

example, regard the film viewer as like a side-participant in conversation; but which conversation? Since the viewer cannot participate in the film character's conversations at all, whilst the film director can at best be thought to converse directly with the viewer, the hypothesis seems incoherent. The Andersons and Hochberg and Brooks relate aspects of opposing positions in cognitivist perceptual theory; but in so doing they leave unquestioned the ambiguity of key concepts such as 'mental representation', as well as the more general modern-dress empiricist assumption that perception is a matter of mentally processing sensory data.

The heart of the collection—some 270 pages—lies in Part Two, 'Film Theory and Aesthetics'. As one might expect with such a capacious bag, its contents are very mixed. On the one hand, Freeland's and Leibowitz's essays on feminist film theory are disappointingly superficial—particularly when discussing individual movies in detail (one of the few contexts in which the over-insistent editorial embargo on interpretation as opposed to theory is breached). On the other hand, the essays by Carroll (on postmodern scepticism) and Currie (on illusionism) demonstrate the virtues of analytical philosophizing; they are argumentative, clearly focused, and penetrating, and leave even the dissenting reader with a much deeper sense of the issues at stake. The other contributors fall between these extremes: some appear to be attacking straw men, or at least to be desperately uncharitable in their readings of their opponents (Jeff Smith's critique of psychoanalytic theories of film music is particularly literal-minded), but others (including Murray Smith on Brechtianism and Bordwell on conventions in film) tackle an interesting topic with some subtlety and originality. It may, however, be worth noting that many of the most interesting and substantial of these essays show no commitment to cognitivism as a theoretical stance—even Carroll develops his critique without any reference to its key assumptions. This certainly supports the denial of monistic ambitions that the editors espouse at the outset; but it also suggests that the real value of the collection lies in its contribution to theoretical pluralism—to its editors' creation of a space in

which otherwise neglected topics and approaches might be addressed, rather than in their frequently intimated desire to annihilate one theoretical monolith and replace it with another.

STEPHEN MULHALL

University of Essex

Negotiations, 1972–1990. By GILLES DELEUZE. Translated by Martin Joughin. Columbia U.P. European Perspectives Series. 1995. pp. 221. \$35.

THIS CURIOUS pot-pourri of interviews and articles, originally published in France as *Pourparlers* in 1990, is billed by the publisher as a suitable 'point of entry' to Deleuze's theories. But the lack of a thematic flow or unity amongst the seventeen diverse entries and the characteristic absence from Deleuze's interviews of introductory accounts of the meaning and prior development of his more difficult concepts make the book unsuitable for this purpose. Readers unfamiliar with Deleuze's work might find his *Dialogues* (1987) with Claire Parnet a better place to start. Furthermore, those already conversant with Deleuze's work will find in *Negotiations* very little that is not better explicated elsewhere. He produced a prodigious body of work during the 18 years from which the book's selections are drawn, and the editorial emphases reflected by the book's five parts (ostensibly covering the two volumes of *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, cinema, Foucault, philosophy, and politics) narrow the possible choices but a little. One is left wondering why these works were chosen and not others.

This is not to say that *Negotiations* is wholly without merit. As a series of footnotes to Deleuze's corpus it makes for interesting reading on at least three fronts. First, it reveals several fascinating points of intellectual and personal biography, despite Deleuze's claim that 'academics' lives are seldom interesting' (p. 137). For example, in the first chapter Deleuze discusses the influence upon his later work of his training in (and 'escape' from) the history of philosophy, and gives a taste of the radical

experiment in tertiary education conducted during his years at Vincennes ('a sort of ongoing party'). Several interviews also provide an impression of the influence upon French academic life and thought of the uprising of May 1968. Deleuze describes these events as 'a demonstration, an irruption, of a becoming in its pure state' (p. 171). As such, Deleuze views them as entirely consistent with the enmity towards the politics of Unity, Totality, Reason, and hierarchical ordering that he believes characterized his own thought and that of contemporaries such as François Chatelet, Foucault, Guattari, and Lyotard. If philosophy is 'a guerilla campaign' against 'the powers that be', as Deleuze writes in his brief foreword, then it was clearly a less covert battle during and immediately after May 1968.

Second, the book illustrates how Deleuze's philosophical concepts relate to activity in a variety of other disciplines. Not only does he draw heavily on examples from film, literature, fine art, plays, science, and sport to illustrate his philosophical positions, but he considers each of these fields to possess some capacity for undoing the identity-thinking that he considers to detract from the richness of experience. As an alternative to the subsumption of particular events under hierarchical groupings and ordered arrangements, Deleuze proposes a proliferation of concepts and productions meant to express events in a variety of 'syntaxes'. Artists should devote themselves to creating different kinds of 'sensory aggregates', for example; scientists should proliferate 'functions'; and philosophers should generate more and more concepts.

Deleuze further holds that such projects must not be bound by traditional notions of expertise and specialization. After all, he argues, it is art rather than the media that best captures the 'becoming' of an event, and the literature of D. H. Lawrence, Kerouac, Burroughs, Miller, Artaud, and Beckett is said to contain more insight into schizophrenia than the work of psychiatrists and psychoanalysts.

Third, the book illustrates Deleuze's selective and idiosyncratic style of interpreting other thinkers and artists. His texts on figures from the received history of philosophy have always been

creative endeavours, containing as much Deleuze as Spinoza, Leibniz, or Nietzsche. In *Negotiations* (as also in *A Thousand Plateaus* and *The Logic of Sense*) we are treated to radical readings of works of art, sport, and science. For example, Deleuze consistently interprets Jean-Luc Godard's films and television shows as experiments in a logic of diversity. According to Deleuze, Godard presents chains of images that disorientate viewers in order to move emphasis away from rational relations between images, and to focus instead on the particularity of the images themselves and on the contingency of the movement from one image to another. Instead of trying merely to portray what is, Godard uses the conjunction 'and'—where one more image can always be added to a set of images without ever converging on a final point of closure—to emphasize the richness of becoming. It is thus in-between images that Deleuze situates Godard's depiction of life's dynamism.

But there are other examples in *Negotiations* where thinkers or artists are given a characteristically Deleuzian 'twist'. Foucault, for example, becomes a Nietzschean philosopher of forces, a vitalist whose aesthetics predominate over his studies of history, power, and knowledge. An idiosyncratic reading of Bergson's account of cinema grounds Deleuze's interpretations of recent developments in film making. Masoch becomes a 'symptomatologist', and Proust a student of signs. But however interesting these brief excursions, they are better established and developed elsewhere in Deleuze's corpus.

This book is, then, more a curio or 'sampler' than a key work from the burgeoning Deleuze library to become available in English. Notwithstanding several typographical errors, it is beautifully produced, featuring a clear and precise translation, a comprehensive index, and exceptional explanatory notes. The translator's notes deserve special mention, since without their accounts of Deleuze's many puns and allusions to obscure events and characters, much of the play and humour typical of his written work would have been lost from the interviews.

CLIFF STAGOLL

University of Warwick