

To me the very-heavy-in your film "DEUX FOIS," it's because it's a true documentary about the spectator place in a theater.

Your film is at the same time a story (fiction) and a demonstration (like an advertising demonstration in front of a store for example). The story is quite simple: it starts with a woman's close-up and ends by a man's close-up. Between the two, another woman is doing the 'Liaison' (Woman-man/Women-Man). The demonstration is also simple: what's most important in movies, it's not mainly what's on the screen, but is it to know that there is a place for the spectator; a place for him to be allowed to "see". One care about this, he is able to accept and to look at anything (sex, blood, politics, ect...). If one doesn't care about this, he is ready to break his seat.

Rare is films which 'hysterises' the spectator; that means, that he is 'out' of the little light 'square' that one make shines for him, and then, he is included into the square (we call that an identification, a 'projection') to 'carry' him into incredible fictions, where he is going to believe anything (for ex. Hitchcock in 'to catch a thief', where he just make you 'swallow' anything, for ex. Kazan in 'Visitors', fascist film. We had enough of that type of films, we had adore it (you too) but we just get out of it (especially you).

Others (directors) refuse to bring the spectator in the screen. Then, it's hat, panic; the spectator when his place moves - he won't recognize anything what's on the screen - For ex. Godard -

You, you are doing both (you can do it, as you are not talking about politics). Your film should be very useful to explain in cine-clubset at Center university, what's happening when one leave the spectator 'out' or when you have him participating.

But for this game, two players are required. You, the Spectator, and the Other. The Other, it's anything but you, but 'attached to you', it's a theater. Then, to a point, there is a place for the spectator to be part of the ... game... of 'hysteria'. In 'DEUX FOIS', it's the sequence shot in 'cinema' in the streets of Barcelona, where the Other (people, the crowd), to look over in your direction (at the camera place) and in the auditorium direction. Did you notice at your cinemathèque screening that people were laughing like mad?

It will be very naive to believe that they were laughing because IT'S just funny to see people going in front of the camera. They laugh because they are on the good side. Laugh = Fear.

0

J.P

On the other hand, you reject to play the game of 'hysteria'; the scene where you talk (mute) to the Spanish guy, who is sitting next to a 'heavy' scene for the spectator.

J O

P

But there is more subtiles combinaisons. When you buy a soap or when you fall down :O, obstacle, have the camera place. You bump into the screen glass wall. Then, you allowed the spectator to participate in what's going on with O(O=element who try to attract you as it is the outside world/ for ex. the birds sounds while you are eating/an arm who gives the newspaper in the little girl)

J/O

P

In that case, who changes? O of course. O, at the beginning is hostile then, domesticated (the spanish guy). At the end, he fills up the all screen and to my thought, it's at this moment that we understand that is the public because your film is the spectacle of your connection with the public in relation with 'a' public, and at the end you allowed the spectator to look at 'himself', and he wont' recognize himself. - The Cinematheque scene a few years ago yes it, when during the final endless close-up, spectators where completely 'mise en scene' by the shot, they were imitating, fews seconds of quiet, boredom, sleep and laugh that you make play to their 'double' on the screen.

Then, we will have: J+O negative J+O positive

P

P

$$\frac{O+P}{P} = \frac{P}{P} \quad \text{EXIT JACKIE RAYNAL}$$