm of the labour and JCP – was met with intense disagreements.32 In Oshima’s Night and Fog in Japan (1960), the narrative centres on a dialectical conflict between “the selfishness and innocence of the student left” and “the inhuman rigidity of the [JCP].”33 The dialectical image manifests itself as the fog that does not seem to dissipate, following shots of the students’ faces. By this point Zengakuren was no longer unified ideologically. Among the

31 Steinhoff, 59.
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divided groups within *Zengakuren* was the emergence of the New Left group, which was accused of being Trotskyite by their former mentor, and their more violent tactics also contributed to the declined public support. To complicate the issues at hand, the New Left was also equally divided.\textsuperscript{34} There were the JCP sympathizers, Leninist and the ideologically Trotsky-leaning reading groups, the more radical *Zenkyoto*, and even Japan Red Army and from the JRA the United Red Army which would become involve in violent events that were deemed acts of terrorism on both international and national arenas. The boundaries of sects within the New Left were unclear and often only gained more significance when they are represented and documented by the media or various scholars\textsuperscript{35}: this is seen in the documentary segment of Oshima’s film, where Motoki, the protagonist who is presumably part of the *Kakemaru* sect, wears a *Chukaku* helmet in the Okinawa solidarity demonstration. This confusion in political subjectivity is also depicted by both the documentary and the newly produced footages in Wakamatsu Koji’s 2007 film, *United Red Army*. In the film, the body of the students was splitting, inflicting violence within and without, starving for food and truth, and rejecting, but absorbed by, money – a painfully violent and confusing image of the body that can all be traced back to the US-Japan strategic and economic logic, and its rendering itself invisible while leaving tremendous effect on the body. Importantly, while Wakamatsu’s film (and cinema in

\textsuperscript{34} Steinhoff, 62 -66.

general) does not provide empirical historical data, it is worth mentioning that the form in this film that mixes documentary and fictional footage, when considered the fact that the director himself lived through this era, we are confronted with the problems of imagining the past: the problems of time and thinkablility of aesthetic system as the division of the sensible. Cinema does not simply represent or depict the struggle: it is part of the struggle through the body and its relations with the dialectics of visibility and invisibility.

Visibility and both political and visual representation were huge determining factors of how the struggles were unfolding. Until 1968, students were not viewed as a self-contained movement but as part of a much wider opposition that included labour unions and major political parties such as the JCP. They were starting to stand out as the violent tactics intensified, but the disagreements between sects were also intensifying. This was marked by the continuous escalation of violence between the New Left student groups and the police, and the resulting decline of public support of the tactics the students employed.\textsuperscript{36} Despite their public image of chaos, within this same time frame, the students also developed “a wide array of cultural and social innovations, including thousands of small publications and new cultural expressions in experimental theatre, literature, film, and visual arts.”\textsuperscript{37} Organizational systems took egalitarian forms such as underground bookstore, publications and even the trial support system to protect
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the arrested activists. The protagonists of Oshima’s *The Man Who Left his Will on Film*, spend most of their time participating such activities as reading groups, self-reflection, making pamphlets, theoretical debates, protest planning, and filmmaking. The multiplicity of activities should be considered alongside the relative intensities of actions and inactions, and the limits of the body and subjectivity, a situation where the movements of the world and that of action are indistinguishable – a dream image. It is process not unlike what Ranciere means by politics, “a struggle for visibility and voice out of noise, a shifting of places and designations, [it is important to] look for its signs in a confluence of perceptual and practical transformation.”

We will return to the issues of disagreements and actions in the public eyes with the discussion of Oshima’s film in part three. It is now high time to see how cinema fits into these issues. Since it is easy to read both Shinoda and Oshima’s films as a post-modernist, experimentations while ignoring the ontological co-existence of body and cinema, we must first tackle to issues of cinema as a form of representation, and how the medium is not simply a detached form that simulates the actual struggles but a part of it. I would further insist that within cinema, some avisual and invisible images of dream projected by the excess in the unbearable struggles become visible. We are reminded by the historical situations here that the task of interpretation requires us to confront the tendency of treating the aesthetic system as simulated realities – as a simulated body - when in fact *it is reality*. The cinematic body is not a simulated body but an avisual body rendered
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visual. The student body was theorized explicitly by the JCP in one instance, but it had also been represented by various media as the manifestations of geo-political forces as mere objects.

2.3 The Dream of Forgetting:

The relationships between cinema and its subject matters are also affected by the relationships between the student activists and the police logic, a direct result of the larger historical context and the implementations of domestic policies of Japan propelled by American hegemonic geo-political forces. Significantly, Igarashi’s discussion of the subsequent reactions to Kishi regime’s implementation of preventive police policy reveals a fundamental contradiction of these political moves: the United States disappeared.\(^{40}\) This collective amnesia took form of a paradigm of two polarities: either the police logic or the student logic. In other words, the violence that erupted was not merely a direct result of the two sides which collided but the disappearance of the United States. The effect of US hegemony inflicted on the everyday body through capitalist relations is rendered invisible within the discourse. Both Maruyama Masao and Takeuchi Yoshimi identified the imminent police activities implied by the Police Duties Performance Law Bill as a reductive “either/or” binary of democracy or dictatorship. To live as a Japanese subject is to live only as \textit{this} Japanese body. Igarashi suggests that this is to

\(^{40}\) Igarashi, 137.
paradoxically negate the historically specific material condition, namely, the archipelagos as a US strategic interests and the nation state remerging as an economic power:

To reflect on the contradiction of the postwar political situation, the opposition movement participants need to focus on enigmatic relations between “democracy and dictatorship” in the political order realized under U.S. hegemony. However, by narrowly focusing on the either/or of “democracy or dictatorship,” Maruyama and Takeuchi demanded that the participants in effect unconditionally embrace the legacy of the U.S. occupation, and many in the movement accepted Maruyama’s and Takeuchi’s call to reduce the issue to the fight between the democratic present and autocratic past.41

The effect was still felt in the everyday, but the discourse of the US hegemony had withdrawn itself from the dominant discourse. The political discourses thus function not only to preserve and enhance power, but also to inevitably reconfigure the mechanism that renders certain images of past visible or invisible.

Consequently, it is important to note that the Anti-Security Movement was by no mean free from nationalism, from the teleological conceptualization of capital. Cultural institutions and the traditional images of Japaneseness shackle the bodies standing in front of the Diet. In fact, one of the driving forces behind the escalation of violence and the “reckless behaviour” was the

41 Igarashi, 137
return of the old feelings and experiences as Japanese. An unprecedented support was given to the commitment of the anti-ANPO movement because it offered a political site to channel the past frustration for the mass who could not express their old experiences.\textsuperscript{42} It can be argued that their version of nationalist expression did not consent to the politico-economic logic of Japan emerging once again as an economic powerhouse under the influence of the US hegemony. It was thus rendered invisible, but flared up as the movement gained momentum. It is more than a past that haunts the present: it is an image of the past that flashes its presence only when a certain future is actualized - a future-past. The dream of the past is actualized by the outside, by the \textit{mise-en-scene} of the communities of landscapes that house the bodily movements, gestures, voices and noise - infinitely pointing to the future, desiring the opening up of a possibility, an alternative. The complicity of the radical movement stands as a juncture of time propelling the desire to overcome its own oppositions and contradictions. The novelistic memory that is capable of only forgetting, as argued by Igarashi, was in fact the paradigm of the visible. The invisible is therefore the dream rendered visible by the body existing in the outside and what relationships this dream has with time. Igarashi is correct in suggesting that “Zengakuren’s confrontation with the police were desperate attempts to pierce the postwar social order that masked its own historicity, to reach a layer of unresolved tensions,”\textsuperscript{43} but what is at play here is more than memory. Paradoxically, then, a desire to escape the past rooted in the nostalgia of past - that
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springs from national sentiment - flares up as body’s violent clash into impossibility. As we will see, like the physical presences of the puppeteers synthesizing the literary functions of the past in Shinoda, the physical body and its capacity to wreak violence to one another enables the physical expression of the struggles in the political, economic and everyday realm – a dream image in which the movements of the world replaces actions. Physical forces of the body are nothing less than the dream that maneuvers the simultaneous paths of possibilities and impossibilities, and within this paradoxical simultaneity the image of time that flashes its presence at junctures of historical continuum. Cinema thinks non-linearly through these convergences of inside and outside, maintaining the gap between words and ideas. The cinematic disruptive synthesis will resemble this movement of thought. The death of Kanba Michiko was a mark of the destruction of a body (the actuality) as well a media spectacle (the representation) that will later leak into the cinematic form of Oshima Nagisa’s sensational *A Man Who Left his Will on Film*, and the film form will struggle with the narrative to establish a piercing link with the body, as the temporality of dream and the temporality of bodily political actions superimpose onto one another.

2.4 Time-Image and Cinematic Form:

A few questions need to be posed at this point where historical events and cinema are at a conjuncture: why is there an intangible element of communications in the New Wave films beyond the simple fact that they were produced in the same time frame, depicting similar themes
or events? Are they communicative in forms, and consequently, are genre or aesthetic similarities capable of informing this communication? Here one is tempted to read that the elements of communication are where the artistic will propels the formations of cinematic images. Circumstances of production undoubtedly affects the forms, but do the already historically bound circumstances inform this communicativeness? In the historical contexts of 1960s, answers were needed, but the phrasing of the right questions were in the unthought because they were already bounded by the same incapacity to answer. I position cinema in this context as the medium that exist in between question and answer, past and present, and future-past and future - a seeing function. Neither in the interiority nor outside, cinema is the medium of time not because its reliance of time duration but because it is capable of sustaining the contradiction of time, the incompatibility of the flows of time, and the incommensurability timelines. The problems of representation that sprung from the collective forgetting faced by the student activists were in fact problems of time, and the inevitable incommensurability of time. An over-arching example of this process can be seen in what Igarashi argues as the forgetting in the disappearance of the United States: to live within the capitalist socio-political paradigm, one is propelled to render the US hegemony invisible in their maneuvering of everyday contradictions. My contention here is that film provides a mode of looking in which this process of rendering invisible is captured by the film form.
For the purpose of the films discussed in this paper, the elemental difference between the movement-image and time-image is the appearance chronosign, “an image where time ceases to subordinate to movement and appears for itself.”\textsuperscript{44} Deleuze explains that this subordination was inevitably to be ceased: “The movement-image, that is, the bond that cinema had introduced between movement and image from the outset, would have to be abandoned, in order to set free other powers that it kept subordinate, and which had not had the time to develop their effects: projection and back-projection.”\textsuperscript{45} Movement-image’s time duration is paradoxically not allocated to represent time. The sequentiality demanded by the illusion of physical movement on film reconstituted by the negatives running inside a camera or projector relinquishes the capacity to represent Time as the duration needed for the nature of this very sequentiality creates the illusory movement itself: it is the time of the film stock, 24 frames per second. Time is constituted in its empirical form: “a successive present in an extrinsic relation of before and after, so that the past is a former present, and the future a present to come.”\textsuperscript{46} As a moving image, cinema is a matter of action and reaction, force and counter-force but the time-image is not so. Time-image exists in the middle. It reveals itself as “pure optical and sound situations.”\textsuperscript{47} The sensory-motor-link is ascended to the realm of metaphor, but the importance of projection and back projection is not diminished, as we will see in a scene in Oshima’s film, in which body

\textsuperscript{44} Deleuze, 335.  
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid, 264.  
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becomes the medium of projection. Let us use the destructive interval at the end of act II in *Double Suicide* as an example as the time-image, instead of the movement-image. The violent movement of Jihei alongside the camera panning from left to right. Met with the freeze frame, the time allocated to optical physics flares up into the landscape of history, image in the middle of past and future. The film resumes: nothing in movement is changed but everything in the narrative has changed. “It is a matter of something too powerful, too unjust, but sometimes also too beautiful, and henceforth outstrips our sensory-motor capacities”: a situation of seeing rather than acting, metaphor rather than sensory-motor schemata. Sequentiality and continuity represented by cinema as instances release their shackles on the intervals. The vector of the smallest unit of interval between two instances of physical dynamics is no longer determined by the instances bracketing the interval. It now retains potential energy, capable of bursting into multiple directions. Time-image’s “interval is autonomous, no longer forming the ending of one and the beginning of another segment.”

Time-image is most graspable in its interplay with film form. In the famous ending sequence of François Truffaut’s *Les Quatre Cents Coups* (1959), the movements of the boy beckon the eyes of the audience to move across the landscape as he escapes from the juvenile centre only to find that his forward thrust will be inevitably extinguished by the relentless wave of the ocean. He is turned around - can we say that he is turned around by the time-image of the

---
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ocean, in which the possibilities of life, death, and the prison that is the Parisian cityscape flash in front of his eyes? His eyes meet with the camera as it pivots and zooms in. The forth wall breaks as the frames close in on his face depicted by the freeze frame. What is inescapably clear is that the thrust of his persistent physical movements symbolizes the hope for a break from his present predicament and the ocean points to the Law that swallows this very hope. Or, a reverse interpretation: the inner angst is displaced onto the relentless sprint and the motion-blurred background, created by the moving camera shadowing the actor’s movement. Outside in, or, inside out. Regardless of the direction of the interpretation, there seems to be no longer inside or outside, but a crystallization of the endless numbers of the passing-through of the boundaries of inside/outside, because of an unknown circuitry actualized in Truffaut’s camera works, actor and mise en scene. The character evaporated into the landscape, or the outside is absorbed into the body. The body of the audience is affected directly: the eyes think they swipe from left to right of the screen but they did not move, for it is the camera that moves with Jean-Pierre Leaud - the organ (eyes) stares at not the figures of outside or interiority but that of the crystal of time. The unknown circuitry connects the dream-image, recollections, past, memory, landscape and living bodies, and prompts a dynamic interaction between the cinematic apparatus, actual scenery and actors, and the body of the audience here reveals to us that the optical organ now is capable of receiving not only light but also the flow of the interiority. This is by no means an inversion of interiority and exteriority, rather, it means that in the age of time-image as assigned by Deleuze (post World War II, with the exception of figures such as Ozu), the everyday objects shot on film
pass through the site where the body and the cinema interact, and become interactive without the need of the eyes. Looking is thus already looking at a look. The look the body gains after being thrown into the landscape behind the forth-wall-breaking look of Leaud is the awareness of the crystal-image of time, and the focal point of attraction is no longer specific components of image but time itself.

2.5 Hara Setsuko’s Face (Time-image flashes in the body):

What is time, and what does it have to do with the dream and the history of the encaptured student body narrated above? We still need to look at how cinema interacts with the body and time, and in turn, strings them into a different mode of exchange. Deleuze conflates Bergon and tells us that: “the present is the actual image, and its contemporaneous past is the virtual image.” Deleuze, 79 The mundane, everyday objects in Late Spring (1949), depicted by the sitting camera, exist at once in the present, the past and even in the future, as the past of these objects haunt the images and possible outcomes of the future. As with most of his works, Ozu’s film is a slice of the on-going lives of his characters. The domestic drama tells a story of Noriko and his academic father after World War II when they are seemingly living a peaceful and unchanging life in the suburbs. Due to both of their ages, her father would like his daughter to marry, but she is reluctant because she would rather maintain her life as is with her father and not leave him alone in old age. Significantly, Hara Setsuko’s character, Noriko’s desire to maintain the past –

49 Deleuze, 79
that is, the life with her father and daily ritual (i.e. tea ceremonies) – is manifested in the banal imageries of Ozu’s usual visual trope, and is encountered and challenged by the flow of life. Unfortunately for her, as Deleuze would say, life in itself is in a constant state of change, and this manifests the landscape through which her figure travels. The metaphor of everyday life – her daily routine, her relationship with her father and her way of dealing with memory of past and the effect of war on her body - that she has been employing to navigate through the time and space of the everyday will be disestablished by the change that has been there all along. The sensory-motor metaphor is absorbed in time. This not a matter of Noriko’s psychology, that of the interiority, nor is it a spatialized division of conscious and unconscious of a single subject, but that of the crystallization of virtual and actual. As Deleuze writes:

indiscernibility [of the virtual and actual] constitutes an objective illusion; it does not supress the distinction between the two sides, but makes it unattributable, each side taking the other’s role in a relation which we must describe as reciprocal presupposition, or reversibility… The indiscernibility of the real and the imaginary, or of the present and the past, of the actual and the virtual, is definitely not produced in the head or the mind, it is the objective characteristic of certain existing images which are by nature double.50

50 Deleuze, 69.
The indiscernibility of the two sides reaches its peak not in her head but on her face. This why Hara’s face is important, for it is where time-image flashes its presence in a crystalized form. If the face of Garbo is an event where we plunge into ecstasy, then the face of Hara - not as a visual landscape in close-up but as a part of her figure moving across the landscape of time in the mundane imageries mobilized in the movement of the world, a dream-image – reveals itself as a crystal image of time of pure recollection (past), of actual image (present) and of her intense desire of the world, actualized by the world (one possible future).

What can these purely optical and sound images of time be put in relation to if not action? More significantly than the awareness of the crystal is the fact that Noriko never dreams in the film, or at least Ozu does not show us sequences that would demand us to view it narratively as dreams. There seems to be no need for flashback or dream sequence in Ozu, since the virtual image of dream that is the predominate image in Ozu is constantly actualized in the image of human body moving across landscape. This is how Deleuze defines the dream-image: “[the projection] of the sensory-motor situation to infinity, sometimes by ensuring the constant metamorphosis of the situation, sometimes by replacing the action of characters with a movement of the world.”^51 A scene depicts Noriko and her father’s colleague chatting in a sake bar in which she comments that her uncle’s remarriage is “impure,” and she is reminded of her image as a child by the bar owner: a description and a recollection. The change in time flashes on

---
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Noriko’s face when the past-present continuum desired by her is betrayed by her frustrated smile, which flashes a different possibility – her own desire is confronted by the flow of time - as she directs her look down onto the table and back to her uncle. When Noriko comes home from Ueno – a journey through the landscape of city and countryside depicted in wide shots - she brings home the father’s forgotten gloves from the bar as well as her frustration with the inevitability of time. Here, the public space infiltrates private space when her awareness of the time flowing through and actualized by Ozu’s depiction of the bar, the train ride, cityscape, countryside, and the front door of her house (which her father will linger briefly after her eventual wedding) prompts her to confront her father with questions concerning their future, an abnormality in their peaceful, seemingly unchanging everyday lives. Moreover, in the famous Noh play scene, as an audience, she looks at the play as well as the lady whom her father may be marrying soon and her father’s polite gaze on the lady. Her expression changes every time Ozu cuts back to her face. This oscillation of looks is soon followed by the famous pillow shot of the tree, in which the leaves flow in the wind. Is her father lying to her about his impending marriage or is this her father’s dream in hoping that she will change her mind? Regardless of the intentionality, the effects of time have been actualized in the movements of the world, of the landscape by the cinematic medium. Yet another oscillation of looking appears toward the end of the film pivoting on the famous vase in a Kyoto hotel. Time never seems to come to a standstill, and a situation never extends into action – it flows on from one random point to another. The power of putting together images was only available in the human body before the advent of
cinema; the flows of thought are grabbed together like a bundle of strings and actualized in human body, and now in the cinematic apparatus. As if a circuit, cinema actualizes the bundle of thought strings the same way the dream-image of the body actualizes time: this oscillation of dream and history, and time and the body, as I have suggested and will further illustrate, is the rhythm of the student body.

What is indiscernible Hara and Ozu is not only the virtual image and the actual image, but also dream-image and action-image. Perhaps for every floating cloud, electric pole, chimney, figure and silhouette of the elderly, tatami mat, sliding screen, and boiling tea, Hara’s face is there to condense the actual image and its virtual double into indiscernible crystals of time. Is it merely due to the bride’s headdress that we barely see Hara’s eyes at the end of the film? Ozu’s sitting camera and his famous rigor in actors’ movements reject the possibility that this effect is coincidental. The image of time is covered up until Noriko bows to her father in accepting this new future and in actualizing the past stored in time – her eyes are visible again. The virtual image of the public role (bride) becomes the actual, but in accordance to the virtual image of a private desire (of maintaining past), which in turns becomes the actual and replaces the former, generating a powerful feeling felt in all Ozu films. We sometimes name it melancholy, nostalgia, or mono no aware. It is not only cultural tradition or Japanese aesthetic systems that are capable of generating this power, but cinematic apparatus and time. One of which is a sense of “too-late” that Deleuze identifies in Visconti. This ‘too-late-ness’ is the reason I chose to read Ozu’s time
with Oshima’s time, in which the cinematic time is no longer contained by cinema but leaks into
the larger movement of Japanese capitalism and history, specifically the student body. Perhaps
Hara’s disappearance in the 1960s was too poetic, for her face and figure were not further
subjected to decompose in the historical moment where Oshima and his contemporaries started
to emerge, when this crystalline description was being absorbed into the movement of the
nation’s violent process of becoming a subject in the international arena, and its seemingly
inevitable motion of shutting out the voice of the students and the farmers, and was being turned
into an essentialized cultural form in coming to contact with Western distribution. The final
sequence of Late Spring depicts the father’s aging figure stumbling into the living room,
encircled by the dark shadows of the sliding doors, through which Noriko used to slide in
and out with tea and laughter as he wrote his articles. The motion of Noriko’s turning head is
contrasted with the loss of vitality in his neck, lowering his head as the apple skin falls off his
hand. This scene depicts a process in which previous time-image (Noriko’s face) becomes the
virtual past, and the father’s withering figure as the crystal image where the indiscernibility
peaks. That is to say, even time-image itself cannot stand against the endless differential process
of becoming that is time, and that if even time-image itself is subject to the relentless flows of
time then how reliable is memory, and how stable is the subjectivity projected by realist politics?
2.6 The Will of Film: History, Author Subject, and Film Form

We have only scratched the surface of Deleuze’s complex plea that cinema is philosophy with these notions narrated above: the recognition of sensory-motor schemata as metaphoric construction, the disappearance of the boundary between interiority and outside, the body as time-image, the dreaming of the effects of history in the images of the outside, in the movement of the world, and the emergence of the time-image. The self-differential process of time is represented directly, thus granting cinema’s power to extend itself beyond its image. The going-beyond of situations created by the image constitutes a crisis of movement-image. This crisis of movement-image marks a will of the eighth art:

The new automatism [of time-image] is worthless in itself if it is not put to the service of a powerful, obscure, condense will to art, aspiring to deploy itself through involuntary movement which none the less do not restrict it. An original will to art has already been defined by us in the change affecting the intelligible content of cinema itself: the substitution of the time-image for the movement-image.52

Hara’s face is superimposed onto Ozu’s tree and vase as time-image – Noriko’s thinking of the historical forces that affects Hara’s body lies within the mundane images actualized by film form. The endless oscillation of looks that produces her head movement is a manifestation of the
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effect of time, and this process of the direct effect of time onto bodily movement will be seen also in the camera works in Oshima. Here, we are seeing the sensory-motor-schemata melting into film forms in order to deal with the effects of time, of the requirements of history old and new. It is the same process of how history is transformed into the menacing optical physics in the figures of puppeteers in Shinoda, albeit in the opposite direction. Through the circuitry of the time-image of the body, film form thus tackles history, its contingencies and economy, and, in turns, is assaulted by history. The Ozuian pillow shot is more a flashing of time-image in accommodating the conflicts between the body and the historical time flowing through it - between the cinematic body and the discursive body - than a quotation of the Japanese poetic tradition. A pillow word contains corporeality only insofar that the viewer reimagine the moment of writing – a pillow shot is corporeality, because without Hara’s endless head-turning and Ozu’s editing, the tree would retain a different meaning, constituting itself as a different flow of time. A literary interpretation of Ozu’s aesthetic system would need to include the historical moment in which the transposition of classic aesthetics from one medium to another – as a disruptive synthesis - and recognize that the harvesting of the tradition is more a dealing of time and technological properties of the apparatus - a thinking power generated by the encountering of cinema and the body - than a result of ‘Japaneseness’. It makes absolutely no difference to the artist’s will whether it borrows from ‘its own tradition’ or from the ‘Western canon’. It is in this sense that the will of art mirrors modernization with no absolute origins but contingencies, and it is at this point of convergence of history and cinema that the will of art and time-image decimate
the reductive readings of Japanese capitalism, everyday life, politics, economic exploitations as
difference-in-identity within the boundaries of a capitalist nation state, which is itself a
construction of this reductive logic. This reduction about the other belongs to the larger
movement of how the US hegemony maneuvered through the cultural and social institution of
Japan in incorporating the geo-political area into its power, as we have seen in academia in the
immediate years of WWII, especially in Area Studies and Comparative Literature. The past was
rendered into a function of the present, fully complicit to the rendering of the exploitative
capitalist forces at work invisible, and at the same time aesthetics is detached from it as if a
stand-alone system – a process that occurs in the realm of images while power in the politico-
economic realm was consolidating in various forms of military and economic infrastructures, the
mutating censorship, ANPO and so on. It is no surprise that Deleuze wrote about money before
he started relentlessly laying his theory of time-image on us. I read Oshima’s film as an attempt
to penetrate the issue that film itself is built from the same money as these manifested
infrastructures in the movement of simultaneous disappearance and consolidation of power. It is
a film the resists the reductive interpretations that are usually complicit with the geo-political
necessities.

The reputation or the image of an iconoclast that Oshima is well known for thus also
encompasses the rejection of this larger context: indeed he and his corpus of films were going
against the grains of the studio system and its aesthetics, but what they were fighting against in
vanguard was no less than the apparent separation of aesthetics and politics as part of the larger process of the consolidation of power and the disappearance of its traces. While his statements such as “all films are political”\(^{53}\) deserves no minor attention, I will refrain from narrating Oshima’s biography and theories on film as they have been concretely narrated by Turim, Desser and Sato. What I am interested in is this specific film’s relation with time, and its allegorical relationship with the image of disappearance-consolidation in the larger context. According to Bock in her interview with the former activist, film critic and director, he was unsatisfied with the New Left movement, but why then did he make a film about the New Left students? And, in the film, faced with the difficulty of making a proper political film, the students in Oshima’s film say that they should ask Oshima and his contemporaries, from Imamura to Suzuki, but curiously not Ogawa, for help. This no doubt points to the frustration with the representational impossibility allegorized as meta-fiction. It is puzzling that Bock would overlook this film when she stresses the importance of understanding Oshima’s frustration with the student movements, including the period when he was an activist.\(^{54}\) What can be more informative about a filmmaker’s frustration with the impossibility of representation of a historical period than a theorization of the cinema by using that very same medium? The film, as I will argue, is not an attempt to address this frustrated memory but *a thinking through* of the very limits and
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problematic of the memory, a function of time. His “revolt against the formula film”\textsuperscript{55} thus must be read in the context of the time-image identified by Deleuze, beyond style and the rigid studio system. It is also worth stating that auteurism and intentionality informed by biographical elements are more interesting when considered in conjunction with the time-image manifested in film form in the age in which the notion of subjectivity was rigorously questioned by filmmakers. The revolt launches its assault on not only aesthetics but the act of interpretation itself. Auteur theory indeed is helpful in bypassing the standardization of aesthetics in the studio systems, but this basic form that projects similarities and repetitions between films must also make room for difference. It had been roughly ten years since he made \textit{Night and Fogs in Japan}, \textit{Sun’s Burial} (1960), and \textit{Cruel Story of Youth} (1960), the trio of films made in the Japanese studio system containing elements that one could easily apply onto the Oshima brand: “…he saw that he was extremely drawn to what society calls criminal behavior…Indeed, in every Oshima film at least one murder, rape, theft or blackmail incident can be found, and often the whole of the film is constructed around the chronic repetition of such a crime.”\textsuperscript{56} However, in \textit{The Man who Left his Will on Film}, the murder could be a suicide, and the rape and the theft only exist if Motoki indeed is another person like he himself claims: Yasuko is his girlfriend and he steals his own camera. The basic form of auteursim is rejected by the narrative that attempts to allegorize the larger movement of history, by Oshima’s paradoxical treatment of film. As we will see in the
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film, the political allegory seen in his corpus of films is further allegorized: he allegorizes his auteurial reputation of a political allegorist.

While I do not dismiss the importance of auteur nor am I arguing for the death of the author, it is my contention to place films of Oshima in the context of the interplay between subjectivity, time and the ontological existence of cinema. If as Deleuze and Bergson insist that it is subjectivity that is within time, then there must be something that exceeds “Oshima,” and it is worth examining whether or not the invisible, or not-yet-visible, excess of determination has already been captured by film. The filmmaking of the likes of Ogawa Pro and De Sica are better described as leap of faith with a bungee jumping core of careful planning in their downtime. Oshima’s films produced with Shochiku or ATG also gains significant difference despite familiarities in aesthetics. More importantly, I am fully aware of the paradox presented in my attempt to read Oshima that we should look beyond the authority of the author, and at the same time it is Oshima himself who stressed the importance of “self-negation.” In other words, his theory and biographical material – his authority - actually informs this this mode of thinking. However, it is in this precise sense that Oshima’s corpus is extremely complex and still full of untapped potential energy in its ability to uphold contradictions. This is again not a question of conscious actions or unconscious thoughts, as we have learned from Deleuze and Hara’s face: Oshima was thinking indeed, but his films and the apparatus were thinking alongside him. If we
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have to use the word “cause” in describing these issues, we also need to consider what exceeds the appearance of the causal relationship. What I am suggesting here is that Oshima’s film, in which the ‘fictional student filmmaker’ is split open and follows himself to his death, can be read as a narrative that attempts to address the very question of cinematic authorship and its political implication in the larger historical context. And, by extension, whether or not the word “fictional” is an appropriate adjective to place in front of “student filmmaker.” If “all films are political,” then they are political in the flow of time, regardless of the instances created by the bracketing function of an author’s conscious action.

It is therefore worth the time to also look at the moments of relative lower intensity of violent clashes, and we should not assume violence was not applied to the student body during such ‘peaceful’ durations. The mere fact that the body’s capacity to express its frustration – its rhythms, pulse, and its being in time – was assigned as “illegitimate action” and therefore preventive police action was legitimized beckons us to examine its effects on the everyday life. Too powerful and too painful is the process in which violence wreaks the inside, the sensory-motor schemata, and its attempt to relink with the landscape of outside to establish the metaphor that makes the body move – the student movements. In Oshima, the cinematic notions we have learned from Deleuze, Hara Setsuko’s face and Jean-Luc Leaud’ body are injected with absolute frustration, pain and violence. Oshima’s film first and foremost, I suggest, allegorizes the mental violence that is turned inward: Motoki’s seeming self-destructive journey to his death belongs to
not only him but also the student body. This is to say, the violence is applied to the question of cinematic authorship itself. The question in Shinoda appears again: is this a suicide? The difference between Shinda and Oshima’s films is that this question manifests in the movements of the puppeteer in the former, and it appears as the incompatibility of narratives, of time, in the latter. We saw this in the 1970s when the same puppeteers that would kill Jihei drove Oshima’s spiritual automaton out of the country. The actual violence applied in the landscape of outside and the imminent violence, the potentiality of it, that surges through the circuit of the crystal image of time into interiority manifested on film as Jihei’s walk toward suicide shot on location and Motoki’s adventure in the landscape interiority, exteriorized by the missing camera, to his death are no less than the violence of the state flashes its presence as time-image. A dialectical image of the will of artist and the will of cinema appears: the former being the body’s survival in history, that of looking at itself, and the latter being the mutual leaking into each other of cinema and the body, that of being seen by cinema by seeing it.
3. The Leaking-Image II: The Film That Left its Will On Men

Politics is not made up of power relationships; it is made up of relationships between worlds.\(^{58}\)

…if 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 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 in thought, the birth of the visible which is still hidden from view.\(^{59}\)

What can a character do in a situation of a certain “motor helplessness”?\(^{60}\) The frustration of in the political realm felt by Oshima is transformed and is theorized in film form, resulting a character created directly from the film form. The ‘story’ of *The Man Who Left His Will on Film* is born out of a chasing after of the student activist and a self-proclaimed political filmmaker. During the era of intense student political activities, the staging and the performance of the violence by the students were what subjectified them in the representational problems that perpetuated the violence, and this, as I will suggest, is what Oshima was attempting to theorize in the various formal experiments in *The Man who Left his Will on Film*. The question is then: what can a perceiver do within a flow of images that sustains him as a perceiver and prevents him to
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be an actor besides dreaming for a surprised moment of unpredictability? Oshima’s Motoki is more sophisticated than Shinoda’s Jihei, I argue, for the sole reason that Motoki not only represents the desire for the unpredictable but also scrutinizes it. The former is, at the end of a deconstructive analysis, an aesthetical practice, a total creation of the auteur. For me, Jihei encompasses a sophisticated mode of looking, but being able to see and to desire for the unpredictable is not the same as being able to act. That is the Neo-Liberal gaze: a naïve belief in that the current mode of visibility that created this precise gaze is a form of action. Motoki’s presence (and absence on film) is a more difficult filmic character to understand: similar to Jihei’s movement of traversing the landscapes of media synthesized by cinema, Motoki is a character that problematizes the political struggles that are rooted in the modes of representations manifested in not only visual media but also organizations. The final section of this paper continues to employ Deleuze’s concept of the time-image while attempts to understand the political representations faced by the student activists in the 1960s by borrowing both Oshima’s and Motoki’s lenses.

*The Man Who Left his Will on Film* captures and (meta-)fictionalizes the oscillation of seeing and being seen within the character of Motoki and ‘his’ camera. The opening sequence shows a violent handheld camera shot as Motoki shouts off-screen at the cameraman, and the cameraman accidentally overexposes the film for a brief moment while being pushed and shoved by Motoki who accuses the cameraman of ignorance in capturing the proper images for the
cause. “What exactly are you planning to do?” Motoki shouts as he comes into the frame and continues to grab the camera. The cameraman runs away with the camera as his suitor gives chase. At this point, Takemitsu’s metallic music whips the handheld camera into a steady cam, that is, Oshima’s camera, and we now see Motoki running tirelessly after the thief/cameraman. We do not see the cameraman until momentarily before he commits suicide by jumping off a high apartment. The plunge into concrete is not shown by Oshima. Instead, the director zooms in and then out on Motoki’s face with a high-angle shot that soon is revealed as the point of view shot of the cameraman standing up high, and Motoki’s look has already fixated on the body on the floor and the camera lying beside it. Our protagonist realizes two paradoxes: the cameraman’s body lying on the floor is himself. And, the camera that shot all of the sequences we have just seen to this point is the same camera that Motoki/cameraman uses. The camera falls into the police’s possession, and Motoki again attempts to steal it to no avail. He runs after the police car as the film fades to black. The rest of the film depicts the everyday life of the student activists and their activities during the downtime, their immature theoretical debates on Marx, reading groups, filmmaking activities and Motoki’s fatal chase to find the camera. It is worth mentioning here that Oshima does not show the footages of violent clashes in student movements – all the violence appears to be exerted inward onto Motoki and his girlfriend Yasuko. Significantly, there are two films within Oshima’s film: the first is a documentary footage of the actual Okinawa Solidarity Day Demonstration. And, the second and the most important film
within film depicts Ozuesque mundane images of the landscapes of the city with no apparent motivation.

The students will spend the rest of the film trying to figure out what the cameraman was trying to depict, trying to see him through the corporeality of the cameraman indexed by camera movement. The film’s central mystery is what exactly happened at the Okinwan solidarity day protest, where Motoki was sent to document the day. According to Yasuko’s memory, Motoki was attacked by the police immediately after the protest and the camera was taken away, but according to what we have just seen, he was applying violence upon himself, and witnessed his own death. That he was indeed entangled with the police is the only fact we can be sure of. At what specific point in time did the young man who is called Motoki participate in the student movement? Which faction of the Zengakuren does he belong to? We cannot be certain. We are not even sure if he is himself or his own body. The only absolute is that he has made a film clip in Oshima’s film - his body existed because the film stocks exist. However, we cannot be sure that he has made the film within Oshima’s film. As the multiplicity of an unstable subject exist in a film within film, the phenomenology of the body and the character of Motoki are beyond the usual political allegorical character in the director’s corpus. Oshima’s “self-negation” as Turim translated, will be seen in his camera work, like Hara Setsuko’s turning of heads in meeting the looks of other characters within the flow of time. The shot-by-shot relationship here is Hara’s neck turning, in joining the passages of time together.
Before we venture further into the film, it is important to examine the facts taunted by Oshima, because the narrative contradictions and inconsistencies are the central points of the film. In fact, these facts only lead to further confusion and frustration. First, there are two visible films within Oshima’s films: a documentary footage depicting a student demonstration, and an Ozuesque student film that was shot on the same roll of negative as Oshima’s film. It is unclear whether the students were indeed in the Okinawan demonstration. It is a fact that the second Ozuesque film, depicting simply landscapes, was shot by a student in the group, but it is unclear whether or not the images we see were shot by Motoki or Takagi, another student filmmaker that never appears in Oshima’s film except in dialogues. Second, Motoki’s chase to replicate the Ozueque film, and ultimately to his death, signifies that there is a third film-within-film that is identical to the second one. In actuality, the third, absent film-within-film is the only one that is for certain produced by Motoki, but it may or may not be inside Oshima’s film since it is identical to the second film-within-film we see alongside the students. Third, it is explicit that Oshima’s film is paradoxically shot on the same roll of negatives as Motoki’s film. The camera that shot this roll can be seen lying next to Motoki’s dead body – this scene is depicted by this very same camera. These endless *mise en abymes* extent beyond the reality marked by the existence of camera apparatuses, as the students discuss the potentiality of asking Oshima, Imamura, Shinoda, and their New Wave contemporaries for help to the cause of the student movements. And, as we will see, Oshima will link these *mise en abymes* to the phenomenology
of the body and the difficult distinction of reality and imagination, the movements of actions and the world.

While the beginning sequence shows that Motoki was indeed running after the police for the camera he borrowed from the student group, his whereabouts is contradictory between what the film shows (trying to take the camera back from ‘another man’ and witnessing ‘his’ death), and what his fellow students suggest (capturing the Okinawan day protest with the missing camera). This early scene introduces the first of many paradoxes to come that tackles the reliability of memory and questions of subjectivity. This is perhaps the immediate political allegory: Oshima shows the inner turmoil of a political subject through the usage of a surreal sequence that showcases the interiority of a frustrated man. We should go further as this interpretation assumes that this representation necessarily conveys the historical currents, excluding the consideration of the representational impossibility that Oshima is trying to achieve. While aptly captures one of the central points of Oshima’s theoretical approach to cinema, this interpretation does not consider that the film’s attempts to destabilize the assumed rigidity of subjectivity. In fact, as I will argue, Motoki is not a human being but a mode of temporality, like the vase or the tree in *Late Spring*. The difference that complicates the situation is that Motoki phenomenological body has a desire that contradicts time’s thought. The film form beckons the viewers to question even their first level of understanding and engage in a phenomenology of the
body, and the movement of the film and the world. If Motoki sees himself while being seen, and if I see him seeing himself on film, then who am I while the film is looking at me?

Immediately after the film begins, the phenomenology of the cinematic body seen in the oscillation of Hara’s head turning – that is to say, the rendering visible of the incompossible time-lines by the film form and the body - manifests again in the contrast between a high and a low angle shot. When Motoki wakes up, a low-angle shot placed on the same height as the bed he lies in shows a group of student activists overlooking him. Motoki’s lying body occupies roughly fifty percent of the shot and is in focus, and the depth of field pushes the figures of his fellow student into the background. He remarks that he needs to get the camera back, as the students observe his condition. A series of close-ups follow, each depicting a student describing to him the current situations with the movement and the lost camera: neither Motoki nor the students know what was in the camera or what the police could prove with this footage. Motoki gets up, and a high-angle-shot, diametrically opposed to the low-angle shot, follows. Now the foreground is the side figure of a smoking student in another room, while Motoki is blurred into the background. At the moment Motoki sits up, when the high-angle shot occurs, he remarks: “I must get my camera back,” and two students scold him that there is no personal possession in their movement. They investigate him like police questioning a suspect to determine whether he wants the camera back for the cause or because he thinks it is his camera. The contrast between the high and low-angle shots marks the difference in looking and to-be-looked, projection and
back-projection, voice and silence, subjectivity and to-be-subjectified. In the first moment, the ‘concept of Motoki’ springs from his body, and in the second, it is projected by speech-acts. He wills and then this will is objectified, conceptualized. Another student remarks that like Motoki, when he uses a camera of the student group, he also thinks that it is his, and it is the only thing he protects when encountering the police – this statement was interrupted by an outburst of anger: “materialistic bourgeois consciousness!” Here, the larger circuit of film form (reversal of the shots) is mirrored in a smaller circuit of speech-act of assigning meaning to others, taking form in petty name-calling: “mindless activist!” “dogmatist!” and “anti-imperialist Stalinist!” – a scene that mirrors the disagreements between student groups. It is safe to say that the students are confused and contradictory even within one’s own subjective view, but one statement that catches our attention is: “the members of the film club believe that proletarian consciousness can produce proletarian films!” At the utterance of this statement, Motoki magically gains the strength to stand up and attempts to go to the police station, but he soon collapses into the arms of Yasuko, who is instructed to “read him a Trotskyist bedtime story.” This oscillation of looks will repeat throughout the film not just in film form but also in projection and back projection, rape and being raped, enforcer of and victim of violence. The time-image flashes its presence at once on the film form and the body constructed by it.

Are they part of the New Left student groups? It seems likely for their militant mannerism and the constant reference to Trotsky, but does this matter to the narrative? The
actual affiliations and ideological differences, that is, the historical accuracy, is negated by
Oshima’s film – only its effects and its violent pressure applied to the body, remain in the film.
The body of Motoki that has just been sketched by the film form that manifests in the low and
high-angle shots – a possibility of a recognition of who he is – is soon disintegrated by the
contradictions of narrative. Oshima taunts us with flashes of facts. Motoki accuses another man
(himself) of his inability to be a proper revolutionary subject and a lousy filmmaker. Yasuko has
enough of her boyfriend’s delusion and narrates her memory of the events that happened on the
Okinawan Solidarity day – this is a back-projection of the memory onto the unstable subject, a
labeling of his being. This is when the first film-within-film occurs as a documentary footage
that depicts the actual event in history. Yasuko’s voice is directed at Motoki but in the film-
within-film it becomes a voiceover that does not correlate to the images shown. According to
Yasuko, their sect was flanked by the Kakumaru sect, and the police intervened, this when
Motoki lost his camera. Significantly, when we are seeing the documentary footage as Yasuko
narrates what had happened to Motoki, he remarks: “ah, the red postal box!” and “huh, children.”
The red postbox and the children are nowhere to be seen in the documentary footage, and we will
later learn that the red postbox is in the Ozuesque film within Oshima’s film, and the children are
found as part of Motoki’s chase of himself in Oshima’s film. The facts are as difficult to track as
the contradictions of the narrative, and the documentary footages are as useless as memory for
the protagonist.
Yasuko provides the voiceover for the documentary footage, but what she describes is her memory, while the footage shows various actualities of the protest shot by unknown cameramen and put together by an unknown editor. That which is depicted by the footage is negated by voiceover, and the narrative of the voiceover is again negated by Oshima’s film. Yasuko’s narration is negated by the documentary footage, and the documentary in turns is negated by her. Oshima’s film hosts these endless negations and contradictions: no memory is reliable. The streams of facts, memory, and events seem to flow from one out-of-field, passing through Oshima’s film, to another. These unending movements of negation of actualities and narrative consistencies are of extreme importance because at the most basic level, the instances of actuality can only project the function of memory, and the characters surrounding Motoki can only make sense of him by projecting their own novelistic memory of him and the events onto him. At this point, he is only being looked at, and not looking. It is as if his phenomenological body exists only in the second high-angle shot in the background. He attempts to assert the existence of his body, desiring to project his look. In the scene after the documentary footage ends, in rage, Motoki has forced himself on Yasuko’s lips, preventing her from doing more voice-over. On the level of the story, he is angry because she was shooting a useless footage during the protest, but at the juncture of film form and history, his violent outburst is the frustration with the absolute unreliability of memory in that it only consists of the projection of the phenomenon body, without a reverse movement: the capacity to look. This is why upon seeing the second film-within-film, Motoki gives chase to the cameraman, revisiting and
reshooting every location that was shot on film. He wants to be the cinematic apparatus that projects a look in attempting to inject his subjectivity, rescuing it from the novelistic memory, and its assertiveness, of others. The self-negation of the narrative movement, in conjunction with film form point to an innate frustration of the body that rejects the projection of the novelistic memory and its attempt to construct a subject.

This absence in projection, the lack of Motoki’s looking function, has more importance outside of the film than the structural integrity of Oshima’s narrative, which does not need any form of integrity. The violence of the state applied inward to students’ everyday life is again applied by the novelistic memory, processed by the historical forces of US hegemony, onto the body. We are seeing an endless movement of disidentification, from the larger historical circuit, passing through the student groups, and to the inner most level – the body. Oshima takes it one step further as Motoki inflicts violence upon himself. The frustration of the intrapersonal, the memory of the interpersonal and the disappearance-consolidation of the historical forces form a Mobius loop of unending disidentification and violence, perpetuating that absence capacity in subjectivity. The ontology of a political subject consists this lack in the capability of projecting back. It is not memory itself that is inflicting the violence, but the desire of the others that attempts to formulate the concept of Motoki by way of back-projection, turning Motoki in to a being that can only be seen and not see. His frustration and the subsequent chase come from being seen, projected, but not being able to see. Sensory-motor-schemata will be re-established
as Mokoki’s frustration propels his body into movements in landscape, in which time-images will continuously be crystalized. Beyond the discernibility of the virtual and actual images, the movements of actions and the movements of the world are no longer discernible in Motoki’s chases. Significant to this line of thought is the fact that Motoki seem to be unstable in every way except for his theory of cinema: he dashes out clear and concise theory of filmmaking and its application to the political realm in one scene. The problem remains that he is still being back-projected by his friends, he does not remember what happens in the streets, and his theory of film is useless without a camera.

3.2 Frustration in the Private, Memory of the Streets, and the Dream of Filmmaking

The frustration of the body (of Motoki) springs from a vanishing difference in political subjectification; to act, he is to become a part of a “student group,” a “son,” and a “political activist and filmmaker.” To ‘act’ only means to be seen – a cycle that he will attempt to break, by means of chasing after himself and by making a film. The clash between the students and the collective suppressive force against them is, as Ranciere might say, the meaning making process of how the word “student activist” is used as a category instituted in the common. These projection processes that take place on the level of the story have a real-life and political counterpart: the various representational impossibilities surrounding the student activists as a political entity. The relentless movements of negation in narratives and disidentification through back-projections allegorize the disagreement between the JCP and the Zengakuren students, the
larger historical context that conditioned it, and the failures that resulted from the disagreements. Motoki’s Mobius journey is punctuated by the encounters with empirical police, but the outward violence directed at the students is turned inward onto an intrapersonal level as Motoki applies violence on himself, and a personal level as Yasuko is beaten and raped by both Motoki and random strangers. Like the mutual negations of the film form and narratives, what actually happened in the public and political realm – student actions such as blockage of a building - is negated by Oshima, and turned inward as bodily, self-inflicted violence. The phenomenological body constructed by the film form is thereby linked to the larger historical context of student movements as a metonymic construction within the film. If we get to the depths of the body constructed by the film, we see that what was happening in the theatre of politics acts on the body of Motoki as invisible forces, affecting his chase of the cameraman through the images of landscape. Manifested as a desire to make films as weapons, the frustration with the historical forces and the political predicaments is represented as direct time-images that appear on the Ozueque film-within-film, and the paradox that Oshima’s film and Motoki’s film are shot on the same roll of film stock. The film plays with levels and modes of visibility like Shinoda’s film plays with the different narrative possibilities on different mediums - the difference is that Oshima is also tackling the problems of political representation head on by paradoxically negating it on the narrative level. The filmmaking processes surrounding Motoki’s film contain a complex frustration to the problems of representation that the students faced. This film thus needs be historicized with the difficulty in political representation that the student activists faced
in constituting themselves as activists. The following section documents what is not in the film, or what is allegorized negatively.

Amidst the first mass Zengakuren occupation of the Diet, Kishi was replaced by the LDP’s Ikeda Hayato on July 19th, 1960. The new administration boasted the slogan “tolerance and endurance”\(^{61}\) as it diverted the public focus toward economic growth. In actuality, however, changes were minimal as the general direction of the country did not detract itself from the trajectory of developmental theory: the Narita airport was in planning and the preparations for Tokyo Olympic was diverting the country’s attention from the issues with which the Left and the students were concerned – a collective forgetting that Igarashi rightly points to. The view that the mass student mobilizations in previous decade were failures by the students themselves led the Zengakuren into disagreements within the sects, and alongside with the momentum of the gradual purging of the JCP from the student federation, the disagreements took the form of money and power struggle within the Zengakuren. The disagreements gradually escalated but intensified in the latter half of the decade. The depiction in the media of the student federation itself was problematic in terms of representation and visibility. Zengakuren was the name of the national student organization that comprised local student self-governed associations, of which membership was compulsory. Zengakuren thus represented in actuality a small number of

\(^{61}\) Igarashi, 140.
activists who belonged to various student political groups. Ichiro Sunada, writing in 1969, saw this as an antecedent problem to the violent struggles inside and outside: “the question arises as to how the Japanese radicals are able to stage their movement in the name of Zengakuren, which is supposed to represent the mass of students in Japan.” For Sunada, the interrelation between Zengakuren as a national organization and as a radical movement – that is, between moments of different intensities - cannot be separated from this antecedent problem and the internal struggles of power, money and control. The relative smallness of the Zengakuren in the representation of the total students of the nation meant that to create mass momentum radical activities needed to take the form of internal struggle. This is due to three major elemental reasons as identified by Sunada:

First, a majority group controlling a student government can easily mobilize the rank and file of students to its policy or further recruit them by monopolizing the machinery of the association to keep contact with the student mass. Second, a majority group can execute its political activities in the name of all the students, as in fact it is legally endorsed to do by virtue of having been elected…. Third, the leaders can appropriate a
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measure of the association’s funds, derived from membership fees collected from all the students, for their political campaigns.\textsuperscript{64}

The organizational differences between sects are therefore more than difference in ideology but also a result of struggles of power and money. Still the Zengakuren’s problems in representation were beyond quantitative organizational structures and the derivative power struggles. The disputes with their former mentor, the JCP, indeed came from the Communist Party’s theorization of the student body as a mere arm of the Party, and by proxy, as the mediator between the state and labour, since the students were elites that would land governmental and bureaucratic positions. Besides the few students at elite schools or those who came from a solid economic background, the JCP’s assignment of these roles seemed like a farce, as the economic situations of the students at less well-known public and private universities did not allow the students to come to the same conclusion. But the disagreements between the JCP and the students were much more than an adolescent cry for attention: this affective posture has a fundamental ideological difference that also had a tremendous impact on the disagreement between the tactics. The JCP, comprised of pre-war prisoners released by the Occupation, experiencing the effects of the reverse course where they saw that war criminals enjoyed the same fate as they did half a decade ago, insisted

\textsuperscript{64} Ibid, 458.
that the highly developed capitalist nation-state of Japan was part and parcel with the US
hegemonic power. The singular most important opponent to the revolution at this point was thus
“US imperialism,” and in order to achieve a Japanese revolution, they believed that a gradual
step by step process through parliamentary politics and gaining public support would eventually
eradicate the US influence on Japanese capitalism.\textsuperscript{65} The students’ task was accordingly not
introducing revolutionary paradigms that would disturb the everyday function of the system, but
democratizing the systems on campuses, by taking in the demands and complaints of the students
and faculties and inducing them to the JCP’s political structures.\textsuperscript{66} Through the political
representation of the JCP, these issues would be addressed in the Diet – an ideological as well as
a strategic move in reinforcing the influence of the party in both ends. Their approaches to the
student body in this context contradicted with the image of agency through selfhood that the anti-
JCP students had insisted.

The anti-JCP radicals rejected first the notion of being a mere arm of the JCP and
second their concept of a gradual revolution pivoting on the removal of US influence. Their
primary concern was class struggle. For them, what this line of thinking lacked was the
consideration of the hidden nationalist sentiment that was fully complicit with the economic
forces of the US presence in terms of capitalist formation of a nation-state, and the undisputable

\textsuperscript{65} Ibid, 461 - 462
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fact that “Japan itself has been rebuilt as a monopolistic, capitalist, imperialist nation which is simply cooperating with US imperialism.” The anti-JCP’s notion of the student body extended beyond the activities on campus. Specifically, the radicals saw that if the student body had the potential of mediating between state policies and class struggle, their activity needed to extend its influence to both ends in revolutionary and disruptive terms. The campuses were bases to their revolutionary activities, manipulating other establishments and in hopes of manipulating the system itself. Direct actions that stop policies being passed were their primary tactics. This desire can be seen in the attention placed on independent thinking and the consciousness of “selfhood,” which would be criticized by the JCP as Trotskyist “existentialist inclination,” reducing it to mere emotional outburst and affective tactics.

Among the anti-JCP groups who were accused of being Trotskyist, the Kakumaru, the Revolutionary Marxists, and the Chukaku sects were mentioned in Oshima’s film. Specifically, Kakuramu’s usually sectarian stance in selectively joined street demonstrations earned
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themselves the nickname of “opportunists.” While Oshima’s film plays the documentary footage for us and Motoki, Yasuko narrates for Motoki that he lost his camera because the police intervened the verbal and physical attacks coming from the Kakumaru, and that she believed had the two factions joined force they would have been able to fend off the police. Yasuko tells the absent minded Motoki that her idea was dismissed by him: “That’s what Kakumaru would call an illicit alliance!” This scene captures a desire for a direct confrontational mode of protest and for an overcoming of difference in representational tactics. For the most 1960s, clashes between the police and the students were spontaneous, but “in 1967 it was evident that a small number of radicals had initiated the confrontations.”

Sunada, writing just two years after the shift he identifies, attributes this perceptual shift in the media, the state police, and the students to two major factors: the routine of ineffective demonstrations and the larger international context. Just short of ten years before, the anti-Anpo protests tried various tactics at airports and the Diet building to stop Kish from renewing the treaty. Fast-forward to the imminent renewal of the treaty in the context of the Vietnam War and Japan’s cooperation with the US, Sunada argues that the uniqueness of the 1967 Haneda incident lies in confrontational tactics: “If by promoting violent clashes they seem intentionally to seek brutal suppression by the police, it is because they are generally much more concerned with the political effect their tactics will bring than with
victory in the immediate confrontation.”\(^{71}\) The radicals’ direct action philosophy was no longer preventive and was being carried out as direct confrontations with the police in hoping to strike a reaction in the media and the public. This marks a different conception of time, for the past (virtual) can be actualized in both preventive actions, or in the politics of representation (actual). The visibility of violence therefore informs that the violence afflicted on the student body was more ambiguous than that of a disclosure of state violence. As Morroti writes: “What was new at Haneda…was the use of violence as a means to prevent the exercise of declared state policy – and consequently, the foregrounding of force itself in the confrontations between protesters and the state.”\(^{72}\) The difference in tactics before and after 1967 was that gaining visibility in the media changed the students’ fundamental approach from merely stopping a passing of a bill through direct action into something more. It was no longer merely direct, physical actions but also a matter of gaining visibility, using images as weapons. I would like to introject that it is here the Deleuzian time-image and cinema become a useful aid in reading historical narratives. The presence of the cinematic and photographic apparatus had been there since the beginning, however, the quantitative increase in exposure, the forms in which the media used these apparatuses, and the changing international climate revealed a shift within both the look and the looked-at. “To put it crudely, “non-violence” was enabled by violence, that is, by a violent display whose results revealed and delegitimated massive state violence, while reenergizing and

\(^{71}\) Ibid, 466.

\(^{72}\) Marotti, 128.
broadening political possibilities.” The presence of helmets and staves augmented on the student body depicted in the images was more than self-defence and had stirred various perceptual changes in the mass, simultaneously gaining sympathy and distain for the students. Oshima’s film needs to be historicized with this particular perceptual process in which the political and everyday frustration with the various representational impossibilities was shaping the occurrences of violence and the moments of intensity. The scene in which Motoki and a student film editor discuss the act of filmmaking is important for it reveals a desire to use film form itself as a means to gain influence in the mass. As we can see now, that Oshima’s films need to be understood with the legacy of the student movements, as suggested by Bock, and virtually all scholars of Oshima, is indeed important, and I would further suggest that, in this context, Oshima’s film form was documenting and theorizing the modes of temporality in which violence and disagreements seemed to be the main characters in the political realm.

While the multiplicity of the political dynamics within the JCP is less a concern in Oshima’s film, it is worth mentioning that at a visible political juncture such as the disputes between the JCP and the anti-JCP students, the interrelations between internal and external disputes seemed to be a point where media made reductive sense of the complexity of the movements and depicted them accordingly. The idea of class struggle and the concept of student participation, in the context of the problematics of both quantitative and ideological
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representations, present a difficulty in discerning how much of the violent tactics came from struggling for visibility, or from the students’ expression of their ideology. The US media jumped on the bandwagon in dubbing the anti-JCP groups as “radical, militant, ultra-left, extremist, Trotskyite,” and who demonstrate “anti-Americanism.” Interestingly, they seemed to conveniently miss that the primary ideology of the JCP is that of repelling US control completely while the students who opposed the JCP control were more focused on the more particular policies. Furthermore, with the Japanese media labeling Chukaku (an anti-JCP sect) in 1967 as “mere yakuza” and “thoughtless violent gangs,” William Morroti is led to write: “reducing the student voices to noise, as a collection of screamed, empty insults, the [Asashi Shimbun] reported the incident as the appearance of a ‘new violent gang rioting on the basis of a-theoretical, special rights due to their freedom and youth.” Significantly, Morroti also points to the stance that the state took, attributing the causes in the clashes to the students’ reckless behaviour. If, as the JCP claimed, the student body was to be in the meditative structure between the state and labour, and, as the students saw their capacity as the potential solution to state and class struggle, then the difficulty lied in political representation on various levels of mediums, and these mediums include not simply actual visual media but also political junctures as mediums of representation. In other words, the dialectics of visibility and invisibility at the junctures where the body and the visual media converge were important key points where one
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party created meaning about another: that is, the disidentifications that evolve into political disagreements and violent conflicts were occurring alongside the quantum mechanics of rendering visible-or-invisible. Oshima’s film, as I have sketched, attempt to theorize this process through an interaction of film form and unique phenomenological body of Motoki created by the film form.

Within this oscillation of the visible and the invisible, the years between 1967 to 1970 saw a period of endless shifting of public supports and disproval for the students due to the interactions of media depictions and novelistic memory. Marotti writes that “while the student violence fell far short of achieving activists’ goal of sparking a general mass insurrection, it brought attention back to what had been a waning issue for both medial and other protest groups, creating the conditions for their voices to initiate a public debate over state force and the connections between internal suppression and support for war in Asia.”⁷⁶ Marotti’s rigorous documentation of the specifics incidents indicates and shows convincingly that this was not always the case. The situation could easily turn out to be undesirable and disastrous for the students. Tactically speaking, it had become that the violence inflicted on the students were used to mobilize the non-radicals to the radicals’ cause. And, it matters not whether this was intentional, for the students’ actions of harvesting the violence inflicted on their own bodies indicated that the student body was becoming mere political means, being treated as an

⁷⁶ Marotti, 117
inhumane object like what the JCP and the Police had done. In fact as James W. Morley documented in 1969 that the brief non-violence of the police was no less a tactic. Violence and non-violence were continuous in form: neither one of these two ‘options’ can be represented as itself. The dark violent time is not monochromatically dark. In his “Japan 1968: The Performance of Violence and the Theater of Protest,” Marotti’s historical narrative argues that the categories of the political and non-political (nonpori) were constantly blurred precisely because this formal continuity: that is, the nonpori students (and everyone else) were quite literally impossible not contributing to how the spurs of violence would take shape. Both sides, the students and the police, utilized the public outrage to their advantage, thereby transforming the everydayness into dramatic spaces where the both sides can ‘act’ violently and politically. I would further add that the act of looking through the visual media, be it cinema, newspaper or television, was the primary reason that transformed the seeming discontinuity into formal continuity in both the everyday realm and the political realm. But Marotti does not offer a potential solution of how the shifting between the two categories can be useful to the global situations both in the 1960s and 2009, when this article was published. I will suggest that Oshima theorizes this ‘either/or’ dilemma within the film form in conjunction with his artist’s frustration, for the difference in what is visible and invisible was driving this endless shifting between the political and the non-political. This is to say that the comprehensive historical narrative Marotti has provided us illuminates a few moments of the possibility of revolution, but The Man has not only recorded similar moments of possibilities but also points to a fabulous insight in which the
desire for the unpredictable is not simply a desire for revolution but one that retains and at the same time relieves the pain – a paradoxical actualization of the unbearable frustration in a series of actions of a body in a given field of experience.

The insights Ranciere offers in Disagreement as well as “Ten Theses on Politics” illustrate why the means of political representation employed to levitate a problem identified could be the precise reason that (re)constitutes and reinforces it. For the philosopher who built his career on problematizing the voices of philosophers, the appearance of a dispute is the absolute removal of the sphere where the people appear – and this is not a paradoxical construction. What he lays out is in tune with Deleuze’s time-image that images are not the images of some being and that they are real:

The regime of the all-visible, of the endless presentation to each and every one of us of a real indissociable from its image, is not the liberation of appearance. It is, on the contrary, its loss. The world of total visibility carves out a real where appearance has no place to occur or to produce its divisive, fragmenting effects. Appearance, particularly political appearance, does not conceal reality but in fact splinters it, introduces contentious objects into it, objects whose mode of presentation is not homogeneous with ordinary mode of existence of the objects thereby identified.77

77 Ranciere, 104
That the becoming visible, becoming a voice, is the replacement of being in the common is the objectification of the infinitely more complex problematics into simple ‘lacks’, flowing out of the necessity of solving it within the process of a dispute, an art of deduction. Appearance is in fact not a simulation but the form in which the pain or frustration becomes the visible, utterable disagreement. Ranciere explains this process, the formation of the form, in spatialized terms. In pedagogy terms, spatial concepts in *Disagreement* are superimposed on top of each other, stacking one space onto another, and the theoretical argument is laid out as layers after layers of spatial terms are conjoined into temporal terms. In both the movement of his formal argumentation and the written words, we see a rigorous rejection of placing the concept of politics into a chain of cause and effect in which a lack within a group can be identified. In fact, the form of Ranciere’s writing is not unlike the interchange of gazes between Hara Setsuko and the vase in which various incompassible time lines are pooled together. In other words, the real question of a spatialized political thinking is this: how does the contingency of a social order become absent in the formal construction of space of encounter where political appears?

With this in mind, we can go ahead and read the potent ideas of *disidentification* and “the partition of the sensible.” For Ranceire, politics is a form of a contingent encounter and the modes of subjectification, “the production through a series of actions of a body and a capacity for enunciation not previously identifiable within a given field of experience, whose
identification is thus part of the reconfiguration of the field of experience.”\textsuperscript{78} Unfortunately, the politics today is precisely the removal of this contingency. A “proletarian/worker” or a “student activist” in the political realm is not really the identity that could represent what the worker or student does in socio-economical configuration. The names assigned are rather instances in the experience of a dispute, and what is ignored is that which exists in the interval, that of the everyday struggles. Here, the space in which the disidentification occurs must be seen as a space of removal from the connections and relations that reveal a ‘natural’ subject: “any subjectification is a disidentification, removal from the naturalness of place, the opening up of a subject space where anyone can be counted, where a connection is made between having a part and no part.”\textsuperscript{79} While this concept of disidentification is not the focal point of Disagreement, I think it is useful for our purpose here. For Motoki’s existence within Oshima’s film form allegorizes the notion of disidentification in the political. And, for the problems of representation faced by the students we have identified above have always already been precisely because that subjectification in the fields of experience – from the inner power struggles between the students, the disputes with the JCP, to the struggles of the form of visibility in the media with the police – starts out as disidentification. In the philosopher’s book on politics we see the superimposition of the spaces: the space of inscription of the names is at once the space of the logic saturated governance. The space of practical transformations, say, in the differences of intensity of
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violence in tactics, is also the space of perceptual shifts and designation. The space that becomes visible also encompasses the hidden visuality that nevertheless structures the visible (avisuality). The space of gaining a voice is also the space where one is silenced. This vanishing appearance is what the phenomenological body created by Oshima’s film form metaphorizes. As a fictional student activist, played by an amateur actor who is an actual student activist, and as a metaphorical construction in film form, he traverses various realms, from the private, public and to the political junctures where disidentification is the point of departure. His construction as a being exists in various incompossible presents.

The question thus still remains: did gaining media attention mean that a shift in the political realm had occurred, say, a conversation between the state and the students? Or, did this form of becoming visible further the resource of violent tactics in the process of reconstituting the egos that ended up reinforcing the violent process of disidentification, and thus further gave momentum to the endless movements of disidentification and the problems of political representation? The arrival of USS Enterprise, a nuclear capable aircraft carrier, in 1968 sparked fear and memory of the atomic bombings in a large portion of the population, and the students took full advantage in this perceptual transformation about them in the public mass by setting up campaigns that collected both sympathy and money.⁸⁰ The latter was, as we might remember, what Sunada identified as the antecedent problem. In the midst of public sympathy, the police
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toned down their violence, and the radicals strengthened their numbers – and the violence soon returned. In the larger context of violent tactics and political representation, the ‘achievement’, if such a thing is indeed possible, of that which the students desired should also encompass a shift in their structural and ideological composition and by proxy the method through which visibility is gained. The new gained visibility in the situations did not spark a shift in the ego that constituted the basic representational structure of the student movements. Gaining sympathy as an underdog in media was reinforcing the affective posture that the students had to inject within the representational struggles mentioned above. It was unfortunately a logic that regulated what is visible in a certain time frame. Oshima’s film apprehends a dimly lit frustration – in which this reconstitution of the ego of group ideology overlooks the importance of cinema - of the director with this perhaps naïve, strategic gesture that points to the limits of student movements in political representation.

What deserves our attention is therefore that the students’ frustration lied within the issues concerning the impossibility of representation existing in various levels ranging from quantitative organizational structures, ideological differences, the physical activities conditioned by the former two reasons, postures that are for pure affective or ideological reasons, the formation of media and mass perceptions, and the way in which these issues interacted and propelled the chain of negation and disidentification not only by the state and media but also by the party and the sects. My point here is that the limits of the student struggles were more than
the strategic incompetence in affecting changes or the state’s competence in eliminating
oppositions, and that memory of the immediate past was promptly subsumed by the mechanisms
of these representational issues at radically yet simultaneous different levels. If we have to use
the word cause, we should note that something more was at work here. We saw an attempt to
discover this ‘something-more’ in casual relations in Neo-Realism, and what Oshima, and
perhaps it can be argued that the New Wave project in its new regimes of images, has tried to
accomplish is to incorporate it into his films - representing a certain impossibility of
representation. More precisely, I think what Oshima has done is allegorize the desire to represent
the impossibility. The chain of negating and disidentifying others took form in mental and
physical violence throughout the 60s, and it takes form of narrative inconsistencies, back-
projections in both film form and the story created by the maneuvering through representational
failures by cinematic form. Turim’s describes this film accurately: “…the radicality of subject
whose primordial cleavage is that which is staged not between man and nature, but a subject and
a representational system (a film) – specially a film whose ‘signification’ is generated
emphatically through that subject’s fragmentation and displacement.”81 But this subject existing
within the filmic system is but one of the endless manifestations within a chain of actualisable
representational contrarieties in the flow of the historical forces, and their derivative geo-politics
and economics, in which cinema is born. A leakage from the cinematic to history, or vice versa,
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appears in Oshima’s film, taking the form of filmmaking in the scene in which the students dispute the theory of film while making a film. Furthermore, history also leaks in on the narrative level: in the final shot of Oshima’s film, after the suicide, the director brings us and Motoki back to the opening shot, except this time it is the students from presumably the Chukaku sect that are confronting Motoki. They enter the point-of-view shot and demand their camera back while uttering the same dialogue that Motoki says to the unknown cameraman (who is Motoki) in the beginning of the film. The others intrude the subjectivity of Motoki both behind the camera and in front of the camera. We now realize that the disagreement within the students is the antecedent disturbance that initiates Motoki’s unstable psyche in the story, and that the problems of political representation are represented as the protagonist’s inconsistent subjectivity.

Why are these issues and historical not recorded in the film directly? Rather than restaging a historical episode, Oshima creates a scene that expresses the artist’s frustration. We will see in the debate on filmmaking. Tracking Sato’s view that this film reacts to the failure of the students in 1969, Turim asks: “Oshima is chronicling that despair through fictional means…is he looking at the process of political opposition and the negotiations of alternative collectivities, theoretically?” The answer is a resounding yes. The scene in which Motoki and Yasuko entre the house where the students edit their films is the only time Motoki projects confidently his theory of film, mirroring his temporary recovery of sensory-motor function
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earlier in the film when he gets up upon the utterance of “weapon film.” In the house, the self-appointed film and political theoretician, Yazawa, is editing the footage of the second film-within-film (the Ozuesque scenes of actualities). The student editors inside the house discuss first Motoki’s condition then lead into their frustration with the movement: the frustration of the outside is inflicted onto the inside of the body, as Motoki is accused of becoming an “opportunist” like the Kakumaru bunch in being elusive in these crucial times where they have to reach a point of mass action to save mankind from the constant suppressions. Motoki answers that his body is fine but his mind is not – and as I will argue, his unstable mind is not a question of psychology but Oshima’s and the film’s thinking through of the problematics of the political representation faced by the students; his unstable psychological state becomes the cinematic medium’s tackling of the political realm. Significantly, Motoki asks his friend to let him take over the editing station to keep his mind out of the crazy ideas about a guy who does not exist and shot a roll of film. Yasuko confronts his delusion of real and imaginary, and one student expresses his frustration that he worries that Motoki is not the only one who is confused about fiction, reality, and imagination. He remarks that like Motoki, the rest of the students are delusional in thinking that “revolution will emerge out of armed insurrections even without mass support.” Motoki declares that the only way to break the oppression of mankind is through imagination. “That’s why we are making films!” agrees Yazawa.
Motoki projects confidently, only at this point, “our task is more than getting the film [in the missing camera] back from the police, but the liberation of imagination.” Motoki starts to edit the film, and oddly remembers that he used to participate in student protests, but was frustrated by “being thrown around by history.” He admires a documentary footage on a protest he had seen: “a thing such as a camera really illustrates history.” He explains: “It seems like the movements of history do not bare any relation to our lives, but the camera makes it seem closer and personal.” To this, Yazawa protests:

You joined our group because of the moral bankruptcy of street activities, and because our film group to use film as means to launch a new struggle. Therefore, the argument that film illustrates history does not stand. Film is to be used as a medium to confront reality – that’s how films becomes weapons!

The disagreement in filmmaking theory between Motoki and Yazawa is the difference between film augmenting (tsukushikazaru) history with a reality closer to the body, and film confronting reality in order to change history: in praise of realist, and formalist disruptive style, respectively. It indicates a fundamental difference in the conceptualization of subjectivity: the former suggests that subjectivity, alongside cinema, is fragile and is formed within the currents of history and streams of time, while the latter assumes an image of a subject that resembles a predetermined
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being, and the task of cinema is to cater the correct information to it. For Yazawa, the moral 
bankruptcy is a symptom to be cured or rescued by the weapon films, but for Motoki, implicitly, 
despite the fact that the cinema forms alongside the movement’s failures, there is potentiality to 
be redeemed by the virtue of a camera’s mere being-in-situation. The difference in theory of 
filmmaking also manifests in Oshima’s construction of the characters: as soon as Motoki 
projects, he is interrupted, and he soon gives in to Yazawa by dismissing his own idea. The 
potentiality is rendered invisible. The whole discussion reveals the notion of cinema projected by 
the student group: cinema needs to create a new relationship between the creative self and 
reality, and this newness in perceptual reality and the creative self are combined and to be used 
as a tool of self-critique, the ideological commonality between the Anti-JCP groups. The 
proletarians have to be confronted by cinema as weapon to be rid of bourgeois consciousness. In 
this context, cinema as a medium in actuality is assigned to secondary importance to the group 
ideology. The students’ views on cinema, represented by Yazawa, think the medium with the 
pre-existing notions spring from the frustrations with the problems of political representation that 
they face outside of the confine of the group housings. The public infiltrates the private, injecting 
a violent force on the thinking power of film and Motoki’s thought. I read this narrative 
construction as an allegorical attempt to express Oshima’s frustration with the contemporary 
political arena and the insufficiency of the student ideology.
The narrative inconsistencies now flash Oshima’s own frustration to this line of thinking, as the students’ theories will soon to be negated by the director’s film form and story. Throughout the disagreements, Yasuko stands in between Yazawa, smoking, and Motoki, editing - a theorist and a practitioner. She attempts to rescue Motoki from regressing back into the passive being who is only capable of being-looked-at by insisting that the descriptive images on film can have meanings beyond themselves. She represents a desire to link theory and practice together through cinema. Her thought is rejected as a blatant disregard of “creative autonomy,” because by that logic bourgeois films would be acceptable. Motoki stays silent and focuses on the negatives he is editing. Ironically enough, he bursts into anger as soon as he recognizes the mundane images in the Ozueques film-within-film – exactly like Yasuko’s theory of film that meanings could leap out from beyond cinematic images. The images on film, charged by historical forces, leaks into Motoki’s body. That which is on the level speech-act (students’ theory) is disrupted by the capacity of the cinematic image to leak beyond itself. The submission of the practitioner to the theorist is rescued by the cinematic form, by Oshima, but cinema does this by inflicting mental violence on the practitioner – Neo-Realism filmmaking, that the auteur is constantly changed by his/her film, is incorporated as an allegory within Oshima’s narrative – and Motoki’s psyche is constantly under the assault of the images of the landscapes, the time-image, as he shoots his film. Hara’s face is now Motoki’s unstable mind. This surreal meta-fiction structure that Oshima employs exposes the weakness in the students’ film theory that springs from the frustration of political representation. The naïve notion of a proletarian weapon
film is exposed by Oshima’s film form and mise en scene, disagreeing with the students’
proletarian filmmaking represented by Yazawa. The brilliance in this scene lie in the synthesis of
narrative inconsistencies, contradictions, paradoxes – the film destroys itself on the narrative
level but reconstitutes itself on the level of form through a linkage or leakage to the
phenomenological body. Oshima’s film proposes a link between the ontology of film and the
phenomenology of the body, mutually constituting, through a synthesis of the presences of the
representational problematics in historical currents, the director’s own legacy, narrative
inconsistencies and disruptive cinematic forms. In short, to be able to look – to fill in the lack in
Motoki’s hitherto being – is to not overlook Motoki’s own film theory which is being rejected by
the ideologically over-determined Yazawa and the group relations. To view this film, to be able
to look at the ‘protagonist’, is to read the theory of film, constructed by the disruptive synthesis
of film form, narrative, and the extra-diegetic elements projected by the author and the historical
circumstances. The representational problematics faced by the Zengakuren, allegorized by the
interplay of a surreal and inconsistent narrative and the experimental film form, are brought forth
into the body through the juxtaposition of what is theorized on the dialogue level and on the film
form level. Here, cinema’s disruptive synthesis again becomes important, but this time it relies
on the linkage to history, rather than focusing on aesthetics in Shinoda.

While, sadly, this linkage escapes the student filmmakers’ attention, this
misinterpretation is absorbed into Oshima’s film form in its process of becoming an image of
history. An earlier scene in which the students decide that they should ask Oshima for help mirrors this scene of filmmaking - by employing this meta-fictional structure, Oshima brings in the literary interpretation that belongs to auteurism assigned to him, and challenges it with the historical problems of representation and admits in frustration that he himself is at a lost. In other words, the images of Oshima’s own struggles as a student activist and a political filmmaker are brought in through the auteur’s failure or refusal to give the students and the audience a clear answer. This is a leaking-image that resists literary criticisms that “shoot too soon to the socio-political level,” because history leaks in and transforms through film form and the crystal image of time into visible image-materials, or, as it is commonly called, aesthetics. This of course implies that there are invisible image-materials that are rendered onto other levels of visibility, as I have shown with *Double Suicide*. At any rate, cinema, with its capacity to represent time directly, deflects the top-down readings that pivot on literariness of the narrative, and Oshima’s film, with its indecipherable narratives, is an extreme example of this leakage of history. Again, like the literary interpretation of a specific politico-economic configuration that transmogrified into the dark figures of Shinoda’s puppeteers as movement-image’s physics, Oshima’s film confronts the literary problems that surround his name and brings forth the students’ struggle with political representations as cinematic and allegorical forms. In this sense, cinematic image itself resists the plugging-in of theory, because it is itself theoretical – in
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viewing cinema, there can only be a resemblance to theory, not the application of, in my view. This is how Oshima positions the nature of cinema within the historical problems of the students that he is attempting to depict, by theorizing alongside cinema. He does so by trespassing the notion of auteurial sensibility, which in itself - like how stars are mobilized in Hollywood vertical integration - is a sign of money in the production of cinema, by transferring historical problems into the body’s movements and the seemingly inconsistent plot points through the process in which cinema represent time - a time-image - and by destabilizing even the medium through which a direct representation of time is possible. No longer is Motoki’s psychological state the individual’s struggle with his own psyche but a pointing-toward a potential of cinema that confronts representational frustrations that appear around the students and Oshima himself with a nihilistic desire that attempts to destabilize the subjectivity of the students and Oshima the filmmaker. And, this desire will not rest until even the individual subjectivity loses its meaning – suicide. The unpredictability of Motoki’s psyche is a presence of time-image: the filmmaking theories, which then appear as his bodily movements in the narrative, are the resulting manifestations of the indiscernibility of virtual and actual, past and present (and future). From the phenomenology of body constructed by film form and the inconsistencies of the narratives to the elements of history and literary interpretation forcibly leaked in by Oshima, the symptoms of Motoki’s psychological are the interceptions of the cinematic medium in the economic-political configuration. The dialectics of two streams of film(-making) theories set up by Oshima reach
beyond “Marx and Freud” - as I will sketch, a third thing appears in this film, the body that grants various levels of visibilities.

Hope is not lost for the student filmmakers, however, in confronting them in his film by the virtue of the intrusion of the meta-level, Oshima is able to create a disruptive counter force in the narrative. While editing the film, Motoki gives in to Yazawa’s approach to problems of representation with ready-made schemata but is immediately subsumed into the cinematic image relations – the cinematic duration intrudes the bodily duration. Motoki stares at the mundane images of the film and screams: “that bastard who shot this must…” In effect, he acknowledges the presence of himself – Yasuko grins in satisfaction. Certain power is discovered to counter disidentification. Here, Motoki can no longer reconstitute his being as only back-projections as his body’s gestures, pulses and rhythms – the anger that springs out of editing a film – confronts the lack in the capacity to project and to look. He leaves the film editing house in despair and launches his deadly chase to recreate the second film-within-film. A counter-force to the relentless movements of disidentification flashes its presence for a brief moment, a destructive interval - Jihei and Motoki. They are characters that exist on at least two levels: first as the discursive body that forgets and second as the cinematic body that does not forget. Their looks are directed at the disappearance and also the consolidation of power. Specifically, this gaze leaps out of the narrative constructs and directly to the effect of American hegemony – a reverse leakage into history. I read Oshima’s filmic interpretation of the Tokyo War as a desire to map
out the coordination of the vectors of the representational, the subjective and even the economic that have appear within the unique being that is Motoki and his capacity to look (at time) but not project. Considering Oshima’s positioning of his protagonist and other student activists within his chain of negating the narrative by means of film form, we see the zones of the unpresentable within the political realm are nevertheless manifested in this strange being of Motoki as flashes of visible and invisible moments, affecting his irrational actions and bodily movements. He is therefore a character that represents time: time-images flash in his phenomenological body, created by cinema and Oshima.

**3.3 Becoming (Dream-)Cinema; ‘Motoki-Cinema’:**

It is thus not a case of the man who left his will on film but that of the film becomes the man and lingers in the material world in material form that points to the secret history of Tokyo War. This movie is in fact the film that leaves its will on man. Motoki’s constitution as a character in Oshima’s film relies on his failure of recognition in the events and frustrations around him. He had a past, according to his friends and Yasuko through back-projections, but that is denied by him. It is not that he does not remember – it is that his existence is the incapacity of recognition, thus the incapacity of imagination. In contrast, his actions are motivated by seemingly nothing – or, sensory-motor-schemata extends not into actions but into landscapes directly. Motoki’s making of a film becomes in itself a time-image that flashes the potential to go against this incapacity. The secret history springs from outside of the frames of
the film and intrudes like the image of time that tilts and turns Hara Setsuko’s head movements. The footage that came closest to Motoki’s memory in the conventional sense is the documentary footage. Yasuko narrates for him, but he is seeing another series of images intruding from an out-of-field, undermining the cinematic apparatus’s basic property of indexicality and recording functions. *He sees the footage as an audience but he sees another unseen visuality that will become his bodily movements.* Shall we call this an avisual inversion? This is to say that the realist documentary becomes as if a formalist Avant-grade film upon being viewed by Motoki, no matter what its stylistic or generic codes would dictate otherwise, which are also construct by the same perceptual process. Likewise, the second film-within-film seems like an impressionist art piece, but it turns into a documentary that is the only thing that records his bing. It is the evidence of Motoki’s existence, for it records a body’s once-was-thereness. In perceiving cinema as that which perceives and absorbs – in looking at a look – generic code collapses at its own construction. This is a case of generic constructions disrupted by an image of time. The dialectical image between documentary and fiction films that arises out of diegesis is more complex than Desser would have it, as it needs to be contextualized by narrative, which is fortunately inconsistent. This is a case that a character literally is composed by history – in being caught in the chain of disidentification, he moves – not merely by aesthetics.

For Desser, the dialectical tension arises out of the disagreement between the theories represented by Yazawa and Motoki expresses a struggle between “Marx and Freud, documentary
and fiction, exterior and interior, between, if you will, Lumiere and Melies.”

This is true, but when considered with the negation of the theories propelled by the narrative, as I have sketched repeatedly, the debate between Yazawa and Motoki is subsumed by Oshima’s film and becomes a mode of looking in the crystalline regime, where contingency is retained by false continuity.

The body in the historical current coincides with cinematic body. This dialectal pair set up by Desser only works insofar as the point of view of the real in the organic regime, where continuity and that which is localizable and casual are the actual linkage, is the only mode of viewing that is true. Desser points to a statement Noel Burch writes in *To the Distant Observer*: “[The Man] is an ambitious attempt to develop a dialectical form in that it does consider mechanisms of the unconscious in relation to the contradictions of political film-making.”

For Desser, this seems to mean that Oshima’s film merely points to a representational impossibility:

> The question is not resolved in the film, nor is it resolved by the film – the best Oshima can do is posit the question in terms of struggle, in terms of the film work. For while Motoki committed suicide at the start, so at the end, as at the start, a new Motoki runs into frame and steals the camera; the film loop continues, the struggle goes on.
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This repetition, to Desser, enters into the frame as memory. And, while he rightly points out that this memory is not that of an individual but acts as that which interacts with the present as historical memory, he nevertheless overlooks the complex interaction between film form and what is presented on the narrative level, thus reducing the inconsistencies of the film into a narrative construction. The struggle indeed went on by the end of 1969 Anpo renewal, but it does not have to be. A dream was appearing in Oshima’s formal theorization, and he was not simply setting up a dialectical image that narrates a tale of frustrated impossibility. Turim’s dictum that this film is a scenario of subject versus representation will therefore need to be modified.

Political subjectivity is disidentification but also the distance between itself to the disidentified subject that constitutes the assumed universal wrong as its object. What about becoming cinema in the precise act of making cinema as a means to traverse this distance? We would like to understand ourselves as contingencies, but Motoki understands himself as the power of false, existing in multiple incompassible presents – as the linkage or the leakage of the incompassible time-lines.

Motoki is not Motoki the body that contains the spirit - nor is he the existence that picks up the essences of life. The subjectivity that is Motoki is cinema, a film-within-film-within-film, but he is also a filmmaker – a filmmaking film. Oshima’s film disidentifies him so he makes a film as a political act. The superimposition of the temporality of dream and the temporality of bodily political actions does not mean that the two are separate entities - they are thought by
cinema-and-Motoki as one and the same and *as itself*. The Motoki-cinema is composed of time, dream and actions, as well as landscapes, rhythms and bodies: without a beginning or end. This is why the Motoki-cinema begins and ends in a Mobius strip. The fact that *The Man who Left his Will on Film* has a beginning and end is an impossibility of representation. That is, this film is not Motoki-cinema. Motoki-cinema is on the same level as the content of Jihei that appears in the destructive interval. The Mobius structure is not here to represent the inconsistencies of the mind of Motoki but to expose this interval opened up by cinema. Now, Motoki has made a film in Oshima’s film, but this film-within-film structure only exists in the narrative and the actual production that we call Oshima’s film. It is not that Motoki-cinema made a film, but that Motoki-cinema exists because it made a film, within Oshima’s film. This is not the case of the body of Motoki, the absolutely fragile subject, being indexed as the corporeality of the cameraman within the image of the amateur 16mm film that Motoki’s body *once was there* to shoot this film and therefore he existed – this level is only true in the narrative. But that Motoki and the 16mm film mutually constitute, and at the same time, obsolesce. This is not to say that the protagonist stirs up irregularity in narrative but that he is, as a character in the narrative, that which represents the incompossibility of presents.

It follows that Motoki’s actions in Oshima’s film contradict the film theory to Yazawa. He first dreams of a film theory but ends up giving in to recollection-image projected by Yazawa’s film theory, but as soon as the chase begins, as soon as Motoki-cinema appears, his
dream is retained. If Motoki is the cinematic apparatus then Yasuko’s body and desire are the creative forces within Motoki’s initial theory of film – the artist’s frustration. Yasuko’s superimposed body by Motoki’s film (the second film-within-film) is Oshima’s presence in *The Man*. The drive to become nameless, to disintegrate into the landscape (of time-image), is not unusual for Japanese cinema produced in this time frame. For instance, in both *Woman in the Dunes* (1964), and *A Man Vanishes* (1967), the narratives are driven by the dynamic characters of becoming nameless, the non-subjects, escaping the chain of disidentification by melting into sand and steam. We also see this in Jihei’s struggles. These are the post war bodies that attempt to escape political representation. The same body houses the Motoki-cinema, but at the same time Motoki-cinema rejects the death drive that looms in the male protagonists of this era. This is because Motokoi-cinema has Yasuko’s body as the screen of projection. As the reversal of Yasuko being raped, she ‘rapes’ Motoki by forcing him to watch the second film-within-film that would force him into the chase. It is Oshima, through the superimposed Yasuko by the film images projected onto her naked body – Yasuko-screen – who makes Motoki-cinema to become caught in the drive that looks at nothing, but it is the same drive that propelled Motoki-cinema to look even though there is no mode of looking yet in Motoki-cinema. He does not know what and where to look, or there is no mode of looking that could constitute that pronoun – a crisis cinema has endured at the end of the era of the movement-image. Rei Terada points out that “the hidden
premise of Cinema 2 is that no form of looking really follows that of the action-image, that that is the crisis.” Motoki and cinema have no obvious meanings; they are two obtuse meanings floating around, shooting in every direction, drifting, and yet seeking each other out indefinitely. It is a situation where the artist’s frustration flows in directly to a character’s action through the second film-within-film that resembles Ozu. It is the landscapes on film that propelle Motoki-cinema’s action of becoming a filmmaker despite there is not yet thinkable mode of looking. Motoki’s incapacity of his phenomenological body, that which exists hitherto as only back-projection, is extended by the ontology of cinema in an indiscernibility of movement of the world and the movement of action. This is the dream that appears out of Motoki-cinema’s chase of himself. His death in fact constitutes Motoki-cinema and it is not Oshima throwing in the towel in merely saying that it is impossible to depict the impossible by simply creating a narrative loop. The loop in narratives is part of the theorization of the film form. This – the chase propelled by the Yasuko-screen that allows for the making of Motoki-cinema – is precisely the auteurial actualization of Oshima’s frustration with the historical context as narrative constructions and formal choices, rather than any aesthetic similarities, common themes among films and so on. For the dream that appears within the film form in the process of making a film is one that was waiting to burst out in the author’s personal frustration with the movements, as we will see in another scene in which students discuss filmmaking.

---

88 Terada, 286
What then is the relation between the artist’s frustration and the exclusion of that which gave birth to the frustration in the first place, the brutality of historical condition? History that is outside of the film but felt by the historical auteur himself appears as Motoki’s disintegrated body, created by and absorbed into film, and remerges and reappears as if a psychological illness, but the unstable mind of Motoki’s character is less a study of psychology than that of time. Oshima’s usual cinematic techniques that allegorize the historical currents as a character’s interiority are again allegorized into a phenomenological character, Motoki-cinema. Its bodily movements are purely optical and sound images that do not extend into actions but directly into the movements of the world. Let me say here again that the leaking-image is the way in which history appears as film form, and then we can finally return to Igarashi’s historical analysis: the memory and the forgetting. The reason why I opt to look at this historical period using the lens of dream-image rather mechanisms of the novelistic memory is not only because my primary concern is with cinema, but also the mechanism of memory often mutate into function of the future, fallen into the movement of the colonialization of the present. It is a function of disappearance-consolidation. Indeed, in between the two moments of intensities, or the two visibly identifiable periods leading up to the Anpo renewals, the renewals of the security treaty, the economic infrastructure and the political climate propelled the exchanges and interactions of everyday life to become fully complicit with the dynamics of forgetting as explained by Igarashi. The students, however, did not forget. They were nevertheless affected by the motion of the collective amnesia. It is important to note here that this disappearance means the consolidation of
power. The shift propelled by the reverse course impacted the students and the political landscape tremendously, and consequently the organizational structures of the students movements. In this sense, that which was forgotten in the public became the obstruction in the wind, an object, of the dreaming of the student. It is as depicted in Oshima’s film, the student never did forget, but they can only act as if they have forgotten – a political problem that is allegorized by the film form. The rapid decrease in public support was but one elements of the students’ increasingly difficulty in mobilizing a coherent and unified movement. The efficiency of the preventive police action could only be maximized if the students became more violent, which is what the police was supposed to prevent. Public sympathy was at the centre of the choices of student tactics as well as the police. This is important to the scene in which the students try to come up with swift solution why they are discussing political filmmaking.

Their choices of tactics mirror a scene in Oshima’s film in which the student filmmakers discuss the definition of a revolutionary film as weapon. They discuss the specific failures of the past and the appropriate ‘solutions’ that can be transformed into the filmmaking. They discuss the current status of student movement, and the proper tactics to not be “morally bankrupt.” At this point, we can perhaps say that being ‘bankrupt morally’ means to live one’s life in complicit to the disappearance-consolidation under the geopolitical configuration in the context of the penetrating influence of the American hegemonic power. I read this “moral bankruptcy” not as the failure of understanding Marxist theory or wanting a communist utopia
but as simply this: “imagining is not recollecting.” Furthermore, they name few prominent filmmakers to help them device a type of film that would be effective. Among the directors that they name are Shinoda, Imamura Shohei, Suzuki Seijun, and even Oshima himself. Motoki stays silent, but glares at his friends intently. Oshima’s critique of the student movements as seen in Night and Fog of Japan (1960) that the lack of real political reflection comes from the problem of memory, from the almost ceremonial repetition of the failure of political reflection. The movement of the 50s, in which Oshima participated, intrudes that of the 60s, in which Oshima made a critical stance, and the 60s in turns, intrudes 1969 and 1970: what is Oshima trying to say here? Motoki’s vacant stare here will be actualized and mobilized by Yasuko’s forcing herself on Motoki, forcing the body projected by the cinematic images onto Motoki. The students here recollect the recent failures and attempt to makes films to correct these ‘mistakes’ with immediate ‘solutions’. This is the precise reason why Motoki-cinema differs from this scene of discussion: imagination and recollections. Motoki literally has no recollection on the level of the narrative but the real significance lies in Motoki-cinema’s non-desire to seek out a connection to the past as an actual. This is the real reason why Motoki is cinematic, Motoki-cinema: he is looking at a mode of looking that is insufficient for the struggle because it concerns itself with only recollection.
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Deleuze spends a great deal of time on the insufficiency of the recollection in relation to the past:

Bergson constantly circles around the following conclusion, which will also haunt cinema: attentive recognition informs us to a much greater degree when it fails than it succeeds. When we cannot remember, sensory-motor extension remains suspended, and the actual image, the present optical perception, does not link up with either a motor image or a recollection-image which would re-establish contact. It rather enters into relation with genuinely virtual elements, feelings of *déjà vu* or past ‘in general’ (I must have seen that man somewhere…), dream-images (I have the feeling that I saw him in a dream….), fantasies or theatre scenes (he seems to play a role that I am familiar with). In short, it is not the recollection or attentive recognition which gives us the proper equivalent of the optical-sound image, it is rather the disturbance of memory and the failures of recognition.\(^90\)

Recollecting is not the same as imagining, and recollection, or memory, regresses into a function of the disappearance-consolidation. What was forgotten in the public was still in the centre of the attention of the students, but they have failed to recognize the forces of the US hegemony despite their actions seemed to challenge it directly. Igarashi stresses this historical process, but is not

\(^{90}\) Deleuze, 54 – 55.
the way in which this historical process of forgetting appears in the body in itself a form of recollection-image that demands an actual without a part? Oshima, rather, harvests this disturbance and theorizes through film. Lippit says that “dreams are visual but not visible.”

Igarashi’s identification of a novelistic memory where the lost was absent is a potent critique but what is lacking in his project is an imagination, or an allowance for intrusion, for the visuality that is not visible. The effects of Oshima’s negating of narrative consistence are similar to what Shinoda has done with the destructive interval in the freeze frame where Jihei is transported across many mediums. The novelistic memory’s function of rendering certain things invisible is bypassed in Oshima and injected with new visibility from an out-of-field. Motoki-cinema is a film full of points of entry where intrusions from the out-of-frame and outside-of-subjectivity flash their presences.

3.4 The Intrusions of the Out-of-Fields: Dream Durations

In cinema, there are surfaces and what is outside but actually is completely inside the design of the moving images - an out-of-field. In its days of advent, the Lumiere brothers already exemplified this with difference between the factory doors and the flowing out of workers in Sortie d’usine (1895). But what factory has workers leaving in orderly fashion in two directions, left and right, without rushing in the direction where the camera was placed? What leaks out of the doors of the factory is not just its interiority and its actual construction but the artifices of
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cinematic apparatus, the author’s intention and conceptualization of the workers. This avisuality that leaks out in the interaction between surfaces and out-of-fields challenges the neutrality of a ‘documentary’, and the theory about cinema by the Lumieres. The sequence in which Motoki wakes up early in the film depicted in low angle and then high angle shots has another significance. When his body is pushed back by the depth of field into the background in the high-angle shot, it does not become mere background. In fact, the body that lies statically out of focus gains depth beyond its surface. Besides the fact that it is being seen, its silent posture, its smallness and blurriness and its absent vitality contribute to the phenomenology of the body, and through the circuit of time-image brings in the historical forces that applied violence on it – from an out-of-field, conditioning the visuality of the sequence from afar. The body’s provisional interiority projected by the narrative material and film form so far coalesces with the time-image of the landscape where Motoki was. His body is in fact affecting the discussion of the students. He was either at the protest or he was chasing after the police car: either way he was dealing with the police in the out-of-field, and the result is here in the visible bodily surface. The students, in turns, in this private realm of non-radical activities, are in fact dealing with the police logic. The frustration with the political realm intrudes the everyday life, and therefore the process of disidentification shackles the students. On the other hand, the dream-image propelled by the chase initiated by Motoki-cinema similarly flashes a potentiality. Motoki is lying here but his body is outside of the students’ discussion room. This potentiality from the out-of-field is still unharnessed at this point, and it will be actualized and brought into the presence of Motoki-
cinema by the chase, propelled by Yasuko. That is to say, by Oshima. The difference between Motoki and Motoki-cinema is the look that is directed at this avisual potentiality. Another difference therefore emerges: the duration felt by the man and the man-film.

This contingent changes in perception are theorized through film frames and sound. It is important to note right away that the outside of film frames is not a single, unified field – there are always multiple out-of-fields existing in the film and a thought could shift from one field to another without entering into the frame. It is equally important to remember that diegetic sound did not create the out-of-fields in cinema. Oshima’s techniques in employing the multiple of out-of-fields can be seen in virtually all of his films, especially in his films concerning the youth. In Cruel Story of Youth (1960), the television screens bring in planes of visuality of the on-going student and labour protests into the private realms where violence and immoral acts are committed by the protagonists, and the diegetic, off-screen sound continues the effect of the planes in both the interiority and the outside of the dejected youths, constructing an allegorical oscillating movement of the fragile subjectivity. The dejected youths’ indifference to the plane of visuality of the protests seems to be ineffective in sustaining their subjective desire to ignore the outside – their lives are about to be changed by a different duration. Durations beyond our own appear as a capacity to look when there is nothing to look. Like Ozu’s vase perceives Noriko’s life, Motoki-cinema perceives Motoki, giving him a new life. This new duration of Motoki-cinema seeks a new body that exists in directly linkage with dream-images. It is a dream that the
student body can become a creative subject that mediates and traverses the landscape of everyday crisis and direct political action, the second and the first film-within-film, respectively. This new “I” retains the distance between the disidentified subject and the frustrated body that constituted this distance. It is a new duration that strings the private and the public, ‘inactivity’ and ‘activity’, and “war” and “whisper.” This is what the cinematic offers to the student politics: the insight that the desire for an unpredictable singular moment is equal to not a desire for a complete revolution, a moment of destruction, but a duration that retains and at the same time relieves the pain. In a series of paradoxical actualizations of the unbearable frustration, the body “is no longer the obstacle that separates thought from itself, that which is has to overcome to reach thinking. It is on the contrary that which it plunges into or plunged into, in order to reach the unthought, that is life… [the body] forces us to think, and forces what is concealed from thought, life.”92 It is also in this sense that I do not see that Oshima flirts with nihilism as Sato Tadao would have it because his distrust in the movement only reinforces his commitment. His eyes tarries with what is unthinkable even for himself, a well-established political filmmaker and an outspoken critic.

Motoki-cinema also turns its lenses toward cinema itself. Cinema, for Deleuze, concerns itself with not representing a world we already have but with creating new worlds out of the existing worlds that are incompassible in the human duration. The first film-within-film, the

92 Deleuze, Cinema 2, 189.
documentary, appears differently to Motoki and to Motoki-cinema, and what has been theorized by the form also hints at a desire of Oshima to relief cinema from its generic construct. Motoki-cinema destabilizes modes of looking at cinema; from the point of view of Motoki-cinema, the first film-within-film becomes something like an avant-garde film since Motoki might not have been there to shoot it. An out-of-field of the documentary genre then intrudes: The documentary ‘retells’ history as much as it ‘affects’ within the body an intuitive understanding of the historical event, and in our examples, its form inflicts as much as violence as its violent events (student protests, farmer’s struggles and political unrests); it provides not a representation of historical event but a direct, affective time-image that injects a new ground on which the audience derives the event through an innate process of differentiation, simultaneously reconstituting and regenerating the dynamic energy of the violent movement of the historical past, and opening up new wounds within the audience’s body. Historical context – the story – is reinvigorated as the wounds begin their healing process, closing up no longer within the original body but with the pricks of cinematic screen – a new organ formed by the closure of the wounds. Historical context, to the film spectators, be they converted Marxists or apathetic viewers, at this juncture, has not yet obtained its power: here, it is the image-objects and its direct affective power propagated by formal intervention of the cinematic apparatus (including the filmmakers) that determine the initial momentum of the leap into the past. Is there no dream image in the form that supposedly reproduces reality, in documentary? If this is the case, why do we make documentaries? Dreams reveal to us in cinematic form itself as the present contains the past as a
verticality to be mined—the virtual image of the past of this present that doubles as an actual image. Their forms store further potentiality as time progresses in the chain of actualizing at different levels of verticality; when a certain past is decoded, thus actualized, as a future-past. This dream about cinema itself is retroactivity imposed by the third, absent film created by Motoki in his chase of himself. These movements created by the oscillations with the out-of-fields structure Motoki-cinema’s journey across the landscape of time-image—this is Oshima’s dream.

3.5 Beyond Either/Or:

Motoki-cinema’s chasing itself is the same search of the dream-image in the real world for actions to extend into. That which allows it to give chase becomes the wrestling away of the same body that constitutes the sensory-motor schemata. The body locked inside the chain of disidentification seems to have a need to disappear, but this is impossible, because ending one’s life is the ultimate acknowledgement of the body’s pain. For this pain seems to be the goal of the discursive body and the novelistic narrated by the state. There can therefore be no satisfying conclusion on the level of the narratives where the violent tactics of the students came from causal relations derived from empirical and historical materials, and yet this is how each political body, media or state, chose to make sense of the task at hand and act accordingly. In submerging into this vicious circle, various political subjects reinforce that which they discerned as a threat to their beings: the effect of the US hegemony and the geo-political deepening of class struggle to
name a few. The Motoki-cinema does not, it seems to me, emerge as an individual that can represent all students within the capitalist paradigm. In being seen by himself, he leaps into his death. In this sense, what he accomplishes is not a solution but an exposure that the desire for the unpredictable could simultaneously be a representational crisis, that is, the fatal difference between the cinematic body and the discursive body. This crisis is comparable to the hidden premise of *Cinema 2* that there is no mode of looking following the movement-image. The desire for the unpredictable becomes the pain and frustration of the artist. The film form in *The Man* is able to think the incapacity of the narrative, and thereby disrupts the narratological limits through a process of synthesizing the moving images into an assemblage. Does this not mean that there is a body in the future, floating and waiting for the new mode of looking to fill in? This particular convergence of crisis and desire in Oshima compresses into the crystal image of time a new power to look but as a virtual future, which seeks a future-past, that which might be too painful and thus invisible, as the point of contingency that propels the actualization of the mode of looking that floats aurally in the future-actual (the future colonized by the present-actual) and in the present-virtual. It is an ability to think about the inability to look. As if a body floating in the future, the crystal time-image propelled by Motoki-cinema appears only because Motoki needs to be in crisis with his thought: it is as if the narratological method needs to be inconsistent in order to depict this character ‘accurately’. Motoki is therefore by no means a character of schizophrenia consciously created by the Oshimanian style of experimentation. Rather, he is a character of the awareness of the impower – “the ability of an image of thought to think about its
inability” – through the circuit of the leaking-image, directly connecting that which is too painful and too powerful in the historical condition and the juncture where the cinematic apparatus interacts with the artist’s frustration.

Conflating Deleuze’s concepts in his cinema books, Terada explains that the when examining the act of looking, the question “why am I looking at this?” is not to be followed by “instead of something else.” Rather, the question would be such that the subjective look must confront what it flares up from the images of the past, present, and even the potential, alternative futures: “why should I look when there is no opportunity for intervening in what I see, which means that fully assimilating the field as given…will transform me, disportionately?” Such a question registers “the newfound totality of something that had previously been imagined to be mobile.” What is floating around the object looked at (say, a commodity’s invisible labour time, or, a certain form of perception required for the said perception) is entered into the cinematic shot-by-shot relation, a duration that is different from that of ours, and in turn is transported back to us as the time-image. While this newfound totality may have arrested what was invisible – what was “imagined mobile” – this is not a case of heightened awareness of reality, but a confrontation mode of perception that shapes further modes of perception, and the
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constituent becoming of the “I.” These are the ‘not-yet-seen’ images, and yet their familiarity frightens, shocks – as if seeing them in a mirror in a dream, the eyes do not yet trust them, but cannot help but linger. For me, this duration in which the eyes linger is where cinematic *mise en scène* occurs, organizing effectively actors, the props, space of the stage, and objects in to a new world that may leak into the world of the “I.”

Hara Setsuko’s face and looks in Ozu bear the load of this intrusion of the temporalities and the relinking of them. What can be considered the nascent movements of the new temporality springing from her face, the potential energy, come from the indiscernibility of the image itself and the virtual dimension which is alongside the image in the present but already archived in the past. The indiscernibility of virtual and actual, the crystal time-image, is responsible for the load that Hara’s characters have to carry, and filmic image-objects are adorned by this crystal image of time. Within this process of load-bearing, an unthought intrudes from both inside and outside without any movement of internalization or integration by the psychology of her character. In this same metaphysical movement, through the utter uneventfulness of the second film-within-film, the historical condition that Motoki exists in leaks into Motoki cinema. But this simultaneous moment of the chase and the appearance of Motoki cinema reveals itself “not in the name of a better and truer world that thought captures the intolerable in this world, but, on the contrary, it is because this world is intolerable that it can no
longer think a world or think itself.”97 Indeed, Motoki-cinema does not offer Motoki a better situation, but an opportunity to “make use of [his] powerlessness to believe in life, and to discover the identity of thought and life.”98

Therefore, Motoki does not emerge as an individual that can represent the students because he does not embody the fantasy of an infinite or perpetual resistance. And yet, he does not tolerate the historical condition and the fantasy of the infinite resistance that is responsible of the projection his ontologically incomplete body – he simply believes the intrusion propelled by time-image and gives chase, fully aware that this means death. Recalling the debate on the theory of filmmaking, we see that the Yazawa who accuses both Motoki and Yasuko as romantics in actuality fantasises a resistance that is infinite. Both Motoki and Yazawa desire for the unpredictable. The difference between them is that Yazawa’s revolution forgets the representational crisis that constitutes him, while Motoki’s searches for a brand new relinkage of the intrusions of the temporal durations confirm his belief of the body, the potentiality of his dream to extend into the world. In this sense, this is perhaps Oshima’s most potent critique of the student crisis in the film: that the student movement has ceased to believe in the world by ignoring the representation crisis, which in itself is the world that constitutes the student body, in their blind pursuit to create an absent centre that is the revolution, and thereby dismissing the

97 Deleuze, 169 - 170
98 Ibid, 170
dream springs from the frustration in the private. Terada puts it better: “within the utterly homogeneous, measurable time there is the interior cursing that inhabits the most coercive kinds of standstill.”99 Within this context, the body floating in the future requires a certain degree of resistance and letting go to appear – the same form of leap of faith in Neo-Realist and New Wave filmmaking. Living as a Japanese subject, or living as the discursive body that either obeys or defies the Police Duties Performance Law Bill, only reinforces and reconstitutes the interaction between Japan and the US hegemonic power that propels the forgetting. The Man who Left his Will on Film, Motoki-cinema, pierces Motoki with new worlds leaked from the world which frustrates both the student activists and the filmmaker, and lifts the man out of the discursive body into the cinematic body whose temporality is that of the dream. Oshima’s frustration connects, through the interplay of film form and historical currents, directly to the look that floats in the future, and it is only through this connection that he criticizes the central “bankruptcy” radical student movements – the submission to recollection.

That the US hegemonic influences on the everyday life were able to disappear in the Post-War imagination is paradoxically pivoted on the struggle of Japan becoming a national subject. It is important to stress again that this disappearance means the consolidation of power. This mode of invisibility is not nothing: infinitely inward, it is as if it is the puppeteer of the spirit. The conflicts between the body and the ‘spirit’ reveal that the former has perceived the

99 Terada, 300.
disappearance of the US hegemony. The rhythms and pulses of the body reject this specific mode of rendering invisible, and yet the body cannot react whilst the cinema of the new regime captures this resistance. What appears to look like the truth must be actualized in time to be perceptible, to even become an actualizable virtual in the here and now, but time has always scrutinized this movement in which truth appears, as crisis, as the incompossible presents. Because the becoming of an actualizable virtual is a time reversed - a time that floats from the future and into the past, the power of the truth lies in a future inaccessible to the here and now, a future which floats from an any-point-whatevers of the various the pasts of the here and now. There exist these any-point-whatevers, the not-yet-thinkables in the organic regime of images. The encountering of looking and thinking in the organic regime tires the mind out, and eventually, only the eye remains. The eye betrays the mind in tarrying with something too powerful, unbearable and devastating. The eye forms an alliance with what is absent in the mind in conjuring up an imagination. This is the power of the false we learn from Deleuze in Cinema 2. The form in which the imagined false flares up, supersedes and replaces the form of the truth. Hara Setsuko is this eye in Ozu: the forger of the power of the false. Her eyes imagined in the vase a possibility in the incompossible presents, carving out a power that comes from the indiscernibility of the real and the imaginary. Jihei could not escape Shinoda’s aestheticization of feeling of injustice. He is a sensibility that allows Shinoda to appropriate the object of wrong: or rather, the director who was trained in theatrical aesthetics appropriated it in an imposition of the universality that he wished to question. Oshima and Motoki-cinema go farther. They allow the
eye to tarry with the unthinkable and the unrepresentable. Oshima appears in the narratives and beckons his characters, or the forgers of the power of the false, to become the eyes that look the unthinkable into thinkability.
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